

# Efficient Set-based Process Monitoring and Fault Diagnosis

**Dissertation**

zur Erlangung des akademischen Grades  
**Doktoringenieur (Dr.-Ing.)**

von

**Anton Savchenko**

geboren am 29. November 1983  
in Minsk, Weißrussland

genehmigt durch die Fakultät für Elektrotechnik und Informationstechnik der  
Otto-von-Guericke-Universität Magdeburg

Gutachter:

Prof. Dr.-Ing. Rolf Findeisen

Prof. Dr.-Ing. Stefan Streif

Prof. Dr.-Ing. Bernd Tibken

eingereicht am 22. Juni 2016

Promotionskolloquium am 27. Februar 2017



**Contributions in Systems Theory and Automatic Control  
Otto-von-Guericke-Universität Magdeburg**

Band 7

**Anton Savchenko**

**Efficient Set-based Process Monitoring  
and Fault Diagnosis**

Shaker Verlag  
Aachen 2017

**Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek**

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

Zugl.: Magdeburg, Univ., Diss., 2017

Copyright Shaker Verlag 2017

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publishers.

Printed in Germany.

ISBN 978-3-8440-5212-1

ISSN 2192-2799

Shaker Verlag GmbH • P.O. BOX 101818 • D-52018 Aachen

Phone: 0049/2407/9596-0 • Telefax: 0049/2407/9596-9

Internet: [www.shaker.de](http://www.shaker.de) • e-mail: [info@shaker.de](mailto:info@shaker.de)

*“An expert is a person who has found out by his own painful experience all the mistakes that one can make in a very narrow field”*

**Niels Bohr**, Danish physicist (1885 - 1962)



# Acknowledgment

This thesis is the result of my PhD studies in the Systems and Control Group at the Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Information Technology at Otto-von-Guericke University of Magdeburg, Germany. I would like to express my gratitude to the people who have made this thesis possible.

Foremost I want to thank my supervisor Prof. Dr.-Ing. Rolf Findeisen for giving me the opportunity to pursue this work and apply my mathematical background in a much more practical field. Furthermore, I would like to thank Prof. Dr.-Ing. Bernd Tibken from the University of Wuppertal and Prof. Dr.-Ing. Stefan Streif from the Technische Universität of Chemnitz for their willingness to act as external reviewers of my thesis.

My most sincere gratitude extends to Philipp Rumschinski, who over the years of my studies was not only my main collaborator, but also a mentor and a great friend. The importance of our discussions for this thesis cannot be understated.

I would also like to thank my colleagues at the Institute for Automation, who for all these years provided me with advice, discussions and moral support. I am especially grateful to Pablo Zometa, Paolo Varutti, Petar Andonov, Janine Matschek and Fabian Marquardt. I immensely enjoyed working alongside Benjamin Kern, Timm Faulwasser, Steffen Borchers, Friedrich von Haeseler, Jürgen Ihlow, Emily Hammes, Markus Kögel, Lisa Carius, Michael Maiworm, Nadine Rudolph, Sergio Lucia, Tobias Bätge, Khalid J. Kazim Al-Chaabawi, Eric Bullinger, Christian Kallies, and Bruno Morabito. Besides, I would like to thank Ulrike Thürmer and Peggy Stein for their invaluable support regarding the organizational issues.

This thesis would not have been possible without the support of my family, to whom I am forever grateful for the inexorable love, support, patience, and faith they had in me. Thank you for standing by me this whole time!





# Contents

<b>Abstract</b>	<b>III</b>
<b>Deutsche Kurzfassung</b>	<b>V</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Contributions . . . . .	4
<b>2 Uncertain hybrid systems and feasibility problems</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 Uncertain hybrid systems . . . . .	7
2.1.1 Hybrid systems with discrete events . . . . .	7
2.1.2 Set-based uncertainty description . . . . .	10
2.2 Feasibility problem formulation . . . . .	11
2.2.1 Solution strategy . . . . .	13
2.2.2 Computational complexity . . . . .	17
2.2.3 Analysis, Design and Model Invalidation Toolbox . . . . .	19
2.3 Summary . . . . .	22
<b>3 Fault detection and isolation for hybrid systems</b>	<b>23</b>
3.1 Set-based fault detection and isolation . . . . .	24
3.1.1 Fault detection and isolation via model invalidation . . . . .	24
3.1.2 Fault detection and isolation via parameter estimation . . . . .	27
3.2 Aggregated models . . . . .	29
3.3 Simulation examples . . . . .	30
3.4 Summary . . . . .	35
<b>4 Diagnosability of hybrid uncertain systems</b>	<b>36</b>
4.1 Fault diagnosability for hybrid uncertain systems . . . . .	36
4.2 Challenges of the approach for nonlinear systems . . . . .	41
4.3 Quantization of the search space . . . . .	41
4.4 Diagnosability of hybrid quantized systems . . . . .	43
4.5 Summary . . . . .	45
<b>5 Notification system</b>	<b>46</b>
5.1 Quantizations guaranteeing diagnosability . . . . .	46
5.1.1 Set-based sensitivity analysis . . . . .	47

5.1.2	Iterative refinement of quantizations . . . . .	49
5.2	Online fault diagnosis algorithm . . . . .	54
5.2.1	Online diagnosis . . . . .	54
5.2.2	Notification algorithm . . . . .	57
5.3	Computational complexity . . . . .	58
5.4	Summary . . . . .	62
<b>6</b>	<b>Further computational complexity reduction</b>	<b>64</b>
6.1	Structural model relaxation based on causal reasoning . . . . .	65
6.1.1	Causal reasoning . . . . .	65
6.1.2	Lifting of the variable space . . . . .	67
6.1.3	Problem reduction . . . . .	69
6.2	Multiple objective structural relaxation . . . . .	71
6.2.1	Determining the monomial relaxation order . . . . .	72
6.3	Structural relaxation example: Multiple tank system . . . . .	74
6.4	Superstructure of models . . . . .	81
6.5	Summary . . . . .	83
<b>7</b>	<b>Efficient closed-loop diagnosability</b>	<b>84</b>
7.1	Modeling closed-loop systems in a set-based framework . . . . .	84
7.1.1	Complexity of diagnosability algorithms for closed-loop models . . . . .	87
7.2	Tailored feasibility formulations . . . . .	88
7.2.1	Proving attractivity in finite time . . . . .	89
7.2.2	Proving invariance of target regions . . . . .	91
7.3	Fault diagnosis of closed-loop systems . . . . .	93
7.4	Simulation study . . . . .	95
7.5	Summary . . . . .	103
<b>8</b>	<b>Conclusions and outlook</b>	<b>104</b>
8.1	Fault diagnosability . . . . .	105
8.2	Online implementation and computational performance . . . . .	105
8.3	Outlook . . . . .	106
<b>A</b>	<b>Bisectioning procedure</b>	<b>108</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Proof of Theorem 7</b>	<b>109</b>
	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>111</b>