



## 2. Study of Linear Differential-Algebraic Equations of Higher-Order and Characteristics of Matrix Polynomials

**Ramesh D. Lashkare, Dr. Jaya Kushwah**

*Dept. of Mathematics,  
Himalayan University, Arunachal Pradesh.*

### **ABSTRACT**

*This proposition adds to the hypothetical investigation of linear Differential Algebraic Equations of higher order just as of the regularity and singularity of matrix polynomials. Begin with ODE system:  $y' (=dy/dt) = f(y, t)$ ,  $y(0) = y_0$*

*Here we anticipate a development of  $y$  in time and there are various methods that guarantee a precise and stable advancement. A few invariant and dense structure under fitting proportionate transformation are given for systems of linear higher order Differential Algebraic Equations with constants and variable coefficients. Inductively, in view of dense structure the first Differential Algebraic Equations system can be changed by differentiation and elimination ventures into an equal oddness free system, from which the arrangement conduct (counting consistency of starting conditions and remarkable resolvability) of the first Differential Algebraic Equations system and related beginning quality problem can be legitimately perused off. It is demonstrated that the accompanying identicalness holds for a Differential Algebraic Equations system oddness record and square and constant coefficient.*

*For any reliable starting condition any right side  $f(t) = C^u(t_0, t_1)C^y$*

*The related beginning worth problem has an interesting arrangement if and just if the matrix polynomial related with the system is normal. It is demonstrated that this proximity problem is identical to a rank insufficiency problem for a specific class of organized and obliged irritation. Likewise a portrayal as far as the particular estimations of matrices, of the separation to singularity for matrix pencil is gotten. At long last, some lower limits for the separation of a matrix polynomial to singularity are set up.*

### **KEYWORDS:**

*Differential, Algebraic, Equations, Problem, Uniqueness, Linear.*

**Introduction:**

**Variable Coefficients Linear Higher-Order Differential-Algebraic Equations**

Consider the (linear implicit) DAE system:

$$E y' = A y + g(t)$$

with steady starting conditions and apply implicit Euler:

$$E(y_{n+1} - y_n)/h = A y_{n+1} + g(t_{n+1})$$

and rearrangement gives:

$$y_{n+1} = (E - A h)^{-1} [E y_n + h g(t_{n+1})]$$

Now the true solution,  $y(t_n)$ , satisfies:

$$E[(y(t_{n+1}) - y(t_n))/h + h y''(x)/2] = A y(t_{n+1}) + g(t_{n+1})$$

and defining  $e_n = y(t_n) - y_n$ , we have:

$$e_{n+1} = (E - A h)^{-1} [E e_n - h^2 y''(x)/2]$$

$e_0 = 0$ , known initial conditions

Where the segments of  $Aa$  relate to the voltage, resistive and capacitive branches separately. The rows speak to the system's hub, so that  $i_1$  and  $1$  demonstrate the hubs that are associated by each branch under thought. In this manner  $Aa$  relegates an extremity to each branch.

**Lemma:**

Let  $M(t), C(t), K(t) \in \mathcal{C}([t_0, t_1], \mathbb{C}^{m \times n})$  be adequately smooth, and  $\sup^-$  represent that the regularity conditions (3.12) hold for the nearby trademark values of  $(M(t), C(t), K(t))$ . At that point,  $(M(t), C(t), K(t))$  is internationally identical to a triple  $(\tilde{M}(t), \tilde{C}(t), \tilde{K}(t))$  of matrix-valued functions of the accompanying consolidated structure

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (M, C, K) \\
 & \sim \left( \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} C & C \\ C & C \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} K & K \\ K & K \end{bmatrix} \right) \\
 & \sim \left( \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} C & C \\ C & U_1^H C V_1 \end{bmatrix} + 2 \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & U_1^H \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \dot{V}_1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} K & K \\ K & K \end{bmatrix} \right) \\
 & \sim \left( \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} C & C & C \\ C & I & 0 \\ C & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} K & K & K \\ K & K & K \\ K & K & K \end{bmatrix} \right) \\
 & \sim \left( \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} C & 0 & C \\ C & I & 0 \\ C & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} K & K & K \\ K & K & K \\ K & K & K \end{bmatrix} \right) \\
 & \sim \left( \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} C & 0 & C \\ 0 & I & 0 \\ C & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + 2 \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\dot{C} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} K & K & K \\ K & K & K \\ K & K & K \end{bmatrix} \right) \\
 & \sim \left( \begin{bmatrix} V_2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} C & 0 & C \\ 0 & I & 0 \\ U_2^H C V_2 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} K & K & K \\ K & K & K \\ K & K & K \end{bmatrix} \right) \\
 & \sim \left( \begin{bmatrix} V_{11} & V_{12} & 0 & 0 \\ V_{21} & V_{22} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} C & C & 0 & C \\ C & C & 0 & C \\ 0 & 0 & I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} K & K & K & K \\ K & K & K & K \\ K & K & K & K \\ K & K & K & K \end{bmatrix} \right) \\
 & \sim \left( \begin{bmatrix} V_{11} & V_{12} & 0 & 0 \\ V_{21} & V_{22} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & C & 0 & C \\ 0 & C & 0 & C \\ 0 & 0 & I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} K & K & K & K \\ K & K & K & K \\ K & K & K & K \\ K & K & K & K \end{bmatrix} \right) \\
 & \sim \left( \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & C & 0 & C \\ 0 & C & 0 & C \\ 0 & 0 & I & 0 \\ I & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} K & K & K & K \\ K & K & K & K \\ K & K & K & K \\ K & K & K & K \end{bmatrix} \right) \\
 & \sim \left( \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & Q_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & C & 0 & C \\ 0 & C Q_1 + 2\dot{Q}_1 & 0 & C \\ 0 & 0 & I & 0 \\ I & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} K & K & K & K \\ K & K & K & K \\ K & K & K & K \\ K & K & K & K \end{bmatrix} \right)
 \end{aligned}$$

(where pointwise nonsingular matrix-valued function  $Q_1(t)$  is chosen as the solution of the initial value problem  $\dot{Q}_1(t) = -\frac{1}{2}C_{2,2}(t)Q_1(t)$ ,  $t \in [t_0, t_1]$ ,  $Q_1(t_0)=I$ )







**LEMMA:**

Let  $\|\cdot\|$  be a group of unitarilyinvariant atandards, and let  $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$  and  $B \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$  where  $m, n, q \in \mathbb{N}$  then

$$\|AB\| \leq \|A\| \|B\|_2 \text{ and}$$

$$\|AB\| \leq \|A\|_2 \|B\|$$

**Proposition:**

Let  $\hat{S} := (n-1)l + 1$ . Then

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\hat{S}}} \max \{ \delta_{\min}(W_{\hat{S}}(A_t, A_{t-1}, \dots, A_0)), \delta_{\min}(\hat{W}_{\hat{S}}(A_t, A_{t-1}, \dots, A_0)) \} \leq \delta_F(A(\lambda)),$$

Where  $(W_{\hat{S}}(A_t, A_{t-1}, \dots, A_0))$  and  $\delta_{\min}(\hat{W}_{\hat{S}}(A_t, A_{t-1}, \dots, A_0))$  are defined as in respectively.

Since it appears that we can not get a “  $\leq$  ” relation of  $\|W_{\hat{S}}(A_t, A_{t-1}, \dots, A_0)\|_2$

$\|\hat{W}_{\hat{S}}(A_t, A_{t-1}, \dots, A_0)\|_2$  to  $c \cdot \delta_2(A(\lambda))$  ( where  $c$  is a constant)

We do not, at this writing obtain a reasonable lower bound on  $\delta_2(A(\lambda))$  which is similar to that on  $\delta_F(A(\lambda))$ .

**EXAMPLE:**

We research the regular matrix pencil.

$$A(\lambda) = \lambda A_1 + A_0 := \lambda \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

By Proposition, We have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_A(A(\lambda)) &= \min \{ \sigma_{\min} \begin{pmatrix} A_1 \\ A_0 \end{pmatrix}, \sigma_{\min}(A_1 \quad A_0) \} \\ &= \min \{ \sqrt{2}, \sqrt{2} \} = \sqrt{2}. \end{aligned}$$

For any  $(\alpha, \beta) \in \{ (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \mid |\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1 \}$ ,

We have

$$\sigma_{\min}(\alpha A_1 + \beta A_0) = \sigma_{\min} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha + \beta & 0 \\ 0 & \beta - \alpha \end{bmatrix}$$

$$= \min \{ |\beta + \alpha|, |\beta - \alpha| \}$$

Since  $|\beta + \alpha| \cdot |\beta - \alpha| = |\beta^2 - \alpha^2| \leq |\alpha^2| + |\beta^2| = 1$

### **Conclusions:**

In this paper we have shown the theoretical examination of two interrelated focuses: straight differential mathematical conditions of higher request and the normality and peculiarity of network polynomials.

By virtue of square grid polynomials, we have investigated the issues of recognizing the consistency and peculiarity and of vicinity to peculiarity for customary framework polynomials. We have acquainted an estimation with check whether a given network polynomials is customary through the rank of information of its lattice coefficients. Subsequently in our examination, we have moreover given attainable lower constrains on the arithmetical assortment of eigenvalues (and) of a polynomials

eigenvalue issue  $\left( \sum_{i=0}^l \lambda^i A_i \right) x = 0$  if the relating matrix polynomial  $\sum_{i=0}^l \lambda^i A_i$  is regular.

For square and normal lattice polynomials, we have given a meaning of the detachment, to the extent the extraordinary and Fresenius framework guidelines, to the nearest solitary grid polynomials. A couple of fundamental and captivating properties of the detachment have been shown. In light of the sufficient and basic conditions of the consistency of framework polynomials got, a general theoretical depiction of the nearest division to peculiarity has been in like manner presented. From the depiction all things being equal, the closeness issue is fundamentally a disturbance composed and constrained position deficiency issue, for which to choose an unequivocal measurable condition has every one of the reserves of being an open issue. Regardless, by virtue of framework pencils we have built up an accommodating depiction, to the extent the solitary estimations of lattices, of the nearest partition, which honestly concurs with the got geometrical depiction for particular network pencils. We have furthermore inspected the closeness issue for two extraordinary occasions of lattice polynomials, and explicitly, presented a model wherein the nearest partition to peculiarity to the extent the spooky standard isn't as much as that to the extent the Fresenius standard. At long last, two sorts of lower constrains on the nearest division for general ordinary framework polynomials have been shown.

### **References:**

1. R. A. Horn, C. R. Johnson. Matrix Analysis. Cambridge University Press, July, 1990.
2. T.-M. Hwang, W.-W. Lin and V. Mehrmann. Numerical solution of quadratic eigenvalue problems with structure-preserving methods. SIAM J. Sci. Comput. 24:1283-1302, 2003.



3. P. Kunkel and V. Mehrmann. Smooth factorizations of matrix valued functions and their derivatives. *Numer. Math.* 60: 115-132, 1991.
4. P. Kunkel and V. Mehrmann. Canonical forms for linear differential-algebraic equations with variable coefficients. *J. Comp. Appl. Math.* 56(1994), 225-251.
5. P. Kunkel and V. Mehrmann. A new look at pencils of matrix valued functions. *Lin. Alg. Appl.*, 212/213: 215-248, 1994.
6. P. Kunkel and V. Mehrmann. Local and global invariants of linear differential-algebraic equations and their relation. *Electron. Trans. Numer. Anal.* 4: 138-157, 1996.
7. P. Kunkel and V. Mehrmann. A new class of discretization methods for the solution of linear differential-algebraic equations. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 33: 1941-1961, 1996.
8. P. Kunkel, V. Mehrmann, W. Rath, and J. Weickert. A new software package for the solution of linear differential algebraic equations. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* 18: 115-138, 1997.
9. P. Kunkel, V. Mehrmann, and Werner Rath. Analysis and numerical solution of control problems in descriptor form. *Math. Control Signals Systems.* 14: 29-61 (2001)
10. P. Kunkel and V. Mehrmann. Analytical and Numerical Treatment of Initial Value Problems for Differential-Algebraic Equations (in manuscript).
11. P. Lancaster. *Lambda-Matrices and Vibrating Systems*. Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1966. xiii+196 pp.
12. P. Lancaster, M. Tismenetsky. *The Theory of Matrices with Applications*. Second Edition. Academic Press. 1985.
13. R. März. The index of linear differential algebraic equations with properly stated leading terms. *Results Math.* 42(2002), 308-338.
14. R. März. Solvability of linear differential algebraic equations with properly stated leading terms. Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Institut für Mathematik, Preprint 02-12.
15. The MathWorks, Inc.  
<http://www.mathworks.com/access/helpdesk/help/techdoc/ref/functionlist.shtml>
16. W. S. Martinson, P. I. Barton. A Differentiation index for partial differential-algebraic equations. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* 21 (2000), 2295-2315.
17. D. S. Mackey, N. Mackey, C. Mehl, V. Mehrmann. Linearization of parabolic polynomial eigenvalue problems: good vibrations from good linearizations. (in manuscript), 2003.
18. T. Maly, L. R. Petzold. Numerical methods and software for sensitivity analysis of differential-algebraic systems. *Appl. Numer. Math.* 20 (1996), 57-79.
19. N. H. McClamroch. Singular systems of differential equations as dynamic models for constrained robot systems. Technical Report RSD-TR-2-86, Univ. of Michigan Robot Systems Division, 1986.
20. K. Meerbergen, F. Tisseur. The Quadratic Eigenvalue Problem. *SIAM Review*, (43)2:235-286,2001.
21. C. B. Moler, G. W. Stewart. An algorithm for generalized matrix eigenvalue problems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 10: 241-56, 1973.
22. V. Mehrmann, D. Watkins. Polynomial eigenvalue problems with Hamiltonian structure. *Electron. Trans. Numer. Anal.* Vol. 13. 2002
23. L. R. Petzold. Differential-algebraic equations are not ODE's. *SIAM J. Sci. & Statist. Comp.* 3(1982), 367-384.
24. P. J. Rabier, W. C. Rheinboldt. *Nonholonomic motion of rigid mechanical systems from a Differential-Algebraic Equations viewpoint*. SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 2000. viii+140 pp. ISBN: 0-89871- 446-X

25. P. J. Rabier, W. C. Rheinboldt. Theoretical and numerical analysis of differential-algebraic equations. Handbook of numerical analysis, Vol. VIII, 183-540, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2002.
26. J. Sand. On implicit Euler for high-order high-index Differential-Algebraic Equations. *Appl. Numer. Math.* 42 (2002), pp. 411-424.
27. R. Schupp. Regelungstechnische Analyse und Synthese von Mehrkörpersystemen in Deskriptorform. *Fortschr.-Ber. VDI Reihe 8 Nr. 478*. Düsseldorf: VDI-Verlag 1995.
28. Leonard M. Silverman. Inversion of multivariable linear systems. *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, Vol. AC-14, No. 3, June 1969.
29. G. W. Stewart. On the sensitivity of the eigenvalue problem  $Ax = \lambda Bx$ . *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 9: 669-686, 1972.
30. G. W. Stewart. Error and perturbation bounds for subspaces associated with certain eigenvalue problems. *SIAM Review*, 15(4):727-764, Oct., 1973.
31. G. W. Stewart, J. Sun. *Matrix Perturbation Theory*. Academic Press, New York, 1991.
32. F. Tisseur. Backward error and condition of polynomial eigenvalue problems. *Lin. Alg. Appl.*, 309: 339-361, 2000.
33. F. Tisseur, N. J. Higham. Structured pseudospectra for polynomial eigenvalue problems, with applications. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.* 23 (1) (2001) 187-208.
34. P. Van Dooren. The computation of Kronecker's canonical form of a singular pencil. *Lin. Alg. Appl.*, 27: 103-141, 1979.
35. P. Van Dooren, P. Dewilde. The eigenstructure of an arbitrary polynomial matrix: computational aspects. *Lin. Alg. Appl.*, 50: 545-579, 1983.