

Identifying the Dynamics of a System by Leveraging Data from Similar Systems

Lei Xin, Lintao Ye, George Chiu, Shreyas Sundaram

Abstract—We study the problem of identifying the dynamics of a linear system when one has access to samples generated by a similar (but not identical) system, in addition to data from the true system. We use a weighted least squares approach and provide finite sample performance guarantees on the quality of the identified dynamics. Our results show that one can effectively use the auxiliary data generated by the similar system to reduce the estimation error due to the process noise, at the cost of adding a portion of error that is due to intrinsic differences in the models of the true and auxiliary systems. We also provide numerical experiments to validate our theoretical results. Our analysis can be applied to a variety of important settings. For example, if the system dynamics change at some point in time (e.g., due to a fault), how should one leverage data from the prior system in order to learn the dynamics of the new system? As another example, if there is abundant data available from a simulated (but imperfect) model of the true system, how should one weight that data compared to the real data from the system? Our analysis provides insights into the answers to these questions.

I. INTRODUCTION

The problem of dynamical system identification has been an important topic in various fields including economics, control theory and reinforcement learning [1]. When modeling from first principles is not possible, one can attempt to learn a predictive model from observed data. While classical system identification techniques focused primarily on achieving asymptotic consistency [2]–[4], recent efforts have sought to characterize the number of samples needed to achieve a desired level of accuracy in the learned model.

The existing literature on finite sample analysis of system identification can be typically divided into two categories: single trajectory-based and multiple trajectories-based. In the single trajectory setup, it is assumed that one has access to a single long record of system input/output data, e.g., [5]–[10]. This approach enables system identification without restarting the experiment multiple times. In contrast, for the multiple trajectories setup, it is typically assumed that one has access to multiple independent (short) trajectories of the system, e.g., [11]–[15]. Due to the assumption of independence over multiple trajectories, standard concentration inequalities usually apply in this case. In practice, one may obtain multiple trajectories of the system if one can restart

the experiment, or if the data are generated from identical systems running in parallel.

We note that all of the above works assume that the data used for system identification are generated from the true system model that one wants to learn. However, in many cases, collecting abundant data from the true system can be costly or infeasible, and one may want to rely on data generated from similar systems. For example, for non-engineered systems like animals, one may only have a limited amount of data from the true animal one wants to model, due to the challenge of conducting experiments. On the other hand, it may be possible to collect data from other animals in the herd or from a reasonably good simulator, and one may want to leverage these available data. Furthermore, when a system changes its dynamics (e.g., due to failures), one needs to decide whether to discard all of the previous data, or to leverage the old information in an appropriate way. In settings such as the ones described above, it is of great interest to determine how one can leverage the data generated from systems that share similar (but not identical) dynamics. This idea is similar to the notion of *transfer learning* in machine learning, where one wants to transfer knowledge from similar tasks to a new task [16]. However, in contrast to system identification, most of the papers on transfer learning consider learning a static mapping from a feature space to a label space [17].

In this paper, we study the system identification problem using both data generated from the true system that one wants to identify and data generated from an auxiliary (potentially time-varying) system that shares similar dynamics. Similarly to [11], we consider the multiple trajectories setup. However, unlike [11], we use all samples instead of only the last one from each trajectory in order to improve data efficiency. We use a weighted least squares approach and provide a finite sample upper bound on the estimation error. Our result shows that one can leverage the auxiliary data to reduce the error due to the noise, at the cost of adding a bias that depends on the difference between the true and auxiliary systems. We also provide simulations to validate our theoretical results, and to provide insights into various settings (including the example scenarios discussed above).

II. MATHEMATICAL NOTATION AND TERMINOLOGY

Let $\mathbb{R}$ denote the set of real numbers. Let $\lambda_{\min}(\cdot)$ and $\lambda_{\max}(\cdot)$ be the smallest and largest eigenvalues, respectively, of a symmetric matrix. We use $*$ to denote the conjugate transpose of a given matrix. We use $\|\cdot\|$ and $\|\cdot\|_F$ to denote

This research was supported by USDA grant 2018-67007-28439. This work represents the opinions of the authors and not the USDA or NIFA. Lei Xin and Shreyas Sundaram are with the Elmore Family School of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Purdue University. George Chiu is with the School of Mechanical Engineering, Purdue University. E-mails: {lxin, gchiu, sundara2}@purdue.edu. Lintao Ye is with the School of Artificial Intelligence and Automation, Huazhong University of Science and Technology. E-mail: yelintao93@hust.edu.cn.

the spectral norm and Frobenius norm of a given matrix, respectively. Vectors are treated as column vectors. A Gaussian distributed random vector is denoted as $u \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$, where μ is the mean and Σ is the covariance matrix. We use I_n to denote the identity matrix with dimension $n \times n$.

III. PROBLEM FORMULATION AND ALGORITHM

Consider a discrete time linear time-invariant (LTI) system

$$\bar{x}_{k+1} = \bar{A}\bar{x}_k + \bar{B}\bar{u}_k + \bar{w}_k, \quad (1)$$

where $\bar{x}_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\bar{u}_k \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $\bar{w}_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$, are the state, input, and process noise, respectively, and $\bar{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\bar{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ are system matrices. The input and process noise are assumed to be i.i.d Gaussian, with $\bar{u}_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_u^2 I_p)$ and $\bar{w}_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_w^2 I_n)$. Note that Gaussian inputs are commonly used in system identification, e.g., [11], [14]. We also assume that both the input $\bar{u}_k$ and state $\bar{x}_k$ can be perfectly measured.

Suppose that we have access to N_r independent experiments of system (1), in which the system restarts from an initial state $\bar{x}_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_x^2 I_n)$, and each experiment is of length T . We call the state-input pairs collected from each experiment a *rollout*, and denote the set of samples we have as $\{(\bar{x}_k^i, \bar{u}_k^i) : 1 \leq i \leq N_r, 0 \leq k \leq T\}$, where the superscript denotes the rollout index and the subscript denotes the time index.

Define the matrices

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{G}_k &= [\bar{A}^{k-2}\bar{B} \quad \bar{A}^{k-3}\bar{B} \quad \dots \quad \bar{B}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (k-1)p}, \\ \bar{F}_k &= [\bar{A}^{k-2} \quad \bar{A}^{k-3} \quad \dots \quad I_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (k-1)n}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

for $k \geq 2$, with $\bar{G}_1 = 0$ and $\bar{F}_1 = 0$. For $k \geq 2$, we have

$$\bar{x}_{k-1}^i = \bar{G}_k \begin{bmatrix} \bar{u}_0^i \\ \vdots \\ \bar{u}_{k-2}^i \end{bmatrix} + \bar{F}_k \begin{bmatrix} \bar{w}_0^i \\ \vdots \\ \bar{w}_{k-2}^i \end{bmatrix} + \bar{A}^{k-1}\bar{x}_0^i. \quad (3)$$

Letting $\bar{z}_k^i = [\bar{x}_k^{i*} \quad \bar{u}_k^{i*}]^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n+p}$ for $k \geq 0$, one can verify that $\bar{z}_k^i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \bar{\Sigma}_k)$, where

$$\bar{\Sigma}_k = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_u^2 \bar{G}_{k+1} \bar{G}_{k+1}^* + \sigma_w^2 \bar{F}_{k+1} \bar{F}_{k+1}^* + \sigma_x^2 \bar{A}^k \bar{A}^{k*} & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_u^2 I_p \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

Note that we have $\lambda_{\min}(\bar{\Sigma}_k) > 0$ for all $k \geq 0$.

For each rollout i , define $\bar{X}^i = [\bar{x}_T^i \quad \dots \quad \bar{x}_1^i] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times T}$, $\bar{Z}^i = [\bar{z}_{T-1}^i \quad \dots \quad \bar{z}_0^i] \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+p) \times T}$, $\bar{W}^i = [\bar{w}_{T-1}^i \quad \dots \quad \bar{w}_0^i] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times T}$. Further, define the batch matrices $\bar{X} = [\bar{X}^1 \quad \dots \quad \bar{X}^{N_r}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times N_r T}$, $\bar{Z} = [\bar{Z}^1 \quad \dots \quad \bar{Z}^{N_r}] \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+p) \times N_r T}$, $\bar{W} = [\bar{W}^1 \quad \dots \quad \bar{W}^{N_r}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times N_r T}$. Denoting $\Theta \triangleq [\bar{A} \quad \bar{B}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n+p)}$, we have

$$\bar{X} = \Theta \bar{Z} + \bar{W}.$$

In general, one would like to solve:

$$\min_{\bar{\Theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n+p)}} \|\bar{X} - \bar{\Theta} \bar{Z}\|_F^2,$$

and obtain an estimate $\Theta_{LS} \triangleq [\bar{A}_{LS} \quad \bar{B}_{LS}]$, of which the analytical form is

$$\Theta_{LS} = \bar{X} \bar{Z}^* (\bar{Z} \bar{Z}^*)^{-1},$$

assuming invertibility of the matrix $\bar{Z} \bar{Z}^*$. However, without enough samples (i.e., if N_r is small, and there is no single long run record available), the obtained estimate could have large estimation error. In such cases, we can rely on samples generated from an auxiliary system, if it shares “similar” dynamics to system (1). In particular, consider an auxiliary discrete time linear time-varying system

$$\hat{x}_{k+1} = \hat{A}_k \hat{x}_k + \hat{B}_k \hat{u}_k + \hat{w}_k, \quad (5)$$

where $\hat{x}_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\hat{u}_k \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $\hat{w}_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are the state, input, and process noise, respectively, and $\hat{A}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\hat{B}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ are system matrices. Again, the input and process noise are assumed to be i.i.d Gaussian, with $\hat{u}_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_u^2 I_p)$ and $\hat{w}_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_w^2 I_n)$. Note that an LTI system is a special case of the above system, with $\hat{A}_k = \hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}_k = \hat{B}$ for all $k \geq 0$. The dynamics of system (5) can be rewritten as

$$\hat{x}_{k+1} = (\bar{A} + \delta_{A_k}) \hat{x}_k + (\bar{B} + \delta_{B_k}) \hat{u}_k + \hat{w}_k, \quad (6)$$

where $\delta_{A_k} = \hat{A}_k - \bar{A}$, $\delta_{B_k} = \hat{B}_k - \bar{B}$. Intuitively, the samples generated from the above system will be useful for identifying system (1) if $\|\delta_{A_k}\|$, $\|\delta_{B_k}\|$ are small for all k .

Now, suppose that we also have access to N_p independent experiments of system (5), in which the system restarts from an initial state $\hat{x}_0 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_x^2 I_n)$, and each experiment is of length T . Let $\{(\hat{x}_k^i, \hat{u}_k^i) : 1 \leq i \leq N_p, 0 \leq k \leq T\}$ denote the samples from these experiments. Define $\Phi(k, l) = \hat{A}_{k-1} \hat{A}_{k-2} \dots \hat{A}_l$ for $k > l$ with $\Phi(k, l) = I_n$ when $k = l$. Let $\hat{G}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (k-1)p}$ and $\hat{F}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (k-1)n}$ be

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{G}_k &= [\Phi(k-1, 1) \hat{B}_0 \quad \Phi(k-1, 2) \hat{B}_1 \quad \dots \quad \hat{B}_{k-2}], \\ \hat{F}_k &= [\Phi(k-1, 1) \quad \Phi(k-1, 2) \quad \dots \quad I_n]. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

for $k \geq 2$, with $\hat{G}_1 = 0$ and $\hat{F}_1 = 0$. For $k \geq 2$, we have

$$\hat{x}_{k-1}^i = \hat{G}_k \begin{bmatrix} \hat{u}_0^i \\ \vdots \\ \hat{u}_{k-2}^i \end{bmatrix} + \hat{F}_k \begin{bmatrix} \hat{w}_0^i \\ \vdots \\ \hat{w}_{k-2}^i \end{bmatrix} + \Phi(k-1, 0) \hat{x}_0^i. \quad (8)$$

Letting $\hat{z}_k^i = [\hat{x}_k^{i*} \quad \hat{u}_k^{i*}]^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n+p}$ for $k \geq 0$, one can verify that $\hat{z}_k^i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \hat{\Sigma}_k)$, where

$$\hat{\Sigma}_k = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_u^2 \hat{G}_{k+1} \hat{G}_{k+1}^* + \sigma_w^2 \hat{F}_{k+1} \hat{F}_{k+1}^* + \sigma_x^2 \Phi(k, 0) \Phi(k, 0)^* & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_u^2 I_p \end{bmatrix}. \quad (9)$$

Again, we have $\lambda_{\min}(\hat{\Sigma}_k) > 0$ for all $k \geq 0$.

Further, the matrices $\hat{X}^i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times T}$, $\hat{Z}^i \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+p) \times T}$, $\hat{W}^i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times T}$, $\hat{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times N_p T}$, $\hat{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+p) \times N_p T}$, $\hat{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times N_p T}$ are defined similarly, using $\hat{u}_k^i, \hat{x}_k^i, \hat{w}_k^i$ from system (5). Let $X = [\hat{X} \quad \hat{X}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (N_r + N_p) T}$, $Z = [\hat{Z} \quad \hat{Z}] \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+p) \times (N_r + N_p) T}$, $W = [\hat{W} \quad \hat{W}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (N_r + N_p) T}$ and $\delta_{\Theta_k} = [\delta_{A_k} \quad \delta_{B_k}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n+p)}$. Defining

$$\Delta^i = [\delta_{\Theta_{T-1}} \hat{z}_{T-1}^i \quad \dots \quad \delta_{\Theta_0} \hat{z}_0^i] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times T},$$

for all $i \in \{1, \dots, N_p\}$, and denoting

$$\Delta = [0 \quad \dots \quad 0 \quad \Delta^1 \quad \dots \quad \Delta^{N_p}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (N_r + N_p) T},$$

we have the relationship

$$X = \Theta Z + W + \Delta. \quad (10)$$

Letting $q_k \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a design parameter that specifies the relative weight assigned to samples generated from the auxiliary system (5) at time step k , we can define $\mathcal{Q} = \text{diag}(q_{T-1}, \dots, q_0) \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times T}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{Q}} = \text{diag}(\mathcal{Q}, \dots, \mathcal{Q}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N_p T \times N_p T}$. Further, define $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}} = \text{diag}(I_{N_r T}, \hat{\mathcal{Q}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{(N_p + N_r)T \times (N_p + N_r)T}$. We are interested in the following weighted least squares problem:

$$\min_{\tilde{\Theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n+p)}} \|X\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}^{\frac{1}{2}} - \tilde{\Theta}\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_F^2. \quad (11)$$

The well known weighted least squares estimate is $\Theta_{WLS} \triangleq [\bar{A}_{WLS} \ \bar{B}_{WLS}]$, which has the form

$$\Theta_{WLS} = X\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}Z^*(Z\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}Z^*)^{-1}, \quad (12)$$

when the matrix $Z\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}Z^*$ is invertible. Using (10), the estimation error can be expressed as

$$\Theta_{WLS} - \Theta = W\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}Z^*(Z\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}Z^*)^{-1} + \Delta\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}Z^*(Z\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}Z^*)^{-1}. \quad (13)$$

The above steps are encapsulated in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 System Identification Using Auxiliary Data

- 1: Gather N_r length T rollouts of samples generated from the true system (1), where $\bar{x}_0^i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_x^2 I_n)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq N_r$.
 - 2: Gather N_p length T rollouts of samples generated from the auxiliary system (5), where $\hat{x}_0^i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_x^2 I_n)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq N_p$.
 - 3: Construct the matrices $X, \mathcal{Q}, Z$. Compute $\Theta_{WLS} = X\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}Z^*(Z\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}Z^*)^{-1}$.
 - 4: Return the first n columns of Θ_{WLS} as an estimated $\bar{A}$, and the remaining columns of Θ_{WLS} as an estimated $\bar{B}$.
-

Remark 1: Note that the weight parameter q_k specifies how much we should weight the data from the auxiliary system relative to the data from the true system, and can be a function of the number of rollouts (N_r and N_p) from each of those systems. Our analysis in the next section, and subsequent evaluation, will provide guidance on the appropriate choice of weight parameter. $\square$

Next, we provide upper bounds on the estimation error $\|\Theta_{WLS} - \Theta\|$ as a function of $N_r, N_p, \|\delta_{\Theta_k}\|, q_k$ and other system parameters. Moreover, we will provide insights into the case when the auxiliary system is time-invariant.

IV. ANALYSIS OF THE SYSTEM IDENTIFICATION ERROR

To upper bound the estimation error in (13), we will upper bound the error terms $\|W\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}Z\|, \|(Z\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}Z^*)^{-1}\|$, and $\|\Delta\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}Z^*\|$ separately. We will start with some intermediate results pertaining to these quantities.

A. Intermediate Results

We will rely on the following lemma from [18, Corollary 5.35], which provides non-asymptotic lower bound and upper bound of a standard Wishart matrix.

Lemma 1: Let $u_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_{n+p})$, $i = 1, \dots, N$ be i.i.d random vectors. For any fixed $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have the following inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\lambda_{\min}(\sum_{i=1}^N u_i u_i^*)} &\geq \sqrt{N} - \sqrt{n+p} - \sqrt{2 \log \frac{2}{\delta}}, \\ \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(\sum_{i=1}^N u_i u_i^*)} &\leq \sqrt{N} + \sqrt{n+p} + \sqrt{2 \log \frac{2}{\delta}}. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

We have the following results.

Proposition 1: For any fixed $\delta > 0$, let $N_p \geq N_0 \triangleq 8(n+p) + 16 \log \frac{2T}{\delta}$. With probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have the following inequalities:

$$\hat{Z}\hat{\mathcal{Q}}\hat{Z}^* \succeq \frac{N_p}{4} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} q_k \hat{\Sigma}_k,$$

$$\|\Delta\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}Z^*\| \leq \frac{9N_p}{4} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} q_k \|\delta_{\Theta_k}\| \|\hat{\Sigma}_k\|.$$

$\square$

Proof: We have

$$\hat{Z}\hat{\mathcal{Q}}\hat{Z}^* = \sum_{i=1}^{N_p} \hat{Z}^i \mathcal{Q} \hat{Z}^{i*} = \sum_{i=1}^{N_p} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} q_k \hat{z}_k^i \hat{z}_k^{i*} = \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N_p} q_k \hat{z}_k^i \hat{z}_k^{i*}.$$

For any fixed k , define $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_k^i = \hat{\Sigma}_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{z}_k^i$. Note that $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_k^i$ are i.i.d random vectors with $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_k^i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_{n+p})$ for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N_p\}$. Hence, the above sum can be written as

$$\sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N_p} q_k \hat{\Sigma}_k^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_k^i \hat{\mathbf{u}}_k^{i*} \hat{\Sigma}_k^{\frac{1}{2}} = \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} q_k \hat{\Sigma}_k^{\frac{1}{2}} (\sum_{i=1}^{N_p} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_k^i \hat{\mathbf{u}}_k^{i*}) \hat{\Sigma}_k^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (14)$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}Z^*\| &= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{N_p} \Delta^i \mathcal{Q} \hat{Z}^{i*} \right\| = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{N_p} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} q_k \delta_{\Theta_k} \hat{z}_k^i \hat{z}_k^{i*} \right\| \\ &= \left\| \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N_p} q_k \delta_{\Theta_k} \hat{z}_k^i \hat{z}_k^{i*} \right\| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} q_k \|\delta_{\Theta_k}\| \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{N_p} \hat{z}_k^i \hat{z}_k^{i*} \right\| \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} q_k \|\delta_{\Theta_k}\| \left\| \hat{\Sigma}_k^{\frac{1}{2}} (\sum_{i=1}^{N_p} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_k^i \hat{\mathbf{u}}_k^{i*}) \hat{\Sigma}_k^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} q_k \|\delta_{\Theta_k}\| \|\hat{\Sigma}_k\| \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{N_p} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_k^i \hat{\mathbf{u}}_k^{i*} \right\|. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Fixing $\delta > 0$ and k and applying Lemma 1, we have with probability at least $1 - \frac{\delta}{T}$ the following:

$$\sqrt{\lambda_{\min}(\sum_{i=1}^{N_p} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_k^i \hat{\mathbf{u}}_k^{i*})} \geq \sqrt{N_p} - \sqrt{n+p} - \sqrt{2 \log \frac{2T}{\delta}},$$

$$\sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(\sum_{i=1}^{N_p} \mathbf{u}_k^i \mathbf{u}_k^{i*})} \leq \sqrt{N_p} + \sqrt{n+p} + \sqrt{2 \log \frac{2T}{\delta}}.$$

Further, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{N_p} &\geq \sqrt{n+p} + \sqrt{2 \log \frac{2T}{\delta}} \\ \iff \frac{N_p}{4} &\geq (\sqrt{n+p} + \sqrt{2 \log \frac{2T}{\delta}})^2. \end{aligned}$$

Noting the inequality $2(a^2 + b^2) \geq (a + b)^2$, we can write

$$2(n+p+2 \log \frac{2T}{\delta}) \geq (\sqrt{n+p} + \sqrt{2 \log \frac{2T}{\delta}})^2.$$

Letting $N_p \geq 8(n+p) + 16 \log \frac{2T}{\delta}$, one can then show that the following inequalities hold with probability at least $1 - \frac{\delta}{T}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\lambda_{\min}(\sum_{i=1}^{N_p} \mathbf{u}_k^i \mathbf{u}_k^{i*})} &\geq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{N_p} + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{N_p} \\ &\quad - \sqrt{n+p} - \sqrt{2 \log \frac{2T}{\delta}} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{N_p}, \\ \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(\sum_{i=1}^{N_p} \mathbf{u}_k^i \mathbf{u}_k^{i*})} &\leq \sqrt{N_p} + \sqrt{n+p} + \sqrt{2 \log \frac{2T}{\delta}} \\ &\leq \frac{3}{2} \sqrt{N_p}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that with probability at least $1 - \frac{\delta}{T}$,

$$q_k \hat{\Sigma}_k^{\frac{1}{2}} (\sum_{i=1}^{N_p} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_k^i \hat{\mathbf{u}}_k^{i*}) \hat{\Sigma}_k^{\frac{1}{2}} \succeq q_k \frac{N_p}{4} \hat{\Sigma}_k,$$

and

$$q_k \|\delta_{\Theta_k}\| \|\hat{\Sigma}_k\| \|\sum_{i=1}^{N_p} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_k^i \hat{\mathbf{u}}_k^{i*}\| \leq \frac{9N_p}{4} q_k \|\delta_{\Theta_k}\| \|\hat{\Sigma}_k\|.$$

The result follows by applying a union bound for all k in (14) and (15), $\blacksquare$

Proposition 2: Fixing $\delta > 0$, and letting $N_r \geq N_0 = 8(n+p) + 16 \log \frac{2T}{\delta}$, we have with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\bar{Z} \bar{Z}^* \succeq \frac{N_r}{4} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \bar{\Sigma}_k.$$

Proof: Replacing q_k by 1, the proof follows directly from Proposition 1. $\blacksquare$

Next, We will leverage the following lemma from [11, Lemma 1] to bound the contribution from the noise terms.

Lemma 2: Let $f_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $g_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be independent random vectors $f_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_f)$ and $g_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_g)$, for $i = 1, \dots, N$. Let $N \geq 2(n+m) \log \frac{1}{\delta}$. For any fixed $\delta > 0$, we have with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\|\sum_{i=1}^N f_i g_i^*\| \leq 4 \|\Sigma_f\|^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\Sigma_g\|^{\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{N(m+n) \log \frac{9}{\delta}}.$$

We have the following results. $\square$

Proposition 3: For any fixed $\delta > 0$, let $N_p \geq N_1 \triangleq (4n+2p) \log \frac{T}{\delta}$. We have with probability at least $1 - \delta$

$$\|\hat{W} \hat{Q} \hat{Z}^*\| \leq 4\sigma_{\bar{w}} \sqrt{N_p(2n+p) \log \frac{9T}{\delta}} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} q_k \|\hat{\Sigma}_k^{\frac{1}{2}}\|.$$

Proof: From the definitions of $\hat{W}$, $\hat{Q}$ and $\hat{Z}$, $\square$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{W} \hat{Q} \hat{Z}^*\| &= \|\sum_{i=1}^{N_p} \hat{W}^i \hat{Q} \hat{Z}^{i*}\| = \|\sum_{i=1}^{N_p} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} q_k \hat{w}_k^i \hat{z}_k^{i*}\| \\ &= \|\sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N_p} q_k \hat{w}_k^i \hat{z}_k^{i*}\| \leq \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \|\sum_{i=1}^{N_p} q_k \hat{w}_k^i \hat{z}_k^{i*}\|. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Fix $\delta > 0$, and let $N_p \geq (4n+2p) \log \frac{T}{\delta}$. For any fixed k , we can apply Lemma 2 to obtain that with probability at least $1 - \frac{\delta}{T}$,

$$\|\sum_{i=1}^{N_p} q_k \hat{w}_k^i \hat{z}_k^{i*}\| \leq 4q_k \sigma_{\bar{w}} \|\hat{\Sigma}_k^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \sqrt{N_p(2n+p) \log \frac{9T}{\delta}}.$$

Further applying a union bound for all k in (16), we get the desired result. $\blacksquare$

Proposition 4: For any fixed $\delta > 0$, let $N_r \geq N_1 = (4n+2p) \log \frac{T}{\delta}$. We have with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\|\bar{W} \bar{Z}^*\| \leq 4\sigma_{\bar{w}} \sqrt{N_r(2n+p) \log \frac{9T}{\delta}} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \|\bar{\Sigma}_k^{\frac{1}{2}}\|.$$

Proof: Replacing q_k by 1, the proof follows directly from Proposition 3. $\blacksquare$

B. Main Results and Insights

We now come to the main result of our paper, providing a bound on the system identification error in (13).

Theorem 1: For any fixed $\delta > 0$, let $\min(N_r, N_p) \geq \max\{N_0, N_1\}$, where $N_0 = 8(n+p) + 16 \log \frac{2T}{\delta}$, $N_1 = (4n+2p) \log \frac{T}{\delta}$. Then, with probability at least $1 - 4\delta$, the least squares solution to problem (11) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} &\max(\|\bar{A}_{WLS} - \bar{A}\|, \|\bar{B}_{WLS} - \bar{B}\|) \\ &\leq \underbrace{\frac{c_0(\sqrt{N_r} \sigma_{\bar{w}} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \|\bar{\Sigma}_k^{\frac{1}{2}}\| + \sqrt{N_p} \sigma_{\bar{w}} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} q_k \|\hat{\Sigma}_k^{\frac{1}{2}}\|)}{\lambda_{\min}(N_r \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \bar{\Sigma}_k + N_p \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} q_k \hat{\Sigma}_k)}}_{\text{Error due to noise}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\frac{9N_p \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} q_k \|\delta_{\Theta_k}\| \|\hat{\Sigma}_k\|}{\lambda_{\min}(N_r \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \bar{\Sigma}_k + N_p \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} q_k \hat{\Sigma}_k)}}_{\text{Error due to difference between true and auxiliary systems}}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$c_0 = 16 \sqrt{(2n+p) \log \frac{9T}{\delta}}.$$

Proof: Recall that the estimation error in (13) satisfies $\|\Theta_{WLS} - \Theta\| \leq \|WQZ^*\| \|(ZQZ^*)^{-1}\| +$ $\square$

$\|\Delta QZ^*\| \|(ZQZ^*)^{-1}\|$. First, note that $ZQZ^* = \bar{Z}\bar{Z}^* + \hat{Z}\hat{Z}^*$. Fixing $\delta > 0$, letting $\min(N_r, N_p) \geq N_0$, combining Proposition 2 and the lower bound in Proposition 1 using a union bound, and taking the inverse, we obtain that with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$,

$$\|(ZQZ^*)^{-1}\| \leq \frac{4}{\lambda_{\min}(N_r \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \bar{\Sigma}_k + N_p \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} q_k \hat{\Sigma}_k)}. \quad (17)$$

Similarly, note that $WQZ^* = \bar{W}\bar{Z}^* + \hat{W}\hat{Z}^*$. Letting $\min(N_r, N_p) \geq N_1$, and combining Proposition 4 and Proposition 3 using a union bound, we obtain that with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|WQZ^*\| &\leq 4\sigma_{\bar{w}} \sqrt{N_r(2n+p) \log \frac{9T}{\delta} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \|\bar{\Sigma}_k^{\frac{1}{2}}\|} \\ &\quad + 4\sigma_{\hat{w}} \sqrt{N_p(2n+p) \log \frac{9T}{\delta} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} q_k \|\hat{\Sigma}_k^{\frac{1}{2}}\|}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Finally, combining (17)-(18) via a union bound, using the upper bound in Proposition 1, and using the fact that $\bar{A}_{WLS} - \bar{A}$, $\bar{B}_{WLS} - \bar{B}$ are submatrices of $\Theta_{WLS} - \Theta$, we get the desired result. ■

Note that the first term in the bound on the error corresponds to the error due to the noise from the two systems, and the second term corresponds to the error due to the intrinsic model difference. Now, we state a corollary of the above theorem when the auxiliary system is time-invariant, which helps us gain more insights into the above result.

Corollary 1: Suppose that the auxiliary system (5) is time-invariant, i.e., $\bar{A}_k = \bar{A}$, $\bar{B}_k = \bar{B}$, $\delta_{\Theta_k} = \delta_{\Theta} = [\delta_A \ \delta_B]$ for all $k \geq 0$, where $\delta_A = \bar{A} - \hat{A}$, $\delta_B = \bar{B} - \hat{B}$. Let $q_k = q$ for all $k \geq 0$ in problem (11). For any fixed $\delta > 0$, let $\min(N_r, N_p) \geq \max\{N_0, N_1\}$, where $N_0 = 8(n+p) + 16 \log \frac{2T}{\delta}$, $N_1 = (4n+2p) \log \frac{T}{\delta}$. Then, with probability at least $1 - 4\delta$, the least squares solution to problem (11) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} &\max(\|\bar{A}_{WLS} - \bar{A}\|, \|\bar{B}_{WLS} - \bar{B}\|) \\ &\leq \underbrace{\frac{c_0(\sqrt{N_r}\sigma_{\bar{w}}c_2 + q\sqrt{N_p}\sigma_{\hat{w}}c_3)}{\lambda_{\min}(N_rM_1 + qN_pM_2)}}_{\text{Error due to noise}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{q\|\delta_{\Theta}\| \frac{N_p c_1}{\lambda_{\min}(N_rM_1 + qN_pM_2)}}_{\text{Error due to difference between true and auxiliary systems}}, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} c_0 &= 16\sqrt{(2n+p) \log \frac{9T}{\delta}} \\ c_1 &= 9 \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \|\hat{\Sigma}_k\|, \quad c_2 = \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \|\bar{\Sigma}_k^{\frac{1}{2}}\|, \quad c_3 = \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \|\hat{\Sigma}_k^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \\ M_1 &= \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \bar{\Sigma}_k, \quad M_2 = \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \hat{\Sigma}_k. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 2: Interpretation of Corollary 1 and the selection of weight parameter q . Recall that N_r is the number

of rollouts from the true system (1), and N_p is the number of rollouts from the auxiliary system (5). From the upper bound in (19), one can observe that when q is fixed, increasing N_p reduces the error due to the noise, at the cost of adding a bias that is due to the intrinsic model difference δ_{Θ} . Choosing the optimal weight q in practice requires an oracle (to know the specific values of the different parameters in (19)), and one would leverage a cross-validation process to select a good q (see [19] for an overview). However, general guidelines can be given based on the upper bound provided by Corollary 1 when N_p is large:

- When N_r is small, we can increase q to reduce the first term in the error bound (such that the error bound is dominated by the second term). This corresponds to the case where we have little data from the true system, and thus there may be a large identification error due to using only that data. In this case, it is worth placing more weight on the data from the auxiliary system, up to the point that the reduction in estimation error due to the larger amount of data is balanced out by the intrinsic differences between the systems.
- When N_r is large, we can decrease q to reduce the second term as well, since the first term is already small enough. This corresponds to the case where we have a large amount of data from the true system, and only need the data from the auxiliary system to slightly improve our estimates (due to the presence of additional data). In this case, we place a lower weight on the auxiliary data in order to avoid excessive bias due to the difference in dynamics.

The above insights align well with intuition, and are supported by the mathematical analysis provided in this section. We also illustrate these ideas experimentally in Section V. □

Finally, the following result provides a (sufficient) condition under which using the data from the auxiliary system leads to a smaller error bound (compared to using data only from the true system).

Corollary 2: Consider the upper bound provided in Corollary 1. Setting q to be non-zero will result in a smaller upper bound if

$$\frac{\sigma_{\bar{w}}c_2}{\sqrt{N_r}\lambda_{\min}(M_1)} > \frac{\sigma_{\hat{w}}c_3}{\sqrt{N_p}\lambda_{\min}(M_2)} + \frac{\|\delta_{\Theta}\|c_1}{\lambda_{\min}(M_2)c_0}. \quad (20)$$

Proof: When $q = 0$, from Corollary 1, we have

$$\max(\|\bar{A}_{WLS} - \bar{A}\|, \|\bar{B}_{WLS} - \bar{B}\|) \leq \frac{c_0\sqrt{N_r}\sigma_{\bar{w}}c_2}{N_r\lambda_{\min}(M_1)}.$$

Similarly, when $q \neq 0$, from Corollary 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\max(\|\bar{A}_{WLS} - \bar{A}\|, \|\bar{B}_{WLS} - \bar{B}\|) \\ &\leq \frac{c_0(\sqrt{N_r}\sigma_{\bar{w}}c_2 + q\sqrt{N_p}\sigma_{\hat{w}}c_3)}{\lambda_{\min}(N_rM_1 + qN_pM_2)} \\ &\quad + q\|\delta_{\Theta}\| \frac{N_p c_1}{\lambda_{\min}(N_rM_1 + qN_pM_2)}. \end{aligned}$$

From Weyl's inequality [20], we have

$$\lambda_{\min}(N_rM_1 + qN_pM_2) \geq N_r\lambda_{\min}(M_1) + qN_p\lambda_{\min}(M_2).$$

The proof now follows by setting

$$\frac{c_0 \sqrt{N_r} \sigma_{\bar{w}} c_2}{N_r \lambda_{\min}(M_1)} > \frac{c_0 (\sqrt{N_r} \sigma_{\bar{w}} c_2 + q \sqrt{N_p} \sigma_{\bar{w}} c_3)}{N_r \lambda_{\min}(M_1) + q N_p \lambda_{\min}(M_2)} + q \|\delta_{\Theta}\| \frac{N_p c_1}{N_r \lambda_{\min}(M_1) + q N_p \lambda_{\min}(M_2)}.$$

Remark 3: Interpretation of Corollary 2. We note that the above sufficient condition (20) could be conservative, and may not be directly checked in practice due to the unknown parameters. However, we describe the insights provided by this condition. In general, condition (20) is more likely to be satisfied if $\sigma_{\bar{w}}$ is small (the auxiliary system is less noisy), $\|\delta_{\Theta}\|$ is small (the true system and auxiliary system are very similar), or N_p is large (one has a lot of samples from the auxiliary system), as this would make the right hand side of (20) smaller. In such cases, the auxiliary samples tend to be more informative. In contrast, condition (20) is less likely to be satisfied if $\sigma_{\bar{w}}$ is small and N_r is large, i.e., when the data from the true system is not too noisy and one has a lot of samples from that system, the auxiliary samples tend to be less informative. $\square$

V. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS TO ILLUSTRATE VARIOUS SCENARIOS FOR SYSTEM IDENTIFICATION FROM AUXILIARY DATA

We now provide some numerical examples of the weighted least squares-based system identification algorithm (Algorithm 1), when the auxiliary system is LTI. The experiments are performed using the following system matrices:

$$\bar{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.6 & 0.5 & 0.4 \\ 0 & 0.4 & 0.3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.3 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \bar{B} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0.5 \\ 0.5 & 1 \\ 0.5 & 0.5 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\hat{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.7 & 0.5 & 0.4 \\ 0 & 0.4 & 0.3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.3 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \hat{B} = \begin{bmatrix} 1.1 & 0.5 \\ 0.5 & 1 \\ 0.5 & 0.5 \end{bmatrix},$$

and $\sigma_{\bar{x}}^2, \sigma_{\bar{u}}^2, \sigma_{\bar{w}}^2, \sigma_{\bar{v}}^2, \sigma_{\bar{w}}^2, \sigma_{\bar{v}}^2$ are set to be 1. The rollout length is set to be $T = 2$ for all experiments in the sequel. All results are averaged over 10 independent runs.

A. Scenario 1: Both N_r and N_p are increasing

For the first experiment, the number of rollouts from the auxiliary system is set to be $N_p = 3N_r$. In practice, one may encounter such a scenario when running experiments to gather data from the true system is time consuming or costly, whereas gathering data from an auxiliary system (such as a simulator) is easier or cheaper.

In Fig. 1, we plot the estimation error versus N_r for different weight parameters q . As expected, setting $q > 0$ leads to a smaller estimation error of system matrices when one does not have enough data from the true system (small N_r). However, the curve for $q = 1$ and $q = 10^{10}$ (corresponding to treating all samples equally and paying almost no attention to the samples from the true system, respectively) eventually plateau and incur more error than

not using the the auxiliary data ($q = 0$). This phenomenon matches the theoretical guarantee in Corollary 1. Specifically, when q is a nonzero constant, the upper bound in (19) will not go to zero as N_r increases; furthermore, since both N_p and N_r are increasing in a linear relationship, there is no need to attach high importance to the auxiliary data when one has enough data from the true system. In contrast, setting q to be diminishing with N_r could perform consistently better than $q = 0$, even when N_r is large. Indeed, one can choose $q = \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N_r}})$ in the upper bound given by (19) in Corollary 1, and show that the upper bound becomes $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N_r}})$. Thus, the estimation error tends to zero as N_r increases to infinity.

Key Takeaway: When N_p and N_r are both increasing linearly, having q diminish with N_r helps to reduce the system identification error when N_r is small (by leveraging data from the auxiliary system), and avoids excessive bias from the auxiliary system when N_r is large.

B. Scenario 2: N_p is fixed but N_r is increasing

In the second experiment, we fix the number of rollouts from the auxiliary system to be $N_p = 2400$, and study what happens as the number of rollouts from the true system increases. One may encounter such a scenario when the system dynamics change due to faults. In this case, the true system is the one after the fault, and the auxiliary system is the one prior to the fault. Consequently, the old data from the system (corresponding to the auxiliary system) may not accurately represent the new (true) system dynamics. While one can collect data from the new system dynamics, leveraging the old data might be beneficial in this case.

In Fig. 2, we plot the estimation error versus N_r for different weight parameters q . As expected, setting $q > 0$ leads to a smaller error during the initial phase when N_r is small. This can be confirmed by Corollary 1 since the error is essentially the error due to the model difference. Namely, the auxiliary data helps to build a good initial estimate. When we set the weight to be $q = 10^{10}$, we are paying little attention to the samples from the true system, i.e., we are not gaining any new information as we collect more data from the true system. Consequently, the error is almost not changed as N_r increases when $q = 10^{10}$. As can be observed from Corollary 1, when N_p is fixed, consistency can always be achieved as N_r increases, using the weights we selected in the experiment. However, when q is set to be too large, it could make the error even larger due to the model difference (or bias) introduced by the auxiliary system. This is captured by Corollary 1 since when q is set to be large (such that qN_p is large compared to N_r), even when N_r gets large, the upper bound in (19) is still large due to the effect from the second term in the bound (capturing model difference).

Key Takeaway: When N_p is fixed and large, and N_r increases over time, setting q to be nonzero builds a good initial estimate for the true system dynamics when N_r is small. Again, having q diminish with N_r helps to reduce the system identification error when N_r is small, and avoids excessive bias from the auxiliary system when N_r is large.




Fig. 1. Scenario 1: Both N_r and N_p increase over time ($N_p = 3N_r$)




Fig. 2. Scenario 2: N_p is fixed, and N_r increases over time




Fig. 3. Scenario 3: N_r is fixed, and N_p increases over time

C. Scenario 3: N_r is fixed but N_p is increasing

In the last experiment, we fix the number of rollouts from the true system to be $N_r = 50$. As discussed earlier, one may encounter such a scenario when one has only a limited amount of time to gather data from true system. As a result, leveraging information from other systems (e.g., from a reasonably accurate simulator) could be helpful to augment the data. This is the most subtle case, since N_r is fixed and there is no way to guarantee consistency from Corollary 1.

In Fig. 3, we plot the the estimation error versus N_p for different weight parameters q . As it can be seen, setting $q = 0$ (not using the auxiliary samples) gives a flat line, which is the error we can achieve purely based on $N_r = 50$ rollouts from the true system. When $q = 10^{10}$, we are essentially identifying the auxiliary system without caring about the true system. In contrast, the results for $q = 1, 0.6, 0.3$ suggest that setting a relatively balanced weight makes the error smaller than the two extreme cases ($q = 0, 10^{10}$). However, in practice, one may want to utilize a cross-validation process to select a good q , when there is not enough prior knowledge about the true system and the auxiliary system.

Key Takeaway: Although consistency cannot be guaranteed when N_r is fixed and small, and N_p increases over time, a relatively balanced q could make the error smaller than the extreme cases ($q = 0, 10^{10}$).

VI. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we provided a finite sample analysis of the weighted least squares approach to LTI system identification, when we have access to samples from an auxiliary system that shares similar dynamics. We showed that one can leverage the auxiliary data generated by the similar system to reduce the estimation error due to the noise, at the cost of adding a portion of error that is due to intrinsic differences in the models of the true and auxiliary systems. One limitation of our result is that our bound cannot capture the empirical trend that a longer length of rollout T (when we do not use samples from the auxiliary system) reduces the estimation error. One future direction is to develop a tighter bound by leveraging results from the single trajectory setup. In addition, it is also of interest to consider systems with special structures, such as sparsity.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Ljung, "System identification," *Wiley encyclopedia of electrical and electronics engineering*, pp. 1–19, 1999.
- [2] D. Bauer, M. Deistler, and W. Scherrer, "Consistency and asymptotic normality of some subspace algorithms for systems without observed inputs," *Automatica*, vol. 35, no. 7, pp. 1243–1254, 1999.
- [3] M. Jansson and B. Wahlberg, "On consistency of subspace methods for system identification," *Automatica*, vol. 34, no. 12, pp. 1507–1519, 1998.
- [4] T. Knudsen, "Consistency analysis of subspace identification methods based on a linear regression approach," *Automatica*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 81–89, 2001.
- [5] M. Simchowitz, H. Mania, S. Tu, M. I. Jordan, and B. Recht, "Learning without mixing: Towards a sharp analysis of linear system identification," in *Proc. Conference On Learning Theory*, 2018, pp. 439–473.
- [6] S. Oymak and N. Ozay, "Non-asymptotic identification of LTI systems from a single trajectory," in *American control conference*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 5655–5661.
- [7] M. Simchowitz, R. Boczar, and B. Recht, "Learning linear dynamical systems with semi-parametric least squares," in *Proc. Conference on Learning Theory*, 2019, pp. 2714–2802.
- [8] T. Sarkar, A. Rakhlin, and M. A. Dahleh, "Nonparametric finite time LTI system identification," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.01848*, 2019.
- [9] M. K. S. Faradonbeh, A. Tewari, and G. Michailidis, "Finite time identification in unstable linear systems," *Automatica*, vol. 96, pp. 342–353, 2018.
- [10] T. Sarkar and A. Rakhlin, "Near optimal finite time identification of arbitrary linear dynamical systems," in *Proc. International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2019, pp. 5610–5618.
- [11] S. Dean, H. Mania, N. Matni, B. Recht, and S. Tu, "On the sample complexity of the linear quadratic regulator," *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, pp. 1–47, 2019.
- [12] S. Fattahi and S. Sojoudi, "Data-driven sparse system identification," in *Proc. Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing*, 2018, pp. 462–469.
- [13] Y. Sun, S. Oymak, and M. Fazel, "Finite sample system identification: Optimal rates and the role of regularization," in *Proc. Learning for Dynamics and Control Conference*, 2020, pp. 16–25.
- [14] Y. Zheng and N. Li, "Non-asymptotic identification of linear dynamical systems using multiple trajectories," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 1693–1698, 2020.
- [15] L. Xin, G. Chiu, and S. Sundaram, "Learning the dynamics of autonomous linear systems from multiple trajectories," in *Proc. American Control Conference*, 2022 (to appear).
- [16] S. J. Pan and Q. Yang, "A survey on transfer learning," *IEEE Transactions on knowledge and data engineering*, vol. 22, no. 10, pp. 1345–1359, 2009.
- [17] H. Bastani, "Predicting with proxies: Transfer learning in high dimension," *Management Science*, vol. 67, no. 5, pp. 2964–2984, 2021.
- [18] R. Vershynin, "Introduction to the non-asymptotic analysis of random matrices," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1011.3027*, 2010.
- [19] P. Refaellizadeh, L. Tang, and H. Liu, "Cross-validation," *Encyclopedia of database systems*, vol. 5, pp. 532–538, 2009.
- [20] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Matrix analysis*. Cambridge university press, 2012.