Challenges in Implementing Nonlinear System Identification Techniques in Structural Dynamic

László Horváth
Researcher
University of Pécs Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology
(Pécsi Tudományegyetem Műszaki és Informatikai Kar)
Adrienn Szabó
University of Pécs Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology
(Pécsi Tudományegyetem Műszaki és Informatikai Kar)
aszabo11@gmail.com

Keywords:
- Nonlinear System Identification
- Structural Dynamics
- Model Structure Determination
- Computational Complexity
- Convergence Issues
- Parameter Interpretability

Excellence in Peer-Reviewed Publishing:
QuestSquare

ABSTRACT

Structural dynamics, the study of structures and their behavior under dynamic loads, is an area of crucial importance in fields such as civil engineering, aerospace engineering, and mechanical engineering. Accurately modeling these dynamic systems is fundamental for design, analysis, and performance prediction. While many systems in this field can be approximated using linear models, the complex and nonlinear behavior of certain systems necessitates the use of nonlinear system identification techniques. The successful application of these techniques, however, remains a significant challenge due to a variety of issues. A critical challenge is the determination of the model structure. In contrast to linear system identification where well-established model structures are used, the nonlinear equivalent does not offer universally applicable model structures, which poses a difficulty in selecting the correct form of the model. Furthermore, the computational complexity of nonlinear system identification algorithms is significant, mainly due to the involved mathematics and typically large datasets. Convergence issues also pose challenges in implementing nonlinear system identification techniques. Iterative algorithms common to these methods often face the risk of becoming entrapped in local minima due to the non-convex nature of many nonlinear system identification problems, preventing them from locating the global optimum. Additionally, validation of the identified nonlinear models remains complex. Although a model might fit the input-output data well, its performance in untested scenarios is not guaranteed. Furthermore, the lack of parameter interpretability in complex nonlinear models, such as neural networks, is an issue for engineers interested in understanding the physical underpinnings of their systems. Lastly, the sensitivity of nonlinear system identification to noise in the input and output data can impact the accuracy of the identified system. Despite these challenges, ongoing research endeavors continue to develop and refine methods that promise to enhance the effectiveness of nonlinear system identification in structural dynamics.

Introduction

Nonlinear system identification is a vital subfield of system identification which deals with the process of developing mathematical models of dynamic systems from observed input and output data [1], [2]. The need for nonlinear system identification arises in many practical scenarios where linear models are inadequate to accurately describe the behavior of complex systems. These systems can be found in a variety of fields such as robotics, ecology, economics, medicine, chemical engineering, and many more.

Nonlinear system identification involves a wide range of methodologies and techniques for handling nonlinearity, many of which are borrowed from the domain of machine learning and statistics. The process typically begins with the collection of input-output data from the system of interest. The collected data is then used to infer the parameters of a nonlinear model that represents the dynamics of the system. Commonly used methods for nonlinear system identification include polynomial models, neural networks, and kernel methods, among others. Each of these methods has its own strengths and weaknesses, and the choice of method can depend on various factors, such as the nature of the system, the quality and quantity of the available data, and the required accuracy of the model [3].

However, nonlinear system identification is inherently more challenging than its linear counterpart. Firstly, nonlinear models are generally more complex and difficult to work with than linear models. For instance, they may have multiple stable states or exhibit chaotic behavior. Secondly, they may have more parameters that need to be estimated from the data, leading to the risk of overfitting, where the model fits the noise in the data rather than the underlying system dynamics. To mitigate this risk, various regularization techniques can be applied to constrain the complexity of the model. Lastly, the input-output data may not be sufficient to fully characterize the system, especially if the system operates in different regimes at different times. To address this, more advanced data collection methods may be needed, such as designed experiments that deliberately perturb the system in order to gather more informative data [4].

The implementation of nonlinear system identification techniques in structural dynamics has become increasingly vital as researchers and practitioners recognize the limitations of linear models in accurately describing and predicting structural behaviors under dynamic conditions. Nonlinear behaviors often arise in structures due to factors such as material nonlinearity, geometric nonlinearity, damage, and large

deflections. For instance, structures subjected to extreme events like earthquakes, high wind loads, or blast loads can exhibit significant nonlinear behavior. Accurately capturing this behavior is essential in the design, analysis, and monitoring of structures, particularly in the context of safety and performance under extreme events [5].

Nonlinear system identification techniques used in structural dynamics can vary greatly in their complexity and accuracy. At one end of the spectrum, there are simple nonlinear models such as the Bouc-Wen model, which can capture certain types of nonlinearity but may struggle with others. More complex models can be constructed using techniques like the NARX (Nonlinear AutoRegressive with eXogenous inputs) model, Volterra series, or even machine learning methods such as artificial neural networks or support vector machines [6]. In general, these techniques seek to find a mapping between observed input (e.g., dynamic loads) and output (e.g., structural responses) data, which can then be used for prediction and control purposes [7].

Challenges

Model Structure Determination:

Model Structure Determination is an intricate and crucial issue that the scientific community faces, particularly when dealing with nonlinear system identification. The root of this challenge lies in the process of deciding the model structure, which is often less straightforward for nonlinear systems compared to their linear counterparts. While the complexity of the subject can sometimes be intimidating, delving into the details can provide profound insight into the challenges and possible solutions associated with nonlinear system identification [8].

Traditional linear system identification methods are known to be reliable, primarily due to their well-established model structures. For instance, the ARX model, or Auto-Regressive with eXogenous input model, forms the basis of a popular and widely-used linear system identification approach. Similarly, ARMAX (Auto-Regressive Moving Average with eXogenous input) models, another archetype of linear system identification methods, have a well-defined structure. This rigid structure is key to their robustness and reliability. The specified model structure guides the analyst during the model-building process, directing them on how to interpret data and predict future trends [9].

However, the situation is radically different when dealing with nonlinear systems. The crux of the problem is that there is no universal model structure for nonlinear systems, unlike the ARX or ARMAX models for linear systems. This lack of a clear guideline for structuring a nonlinear model introduces a significant layer of complexity. It raises several issues, such as how to handle the nonlinearity inherent in the system and how to establish a model structure that accurately represents the system while maintaining computational efficiency [10].

The choice of model structure is vital in nonlinear system identification. A model structure that fails to capture the system's inherent nonlinearity can lead to inaccurate predictions and poor system performance. On the other hand, an overly complex

model can result in overfitting, where the model ends up capturing the noise in the data rather than the underlying trend. As a result, it's a delicate balancing act between simplicity and accuracy, often dubbed as the bias-variance tradeoff in machine learning parlance [11].

There are several approaches to determine the model structure in nonlinear system identification. One approach is to use nonlinear extensions of linear models, such as the Nonlinear AutoRegressive with eXogenous input (NARX) model. This model extends the ARX model by allowing nonlinear relationships between the inputs and outputs. While this approach provides a structured framework for modeling nonlinear systems, it may not be sufficient to capture highly nonlinear systems.

Another approach is to use flexible, non-parametric models such as neural networks or decision tree-based methods. These models do not assume a specific form of the relationship between inputs and outputs, allowing them to capture highly nonlinear relationships. However, they suffer from a lack of interpretability and a high risk of overfitting, especially in cases where data is scarce or noisy. Kernel-based methods, such as support vector machines (SVM) or Gaussian process regression, offer another approach [12]. These methods map the input data into a high-dimensional space where a linear model is fit. This strategy often makes these methods capable of modeling complex, nonlinear relationships. However, they come with their challenges, such as the choice of the kernel function and the high computational cost associated with high-dimensional data [13].

More recently, ensemble methods like boosting and bagging have gained popularity for nonlinear system identification. They combine several simple models to create a more powerful and robust model. These methods can capture complex nonlinear relationships and are resistant to overfitting. However, they also suffer from a lack of interpretability, and their performance depends on the quality of the individual models [14].

Lastly, a promising approach lies in the use of deep learning techniques, particularly Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs) and Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) networks, for modeling dynamic nonlinear systems [15]. These methods have shown great promise in capturing long-term dependencies and complex nonlinearities. However, they require large amounts of data and computational resources, and their "black box" nature can make interpretation challenging.

Computational Complexity:

The algorithms for nonlinear system identification often present a unique set of challenges, particularly in their execution. These algorithms, by nature, are computationally intensive, demanding substantial processing power and time for execution. To fully comprehend this, it is essential to delve into the depth of the computational needs of these algorithms and understand why such resources are required [16].

Nonlinear system identification algorithms deal with complex mathematical operations to identify system parameters or states. These algorithms try to capture

nonlinear relationships within a given system, requiring them to work with a much broader spectrum of potential relationships and dependencies than their linear counterparts. For example, whereas linear systems can often be represented with simple mathematical expressions, nonlinear systems might require polynomials, trigonometric functions, or even complex mathematical expressions with exponentials, logarithms, or other nonlinear functions [17].

Moreover, nonlinear system identification requires the estimation of a larger number of parameters compared to linear system identification. This is due to the higher complexity of the nonlinear models and the need to capture the inherent nonlinearity in the system's behavior. Consequently, the optimization algorithms used for parameter estimation are computationally demanding, often involving iterative processes that can require significant computational resources and time, especially for high-dimensional systems [18].

Another challenge in nonlinear system identification is the size and complexity of the datasets that need to be processed. In today's age of big data, systems are often monitored and controlled using a multitude of sensors generating massive amounts of data. To accurately model a nonlinear system, it is often necessary to process all this data, which can be a computationally intensive task. For instance, deep learning methods [19], which have shown great promise in nonlinear system identification, are notorious for their requirement of large datasets and their high computational needs [20].

Furthermore, model selection and validation, which are essential steps in system identification, also contribute to the computational burden. Model selection involves the comparison of several candidate models to choose the one that best fits the data. This process requires the fitting of each candidate model to the data, which can be computationally intensive, especially when the number of candidate models is large. Similarly, model validation, which involves testing the chosen model's predictive performance, requires the execution of the model on a validation dataset, which can also be a time-consuming process [21].

Despite these challenges, nonlinear system identification plays a vital role in many scientific and engineering fields. It allows for more accurate modeling of complex real-world systems, leading to better understanding and control of these systems. The field has seen significant advancements in recent years, with the development of more efficient algorithms and the increasing availability of high-performance computing resources. Furthermore, the adoption of parallel computing and the emergence of hardware designed for specific tasks, such as GPUs for deep learning, have made it possible to manage the computational intensity associated with nonlinear system identification.

Convergence Issues:

In the landscape of nonlinear system identification, one of the frequently encountered difficulties lies in the optimization process: convergence issues. These are problematic scenarios that can significantly affect the reliability and accuracy of the nonlinear

system identification techniques, largely due to the iterative algorithms they employ. The root of this problem lies in the non-convex nature of many nonlinear system identification problems, leading to circumstances where these algorithms become entrapped in local minima, thereby failing to reach the global optimum [22].

To put it in context, the goal of nonlinear system identification is to create models that accurately reflect the behavior of real-world systems. To achieve this, these techniques often involve an optimization process to estimate the parameters of the model. This process is typically iterative, meaning that it repeatedly adjusts the model parameters to minimize the discrepancy between the model's predictions and the actual system output. This discrepancy, or error, is often quantified using a loss function, and the goal of the optimization process is to find the model parameters that minimize this loss function [23].

However, the loss function in many nonlinear system identification problems is non-convex. A non-convex function has a landscape with multiple valleys (local minima) and hills (local maxima), unlike a convex function, which has a single valley (global minimum). The iterative algorithms used for optimization, such as gradient descent, navigate this landscape by taking steps in the direction of steepest descent. But due to the complex terrain of a non-convex function, these algorithms can easily get trapped in a local minimum, mistaking it for the global minimum.

This issue is further exacerbated when dealing with high-dimensional nonlinear system identification problems. In these cases, the loss function's landscape becomes even more complex, with many more local minima, making it more challenging for the optimization algorithm to find the global minimum. As a result, the iterative algorithm can converge to a suboptimal solution, leading to a model that does not accurately represent the system's behavior [24].

Several strategies have been proposed to mitigate this issue. One common approach is to use random initialization and run the optimization algorithm multiple times. This strategy increases the chances that at least one of the runs will converge to the global minimum. However, this method is computationally expensive and does not guarantee success.

Another approach is to use advanced optimization techniques that are less prone to getting trapped in local minima, such as simulated annealing, genetic algorithms, or particle swarm optimization. These techniques employ stochastic processes to explore the loss function's landscape more thoroughly and have a higher chance of escaping local minima. However, they are typically more complex and computationally intensive than standard iterative algorithms [25].

More recently, there has been increasing interest in global optimization methods, such as Bayesian optimization or branch and bound methods [26], [27]. These methods systematically explore the loss function's landscape and provide guarantees on finding the global minimum under certain conditions [28]. However, these methods can be challenging to implement and may not be suitable for all types of nonlinear system identification problems.

Validation of Identified Models:

The process of nonlinear system identification does not stop at the point of model creation. Validation is a crucial next step that often presents its own challenges, especially in the realm of nonlinear models. The complexity of the validation task is due to several factors, primarily revolving around the nature of the models themselves and their ability to generalize to unseen scenarios [29].

Validation involves testing the identified model's performance on new data, which hasn't been used during the model identification process. This is done to evaluate whether the model can generalize beyond the data it was trained on, a crucial requirement for a useful model. For a model to be considered valid, it must not only fit the input-output data well but also exhibit good performance in untested situations. This is where the complexities arise with nonlinear models.

One of the most prominent difficulties in nonlinear model validation is overfitting. Overfitting is a situation where the model fits the training data too well, to the extent that it starts to capture the noise or random fluctuations in the data rather than the underlying system behavior [30], [31]. In such cases, while the model might show an excellent fit to the training data, it performs poorly on new, unseen data. Overfitting is particularly prevalent in nonlinear models due to their flexibility to fit complex patterns [32].

Another challenge in validating nonlinear models is related to the complexity of the model itself. Nonlinear models often involve complex mathematical expressions, making them inherently more difficult to validate compared to simpler, linear models. This complexity can lead to unexpected behavior in untested situations, making it challenging to ensure that the model is robust and reliable [33].

Additionally, the lack of universal performance measures for nonlinear models further compounds the problem. While there are well-established metrics for linear models, such as the mean square error or the coefficient of determination (R^2), these may not always be suitable or sufficient for nonlinear models. The validation process thus needs to incorporate diverse measures that can adequately capture the performance of the nonlinear model across various aspects, adding another layer of complexity to the task.

Despite these challenges, several strategies can be used to validate nonlinear models effectively. One such strategy is to split the available data into training and validation sets [34], [35]. The model is identified using the training set and validated on the separate validation set, providing an unbiased estimate of its generalization performance. Another common strategy is to use cross-validation, where the data is split into several subsets, and the model is trained and validated multiple times on different combinations of these subsets [36].

In recent years, Bayesian methods have gained traction for model validation. These methods provide a probabilistic measure of uncertainty in the model's predictions, which can be particularly useful for complex nonlinear models. Additionally,

techniques like bootstrapping can be used to estimate the variability in the model's predictions, further enhancing the validation process [37].

Parameter Interpretability:

The implementation of nonlinear models, especially those based on advanced methodologies like neural networks, frequently presents an obstacle in the form of reduced parameter interpretability. This lack of interpretability can be troublesome for engineers and scientists, who often seek not just to predict system behavior, but also to understand the underlying physics or mechanistic properties driving that behavior.

When we consider traditional parametric models, their strength lies in their interpretability. The parameters in these models usually have a clear physical or mathematical interpretation, such as rates of change, time constants, or equilibrium points. Consequently, an adjustment in these parameters corresponds to a change in a specific characteristic of the system. This interpretability not only helps in understanding the system but also aids in troubleshooting, system design, and control.

In contrast, the parameters in a nonlinear model, particularly in advanced models like neural networks, lack this direct interpretability. A neural network consists of multiple layers of interconnected nodes (neurons), and the "parameters" of the network are the weights and biases of these connections. However, these weights and biases don't usually correspond to any identifiable or intuitive physical quantities in the system being modeled. In essence, neural networks function more as a 'black box,' where input data goes in, and output data comes out, but the transformations in between are difficult to interpret in meaningful terms [38].

This characteristic of neural networks and other complex nonlinear models can be problematic in engineering contexts. If the model is not interpretable, it can be difficult to gain insights about the system, to debug issues with the model, or to use the model to design system improvements. Moreover, it can be challenging to establish trust in a model if its workings are not understood. This is particularly crucial in fields like healthcare, finance, or critical infrastructure, where model-based decisions can have significant real-world impacts.

Despite these challenges, strides are being made to improve the interpretability of complex nonlinear models. Techniques like sensitivity analysis, which investigates how changes in the inputs affect the output of the model, can provide some insight into the model's behavior. Visualization techniques for neural networks, like layer activation maps or feature maps, can also help to shed light on what the model is "focusing on" when making its predictions.

Moreover, hybrid modeling approaches are emerging that combine data-driven models like neural networks with physics-based models. These hybrid models leverage the strengths of both approaches, providing the flexibility and predictive power of neural networks, along with the interpretability and physical consistency of traditional models [39].

Noise Influence:

Nonlinear system identification, while potent in capturing the intricacies of complex systems, is often found to be highly sensitive to noise in the input and output data. Noise, which refers to random or inconsistent fluctuations, can have a pronounced effect on the identification process and, consequently, severely impact the accuracy of the resultant models. This sensitivity arises from the intrinsic properties of nonlinear systems and the methods employed for their identification.

Noise in system identification is inevitable as it comes from various sources such as sensor inaccuracies, environmental disturbances, and measurement errors. While these disturbances are usually treated as negligible in linear system identification due to the robustness of linear models to noise, the same cannot be said for nonlinear systems [40]. Nonlinear system identification algorithms often interpret noise as a part of the system's dynamics due to their ability to fit complex patterns, leading to models that are not only inaccurate but also more complex than necessary, a situation often referred to as overfitting.

In addition, the presence of noise can distort the underlying relationships in the data, making it harder for the identification algorithm to correctly capture the system's nonlinearities. Noise can even introduce apparent nonlinearities where none exist, leading to the incorrect identification of a system as nonlinear. The impact of noise is particularly pronounced in cases where the nonlinear dynamics are subtle or when the noise level is high compared to the signal [41].

Moreover, nonlinear system identification often involves an optimization process to estimate model parameters. Noise can affect the optimization landscape, introducing local minima where none would exist in the absence of noise. This can lead to convergence issues, with optimization algorithms getting stuck in these noise-induced local minima, thereby further affecting the accuracy of the identified system.

To address these issues, several noise handling techniques are employed. One common approach is to use noise filtering or smoothing techniques on the input and output data before the identification process. These techniques aim to reduce the noise level while preserving the underlying system dynamics, providing a cleaner dataset for the identification algorithm.

Another approach is to incorporate noise models directly into the system identification process. These noise models account for the noise in the data, allowing the identification algorithm to separate the system dynamics from the noise. This is particularly useful in cases where the noise cannot be easily filtered out or where the noise structure contains valuable information about the system.

Moreover, advanced identification algorithms have been developed that are more robust to noise, such as regularized or Bayesian methods. These algorithms incorporate a penalty for model complexity, preventing overfitting and making the identified models more robust to noise.

Conclusion

Nonlinear system identification plays a crucial role in various fields, including engineering, economics, biology, and neuroscience, to name a few. It involves extracting accurate models from data that describe the underlying dynamics of complex systems. However, this process is not without its challenges. In this essay, we will delve into three significant issues faced in nonlinear system identification: model structure determination, computational complexity, and convergence issues.

In linear system identification, well-established model structures like ARX and ARMAX make the process more straightforward and provide reliable results. Unfortunately, when it comes to nonlinear systems, there is no universal model structure that can be universally applied [42]. This lack of a standardized approach makes determining the appropriate form of the model a daunting task.

Nonlinear systems can exhibit highly intricate and unpredictable behaviors, often characterized by nonlinearity, time-variance, and various interactions between system variables. Capturing such complexity requires more flexible and versatile model structures. Some commonly used nonlinear models include Volterra series, neural networks, polynomial models, and state-space models [43].

However, choosing the correct model structure is challenging due to the trade-off between model complexity and generalization ability. An overly complex model may lead to overfitting, where the model performs well on the training data but fails to generalize to new, unseen data. On the other hand, an overly simplistic model may not capture all the underlying dynamics, resulting in poor performance.

Researchers often use model selection techniques, cross-validation, and goodness-of-fit measures to identify the optimal model structure. Nevertheless, the process remains an art as much as a science, and domain expertise and intuition play a significant role in determining the suitable model structure for a given problem.

Nonlinear system identification algorithms are computationally intensive due to the inherent complexity of the underlying mathematics and the large datasets involved. Unlike linear models, nonlinear models often have more parameters and involve non-polynomial functions, leading to increased computation time [44].

Many nonlinear system identification techniques rely on numerical optimization methods to estimate the model parameters that best fit the data. These optimization algorithms involve iterative processes that refine the parameter estimates until a convergence criterion is met. Examples of commonly used optimization techniques include the Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm, genetic algorithms, particle swarm optimization, and simulated annealing.

As the number of model parameters increases, the optimization process becomes more demanding, often resulting in longer execution times. Additionally, the presence of noise in the data and potential model non-identifiability (multiple parameter combinations yielding similar model behavior) further complicates the optimization process.

To address computational challenges, researchers have explored parallel processing, distributed computing, and optimization algorithms tailored for specific model structures. These approaches aim to leverage the computational power of modern hardware and reduce the overall identification time.

The non-convex nature of many nonlinear system identification problems introduces convergence issues during the optimization process. Non-convexity means that the objective function (usually a measure of the model's fit to the data) has multiple local minima, making it challenging for iterative optimization algorithms to find the global minimum, which represents the best model fit [45].

When an optimization algorithm gets trapped in a local minimum, it converges to a suboptimal set of parameter values, leading to inaccurate model estimates. To mitigate this issue, researchers often attempt to run the optimization process multiple times with different initial parameter values or use global optimization techniques that can explore the parameter space more thoroughly.

In some cases, researchers employ regularization techniques to prevent overfitting and reduce the sensitivity of the optimization process to initial parameter guesses. Regularization adds penalty terms to the objective function to discourage excessive parameter values, leading to more stable and robust optimization. Once a nonlinear model is identified from input-output data, it is essential to assess its performance in untested situations. A model may fit the training data well but fail to generalize to new data, a phenomenon known as overfitting. Overfitting occurs when the model captures noise and idiosyncrasies in the training data, leading to poor performance on unseen data.

To address this issue, researchers use validation techniques such as cross-validation and hold-out validation. Cross-validation involves partitioning the data into multiple subsets and training the model on different combinations of these subsets. The model's performance is then evaluated on the remaining data not used during training. Hold-out validation, on the other hand, involves splitting the data into training and testing sets, training the model on the training set, and evaluating its performance on the testing set.

While these validation techniques provide valuable insights into model generalization, they may not fully capture the real-world complexity and variations. In practice, validating the identified models often involves testing them in controlled experiments or comparing their predictions to actual system responses.

Nonlinear models, particularly those based on advanced techniques like neural networks, are often criticized for their lack of parameter interpretability. In traditional linear models, each parameter has a clear physical meaning, allowing engineers and researchers to gain valuable insights into the underlying system dynamics.

In contrast, nonlinear models, especially deep neural networks, can have millions of parameters, making it challenging to understand the individual contributions of each parameter to the overall system behavior. This lack of interpretability poses a

significant challenge for engineers and scientists who aim to comprehend the underlying physics of the system they are modeling.

To address this issue, researchers have explored various approaches to interpret black-box models, such as sensitivity analysis, feature visualization, and layer-wise relevance propagation. These methods attempt to highlight the most influential features or inputs and provide some level of insight into the model's decision-making process.

Additionally, simplifying the model structure or using more interpretable nonlinear models, such as decision trees or rule-based models, can help improve parameter interpretability at the cost of potentially reduced model accuracy. Noise in input and output data is an inherent part of real-world systems. However, nonlinear system identification can be highly sensitive to noise, and even small levels of noise can significantly impact the accuracy of the identified model. Noise can distort the underlying dynamics of the system and introduce spurious correlations in the data.

References

[1] O. Nelles and O. Nelles, "Nonlinear dynamic system identification," 2020.

[2] D. Gedon, N. Wahlström, T. B. Schön, and L. Ljung, "Deep state space models for nonlinear system identification," *arXiv [eess.SY]*, 31-Mar-2020.

[3] H. Chen, Y. Chen, and L. Yang, "Intelligent early structural health prognosis with nonlinear system identification for RFID signal analysis," *Comput. Commun.*, vol. 157, pp. 150–161, May 2020.

[4] M. Eriten, M. Kurt, G. Luo, D. Michael McFarland, L. A. Bergman, and A. F. Vakakis, "Nonlinear system identification of frictional effects in a beam with a bolted joint connection," *Mech. Syst. Signal Process.*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 245–264, Aug. 2013.

[5] A. Yazdizadeh and K. Khorasani, "Adaptive time delay neural network structures for nonlinear system identification," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 207–240, Aug. 2002.

[6] H. Du and N. Zhang, "Application of evolving Takagi–Sugeno fuzzy model to nonlinear system identification," *Appl. Soft Comput.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 676–686, Jan. 2008.

[7] V. Prasad and B. W. Bequette, "Nonlinear system identification and model reduction using artificial neural networks," *Comput. Chem. Eng.*, vol. 27, no. 12, pp. 1741–1754, Dec. 2003.

[8] E. Reynders, G. Wursten, and G. De Roeck, "Output-only structural health monitoring in changing environmental conditions by means of nonlinear system identification," *Structural Health Monitoring*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 82–93, Jan. 2014.

[9] X. Wu, H. Han, Z. Liu, and J. Qiao, "Data-Knowledge-Based Fuzzy Neural Network for Nonlinear System Identification," *IEEE Trans. Fuzzy Syst.*, vol. 28, no. 9, pp. 2209–2221, Sep. 2020.

[10] H.-J. Rong, N. Sundararajan, G.-B. Huang, and P. Saratchandran, "Sequential Adaptive Fuzzy Inference System (SAFIS) for nonlinear system identification and prediction," *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, vol. 157, no. 9, pp. 1260–1275, May 2006.

[11] Y. S. Lee, A. F. Vakakis, D. M. McFarland, and L. A. Bergman, "A global-local approach to nonlinear system identification: A review," *Struct. Contr. Health Monit.*, vol. 17, no. 7, pp. 742–760, Nov. 2010.
[12] K. Nova, A. Umaamaheshvari, S. S. Jacob, G. Banu, M. S. P. Balaji, and S. Srithar, "Floyd–Warshalls algorithm and modified advanced encryption standard for secured communication in VANET," *Measurement: Sensors*, vol. 27, p. 100796, Jun. 2023.
[13] E. de la Rosa and W. Yu, "Randomized algorithms for nonlinear system identification with deep learning modification," *Inf. Sci.* , vol. 364–365, pp. 197–212, Oct. 2016.
[14] A. Kroll and H. Schulte, "Benchmark problems for nonlinear system identification and control using Soft Computing methods: Need and overview," *Appl. Soft Comput.*, vol. 25, pp. 496–513, Dec. 2014.
[15] K. Nova, "Analyzing Keystroke Dynamics for User Authentication: A Comparative Study of Feature Extractions and Machine Learning Models," *Sage Science Review of Applied Machine Learning*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 67–80, 2022.
[16] S. Jahandari, A. Kalhor, and B. N. Araabi, "Order determination and robust adaptive control of unknown deterministic input-affine systems: An operational controller," in *2016 IEEE 55th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2016, pp. 3831–3836.
[17] M. Thothadri, R. A. Casas, F. C. Moon, R. D'Andrea, and C. R. Johnson, "Nonlinear System Identification of Multi-Degree-of-Freedom Systems," *Nonlinear Dyn.*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 307–322, May 2003.
[18] J. Tavoosi, A. A. Suratgar, and M. B. Menhaj, "Stable ANFIS2 for Nonlinear System Identification," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 182, pp. 235–246, Mar. 2016.
[19] A. Nallathambi and K. Nova, "Deep Learning-Enabled Edge Computing and IoT," in *Convergence of Deep Learning and Internet of Things: Computing and Technology*, IGI Global, 2023, pp. 71–95.
[20] K. Nova, "The Art of Elasticity and Scalability of Modern Cloud Computing World for Automation," *American Journal of Computer Architecture*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 1–6, 2019.
[21] B. Boots and G. Gordon, "Two-Manifold Problems with Applications to Nonlinear System Identification," *arXiv [cs.LG]*, 18-Jun-2012.
[22] P. Koukoulas and N. Kalouptsidis, "Nonlinear system identification using Gaussian inputs," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 43, no. 8, pp. 1831–1841, Aug. 1995.
[23] T. Ogunfunmi, *Adaptive nonlinear system identification: The Volterra and wiener model approaches*, 2007th ed. New York, NY: Springer, 2007.
[24] B. Subudhi and D. Jena, "A differential evolution based neural network approach to nonlinear system identification," *Appl. Soft Comput.*, 2011.
[25] S. Jahandari, F. F. Beyglou, and A. Kalhor, "A robust adaptive linear control for a ball handling mechanism," *2014 Second RSI/ISM*, 2014.
[26] S. Lu and T. Basar, "Robust nonlinear system identification using neural-network models," *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw.*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 407–429, 1998.
[27] E. Bradley, M. Easley, and R. Stolle, "Reasoning about nonlinear system identification," *Artif. Intell.*, vol. 133, no. 1, pp. 139–188, Dec. 2001.
[28] K. Nova, "AI-Enabled Water Management Systems: An Analysis of System Components and Interdependencies for Water Conservation," *ERST*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 105–124, Jun. 2023.

[29] T. A. Johansen, “On Tikhonov regularization, bias and variance in nonlinear system identification,” *Automatica* , vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 441–446, Mar. 1997.
[30] J. Roll, A. Nazin, and L. Ljung, “Nonlinear system identification via direct weight optimization,” *Automatica* , vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 475–490, Mar. 2005.
[31] C. R. Farrar, K. Worden, M. D. Todd, G. Park, and J. Nichols, “Nonlinear system identification for damage detection,” 2007.
[32] X. Zhou, C. Yang, and W. Gui, “Nonlinear system identification and control using state transition algorithm,” *Appl. Math. Comput.*, vol. 226, pp. 169–179, Jan. 2014.
[33] S. Jahandari, A. Kalhor, and B. N. Araabi, “Order determination and transfer function estimation of linear mimo systems: application to environmental modeling,” *Environmental Modeling and Software*, 2016.
[34] A. H. Ribeiro, K. Tiels, J. Umenberger, T. B. Schön, and L. A. Aguirre, “On the smoothness of nonlinear system identification,” *Automatica* , vol. 121, p. 109158, Nov. 2020.
[35] M. Schoukens and J. P. Noël, “Three benchmarks addressing open challenges in nonlinear system identification,” *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 2017.
[36] S. Jahandari, A. Kalhor, and B. N. Araabi, “Online forecasting of synchronous time series based on evolving linear models,” *IEEE Transactions on*, 2018.
[37] W. Spinelli, L. Piroddi, and M. Lovera, “On the role of prefiltering in nonlinear system identification,” *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 50, no. 10, pp. 1597–1602, Oct. 2005.
[38] T. Wigren and J. Schoukens, “Three free data sets for development and benchmarking in nonlinear system identification,” in *2013 European Control Conference (ECC)*, 2013, pp. 2933–2938.
[39] L. Ljung, “SOME ASPECTS ON NONLINEAR SYSTEM IDENTIFICATION,” *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 553–564, Jan. 2006.
[40] S. Ansari-Rad, S. Jahandari, and A. Kalhor, “Identification and control of mimo linear systems under sufficient and insufficient excitation,” *2018 Annual American*, 2018.
[41] A. Novak, L. Simon, F. Kadlec, and P. Lotton, “Nonlinear System Identification Using Exponential Swept-Sine Signal,” *IEEE Trans. Instrum. Meas.*, vol. 59, no. 8, pp. 2220–2229, Aug. 2010.
[42] S. Jahandari, A. Kalhor, and B. N. Araabi, “A self tuning regulator design for nonlinear time varying systems based on evolving linear models,” *Evolving Systems*, 2016.
[43] J. de J. Rubio and W. Yu, “Stability Analysis of Nonlinear System Identification via Delayed Neural Networks,” *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. Express Briefs*, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. 161–165, Feb. 2007.
[44] J. C. Bongard and H. Lipson, “Nonlinear system identification using coevolution of models and tests,” *IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput.*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 361–384, Aug. 2005.
[45] G. Kerschen, K. Worden, A. F. Vakakis, and J.-C. Golinval, “Past, present and future of nonlinear system identification in structural dynamics,” *Mech. Syst. Signal Process.*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 505–592, Apr. 2006.