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Abstract—This paper concerns the adaptive control of a class of discrete-time nonlinear systems with all states accessible. Recently, a high-order tuner algorithm was developed for the minimization of convex loss functions with time-varying regressors in the context of an identification problem. Based on Nesterov’s algorithm, the high-order tuner was shown to guarantee bounded parameter estimation when regressors vary with time, and to lead to accelerated convergence of the tracking error when regressors are constant. In this paper, we apply the high-order tuner to the adaptive control of a particular class of discrete-time nonlinear dynamical systems. First, we show that for plants of this class, the underlying dynamical error model can be causally converted to an algebraic error model. Second, we show that using this algebraic error model, the high-order tuner can be applied to provably stabilize the class of dynamical systems around a reference trajectory.

I. INTRODUCTION

Adaptive control problems take the form of controlling a plant containing unknown parameters, which requires simultaneous online learning and control [1]–[4]. The field is rich with numerous applications and a theoretical history stretching back decades [2]. As autonomous systems become more and more pervasive, there is a growing need for faster learning and faster control. The many approaches to adaptive control that have been developed over the years can be roughly divided into two categories [4]: indirect adaptive control, in which the unknown plant parameters are learned and state feedback is calculated from the estimates; and direct adaptive control, in which the state feedback is directly learned.

Many recent approaches have taken an indirect approach. The approaches in [5], [6] are one illustration of indirect adaptive control of LTI systems, where the unknown parameters are first estimated using a least squares approach followed by a system-level synthesis method to determine the resulting LQR gain $K$. It should be noted that indirect adaptive control has a very rich history prior to [5], [6] as well [1]–[4].

Indirect approaches, however, have the requirement that the initial parameter estimate is sufficiently close, and they require a persistently exciting input so that the parameter estimates converge to their true values – [5], for example, calls for Gaussian noise as input. Direct adaptive control algorithms, on the other hand, determine a control structure wherein the parameters are directly adjusted based on a suitable performance error derived using a reference model.

Often the adaptive laws for adjusting these parameters are based on an error model [1] that leads to a stable adaptive law. The main advantage of this approach over the indirect one is that there is no requirement related to persistent excitation. As one cannot always guarantee that such an excitation is present, and as it is often counter to the system performance goals, this direct approach can be advantageous in many cases. For the most part, the adaptive laws for updating the parameter estimates are based on a gradient descent approach, both in continuous time [1], [2] and discrete-time [4].

Within direct adaptive control, high-order tuners represent a more recent departure from gradient descent-based methods. High-order tuners for adaptive control were first studied in [7]. Within the past few years, a discrete-time high-order tuner was developed in [8] for parameter learning with time-varying regressors. Developed from a well-known theory of 2nd-order gradient algorithms for accelerated convergence [9]–[12], the high-order tuner algorithm in [8] was shown to lead to faster learning than gradient descent-based methods, as well as strong non-asymptotic convergence guarantees for constant regressors. Crucially, the discrete-time high-order tuner is provably stable when regressors vary with time. Its distinct advantage is accelerated convergence of the output error: it has been shown in [8] that when regressors are constant, the high-order tuner has convergence guarantees that are a log factor away from those of Nesterov’s algorithm [11] and that are significantly faster than those of gradient descent algorithms.

The discrete-time high-order tuner discussed above has only been studied in the context of system identification, and has employed algebraic error models for parameter learning. In this paper, we consider the adaptive control problem for a class of single-input, feedback-linearizable dynamical systems whose states are accessible. For this class, we show that the high-order tuner can be applied, leading to global stability and convergence of the underlying tracking error in the state to zero. A causal filtering approach based on [13] is used to convert the underlying dynamical error model into an algebraic error model. Unlike in [14]–[18] where the underlying states are filtered as well, the approach used here only generates an augmented error signal, as in [13]. Using this error model and a high-order tuner, we show that the class of dynamic systems can be adaptively controlled in a stable manner.

The main contribution of this paper is the development of a novel algorithm based on the high-order tuner in [8] for direct adaptive control of a class of single-input, feedback-
linearizable systems. We prove that this algorithm guarantees global boundedness of the closed-loop adaptive system and asymptotic tracking of a reference model, regardless of persistent excitation or the initial parameter estimate. The high-order tuner is applied to the adaptive control problem via a causal method of converting a dynamical error model with all states accessible to an algebraic error model. Finally, our proof technique is straightforward and generalizable to a broad class of laws for updating the parameter estimate.

To the authors’ knowledge, ours is the first paper to apply a high-order tuner to adaptive control in discrete time. Our paper complements [19], which establishes parameter learning for identification problems in discrete-time dynamical systems with persistent excitation.

The paper proceeds as follows. Section II lays out the problem setting, describes the framework by which we convert the dynamical error model to an algebraic error model, and introduces useful notation for the subsequent proofs. Section III provides an illustrative example of our proof technique on a gradient descent-based adaptive law. Section IV presents the main result of our paper: a proof technique on a gradient descent-based adaptive law. Finally, Section V provides concluding remarks, and the Appendix contains all proofs in the paper.

II. PROBLEM SETTING

The problem that we consider in this paper is the adaptive control of the single-input plant

\[ x_{p(k+1)} = Ax_p + b\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i^T f_i(x_p) + u_k\right) \]  

(1)

where \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \) and \( a_i \in \mathbb{R}^m \) are unknown, while \( b \in \mathbb{R}^n \) and \( f_i(\cdot) \in \mathbb{R}^m \) are known. We assume that each \( f_i(\cdot) \) is globally \( M \)-Lipschitz. The goal is to determine the control input \( u_k \) in real time such that \( x_{pk} \) behaves in a desired manner.

A standard procedure in adaptive control is to choose a reference model

\[ x_{m(k+1)} = A_m x_{mk} + br_k \]  

(2)

where \( A_m \) is chosen by the control designer to be Schur-stable with the desired closed-loop eigenvalues, and \( r_k \) is a bounded reference input chosen such that \( x_{mk} \) follows the desired trajectory of the plant. If all parameters were known, choosing \( u_k \) of the form

\[ u_k = k_*^T x_{pk} - \sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i^T f_i(x_{pk}) + r_k, \]  

(3)
a feedback linearizing controller, would ensure that the closed-loop plant response follows the same trajectory as the reference model, provided that \( A_m = A + bk_*^T \). Given that \( A_m \) is chosen without a priori knowledge of \( A \), the following matching condition is a standard assumption employed in adaptive control:

**Assumption 1:** We assume that there exists some \( k_* \in \mathbb{R}^n \) such that

\[ A + bk_*^T = A_m \]  

(4)

It is well-known that an adaptive control input of the form

\[ u_k = \hat{k}_k^T x_{pk} - \sum_{i=1}^{N} \hat{a}_{ik} f_i(x_{pk}) + r_k, \]  

(5)

where \( \hat{k}_k \) and \( \hat{a}_{ik} \) are estimates of the unknown parameters \( k_* \) and \( a_i \) in (3), can guarantee that the state error

\[ e_k := x_{pk} - x_{mk} \]  

(6)

converges to zero if the estimates are suitably adjusted using an adaptive law [1], [4].

In the remainder of this section, we propose a new general algorithm for this adaptive control problem, based on results in [13] for system identification. In Section V we then propose the addition of the high-order tuner developed in [8], [19] as a particular adaptive law.

The closed-loop adaptive system for the plant in (1) with the controller in (5) is described by

\[ x_{p(k+1)} = A_m x_{pk} + b\theta_k^T \phi_k + br_k \]  

(7)

where

\[ \theta_k^T := [\hat{k}_k^T, \hat{a}_{11}^T, \ldots, \hat{a}_{N1}^T] \]  

(8)

\[ \theta_*^T := [k_*^T, a_{11}^T, \ldots, a_{N1}^T] \]  

(9)

\[ \hat{\theta}_k := \theta_k - \theta_* \]  

(10)

\[ \phi_k := [x_{pk}^T, -f_1(x_{pk}), \ldots, -f_N(x_{pk})] \]  

(11)

It is easy to see that (7), (2), and (6) yield the error model:

\[ e_{k+1} = A_m e_k + b\tilde{\theta}_k^T \phi_k \]  

(12)

A. An Equivalent Algebraic Error Model

Equation (12) is a dynamical error model, as it relates the two main errors, the state error \( e_k \) and the parameter error \( \hat{\theta}_k \), through a dynamical model. Our approach based on [13] transforms this problem into an algebraic error model of the form

\[ e_{k+1} = \tilde{\theta}_k^T \phi_k \]  

(13)

where [13]

\[ e_{k+1} := b^T \Gamma(e_{k+1} - A_m e_k) / \beta^T b \]  

(14)

and \( \Gamma > 0 \) is any positive definite matrix. It should be noted that \( e_{k+1} \) is another performance error that depends on the state error through the relation

\[ e_{k+1} = A_m e_k + b e_{k+1} \]  

(15)

Therefore, as \( A_m \) is Schur-stable, any adaptive law that is designed so that \( e_k \) is bounded guarantees that \( e_{k+1} \) is bounded as well. Similarly, if \( e_k \to 0 \) as \( k \to \infty \), then \( e_{k+1} \to 0 \) as well.

It should also be noted that a causal adaptive law can be derived for adjusting the parameter estimate \( \theta_k \) defined in (8) by first measuring the state and the corresponding
errors on the right-hand side of (14) and then updating the parameter estimate. This overall algorithm is summarized in Algorithm 1. In line 11, ADAPTIVE_LAW refers to any iterative algorithm for updating \( \theta_k \).

As we shall show in the following sections, update laws based on the gradient of a loss function - in particular, normalized gradient descent and the high-order tuner - lead to global stability, regardless of the level of excitation in the input or the initial parameter estimate \( \theta_0 \).

B. Preliminaries

In this section, we review notation used in [20] for the relative rates at which sequences of real numbers grow. We also provide a useful result pertaining to the relative growth rates of \( x_{pk} \) and \( \phi_k \).

Definition 1 ([20]): Let \( \{x_k\} \) and \( \{y_k\} \) be two sequences such that \( x_k, y_k \in \mathbb{R}_+ \). If there exists a sequence \( \{\beta_k\} \) with \( \beta_k \to 0 \) as \( k \to \infty \) such that \( y_k = \beta_k x_k \), then we denote

\[
y_k = o[x_k]\]

Definition 2 ([20]): Let \( \{x_k\} \) and \( \{y_k\} \) be two sequences. If there exists a constant \( M > 0 \) such that \( |y_k| \leq M|x_k| \ \forall k \), then we denote

\[
y_k = O[x_k]\]

Lemma 1: Let \( \phi_k \) be the regressor defined in (11) with each \( f_i(\cdot) \) an \( M_i \)-Lipschitz function with \( f_i(0) = 0 \). Then, \( ||\phi_k|| = O(||x_{pk}||) \).

We omit the proof, as it is fairly straightforward.

III. A FIRST-ORDER APPROACH TO ADAPTIVE CONTROL

The algebraic error model in (13) lends itself easily to a loss function given by [8]

\[
L_k(\theta_k) = \frac{1}{2} x_{k+1}^2 = \frac{1}{2} (\hat{\theta}_k^T \phi_k)^2
\] (16)

The gradient of the loss function can then be calculated as

\[
\nabla L_k(\theta_k) = \phi_k \tilde{\theta}_k = \phi_k \varepsilon_{k+1}
\] (17)

Algorithm 1 General Algorithm for Direct Adaptive Control of the Error Model in (12)

```plaintext
1: Input: initial conditions \( x_{p0}, x_{m0} \), initial parameter estimate \( \theta_0 \), reference input \( \{r_k\}_{k \geq 0} \), reference system \( (A_m, b) \), functions \( f_1(\cdot), \ldots, f_N(\cdot) \), gain \( \Gamma \), adaptive law gains
2: for \( k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \) do
3:   Let \( \phi_k = [x_{p1}^T, -f_1(x_{pk}), \ldots, -f_N(x_{pk})]^T \)
4:   Receive reference input \( r_k \)
5:   Let \( u_k = \tilde{\theta}_k^T \phi_k + r_k \)
6:   Apply \( u_k \) to plant
7:   Measure new state \( x_{p(k+1)} \)
8:   Simulate \( x_{m(k+1)} = A_m x_{m(k)} + br_k \)
9:   Let \( \varepsilon_{k+1} = x_{p(k+1)} - x_{m(k+1)} \)
10: Let \( \varepsilon_{k+1} = b \tilde{\Gamma}(r_{k+1} - A_m r_k) \)
11: Update \( \theta_{k+1} \leftarrow \text{ADAPTIVE}_LAW(\theta_k, \phi_k, \varepsilon_{k+1}, \gamma) \)
12: end for
```

It is easy to see that \( L_k(\theta_k) \) is non-strongly convex and has a time-varying smoothness parameter of \( ||\phi_k||^2 \). We therefore use a normalized loss function given by [8]

\[
\overline{L}_k(\theta_k) = \frac{L_k(\theta_k)}{N_k}
\] (18)

where \( N_k \) is a normalization term given by

\[
N_k := 1 + ||\phi_k||^2
\] (19)

It is apparent from (18) and (19) that \( \overline{L}_k(\theta_k) \) is convex and 1-smooth, with a gradient that can be calculated as

\[
\nabla L_k(\theta_k) = \frac{1}{N_k} \phi_k \phi_k^T \varepsilon_k = \frac{1}{N_k} \phi_k \varepsilon_{k+1}
\] (20)

The problem of minimizing the loss function in (18) leads naturally to the well-known normalized gradient descent adaptive law given by [4]

\[
\theta_{k+1} = \theta_k - \gamma \overline{L}_k(\theta_k)
\] (21)

A. Stability of the Gradient Descent Adaptive Law

We now show that Algorithm 1 with (20) and (21) in place of the ADAPTIVE_LAW on line 11 is a globally stable adaptive controller. The first step is to show that the parameter errors are bounded, which is addressed in Proposition 1.

Proposition 1: The adaptive law in (21) results in a bounded parameter error \( \theta_k \) for all \( k \) if \( 0 < \gamma < 2 \) with

\[
V_k = ||\theta_k - \theta_\star||^2
\] (22)

as a Lyapunov function.

Proof: See Subsection A in the Appendix. ■

We now prove the boundedness of the overall closed loop adaptive control system described by the error model in (12): Theorem 1: The closed-loop adaptive system defined by (7), (12), (14), and (21) with \( 0 < \gamma < 2 \) results in \( e_k \to 0 \) as \( k \to \infty \).

Proof: See Subsection B in the Appendix. ■

Remark 1: Theorem 1 together with Proposition 1 extends the results of [13] to show that the approach based on an algebraic error model can be used to guarantee closed-loop stability for discrete-time adaptive control.

Remark 2: As is clear from the proof in the Appendix, elements of [20] were employed to prove Theorem 1. Our overall approach, however, is much more simplified than that in [20]. The more elaborate arguments of positive realness in [20] are not needed here as we are considering the case where all states are accessible.

Yet another interesting point to note is the generality of the proof. As will become evident from our discussions in the next section, the same method of proof can be employed for any adaptive law that can guarantee the property \( \theta_k^T \phi_k = o(||\theta_k||) \). In this case, this small-order property followed from the structure of the Lyapunov increment (see (31) in the Appendix).

In summary, we have shown in this section that the normalized gradient descent adaptive law in (21) applied to the adaptive system defined by (7), (12), (14) guarantees that...
\[ \tilde{h}_k \in \ell_\infty \] and that \( e_k \to 0 \) as \( k \to \infty \). In the following section, we will show that these stability properties still hold if a high-order tuner is employed to adjust the parameters rather than a gradient-descent based approach.

IV. ADAPTIVE CONTROL WITH A HIGH-ORDER TUNER

We now state the main result of this paper. For the plant given in (1), we propose the adaptive controller given in Algorithm 1 with Algorithm 2 in place of the ADAPTIVE-LAW in line 11. Algorithm 2 summarizes the high-order tuner adaptive law [8].

The specific updates that define the evolution of \( \theta_k \) are summarized as

\[
\begin{align*}
\theta_{k+1} &= \tilde{h}_k - \gamma \nabla \tilde{J}_k(\theta_{k+1}) \\
\tilde{h}_k &= \tilde{h}_k - \gamma \beta \nabla \tilde{J}_k(\theta_k) \\
\theta_{k+1} &= \tilde{h}_k - \beta (\tilde{h}_k - \tilde{h}_0) 
\end{align*}
\]

(23)-(25) reduce to Nesterov’s algorithm [8], respectively, by setting \( \gamma = 1 \) and \( \beta = 1 \). These results in a high-order counterpart to the adaptive law and \( \theta_k \) for all \( k \) if \( 0 < \beta < 1 \) and \( 0 < \gamma < \frac{4\beta(1-\beta)}{1+(3-5\beta)(1-\beta)} \) results in \( e_k \to 0 \) as \( k \to \infty \). See Subsection C in the Appendix.

A. Stability of the High-Order Tuner Adaptive Law

As before, we first prove the boundedness of the parameter error \( \tilde{h}_k \) and the auxiliary parameter estimate \( \theta_k \) in the following proposition.

Proposition 2: The adaptive law in (23)-(25) results in a bounded parameter error \( \tilde{h}_k \) and a bounded auxiliary parameter estimate \( \theta_k \) for all \( k \) if \( 0 < \beta < 1 \) and \( 0 < \gamma < \frac{4\beta(1-\beta)}{1+(3-5\beta)(1-\beta)} \) with

\[
V_k = \| \tilde{h}_k - \theta_k \|^2 + \| \tilde{h}_k - \theta_k \|^2
\]

(30) as a Lyapunov function.

Proof: See Subsection D in the Appendix.

Remark 3: In Proposition 2 and Theorem 2 (as in Proposition 1 and Theorem 1), we make no assumptions on the level of excitation in the input or on the initial parameter estimate \( \theta_0 \). Therefore, this adaptive law can be applied with any bounded input \( \{ r_k \} \) and any initial parameter estimate.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORKS

In this paper, we present a novel algorithm for model-reference adaptive control of the class of nonlinear systems given in (1). This algorithm uses a causal filtering method to convert the resulting dynamical error model into an algebraic error model and applies the discrete-time high-order tuner present in [8] as the adaptive law. Crucially, the algorithm is shown to guarantee that \( e_k \to 0 \) as \( k \to \infty \) using a simple and general proof method for systems with all states accessible. In this proof, we make no assumptions on the initial parameter estimate or the amount of excitation in the input. This work is an essential stepping stone to future research in applying high-order tuners to discrete-time adaptive control.

Areas for future research on this topic include extensions to other convex loss functions that might be applicable to adaptive control, as well as finite-time regret bounds. Of particular interest are results in [8] regarding exponential and non-asymptotic convergence rates of the parameter error, and how those results might be leveraged to achieve non-asymptotic convergence of the state error to zero.
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APPENDIX

Proofs of all propositions and theorems are provided below. While the proof of Proposition 1 is well-known, we include it for completeness. The proof of Proposition 2 is based on the proof of Theorem 4 in [8], but differs in several crucial steps that are needed for the proof of Theorem 2. Finally, as the proof of Theorem 2 is very similar to that of Theorem 1 we say it in brief.

A. Proof of Proposition 1

Proof: Consider the candidate Lyapunov function given in (22). The increment can be written as

\[
\Delta V_k = ||\theta_{k+1} - \theta_\star||^2 - ||\theta_k - \theta_\star||^2
\]

Applying (20) and (21) and rearranging, we obtain

\[
\Delta V_k = \|\hat{\theta}_k - \gamma \frac{1}{N_k} \phi_k \hat{\theta}_k \|^2 - \|\hat{\theta}_k\|^2
\]

\[
= \frac{\gamma^2 \phi_k^\top \hat{\theta}_k \phi_k \hat{\theta}_k}{N_k} - \frac{2 \gamma}{N_k} \phi_k \hat{\theta}_k \hat{\theta}_k^\top \phi_k^\top
\]

\[
= - \gamma \left( 2 - \frac{\gamma}{N_k} \right) (\hat{\theta}_k^\top \phi_k)^2
\]

Finally, noting that \(2 - \gamma < 2 - \frac{\gamma}{N_k} \leq 2\), we are left with

\[
\Delta V_k \leq - \frac{\gamma (2 - \gamma)}{N_k} (\hat{\theta}_k^\top \phi_k)^2 \tag{31}
\]

\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} N_k (\hat{\theta}_k^\top \phi_k)^2 = 0 \tag{33}
\]

We now show that \(\lim_{k \to \infty} \|\phi_k\| = 0\), which we have shown implies that \(\lim_{k \to \infty} \|\phi_k\| = 0\). We accomplish this by considering two cases: either 1) \(\|\phi_k\|\) is bounded, or 2) \(\|\phi_k\|\) is unbounded.

1) Suppose that \(\|\phi_k\|\) is bounded. Then, \(\frac{1}{N_k} \to 0\) is also bounded. Equation (33) therefore implies that \(\hat{\theta}_k^\top \phi_k\) goes to 0, and the proof is complete.

2) Now suppose that \(\|\phi_k\|\) is unbounded. Then, \(\lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{1}{N_k} = 0\). As (33) still holds, \(\hat{\theta}_k^\top \phi_k\) is either bounded or grows at a slower rate than \(\|\phi_k\|\), i.e. \(\hat{\theta}_k^\top \phi_k = o(\|\phi_k\|)\). By Lemma 1 we have \(\|\phi_k\| = O(\|x_{pk}\|)\), and hence

\[
\hat{\theta}_k^\top \phi_k = o(\|x_{pk}\|) \tag{34}
\]

From (7), since \(r_k\) is bounded, \(x_{pk}\) is the state of a Schur-stable LTI system with input that is \(o(\|x_{pk}\|)\). It follows immediately that \(\|x_{pk}\|\) must be bounded and therefore \(\|\phi_k\|\) is bounded, which contradicts case 2.)
C. Proof of Proposition 2

Proof: Consider the candidate Lyapunov function given in (30). The increment can be written as

\[
\Delta V_k = \|\tilde{\theta}_{k+1} - \theta_k\|^2 - \|\tilde{\theta}_k - \theta_k\|^2
\]

We now apply (23)-(25) and (26)-(27). (A note on notation: we define \( \delta_k := \theta_k - \theta_* \))

\[
\Delta V_k = \|\tilde{\theta}_k - \frac{\gamma N_k}{k} \nabla L_k(\theta_{k+1})\|^2 - \|\tilde{\theta}_k\|^2
\]

\[
+ \|\tilde{\theta}_k - \beta(\tilde{\theta}_k - \theta_k) - \delta_k + \frac{\gamma N_k}{k} \nabla L_k(\theta_{k+1})\|^2
\]

\[
- \|\theta_k - \delta_k\|^2
\]

\[
= \frac{\gamma^2}{N_k} \|\nabla L_k(\theta_{k+1})\|^2 - \frac{2\gamma}{N_k} \tilde{\theta}_k^\top \nabla L_k(\theta_{k+1})
\]

\[
+ \|\tilde{\theta}_k - \beta(\tilde{\theta}_k - \theta_k) - \delta_k + \frac{\gamma N_k}{k} \nabla L_k(\theta_{k+1})\|^2
\]

\[
- \|\theta_k - \delta_k\|^2
\]

\[
= \frac{\gamma^2}{N_k} \|\nabla L_k(\theta_{k+1})\|^2 - \frac{2\gamma}{N_k} \tilde{\theta}_k^\top \nabla L_k(\theta_{k+1})
\]

\[
+ \|\tilde{\theta}_k - \beta(\tilde{\theta}_k - \theta_k) - \delta_k + \frac{\gamma N_k}{k} \nabla L_k(\theta_{k+1})\|^2
\]

\[
- \|\theta_k - \delta_k\|^2
\]

\[
= \frac{2\gamma^2}{N_k} \|\nabla L_k(\theta_{k+1})\|^2 - \frac{2\gamma}{N_k} \tilde{\theta}_k^\top \nabla L_k(\theta_{k+1})
\]

\[
- 2\gamma(1 - \beta) (\tilde{\theta}_k - \theta_k)^\top \nabla L_k(\theta_{k+1})
\]

\[
+ \|\tilde{\theta}_k - \beta(\tilde{\theta}_k - \theta_k) - \delta_k + \frac{\gamma N_k}{k} \nabla L_k(\theta_{k+1})\|^2
\]

\[
- \|\theta_k - \delta_k\|^2
\]

\[
= \frac{2\gamma^2}{N_k} \|\nabla L_k(\theta_{k+1})\|^2 - \frac{2\gamma}{N_k} \tilde{\theta}_k^\top \nabla L_k(\theta_{k+1})
\]

\[
- 2\gamma(1 - \beta) (\tilde{\theta}_k - \theta_k)^\top \nabla L_k(\theta_{k+1})
\]

\[
+ \|\tilde{\theta}_k - \beta(\tilde{\theta}_k - \theta_k) - \delta_k + \frac{\gamma N_k}{k} \nabla L_k(\theta_{k+1})\|^2
\]

\[
- \|\theta_k - \delta_k\|^2
\]

\[
= -2\gamma \left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{N_k} \phi_k^\top \phi_k\right) (\tilde{\theta}_{k+1}^\top \phi_k)^2
\]

\[
+ \frac{\gamma^2}{N_k} \|\nabla L_k(\theta_{k+1})\|^2 - \frac{2\gamma}{N_k} (\theta_k - \delta_k)^\top \nabla L_k(\theta_k)
\]

\[
- \beta(2 - \beta) ||\tilde{\theta}_k - \theta_k||^2
\]

\[
+ \frac{4\gamma(1 - \beta)}{N_k} (\tilde{\theta}_k - \theta_k)^\top \nabla L_k(\theta_{k+1})
\]

\[
= -2\gamma \left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{N_k} \phi_k^\top \phi_k\right) (\tilde{\theta}_{k+1}^\top \phi_k)^2
\]

\[
+ \frac{\gamma^2}{N_k} \|\nabla L_k(\theta_{k+1})\|^2 - \frac{2\gamma}{N_k} (\theta_k - \delta_k)^\top \nabla L_k(\theta_k)
\]

\[
- \beta(2 - \beta) ||\tilde{\theta}_k - \theta_k||^2
\]

\[
+ \frac{4\gamma(1 - \beta)}{N_k} (\tilde{\theta}_k - \theta_k)^\top \nabla L_k(\theta_{k+1})
\]

\[
= -2\gamma \left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{N_k} \phi_k^\top \phi_k\right) (\tilde{\theta}_{k+1}^\top \phi_k)^2
\]

\[
+ \frac{\gamma^2}{N_k} \|\nabla L_k(\theta_{k+1})\|^2 - \frac{2\gamma}{N_k} (\theta_k - \delta_k)^\top \nabla L_k(\theta_k)
\]

\[
- \beta(2 - \beta) ||\tilde{\theta}_k - \theta_k||^2
\]

\[
+ \frac{4\gamma(1 - \beta)}{N_k} (\tilde{\theta}_k - \theta_k)^\top \nabla L_k(\theta_{k+1})
\]

\[
= -2\gamma \left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{N_k} \phi_k^\top \phi_k\right) (\tilde{\theta}_{k+1}^\top \phi_k)^2
\]

\[
+ \frac{\gamma^2}{N_k} \|\nabla L_k(\theta_{k+1})\|^2 - \frac{2\gamma}{N_k} (\theta_k - \delta_k)^\top \nabla L_k(\theta_k)
\]

\[
- \beta(2 - \beta) ||\tilde{\theta}_k - \theta_k||^2
\]

\[
+ \frac{4\gamma(1 - \beta)}{N_k} (\tilde{\theta}_k - \theta_k)^\top \nabla L_k(\theta_{k+1})
\]
\[
\Delta V_k \leq -\frac{2\gamma}{N_k}(1 - \frac{\gamma \phi_k^T \phi_k}{N_k}) (\theta_{k+1}^T \phi_k)^2 \\
- \frac{2\gamma^2 \beta^2}{N_k^2} \| \nabla L_k(\theta_k) \|^2 \\
+ \frac{2\gamma(2 - 3\beta)}{N_k} (\theta_k - \theta_k^*)^T \phi_k \phi_k^T \theta_{k+1} \\
- \frac{\beta(2 - \beta)}{N_k} \| \bar{\theta}_k - \theta_k \|^2 \\
- \frac{2\gamma^2\beta}{N_k^2} (\bar{\theta}_k - \theta_k)^T \phi_k \phi_k^T \nabla L_k(\theta_k) \\
- \frac{2\gamma \beta^2}{N_k} (\bar{\theta}_k - \theta_k)^T \phi_k^2 - \frac{\beta(2 - \beta)}{N_k} \| \bar{\theta}_k - \theta_k \|^2 \\
\leq -\frac{2\gamma}{N_k}(1 - \frac{\gamma \phi_k^T \phi_k}{N_k}) (\theta_{k+1}^T \phi_k)^2 \\
- \frac{2\gamma^2 \beta^2}{N_k^2} \| \nabla L_k(\theta_k) \|^2 \\
+ \frac{2\gamma(2 - 3\beta)}{N_k} \| \bar{\theta}_k - \theta_k \| \theta_k^T \phi_k \\
- \frac{\beta(2 - \beta)}{N_k} \| \bar{\theta}_k - \theta_k \|^2 \\
+ \frac{2\gamma^2 \beta}{N_k^2} \| \bar{\theta}_k - \theta_k \| \| \nabla L_k(\theta_k) \| \\
- \frac{2\gamma \beta^2}{N_k} ((\bar{\theta}_k - \theta_k)^T \phi_k)^2 - \frac{\beta(2 - \beta)}{N_k} \| \bar{\theta}_k - \theta_k \|^2 \\
\leq 0
\]

where the last inequality holds iff \(0 < \gamma < 1\). We now complete squares with the \( \| \nabla L_k(\theta_k) \| \) terms and the \( \| \phi_k \|^2 \| \bar{\theta}_k - \theta_k \|^2 \) term to obtain

\[
\Delta V_k \leq -\frac{\gamma \alpha}{N_k}(1 - \frac{\gamma \beta \| \phi_k \|^2}{N_k})^2 (\theta_{k+1}^T \phi_k)^2 \\
- \frac{\gamma \alpha \beta}{N_k} \left( \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{N_k}} \| \nabla L_k(\theta_k) \| - \| \phi_k \| \| \bar{\theta}_k - \theta_k \| \right)^2 \\
+ \frac{\gamma(2 - 3\beta)}{N_k} (\theta_k - \theta_k^*)^T \phi_k \phi_k^T \theta_{k+1} \\
- \frac{\beta(2 - \beta)}{N_k} \| \bar{\theta}_k - \theta_k \|^2 \\
- \frac{2\gamma \beta^2}{N_k} ((\bar{\theta}_k - \theta_k)^T \phi_k)^2 - \frac{\beta(2 - \beta)}{N_k} \| \bar{\theta}_k - \theta_k \|^2 \\
\leq 0
\]

We note that \(1 - \gamma < 1 - \frac{\gamma \beta \| \phi_k \|^2}{N_k} \leq 1\) and complete squares with the \( \theta_{k+1}^T \phi_k \) terms and the \( \| \phi_k \|^2 \| \bar{\theta}_k - \theta_k \|^2 \) term to obtain

\[
\Delta V_k \leq -\frac{\gamma \alpha}{N_k}(1 - \frac{\gamma \beta \| \phi_k \|^2}{N_k})^2 (\theta_{k+1}^T \phi_k)^2 \\
- \frac{\gamma \alpha \beta}{N_k} \left( \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{N_k}} \| \nabla L_k(\theta_k) \| - \| \phi_k \| \| \bar{\theta}_k - \theta_k \| \right)^2 \\
+ \frac{2\gamma \beta^2}{N_k} (\theta_k - \theta_k^*)^T \phi_k \phi_k^T \theta_{k+1} \\
- \frac{\beta(2 - \beta)}{N_k} \| \bar{\theta}_k - \theta_k \|^2 \\
- \frac{2\gamma \beta^2}{N_k} ((\bar{\theta}_k - \theta_k)^T \phi_k)^2 - \frac{\beta(2 - \beta)}{N_k} \| \bar{\theta}_k - \theta_k \|^2 \\
\leq 0
\]

if \(0 < \beta < 1\) and \(0 < \gamma < \frac{4\beta(1 - \beta)}{1 + (1 - 3\beta)(1 - \beta)}\).

This is sufficient to prove that \(V_k\) is a Lyapunov function. However, for the purposes of Theorem 2, we want the increment in terms of \(\theta_k^T \phi_k\). Using (25) and rearranging,

\[
(\theta_{k+1}^T \phi_k)^2 = \left(1 - \frac{\gamma \beta \| \phi_k \|^2}{N_k}\right)^2 (\theta_k^T \phi_k)^2 \\
- 2\beta \left(1 - \frac{\gamma \beta \| \phi_k \|^2}{N_k}\right) (\bar{\theta}_k - \theta_k)^T \phi_k \phi_k^T \bar{\theta}_k \\
+ \beta^2 ((\bar{\theta}_k - \theta_k)^T \phi_k)^2
\]

Finally, defining \(\alpha\) as

\[
\alpha := 2(1 - \gamma) - \frac{\gamma(2 - 3\beta)^2}{2\beta(1 - \beta)}
\]

we substitute the expression above into the Lyapunov increment and rearrange to yield

\[
\Delta V_k \leq -\frac{\gamma \alpha}{N_k}(1 - \frac{\gamma \beta \| \phi_k \|^2}{N_k})^2 (\theta_{k+1}^T \phi_k)^2 \\
+ \frac{2\gamma \alpha \beta}{N_k} \left( \frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{N_k}} \| \nabla L_k(\theta_k) \| - \| \phi_k \| \| \bar{\theta}_k - \theta_k \| \right)^2 \\
- \frac{2\gamma \beta^2}{N_k} ((\bar{\theta}_k - \theta_k)^T \phi_k)^2 \\
- \frac{\beta(2 - \beta)}{N_k} \| \bar{\theta}_k - \theta_k \|^2
\]

Completing the square with the \(\theta_k^T \phi_k\) and \((\bar{\theta}_k - \theta_k)^T \phi_k\) terms and noting that \(1 - \gamma \beta < 1 - \frac{\gamma \beta \| \phi_k \|^2}{N_k} \leq 1\), we obtain the final expression:

\[
\Delta V_k \leq -\frac{\gamma \alpha}{N_k}(1 - \frac{\gamma \beta \| \phi_k \|^2}{N_k})^2 (\theta_{k+1}^T \phi_k)^2 \\
- \frac{\gamma(2 + \alpha)}{N_k} \left( \frac{\gamma}{2 + \alpha} \left(1 - \frac{\gamma \beta \| \phi_k \|^2}{N_k}\right)\theta_k^T \phi_k \\
- \frac{\beta \| \bar{\theta}_k - \theta_k \|^2}{N_k} (\bar{\theta}_k - \theta_k)^T \phi_k\right)^2 \\
- \frac{\beta(2 - \beta)}{N_k} \| \bar{\theta}_k - \theta_k \|^2 \\
\leq 0
\]

since \(\alpha \geq 0 \Rightarrow 1 - \frac{\alpha}{2+\alpha} > 0\).
In summary, we have
\[
\Delta V_k \leq -\frac{\gamma\alpha(1-\gamma\beta)^2}{N_k}\left(1-\frac{\alpha}{2+\alpha}\right)(\tilde{\theta}_k^\top\phi_k)^2
- \frac{\beta(2-\beta)}{N_k}\|\tilde{\theta}_k - \theta_k\|^2
\leq 0
\] (36)

D. Proof of Theorem 2

Proof: Consider the Lyapunov function in (30). From Proposition 2, we know that \(V_k \geq 0\) and \(\Delta V_k \leq 0\). It follows immediately that
\[
0 \leq \lim_{k \to \infty} V_k \leq V_0 \implies
0 \leq V_0 + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \Delta V_k \leq V_0 \implies
\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \Delta V_k = 0 \implies
\lim_{k \to \infty} \Delta V_k = 0
\] (37)

Substituting (36), we get
\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{1}{N_k}(\tilde{\theta}_k^\top\phi_k)^2 + \frac{\hat{c}_1}{N_k}\|\tilde{\theta}_k - \theta_k\|^2 = 0, \ \hat{c}_1, \hat{c}_2 > 0 \implies
\lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{1}{N_k}(\tilde{\theta}_k^\top\phi_k)^2 = 0
\] (38)

As before, we prove that \(\lim_{k \to \infty} \|e_k\| = 0\) by showing that \(\lim_{k \to \infty} \tilde{\theta}_k^\top\phi_k = 0\). Supposing that \(\|\phi_k\|\) is unbounded results in a contradiction because \(\tilde{\theta}_k^\top\phi_k = o[\|x_{pk}\|]\) (using (38) and Lemma 1), so \(x_{pk}\) is the state of a Schur-stable LTI system with input that grows like \(o[\|x_{pk}\|]\). It follows immediately that \(\|x_{pk}\|\) and therefore \(\|\phi_k\|\) are bounded. We then know that if \(\|\phi_k\|\) is bounded, (38) implies that \(\tilde{\theta}_k^\top\phi_k\) goes to 0, and the proof is complete.