
Meta-Learning Guarantees for Online Receding Horizon Learning Control

Deepan Muthirayan¹ Pramod Khargonekar¹

Abstract

In this paper we provide provable regret guarantees for an online meta-learning receding horizon control algorithm in an iterative control setting. We consider the setting where, in each iteration the system to be controlled is a linear deterministic system that is different and unknown, the cost for the controller in an iteration is a general additive cost function and there are affine control input constraints. By analysing conditions under which sub-linear regret is achievable, we prove that the online receding horizon controller achieves a regret for the controller cost and constraint violation that are $\tilde{O}(T^{3/4})$ with respect to the best policy that satisfies the control input control constraints, when the preview of the cost functions is limited to an interval and the interval size is doubled from one to the next. We then show that the average of the regret for the controller cost and constraint violation with respect to the same policy vary as $\tilde{O}((1 + 1/\sqrt{N})T^{3/4})$ with the number of iterations N , under the same setting.

1. Introduction

In this paper, our goal is to explore theoretical properties of meta-learning in a suitable closed-loop control setting. Specifically, we consider a scenario in which there is a sequence of episodes, each of a finite duration. In each episode, the system to be controlled is unknown, different and drawn from a fixed set. The controller has preview of the cost functions for a certain duration but doesn't have any other prior information, has to learn to control on-the-fly and can leverage the experience from previous episodes to improve its learning during a new episode. For this setting we propose and study an *online model-based meta-learning receding horizon control algorithm*. It has two levels of learning: an *outer learner* that continually learns a general model by adapting the model after every new episode of experience and an *inner learner* that continually learns a model of the system during an episode by adapting the model proposed by the outer learner. The receding horizon controller computes the control input for a particular time during an episode by optimizing the cost-to-go using the

model estimate provided by the inner learner in place of the actual model in the transition dynamics. The role of the outer learner is to learn a general model so that the adaptations within an episode improve across the episodes, and thus the overall controller is a meta-learning controller.

Since there are two levels of learning in our meta learning algorithm, we assess its performance through two notions of regret: (i) the regret for the performance within an episode (ii) the average regret for the performance across the episodes. Here we measure the performance of the algorithm for an episode by (i) the controller cost for the episode and (ii) the cumulative of the violation of the control input constraints at each time step for the duration of an episode. The idea for using the average regret as a measure is to assess the ability of the meta-learner to improve the adaptations and hence the performance with more episodes of experience. We explore different conditions under which both the regret and the average regret are sub-linear. We analyse the case where the online controller has preview of the cost functions only for an interval. We show that when the interval size is doubled from one interval to the next, the online controller achieves sub-linear regret and sub-linear average regret. More importantly, we show that the average regret improves with the number of iterations.

1.1. Related Work

Meta-learning research has been pioneered by (Schmidhuber, 1987), (Naik & Mammone, 1992), and (Thrun & Pratt, 1998). Recently, there has been a renewed interest in meta-learning, and allied ideas like few-shot learning, motivated by the success of deep learning. (Andrychowicz et al., 2016), (Li & Malik, 2016), (Ravi & Larochelle, 2016) explored meta-learning in the context of learning to optimize. (Finn et al., 2017) explored the case where the meta-learner uses ordinary gradient descent to update the learner (Model-Agnostic Meta-Learner (MAML)) and showed that this simplified approach can achieve comparable performance. The MAML approach has been subsequently improved and refined by many other works (Flennerhag et al., 2019; Nichol & Schulman, 2018; Rajeswaran et al., 2019). (Duan et al., 2016) and (Wang et al., 2016) both investigated meta-learning in reinforcement-learning domains using traditional Recurrent Neural Networks (RNN) architectures, Gated Recurrent Units (GRUs) and Long Short-Term mem-

ories (LSTMs). (Mishra et al., 2018) investigated a general meta-learner architecture that combines temporal convolutions and causal attention and showed that this model achieves improved performance.

In the OCO framework, under the full information feedback setting, it is established that the best possible regret scales as $O(T^{1/2})$ (resp. $O(\log T)$) for convex (resp. strongly convex) loss functions, where T is the number of time steps (Abernethy et al., 2009; Hazan et al., 2006; Zinkevich, 2003). These results have also been extended to constrained online convex optimization where it has been shown that the best regret scales as $O(T^{\max\{c, 1-c\}})$ for the cost and $O(T^{1-c/2})$ for constraint violation, where c is a constant (Jenatton et al., 2016; Yuan & Lamperski, 2018).

There are some papers in the machine learning literature that provide online regret analysis for meta-learning algorithms. These works analyse gradient based meta-learners because of the natural connection between gradient based learning and online convex optimization. (Finn et al., 2019) provide $O(\log(T))$ regret bound for a gradient based online meta-learner under certain smoothness assumptions. (Balcan et al., 2019) extend the OCO setting to a meta-learning setting and provide regret analysis for a gradient based meta-learning algorithm. They show that the best regret scales as $O((1 + \log(N)/N)T^{1/2})$, where T represents the number of time steps within an OCO procedure and N represents the number of such procedures.

Some significant advancements have been made in the recent years in providing convergence guarantees for standard learning methods in control problems. (Fazel et al., 2018) proved that the policy gradient based learning converges asymptotically to the optimal policy for the Linear-Quadratic Regulator (LQR) problem. (Zhang et al., 2019) extended this result to the $\mathcal{H}_2/\mathcal{H}_\infty$ control problem. Recently, (Molybog & Lavaei, 2020) proved asymptotic convergence of a gradient based meta-learner for the LQR problem. All of these works provide asymptotic convergence guarantees.

Recently, there has also been considerable interest in establishing online learning guarantees in standard control settings. (Dean et al., 2018) provide an algorithm for the Linear-Quadratic control problem with unknown dynamics that achieves a regret of $O(T^{3/4})$. Just recently, (Cohen et al., 2019) improved on this result by providing an algorithm that achieves a regret of $O(T^{1/2})$ for the same problem. (Agarwal et al., 2019a) consider the control problem for a general convex cost and a linear dynamic system with additive adversarial disturbance. They provide an online learning algorithm that achieves an $O(\sqrt{T})$ regret for the cost with respect to the best linear control policy. Agarwal et al. also showed in a subsequent work (Agarwal et al., 2019b) that a poly logarithmic regret is achievable for the

same setting when the transition dynamics is known.

In contrast to the recent splendid work on online learning in control settings, our work considers the online meta-learning setting for a control problem with a general cost function for an episode and control input constraints. We emphasize that the regret analysis we provide is the first of its kind for an online meta-learning control algorithm. The key difference from similar works is that the regret analysis we provide is w.r.t the optimal for a sufficiently general cost function that includes LQR as a special case.

1.2. Our Contribution

In this work we propose a model-based meta-learning receding horizon control algorithm for a general control setting and provide guarantees for its online performance. We show that the proposed meta-learning controller achieves (i) a regret for the controller cost that is $\sim \tilde{O}(T^{3/4})$ for an individual episode of duration T with respect to the best policy that satisfies the control input constraints, when the controller has preview of the cost functions for an interval and the interval is doubled in size from one to the next; (ii) an average regret for the controller cost that varies as $\sim \tilde{O}((1 + 1/\sqrt{N})T^{3/4})$ with the number of episodes N under the same preview setting; (iii) a regret for constraint violation that is $\sim \tilde{O}(T^{3/4})$ for an episode of duration T with respect to the best policy that satisfies the control input constraints under the same preview setting; and (iv) an average regret for constraint violation that varies as $\sim \tilde{O}((1 + 1/\sqrt{N})T^{3/4})$ with the number of episodes N under the same preview setting. Hence we show that the worst regret for the learning within an episode continuously improves with experience of more episodes.

In section 2 we outline the learning setting. In section 3 we introduce and briefly discuss the online meta-learning control algorithm. In section 4 we discuss the inner learner and provide an upper bound for the cumulative error in the model estimation for the inner learner during an episode. In section 5 we discuss the outer learner and provide an upper bound for the average of the cumulative error in model estimation across the episodes. And finally in section 6 we characterize the regret for the controller’s cost and cumulative constraint violation within an episode and the respective averages across the episodes.

Notation: The n -dimensional euclidean space is denoted as \mathbb{R}^n . We denote the null set by \emptyset . The transpose of a vector x is denoted as x^\top . The notation $X > 0$ means that the matrix X is a positive-definite matrix. The minimum eigenvalue of a matrix M is denoted as $\lambda_{\min}(M)$. The sequence $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t\}$ is denoted as $x_{1:t}$. The expectation and conditional expectation w.r.t a filtration \mathcal{F}_t is denoted by $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\cdot|\mathcal{F}_t]$ respectively. We denote the 2-norm by $\|\cdot\|_2$ and the Frobenious norm by $\|\cdot\|_F$. Let $\theta_{s_l}^{s_u} = [A_{s_l}^{s_u}, B_{s_l}^{s_u}]$, $\hat{\theta}_{s_l}^{s_u} =$

$[\hat{A}_{s_l}^{s_u}, \hat{B}_{s_l}^{s_u}]$, $\tilde{\theta}_{s_l}^{s_u} = [\tilde{A}_{s_l}^{s_u}, \tilde{B}_{s_l}^{s_u}]$, where s_u and s_l denotes any superscript and subscript. The notation \tilde{O} implies the following: $\tilde{O}(h(N, T)) = O(\log(N^a(\log T)^b)h(N, T))$, $a \geq 1, b \geq 1$.

2. Problem Setup

2.1. Episodes

The learning setting comprises a sequence of episodes of duration T , from 1 to N , and the system to be controlled in each episode is an unknown linear deterministic system. We denote the matrices of the system in episode i by $A^i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, and $B^i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$. Let $\theta^i = [A^i, B^i] \in \Theta$, a known compact set, and $\|\theta\|_F \leq S$, $\forall \theta \in \Theta$. The parameter θ^i is unknown. We denote the state of the system and the control input to the system at time t in episode i by $x_t^i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $u_t^i \in \mathbb{R}^m$. The initial condition is that $x_1^i = x_s \forall i$. The dynamics of the system is given by the equation

$$x_{t+1}^i = A_i x_t^i + B_i u_t^i \quad (1)$$

We denote the control policy by \mathcal{H} . The controller observes the noise perturbed state y_t^i at time t :

$$y_t^i = x_t^i + \epsilon_t^i,$$

where ϵ_t^i is the zero mean noise. The control policy's output at time t is the control action u_t^i for time t . The control policy has the following information to compute the control action u_t^i at time t : (i) the cost functions c_j for all $j \geq t$, (ii) $\{y_1^i, y_2^i, \dots, y_t^i\}$ and $U_{1:t-1} = \{u_1^i, u_2^i, \dots, u_{t-1}^i\}$. The control cost at time step t is a function of the state x_t^i and the control input u_t^i generated by the controller and is denoted by $c_t(x_t^i, u_t^i)$. Hence the overall cost for the controller \mathcal{H} in episode i is given by

$$\mathcal{C}_i(\mathcal{H}) = \sum_{t=1}^T c_t(x_t^i, u_t^i). \quad (2)$$

Additionally, it is required that the control input be constrained within a bounded convex polytope given by

$$u \in \mathcal{U}, \forall i \text{ and } t, \mathcal{U} = \{u | F_u u \leq b_u\}, \quad (3)$$

where the set \mathcal{U} defined by the matrix F_u and vector b_u of appropriate dimensions is a bounded polytope.

The assumptions used throughout this paper are as follows:

Assumption 1 *The spectral radius $\rho(A) < 1 \forall \theta \in \Theta$ and the system in Eq. (1) is controllable.*

The assumptions on the spectral radius (or the assumption that there is additional knowledge of a feedback rule to stabilize the system) and controllability are standard in online learning and control problems (Abbasi-Yadkori & Szepesvari, 2011; Cohen et al., 2019; Dean et al., 2018; Li et al., 2019; Simchowitz et al., 2020).

Assumption 2 (i) *for each episode (dropping the superscript in all the variables) the stochastic process given by $\{\{z_1, \epsilon_0\}, \{z_2, \epsilon_1\}, \dots\}$, where $z_t^\top = [x_t^\top, u_t^\top]$, there exists a filtration \mathcal{F}_t s.t. z_{t+1}, ϵ_t are \mathcal{F}_t measurable (ii) the noise ϵ_t is bounded, i.e., $\|\epsilon_t\|_2 \leq \epsilon_c$ (iii) each component of the sequence $\{\epsilon_t\}$ is a real-valued martingale difference sequence w.r.t the filtration \mathcal{F}_t and conditionally R sub-Gaussian.*

The filtration assumption was used in (Abbasi-Yadkori & Szepesvari, 2011; Cohen et al., 2019). The assumption that the noise is sub-Gaussian and a martingale difference are standard assumptions in prior works (Abbasi-Yadkori & Szepesvari, 2011; Cohen et al., 2019; Dean et al., 2018).

Definition 1 *A sequence of stage cost functions $\{c_t\}$ is said to be globally exponentially controllable to zero with respect to a function $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ if there exists a pair $M_\lambda > 0, \lambda_e > 0$ such that for any t and x_t there exists an infinite length control input sequence $U_{t:\infty} = \{u_t, u_{t+1}, \dots\}$ such that*

$$c_k(x_k, u_k) \leq M_\lambda \exp^{-\lambda_e(k-t)} \sigma(x_t), \forall k \geq t.$$

Assumption 3 *The function c_t is continuous and locally Lipschitz for all t , with a uniform Lipschitz constant for all t . The sequence of functions given by c_t s is globally exponentially controllable w.r.t $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with constraints $M_\lambda > 0, \lambda_e > 0$ and there exists a constant $\alpha > 0$ such that $c_t(x, u) \geq \alpha \sigma(x)$.*

The cost functions that satisfy Assumption 3 include quadratic functions of the type $x^\top Q x + u^\top R u$, where $Q > 0$ and $R \geq 0$ (see Corollary 4, (Grimm et al., 2005)). Hence the class of cost functions c_t that satisfy Assumption 3 include the loss function in the Linear Quadratic Regulator (LQR) case. The assumption that the cost functions are locally Lipschitz is also a standard assumption (Li et al., 2019; Simchowitz et al., 2020).

2.2. Performance Objective

We define the regret for the controller's cost in a particular episode as the difference between the cost $\mathcal{C}_i(\mathcal{H})$ and the overall cost for the best policy that satisfies the control input constraints. Thus, the average regret for N episodes is given by

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N [\mathcal{C}_i(\mathcal{H}) - \mathcal{C}_i^*], \text{ where}$$

$$\mathcal{C}_i^* = \min \sum_{j=1}^T [c_j(\cdot, \cdot)],$$

$$\text{s.t. (Eq. 1) and (Eq. 3) are satisfied } \forall t, x_1^i = x_s. \quad (4)$$




Figure 1. Online Model-based Meta-learning Control Architecture

The cumulative constraint violation is defined as follows

$$\mathcal{V}_i(\cdot) = \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\sum_k \{F_u u_t^i - b_u\}_{k,+} \right), \quad (5)$$

where $\{\cdot\}_l$ denotes the l th component of a vector. The subscript $\{\cdot\}_+$ is a shorthand notation for $\max\{\cdot, 0\}$. This is also the regret for constraint violation with respect to the best policy that satisfies the control input constraints. Thus the average regret for constraint violation for N episodes is given by

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{V}_i. \quad (6)$$

The objective is to design a suitable meta-learning controller such that the average regret for both the controller's cost and constraint violation are minimized.

3. Structure of the Meta-Learning Control Algorithm

In this section we propose a model-based meta-learning receding horizon control algorithm for the learning setting described above. The overall meta-learning control architecture is shown in Fig. 1. The overall controller comprises an *outer learner* and an *inner learner*. The outer learner learns a general model parameter by continually adapting it following new episodes of experience. The inner learner learns an estimate of the parameter of the model of the system during an episode by continually adapting the suggestion by the outer learner as more observations of the state transitions are made. The outer learner learns the general model parameter such that the learning within an episode continuously improves with experience of more episodes. We denote the outer learner by \mathcal{A}_s and the inner learner by \mathcal{A}_f . We denote the output of \mathcal{A}_s in episode i by $\hat{\phi}_i$ and the estimate of the model parameter for time t in episode i by $\hat{\theta}_t^i$. At time t the control policy computes the control input u_t^i by minimizing the look-ahead cost for horizon M for the dynamics defined

by the model estimate $\hat{\theta}_t^i$. The meta-learning algorithm is given in Algorithm 1 and the control policy for an episode is given in Algorithm 2 (the index i is removed from all the variables for simpler notation).

Algorithm 1 Outer learner

- 1: **Input:** $T, N, \hat{\phi}_{i-1}$
 - 2: **Output:** $\hat{\phi}_i$
 - 3: **while** $i < N$ **do**
 - 4: Observe $y_1^i, y_2^i, \dots, y_T^i, \bar{U}_{1:T} = \{\bar{u}_1^i, \dots, \bar{u}_T^i\}$
 - 5: $\theta_j^* = \arg \min_{\hat{\theta}} \sum_{k=1}^{t_j} l_{\hat{\theta},k}$,
 $l_{\hat{\theta},k} = \|y_{k+1}^i - \hat{\theta}[(y_k^i)^\top, (\bar{u}_k^i)^\top]^\top\|_2^2$
 - 6: $\theta^{*,i} = \arg \max_j \|\theta_j^* - \hat{\phi}_i\|_F$
 - 7: $\psi_{i+1} = \hat{\phi}_i - \eta_t \nabla l_i^o(\hat{\phi}_i)$, $\eta_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{i}}$,
 $\hat{\phi}_{i+1} = \text{Proj}_{\Theta}(\psi_{i+1})$, $l_i^o(\hat{\phi}) = \|\theta^{*,i} - \hat{\phi}\|_F$
 - 8: **end while**
-

Algorithm 2 Control Policy, $\mathcal{H}(\phi)$

- 1: **Input:** H
 - 2: $j = 1, t_j = \sum_{k=1}^j 2^{k-1} H$
 - 3: **while** $t < T$ **do**
 - 4: Observe $y_t, Y_{1:t} = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_t\}$
 - 5: **if** $t == 1$ **then**
 - 6: $\{\hat{x}_1, \hat{\theta}_0\} = \text{SELECT}(0, t, \hat{\phi}, Y_{1:1}, [], 0, t_1)$
 - 7: $\bar{x}_t = \hat{x}_1$
 - 8: **else**
 - 9: **if** $t == t_i + 1$ **then**
 - 10: $\{\hat{x}_{j+1}, \hat{\theta}_j\} = \text{SELECT}(j, t, \hat{\phi}, Y_{1:t}, \bar{U}_{1:t-1}, t_j, t_{j+1})$
 - 11: $\bar{x}_t = \hat{x}_{j+1}$
 - 12: $j = j + 1, t_j = \sum_{k=1}^j 2^{k-1} H$
 - 13: **end if**
 - 14: **end if**
 - 15: $u_t = \text{MPC}(\bar{x}_t, \hat{\theta}_{j-1})$,
 - 16: $\bar{x}_{t+1} = \hat{A}_{j-1} \bar{x}_t + \hat{B}_{j-1} u_t$, $[\hat{A}_{j-1}, \hat{B}_{j-1}] = \hat{\theta}_{j-1}$
 - 17: $\delta u_t = \text{PERTURB}(j, t, u_t, \bar{U}_{1:t-1})$
 - 18: Control Input, $\bar{u}_t = u_t + \delta u_t, \bar{U}_{1:t} = \{\bar{u}_1, \dots, \bar{u}_t\}$
 - 19: $t = t + 1$
 - 20: **end while**
-

3.1. Control Policy, \mathcal{H}

We consider the setting where the duration T of episode i is split into intervals $[1, t_1], [t_1 + 1, t_2], [t_2 + 1, t_3]..$ and so on. We index the intervals by j . The duration of interval j , denoted by H_j , is given by

$$H_j = 2^{j-1} H, \quad (7)$$

where H is a constant to be specified later. We denote the control input computed by the control policy \mathcal{H} at time t by \bar{u}_t^i . The online MPC policy has the following information

Algorithm 3 SELECT($j, t, \hat{\phi}, Y_{1:t}, \bar{U}_{1:t-1}, t_j, t_{j+1}$)

- 1: **Input:** $\lambda, \Theta, S, R, \gamma, \gamma_y, \lambda, \tilde{\delta}, n, m, \epsilon_c$
 - 2: **Output:** $\hat{x}_{j+1}, \hat{\theta}_j = [\hat{A}_j, \hat{B}_j]$
 - 3: $\tilde{R} = n(n+1)R \max\{1, S\} \sqrt{4 \log \left(\frac{(\sqrt{2})^{n+m}}{\tilde{\delta}} \right)}$
 - 4: **if** $j == 0$ **then**
 - 5: $\hat{\Theta}_j = \Theta$
 - 6: **else**
 - 7: $\beta_j(\tilde{\delta}) = \tilde{R} / \sqrt{\gamma c_{p,i} t_j} + \lambda S / \gamma_y$
 - 8: $\hat{\theta}_{l,j} = \arg \min_{\hat{\theta}} \sum_{k=1}^{t_j} \|y_{k+1} - \hat{\theta}[y_k^\top, \bar{u}_k^\top]^\top\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\hat{\theta} - \hat{\phi}\|_F^2,$
 - 9: $\hat{\Theta}_j = \left\{ \theta : \|\theta - \hat{\theta}_{l,j}\|_F \leq \beta_j(\tilde{\delta}) \right\} \cap \Theta, \theta = [A, B]$
 - 10: **end if**
 - 11: $\{\hat{x}_{j+1}, \hat{\theta}_j\} = \arg \min_{\hat{x}, \hat{\theta}} \sum_{k=t}^{t_{j+1}} c_k(\tilde{x}_k, w_k), \tilde{x}_{k+1} = \hat{A}\tilde{x}_k + \hat{B}w_k, w_k = \text{MPC}(\tilde{x}_k, \hat{\theta}), \hat{\theta} = [\hat{A}, \hat{B}], \tilde{x}_t = \hat{x}, \hat{x} \in \{x : \|x - y_t\|_2 \leq \epsilon_c\}, \hat{\theta} \in \hat{\Theta}_j$
-

Algorithm 4 MPC($t, x, \hat{\theta}$)

- 1: **Input:** M, Γ, \mathcal{U}
 - 2: **Output:** u
 - 3: **Definition:** $U = \{w_0, w_1, \dots, w_{M-1}\}$
 - 4: $U^* = \arg \min_U \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} c_{k+t}(\tilde{x}_k, w_k)$ s.t. $\tilde{x}_{k+1} = \hat{A}\tilde{x}_k + \hat{B}w_k, \hat{\theta} = [\hat{A}, \hat{B}], w_k \in \mathcal{U}, \tilde{x}_0 = x$
 - 5: $u = w_0^*, \{w_0^*, w_1^*, \dots, w_{M-1}^*\} = U^*$
-

Algorithm 5 PERTURB($j, t, u_t, \bar{U}_{1:t-1}$)

- 1: **Input:** $c_{p,j}, q, n$
 - 2: **Output:** δu_t
 - 3: **Definition:** $W_k^\top = [(\bar{u}_k)^\top, \dots, (\bar{u}_{k+n})^\top],$
 $(W_k^\perp)^\top = [(u_k^\perp)^\top, \dots, (u_{k+n}^\perp)^\top],$
 $(W_k^\perp)^\top W_{k-l} = 0, \forall 1 \leq l \leq q-1$
 - 4: $e_t = u_t / \|u_t\|_2, e_t^\perp = u_t^\perp / \|u_t^\perp\|_2,$
 - 5: $\delta u_t^i = \begin{cases} \pm \sqrt{c_{p,j}} e_t^\perp & \text{if } (u_t^\perp)^\top u_t^i = 0 \\ \pm O(\sqrt{c_{p,j}}) e_t & \text{Otherwise} \end{cases}.$
-

at time t : (i) the cost functions $\{c_k, t_{i-1} + 1 \leq k \leq t_i\}$, when $t \in [t_{i-1} + 1, t_i]$ (ii) $\bar{U}_{1:t-1} = \{\bar{u}_1^i, \dots, \bar{u}_{t-1}^i\}$, (ii) $\bar{Y}_{1:t} = \{y_1^i, \dots, y_t^i\}$.

The control policy for this setting is given in Algorithm 2. Denote the time step at the beginning of interval j by t_j^s . At the beginning of interval $j+1$, the algorithm computes an estimate of the system's state at the beginning of this new interval using $y_{t_j^s}$ and an estimate $\hat{\theta}_j^i$ of the system model parameter. To estimate $\hat{\theta}_j^i$, the algorithm computes a set of estimates $\hat{\Theta}_j^i$ in which the system model parameter is guaranteed to lie with high probability using the information $\bar{U}_{1:t_j}, \bar{Y}_{1:t_j^s}$. The estimate $\hat{\theta}_j^i$ is selected from the set $\hat{\Theta}_j^i$ and is set to be the model parameter estimate for the interval $j+1$, i.e., $\hat{\theta}_t^i = \hat{\theta}_j^i, \forall t_j < t \leq t_{j+1}$. The selection of \hat{x}_{j+1} and $\hat{\theta}_j$ is outlined in Algorithm 3 and in detail below.

Given the model estimate $\hat{\theta}_j^i = [\hat{A}_j^i, \hat{B}_j^i]$ and the estimate of the initial state \hat{x}_{j+1} , the estimated dynamics for the interval $j+1$ is defined as

$$\bar{x}_{t+1} = \hat{A}_j^i \bar{x}_t + \hat{B}_j^i u_t, \bar{x}_{t_j^s+1} = \hat{x}_{j+1}, t_{j+1}^s \leq t \leq t_{j+1}. \quad (8)$$

Within interval $j+1$, the controller computes an intermediate control input u_t^i at time step t , where $t_j < t \leq t_{j+1}$, by minimizing the look-ahead cost over the horizon M for the estimated dynamics (Algorithm 4). The intermediate control input u_t^i is given by

$$u_t^i = \text{MPC}(t, \bar{x}_t, \hat{\theta}_j^i) \quad (9)$$

The algorithm computes the final control input, \bar{u}_t^i , by adding a perturbation (or a small deviation from u_t^i) δu_t to the intermediate control input u_t^i . The calculation of the perturbation is shown in Algorithm 5. Thus

$$\bar{u}_t^i = u_t^i + \delta u_t^i. \quad (10)$$

Note that adding the perturbation will result in violation of the control input constraint, which leads to the constraint violation cost defined in Eq. (5). The perturbation is needed to ensure that the control sequence has persistent excitation, a condition that is required in adaptive control for convergence of parameter estimation. This condition is needed to ensure that the computed set $\hat{\Theta}_j^i$ is improved after a new interval is completed. We formally define persistence of excitation below. Let $(z_k^i)^\top := [(x_k^i)^\top (\bar{u}_k^i)^\top]$, and

$$V_j = \sum_{k=1}^{t_j} z_k^i (z_k^i)^\top$$

Definition 2 We say that the control inputs are persistently exciting provided \exists a constant $\gamma > 0$ such that

$$V_j \geq c_j = \gamma c_{p,j} t_j > 0,$$

where $c_{p,j} > 0$, and $X \geq c > 0 \iff v^\top X v \geq c, \forall \|v\|_2 = 1$.

The design constant $c_{p,i}$ will be specified later. Let $W_t^\top := [(\bar{u}_t^i)^\top, \dots, (\bar{u}_{t+n}^i)^\top]^\top$, $e_t = u_t^i / \|u_t^i\|_2$. Let $(W_{t-n}^\perp)^\top = [(u_{t-n}^\perp)^\top, \dots, (u_t^\perp)^\top]$, $e_t^\perp = u_t^\perp / \|u_t^\perp\|_2$, where $(W_{t-n}^\perp)^\top W_{t-n-k} = 0, \forall 1 \leq k \leq q-1$ and q is a design constant to be specified later. The perturbation δu_t^i (see Algorithm 5) is given by

$$\delta u_t^i = \begin{cases} \pm \sqrt{c_{p,j}} e_t^\perp & \text{if } (u_t^\perp)^\top u_t^i = 0 \\ \pm O(\sqrt{c_{p,j}}) e_t & \text{Otherwise} \end{cases}. \quad (11)$$

Please see the proof for the exact definition of δu_t^i . The key idea here is to perturb u_t^i just enough so that the persistence of excitation is satisfied while the perturbed control input does not cause the controller's regret and the cumulative constraint violation to grow more than sub-linearly w.r.t the period T of the episode. We will show later that the persistence of excitation condition is satisfied by this design.

3.2. Selecting $\hat{\theta}_j^i$ and \hat{x}_{j+1}

The algorithm selects an estimate of the model parameter $\hat{\theta}_j^i \in \hat{\Theta}_j^i$ and the approximation \hat{x}_{j+1} of the state $x_{t_{j+1}^s}$ by solving the following optimization at the end of interval j :

$$\begin{aligned} \{\hat{x}_{j+1}, \hat{\theta}_j^i\} &= \arg \min_{\hat{x}, \hat{\theta}} \sum_{k=t_{j+1}^s}^{t_{j+1}} c_k(\tilde{x}_k, w_k), \hat{\theta} = [\hat{A}, \hat{B}], \\ \tilde{x}_{k+1} &= \hat{A}\tilde{x}_k + \hat{B}w_k, w_k = \text{MPC}(\tilde{x}_k, \hat{\theta}), \tilde{x}_{t_{j+1}^s} = \hat{x}, \\ \hat{x} &\in \left\{ x : \|x - y_{t_{j+1}^s}\|_2 \leq \epsilon_c \right\}, \hat{\theta} \in \hat{\Theta}_j^i. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

The objective of this optimization is just the cost over the duration of the interval $j+1$ for a given $\hat{\theta} \in \hat{\Theta}_j^i$ and an initial state estimate \hat{x} . Hence, the overall cost for the estimated dynamics given by Eq. (8) in interval $j+1$ will be upper bounded by the overall cost for the actual system in Eq. (1) when driven by MPC(x_k^i, θ) with a high probability. Later, we will show that the stage cost for the estimated dynamics converges to the best achievable stage cost and as a consequence establish that the estimated dynamics' overall cost for the interval $j+1$ will differ from the best achievable cost only by a constant with high probability.

4. Inner Learner \mathcal{A}_f

The inner learner updates its loss function at the end of every interval j . Denote the inner-learner's updated loss function at the end of interval j by $\mathcal{L}_j^i(\hat{\theta})$. Then

$$\mathcal{L}_j^i(\hat{\theta}) = \sum_{k=1}^{t_j} l_{\hat{\theta},k}, l_{\hat{\theta},k} = \|y_{k+1}^i - \hat{\theta}[(y_k^i)^\top, (\bar{u}_k^i)^\top]^\top\|_2^2. \quad (13)$$

To compute the set $\hat{\Theta}_j^i$ at the end of the iteration $j > 1$, the inner-learner computes $\hat{\theta}_{l,j}$, the λ -regularized least-squares estimate by minimizing its updated loss function plus a regularizer $\mathcal{R}_e(\hat{\theta}, \hat{\phi}_i)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\theta}_{l,j} &= \arg \min_{\hat{\theta}} \mathcal{L}_j^i(\hat{\theta}) + \mathcal{R}_e(\hat{\theta}, \hat{\phi}_i), \\ \mathcal{R}_e(\hat{\theta}, \hat{\phi}_i) &= \lambda \|\hat{\theta} - \hat{\phi}_i\|_F^2. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Using the least square estimate $\hat{\theta}_{l,j}$, the inner learner computes a set $\hat{\Theta}_j^i$ within which the system model parameter is guaranteed to lie with probability greater than $1 - \tilde{\delta}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Theta}_j &= \left\{ \hat{\theta} : \|\hat{\theta} - \hat{\theta}_{l,j}\|_F \leq \beta_j(\tilde{\delta}) \right\} \cap \Theta, \text{ where} \\ \beta_j(\tilde{\delta}) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma c_{p,j} t_j}} \tilde{R} + \lambda \frac{\|\theta_j^* - \hat{\phi}_i\|_F}{\gamma c_{p,j} t_j}, \\ \tilde{R} &= 2\hat{R} \sqrt{(n+m) \log \sqrt{2} - \log \tilde{\delta}}, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

$\hat{R} = n(n+1) \max\{1, S\}R$, γ_y is a constant to be defined later, $\theta_j^* = \arg \min_{\hat{\theta}} \sum_{k=1}^{t_j} l_{\hat{\theta},k}$.

We described how the model parameter estimate $\hat{\theta}_t^i$ is set in Section 3.1. The cumulative error in the estimation of the model parameters for the duration of an episode is given by

$$E_{\theta,T} = \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \|\hat{\theta}_t^i - \theta\|_2 \quad (16)$$

In the next theorem we provide a bound on this cumulative error under persistence of excitation. Let

$$\begin{aligned} j^* &= \inf_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}} j \\ \text{s.t. } j n_c &\geq \max \left\{ 2n_c, \tilde{n}_c (\log \tilde{n}_c (\log 2T/\delta))^2 \right\}, \\ n_c &= (n+1)m, \tilde{n}_c = (16n^2 R^2 / \gamma)^2, \\ \tilde{n}_c &= \left(\sqrt{2} \right)^{n+m+2}. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Theorem 1 Consider the estimation in Eq. (14) and let $\hat{\theta}_j^i$ be selected according to Eq. (12). Suppose the persistence of excitation (Definition 2) holds, $\tilde{\delta} = \delta / (2N^a (\log 2T)^b)$, $a \geq 1, b \geq 1, N \geq T, c_{p,j} = H_j^{-1/2}, H = j^* n_c + n$. Then, the optimal scaling is $\lambda = T^{1/4}$, and for this scaling the expected cumulative error

$$\mathbb{E}[E_{\theta,T}] \leq \tilde{O}\left(T^{3/4}\right),$$

and with probability greater than $1 - O(\delta/N)$

$$E_{\theta,T} \leq \tilde{O}\left(\left(1 + \|\theta^{*,i} - \hat{\phi}_i\|_F\right) T^{3/4}\right),$$

where $\theta^{*,i} = \arg \max_j \|\theta_j^* - \hat{\phi}_i\|_F$.

Please see the Appendix for the proof.

5. Outer Learner \mathcal{A}_s

Here we discuss the outer learner and also formally establish that the worst regret for learning within an episode continuously improves with experience of more episodes because of the meta-updates provided by the outer learner.

We set the loss function for the outer learner for the i th episode as $l_i^o(\hat{\phi}) = \|\theta^{*,i} - \hat{\phi}\|_F$. We denote the overall loss function for the outer learner at the end of episode i which is the sum of the loss functions for the individual episodes till episode i by \mathcal{L}_s^{i+1} . Thus

$$\mathcal{L}_s^{i+1}(\hat{\phi}) = \sum_{k=1}^i l_k^o(\hat{\phi}). \quad (18)$$

The outer learner applies Online Gradient Descent (OGD) to update $\hat{\phi}$. The OGD update is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{i+1} &= \hat{\phi}_i - \eta_i \nabla l_i^o(\hat{\phi}_i), \quad \eta_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{i}} \\ \hat{\phi}_{i+1} &= \text{Proj}_{\Theta}(\psi_{i+1}). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

In the theorem we present next we show the rate at which the meta-learning can improve the average of the cumulative error in the model parameter estimation with the number of episodes. We denote this average by $\bar{E}_{\theta,N}$:

$$\bar{E}_{\theta,N} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N E_{\theta,T}. \quad (20)$$

Theorem 2 *Consider the setting in Theorem 1 and the meta-learner. Suppose the outer-learner employs the online gradient descent (OGD) algorithm (Eq. (19)) to update $\hat{\phi}$. Then, the optimal scaling for $\{a, b\}$ is $a = b = 1$, the optimal scaling for λ is $\lambda = T^{1/4}$, and for this scaling*

$$\mathbb{E}[\bar{E}_{\theta,N}] \leq \tilde{O}\left(T^{3/4}\right),$$

and with probability greater than $1 - O(\delta)$ the average regret across N episodes

$$\bar{E}_{\theta,N} \leq \tilde{O}\left(\left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\right)T^{3/4}\right).$$

Please see the Appendix for the proof. The scaling has the factor $T^{3/4}$ because even after the meta-updates converge each episode can still incur a regret of $T^{3/4}$. Most importantly, the scaling shows that the average cumulative error $\bar{E}_{\theta,N}$ reduces at the rate of $1/\sqrt{N}$ as N increases which is a result of the meta-update. This suggests that the worst regret for learning within an episode is continuously improved with experience of more episodes.

6. Controller Performance

The total cost and the cumulative constraint violation for the controller for episode i are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{c,T}^i &= C_i(\mathcal{H}) = \sum_{t=1}^T c_t(x_t^i, \bar{u}_t^i), \quad \mathcal{V}_{c,T}^i = \mathcal{V}(\bar{U}_{1:T}^i), \quad \text{where} \\ X_{1:T} &= \{x_1^i, x_2^i, \dots, x_T^i\}, \quad \bar{U}_{1:T}^i = \{\bar{u}_1^i, \bar{u}_2^i, \dots, \bar{u}_T^i\}. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Denote the cost and the cumulative constraint violation for the best policy that satisfies the control input constraints for the duration of an episode by $\mathcal{L}_{b,T}^i$ and $\mathcal{V}_{b,T}^i$, respectively.

First, we provide a Lemma that bounds the regret and cumulative constraint violation for an episode.

Lemma 1 *Consider the system given in Eq. (1). Suppose Assumptions 1, 2, 3 are valid, $M > \bar{\alpha}^2/\alpha + 1$, and the control input is given by Eq. (10). Then under the event that $\theta \in \hat{\Theta}_j, \forall j$*

$$\mathcal{L}_{c,T}^i - \mathcal{L}_{b,T}^i \leq O(E_{\theta,T}) + O(\log(T)) + \sum_i O(\sqrt{c_{p,i}} H_i),$$

$$\mathcal{V}_{c,T}^i - \mathcal{V}_{b,T}^i \leq \sum_j O(\sqrt{c_{p,j}} H_j).$$

In the next theorem we combine the result from Theorem 1 and Lemma 1 to provide an upper bound for the average regret that is achievable for the controller's cost and cumulative constraint violation.

Theorem 3 *Consider the setting given in Lemma 1, Theorem 1, and suppose the outer-learner employs the OGD algorithm (Eq. (19)) to update $\hat{\phi}$. Then, the optimal scaling for $\{a, b\}$ is $a = b = 1$, the optimal scaling for λ is $\lambda = T^{1/4}$, and for this scaling*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mathcal{L}_{c,T}^i - \mathcal{L}_{b,T}^i}{N}\right] \leq \tilde{O}(T^{3/4}), \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mathcal{V}_{c,T}^i}{N}\right] \leq \tilde{O}(T^{3/4}),$$

and with probability greater than $1 - O(\delta)$ the average regrets across N episodes is given by

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mathcal{L}_{c,T}^i - \mathcal{L}_{b,T}^i}{N} \leq \tilde{O}\left(\left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\right)T^{3/4}\right),$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mathcal{V}_{c,T}^i}{N} \leq \tilde{O}\left(\left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\right)T^{3/4}\right).$$

Please see the Appendix for the proof.

7. Conclusion

In this work we explored theoretical properties of a model based meta-learning receding horizon control algorithm for an iterative control setting, where in each iteration the system to be controlled is different and unknown, the control objective is a general additive cost function, and there are affine control input constraints. We explored conditions under which we can guarantee sub-linear regret. Specifically, we considered the setting where the preview of the cost functions is limited to an interval and the interval size is doubled from one to the next. We proved that the proposed online controller achieves $\tilde{O}(T^{3/4})$ regret for the controller cost and constraint violation for an episode of duration T with respect to the optimal and an average of this regret and constraint violation across N iterations that varies as $\tilde{O}((1 + 1/\sqrt{N})T^{3/4})$.

References

- Abbasi-Yadkori, Y. and Szepesvari, C. Regret bounds for the adaptive control of linear quadratic systems. In *Proceedings of the 24th Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pp. 1–26, 2011.
- Abernethy, J., Agarwal, A., and Bartlett, P. L. A stochastic view of optimal regret through minimax duality. In *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, 2009.
- Agarwal, N., Bullins, B., Hazan, E., Kakade, S., and Singh, K. Online control with adversarial disturbances. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 111–119, 2019a.
- Agarwal, N., Hazan, E., and Singh, K. Logarithmic regret for online control. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 10175–10184, 2019b.
- Andrychowicz, M., Denil, M., Gomez, S., Hoffman, M. W., Pfau, D., Schaul, T., Shillingford, B., and De Freitas, N. Learning to learn by gradient descent by gradient descent. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pp. 3981–3989, 2016.
- Balcan, M.-F., Khodak, M., and Talwalkar, A. Provable guarantees for gradient-based meta-learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2019.
- Cohen, A., Koren, T., and Mansour, Y. Learning linear-quadratic regulators efficiently with only \sqrt{T} regret. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1300–1309, 2019.
- Dean, S., Mania, H., Matni, N., Recht, B., and Tu, S. Regret bounds for robust adaptive control of the linear quadratic regulator. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 4188–4197, 2018.
- Duan, Y., Schulman, J., Chen, X., Bartlett, P. L., Sutskever, I., and Abbeel, P. RL²: Fast reinforcement learning via slow reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.02779*, 2016.
- Fazel, M., Ge, R., Kakade, S., and Mesbahi, M. Global convergence of policy gradient methods for the linear quadratic regulator. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1467–1476, 2018.
- Finn, C., Abbeel, P., and Levine, S. Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1126–1135, 2017.
- Finn, C., Rajeswaran, A., Kakade, S., and Levine, S. Online meta-learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1920–1930, 2019.
- Flennerhag, S., Rusu, A. A., Pascanu, R., Visin, F., Yin, H., and Hadsell, R. Meta-learning with warped gradient descent. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- Green, M. and Moore, J. B. Persistence of excitation in linear systems. *Systems & control letters*, 7(5):351–360, 1986.
- Grimm, G., Messina, M. J., Tuna, S. E., and Teel, A. R. Model predictive control: for want of a local control lyapunov function, all is not lost. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 50(5):546–558, 2005.
- Hazan, E., Kalai, A., Kale, S., and Agarwal, A. Logarithmic regret algorithms for online convex optimization. In *International Conference on Computational Learning Theory*, pp. 499–513. Springer, 2006.
- Jenatton, R., Huang, J., and Archambeau, C. Adaptive algorithms for online convex optimization with long-term constraints. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 402–411, 2016.
- Klatte, D. and Kummer, B. Stability properties of infima and optimal solutions of parametric optimization problems. In *Nondifferentiable Optimization: Motivations and Applications*, pp. 215–229. Springer, 1985.
- Li, K. and Malik, J. Learning to optimize. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.01885*, 2016.
- Li, Y., Chen, X., and Li, N. Online optimal control with linear dynamics and predictions: Algorithms and regret analysis. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 14887–14899, 2019.
- Mishra, N., Rohaninejad, M., Chen, X., and Abbeel, P. A simple neural attentive meta-learner. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.

Molybog, I. and Lavaei, J. Global convergence of MAML for LQR. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.00453*, 2020.

Moore, J. Persistence of excitation in extended least squares. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 28(1):60–68, 1983.

Naik, D. K. and Mammone, R. J. Meta-neural networks that learn s learning. In *[Proceedings 1992] IJCNN International Joint Conference on Neural Networks*, volume 1, pp. 437–442. IEEE, 1992.

Nichol, A. and Schulman, J. Reptile: a scalable metalearning algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.02999*, 2(3):4, 2018.

Rajeswaran, A., Finn, C., Kakade, S. M., and Levine, S. Meta-learning with implicit gradients. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 113–124, 2019.

Ravi, S. and Larochelle, H. Optimization as a model for few-shot learning. 2016.

Schmidhuber, J. *Evolutionary principles in self-referential learning, or on learning how to learn: the meta-meta... hook*. PhD thesis, Technische Universität München, 1987.

Shalev-Shwartz, S. and Kakade, S. M. Mind the duality gap: Logarithmic regret algorithms for online optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 1457–1464, 2009.

Shalev-Shwartz, S. et al. Online learning and online convex optimization. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 4(2):107–194, 2011.

Simchowitz, M., Singh, K., and Hazan, E. Improper learning for non-stochastic control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.09254*, 2020.

Thrun, S. and Pratt, L. Learning to learn: Introduction and overview. In *Learning to Learn*, pp. 3–17. Springer, 1998.

Wang, J. X., Kurth-Nelson, Z., Tirumala, D., Soyer, H., Leibo, J. Z., Munos, R., Blundell, C., Kumaran, D., and Botvinick, M. Learning to reinforcement learn. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.05763*, 2016.

Yuan, J. and Lamperski, A. Online convex optimization for cumulative constraints. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 6137–6146, 2018.

Zhang, K., Hu, B., and Basar, T. Policy optimization for \mathcal{H}_2 linear control with \mathcal{H}_∞ robustness guarantee: Implicit regularization and global convergence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.09496*, 2019.

Zinkevich, M. Online convex programming and generalized infinitesimal gradient ascent. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 928–936, 2003.

Appendix

Proof for Theorem 1

We start by stating Theorem 16 from (Abbasi-Yadkori & Szepesvari, 2011) as a Lemma.

Lemma 2 *Let \mathcal{F}_t be a filtration. Let m_t be an \mathbb{R}^d valued stochastic process adapted to the filtration \mathcal{F}_t , $(\eta_t, t \geq 1)$ be a real-valued martingale difference sequence adapted to \mathcal{F}_t and is conditionally sub-Gaussian with constant R . Consider the martingale stochastic process*

$$S_t = \sum_{k=1}^t \eta_k m_{k-1}.$$

Consider the matrix valued process

$$\bar{V}_t = \tilde{V} + \tilde{V}_t, \quad \tilde{V}_t = \sum_{k=1}^t m_{k-1} m_{k-1}^\top$$

Then, with probability $1 - \delta$, $\delta > 0$, we get that

$$\forall t > 0, \|S_t\|_{\bar{V}_t^{-1}}^2 \leq 2R^2 \log \left(\frac{\det(\bar{V}_t)^{1/2} \det(\tilde{V})^{-1/2}}{\delta} \right)$$

For simplicity, here we just assume u_t to be the final control input and also drop the interval index i from all the variables. From the state equation Eq. (1), we know that

$$x_{t+1} = Ax_t + Bu_t. \quad (22)$$

Let $X_j = [z_1, z_2, z_3, \dots, z_{t_j}]^\top$, where $z_t^\top = [x_t^\top u_t^\top]$ and $Y_i = [x_2, x_3, \dots, x_{t_j+1}]^\top$. Then, it follows from Eq. (22) that

$$Y_j = X_j \theta^\top \quad (23)$$

Let $X_j^y = [z_1^y, z_2^y, z_3^y, \dots, z_{t_j}^y]^\top$, where $(z_t^y)^\top = [y_t^\top u_t^\top]$ and $Y_j^y = [y_2, y_3, \dots, y_{t_j+1}]^\top$. Let θ_j^* be given by

$$\theta_j^* = \arg \min \sum_{k=1}^{t_j} l_{\theta,k}, \quad l_{\theta,k} = \|y_{k+1} - \theta z_k^y\|_2^2. \quad (24)$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_j^y &= [\epsilon_2, \epsilon_3, \dots, \epsilon_{t_j+1}]^\top \\ \mathcal{E}_j^\top &= [[\epsilon_1^\top \ 0_{m \times 1}^\top]^\top, [\epsilon_2^\top \ 0_{m \times 1}^\top]^\top, \dots, [\epsilon_{t_j}^\top \ 0_{m \times 1}^\top]^\top]. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by definition

$$Y_j^y = Y_j + \mathcal{E}_j^y, X_j^y = X_j + \mathcal{E}_j.$$

We denote these variables by $Y_\tau^y, Y_\tau, X_\tau^y, \mathcal{E}_\tau, \mathcal{E}_\tau^y$ for a general time index τ that is different from t_j . First, we show that $(X_j^y)^\top X_j^y$ is invertible.

$$\begin{aligned} (X_j^y)^\top X_j^y &= (X_j + \mathcal{E}_j)^\top (X_j + \mathcal{E}_j) \\ (X_j^y)^\top X_j^y &= X_j^\top X_j + X_j^\top \mathcal{E}_j + \mathcal{E}_j^\top X_j + \mathcal{E}_j^\top \mathcal{E}_j. \end{aligned}$$

For a matrix W , let the $\sum_j \|V^{-1/2} W_j\|_2$, where W_j are columns of W , be denoted by $\|W\|_{V^{-1}}$. Consider an arbitrary unit vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$. Then, using the fact that $\|V^{-1/2}(\cdot)\|_2 \leq \|V^{-1/2}(\cdot)\|_F \leq \|\cdot\|_{V^{-1}}$, and applying Cauchy-Schwarz, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} v^\top (X_j^y)^\top X_j^y v &\geq v^\top X_j^\top X_j v \\ &+ v^\top (X_j^\top X_j)^{1/2} (X_j^\top X_j)^{-1/2} (X_j^\top \mathcal{E}_j + \mathcal{E}_j^\top X_j) v, \\ &\geq v^\top X_j^\top X_j v \\ &- \|v^\top (X_j^\top X_j)^{1/2}\|_2 \| (X_j^\top \mathcal{E}_j + \mathcal{E}_j^\top X_j) \|_{(X_j^\top X_j)^{-1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Let $V_\tau = \sum_{k=1}^\tau z_k z_k^\top = X_\tau^\top X_\tau$. Also, $V_j = \sum_{k=1}^{t_j} z_k z_k^\top = X_j^\top X_j$. In our case, z_{k+1} is a vector-valued process adapted to \mathcal{F}_k , any component of ϵ_k by definition is a martingale difference and adapted to \mathcal{F}_k . Hence, Lemma 2 can be applied to each component of ϵ_k , by recognizing that $m_{k-1} = z_k/\sqrt{2}$ and η_k can be any of the components of $\sqrt{2}\epsilon_k$, setting $\tilde{V} = V_\tau/2$, $\tilde{V}_\tau = V_\tau/2$, and using τ in place t . Then, using union bound after applying Lemma 2 to each component of ϵ_k and for each $\tau \in \{t_1, t_j\}$, we get that with probability at least $1 - 2n\tilde{\delta}$ for all $\tau \in \{t_1, t_j\}$

$$\|X_\tau^\top \mathcal{E}_\tau\|_{V_\tau^{-1}} \leq nR \sqrt{4 \log \left(\frac{\det(V_\tau)^{1/2} \det(\tilde{V})^{-1/2}}{\tilde{\delta}} \right)}, \quad (26)$$

where the additional factor n follows from the fact that η_k has at most n non-zero components. Noting that $V_\tau = V_j$ when $\tau = t_i$, we get that with probability at least $1 - n\tilde{\delta}$

$$\|X_j^\top \mathcal{E}_j\|_{V_j^{-1}} \leq nR \sqrt{4 \log \left(\frac{(\sqrt{2})^{n+m}}{\tilde{\delta}} \right)}$$

Then, by triangle inequality, we get that with probability at least $1 - n\tilde{\delta}$

$$\|X_j^\top \mathcal{E}_j + \mathcal{E}_j^\top X_j\|_{V_j^{-1}} \leq 2nR \sqrt{4 \log \left(\frac{(\sqrt{2})^{n+m}}{\tilde{\delta}} \right)}. \quad (27)$$

The persistence of excitation implies that

$$v^\top X_j^\top X_j v \geq \gamma c_{p,j} t_j.$$

Then, using Eq. (27) in Eq. (25) we get that with probability at least $1 - n\tilde{\delta}$

$$\begin{aligned} v^\top (X_j^y)^\top X_j^y v &\geq \sqrt{\gamma c_{p,j} t_j} \times \\ &\left(\sqrt{\gamma c_{p,j} t_j} - 2nR \sqrt{4 \log \left(\frac{(\sqrt{2})^{n+m}}{\tilde{\delta}} \right)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Similarly, for the initial interval, where $t_1 = H$, $c_{p,1} = H^{-1/2}$, using Eq. (26) and following a similar argument, we get that under the same event

$$\begin{aligned} v^\top (X_1^y)^\top X_1^y v &\geq \sqrt{\gamma c_{p,1} t_1} \times \\ &\left(\sqrt{\gamma} H^{1/4} - 2nR \sqrt{4 \log \left(\frac{(\sqrt{2})^{n+m}}{\tilde{\delta}} \right)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Equation (17) and the fact that $H = j^* n_c$ implies

$$\sqrt{\gamma} H^{1/4} - 2nR \sqrt{4 \log \left(\frac{(\sqrt{2})^{n+m}}{\tilde{\delta}} \right)} > 0. \quad (30)$$

And so for any interval j , we get that

$$\sqrt{\gamma} H_j^{1/4} - 2nR \sqrt{4 \log \left(\frac{(\sqrt{2})^{n+m}}{\tilde{\delta}} \right)} > 0. \quad (31)$$

Hence, from Eq. (28) and Eq. (30), it follows that with probability at-least $1 - n\tilde{\delta}$

$$\begin{aligned} v^\top (X_j^y)^\top X_j^y v &> \gamma_y c_{p,j} t_j, \forall v \text{ s.t. } \|v\|_2 = 1, \\ \gamma_y &= \gamma \left(1 - \frac{2nR}{\sqrt{\gamma} H^{1/2}} \sqrt{4 \log \left(\frac{(\sqrt{2})^{n+m}}{\tilde{\delta}} \right)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

That is, with probability at-least $1 - n\tilde{\delta}$, $(X_j^y)^\top X_j^y$ is invertible. Consequently, the solution to Eq. (24) under such an event satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} Y_j^y &= X_j^y (\theta_j^*)^\top, \\ \text{where } (\theta_j^*)^\top &= ((X_j^y)^\top X_j^y)^{-1} (X_j^y)^\top Y_j^y. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

From $Y_j^y = X_j^y (\theta_j^*)^\top$ we get that $Y_1^y = X_1^y (\theta_1^*)^\top$. Also, X_1^y is a full column rank matrix because Eq. (29) holds

under such an event. Hence, under such an event, $(\theta_j^*)^\top$ is also given by

$$\begin{aligned} (\theta_j^*)^\top &= ((X_1^y)^\top X_1^y)^{-1} (X_1^y)^\top Y_1^y \\ \text{i.e. } \|(\theta_j^*)^\top\|_F &\leq \|((X_1^y)^\top X_1^y)^{-1}\|_F \| (X_1^y)^\top Y_1^y \|_F. \end{aligned}$$

The fact that the elements of X_1^y , and Y_1^y are bounded and Eq. (29) imply that the norm of $(\theta_j^*)^\top$ is bounded under such an event. Let S be such that $\|(\theta_j^*)^\top\|_F \leq S$. Then, subtracting Eq. (23) from Eq. (33) we get that

$$X_j ((\theta_j^*)^\top - \theta^\top) = \mathcal{E}_j^y - \mathcal{E}_j(\theta_j^*)^\top \quad (34)$$

under such an event. Since $X_j^\top X_j$ is invertible, which holds because of the persistence of excitation, it follows that

$$((\theta_j^*)^\top - \theta^\top) = (X_j^\top X_j)^{-1} X_j^\top (\mathcal{E}_j^y - \mathcal{E}_j(\theta_j^*)^\top). \quad (35)$$

The solution $\hat{\theta}_{l,j}$ to the least-squares problem in Eq. (14) is given by

$$\hat{\theta}_{l,j}^\top - \hat{\phi} = ((X_j^y)^\top X_j^y + \lambda I)^{-1} (X_j^y)^\top (Y_j^y - X_j^y \hat{\phi}^\top). \quad (36)$$

Then, using Eq. (24) we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\theta}_{l,j}^\top - \hat{\phi}^\top &= ((X_j^y)^\top X_j^y + \lambda I)^{-1} (X_j^y)^\top (X_j^y (\theta_j^* - \hat{\phi})^\top) \\ &= (\theta_j^*)^\top - \hat{\phi}^\top - ((X_j^y)^\top X_j^y + \lambda I)^{-1} \lambda (\theta_j^* - \hat{\phi})^\top. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the previous equation with Eq. (35), we get that with probability at-least $1 - n\tilde{\delta}$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\theta}_{l,j}^\top - \theta^\top &= (X_j^\top X_j)^{-1} X_j^\top (\mathcal{E}_j^y - \mathcal{E}_j(\theta_j^*)^\top) \\ &\quad - ((X_j^y)^\top X_j^y + \lambda I)^{-1} \lambda (\theta_j^* - \hat{\phi})^\top. \end{aligned}$$

Then, using the fact that $\|V^{-1/2}(\cdot)\|_F \leq \|\cdot\|_{V^{-1}}$, and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality on the first term, and using Eq. (32) on the second term, we get that with probability at-least $1 - n\tilde{\delta}$

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\hat{\theta}_{l,j}^\top - \theta^\top\|_F \\ &\leq \|(X_j^\top X_j)^{-1/2}\|_2 \|X_j^\top ((\mathcal{E}_j^y - \mathcal{E}_j(\theta_j^*)^\top))\|_{V_j^{-1}} \\ &\quad + \frac{\lambda \|\theta_j^* - \hat{\phi}\|_F}{\gamma_y c_{p,j} t_j}, \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\min}(V_j)}} \|X_j^\top ((\mathcal{E}_j^y - \mathcal{E}_j(\theta_j^*)^\top))\|_{V_j^{-1}} + \frac{\lambda \|\theta_j^* - \hat{\phi}\|_F}{\gamma_y c_{p,j} t_j}. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Now, using triangle inequality we get that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|X_j^\top ((\mathcal{E}_j^y - \mathcal{E}_j(\theta_j^*)^\top))\|_{V_j^{-1}} \\ &\leq \|X_j^\top \mathcal{E}_j^y\|_{V_j^{-1}} + \|X_j^\top (\mathcal{E}_j(\theta_j^*)^\top)\|_{V_j^{-1}} \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Let $X(k, l)$ denote the l th component of k th row of a matrix X . Then, $\mathcal{E}_j(\theta_j^*)^\top(k, l) = [\epsilon_k^\top \ 0_{m \times 1}^\top] (\theta_j^*)^\top(:, l)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} &\|X_j^\top ((\mathcal{E}_j^y - \mathcal{E}_j(\theta_j^*)^\top))\|_{V_j^{-1}} \\ &\leq \|X_j^\top \mathcal{E}_j^y\|_{V_j^{-1}} + \sum_{l=1}^n \|X_j^\top (\mathcal{E}_j(\theta_j^*)^\top(:, l))\|_{V_j^{-1}} \\ &\leq \|X_j^\top \mathcal{E}_j^y\|_{V_j^{-1}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^n \|X_j^\top (\mathcal{E}_j(:, m)(\theta_j^*)^\top(m, l))\|_{V_j^{-1}} \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Then, applying Lemma 2 on each individual term of the sum on the right of equation Eq. (39), and using union bound we get that with probability at-least $1 - n(n+2)\tilde{\delta}$

$$\|\hat{\theta}_{l,j}^\top - \theta^\top\|_F \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\min}(V_i)}} \tilde{R} + \frac{\lambda \|\theta_j^* - \hat{\phi}\|_F}{\gamma_y c_{p,j} t_j}.$$

Now, the persistence of excitation lower bounds $\lambda_{\min}(V_j)$: $\lambda_{\min}(V_j) \geq \gamma c_{p,j} t_j$. Using this in the previous equation we get that with probability at-least $1 - n(n+2)\tilde{\delta}$

$$\|\hat{\theta}_{l,j}^\top - \theta^\top\|_F \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma c_{p,j} t_j}} \tilde{R} + \frac{\lambda \|\theta_j^* - \hat{\phi}\|_F}{\gamma_y c_{p,j} t_j}.$$

Combining this with Eq. (12), it follows that with probability at-least $1 - O(\tilde{\delta})$

$$\|\hat{\theta}_j^\top - \theta^\top\|_F \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{\gamma c_{p,j} t_j}} \tilde{R} + \frac{\lambda \|\theta_j^* - \hat{\phi}\|_F}{\gamma_y c_{p,j} t_j}, \quad \forall t_j < t \leq t_{j+1}. \quad (40)$$

Let N_T be the number of intervals. Given that $H_j = 2^{j-1} H$,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N_T} H_j = H(2^{N_T} - 1) = T$$

Hence, $N_T = \log((T + H)/H) \leq \log T$. Given that $\tilde{\theta}_t$ is constant within an interval, for interval j

$$\sum_{k=t_j^*}^{t_j} \|\tilde{\theta}_k - \theta\|_F = \|\hat{\theta}_{j-1} - \theta\|_F H_j.$$

Combining Eq. (40) with the previous equation, and using union bound, we get that with probability at-least $1 - O(\tilde{\delta} N_T)$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^T \|\tilde{\theta}_k - \theta\|_F &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{N_T} \left(\frac{2\tilde{R}H_j}{\sqrt{\gamma c_{p,j-1} t_{j-1}}} \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{N_T} \frac{\lambda \|\theta_{j-1}^* - \hat{\phi}\|_F H_j}{\gamma_y c_{p,j-1} t_{j-1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Then, using $H_j = 2^{j-1}H$, $c_{p,j} = H_j^{-1/2}$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} c_{p,j} \sum_{k=1}^j H_k &= 2^{-(j-1)/2} H^{-1/2} \sum_{k=1}^j 2^{k-1} H \\ &= 2^{-(j-1)/2} H^{1/2} \sum_{k=1}^j 2^{k-1} \\ &= H^{1/2} 2^{-(j-1)/2} (2^j - 1) \geq \sqrt{2^{j-1}H}. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting the above expression in Eq. (41), we get that with probability at-least $1 - O(\delta N_T)$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^T \|\tilde{\theta}_k - \theta\|_F &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{N_T} \left(\frac{(32)^{1/4} \tilde{R} H_j}{\sqrt{\gamma} \sqrt{2^{(j-1)/2} H^{1/2}}} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{\lambda \|\theta_{j-1}^* - \hat{\phi}\|_F H_j^{1/2}}{\gamma_y} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{N_T} \left(\frac{(32)^{1/4} \tilde{R} 2^{(j-1)3/4} H^{3/4}}{\sqrt{\gamma}} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{\lambda \|\theta_{j-1}^* - \hat{\phi}\|_F H_j^{1/2}}{\gamma_y}. \end{aligned}$$

Defining $\theta^* = \arg \max_j \|\theta_j^* - \hat{\phi}\|_F$, with probability at-least $1 - O(\delta N_T)$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^T \|\tilde{\theta}_k - \theta\|_F &\leq \frac{(32)^{1/4} \tilde{R} H^{3/4}}{\sqrt{\gamma}} \sum_{j=1}^{N_T} \left(2^{(j-1)3/4} \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^T \frac{\lambda \|\theta^* - \hat{\phi}\|_F H^{1/2}}{\gamma_y} \sum_{j=1}^{N_T} \left(2^{(j-1)/2} \right) \\ &= \frac{(32)^{1/4} \tilde{R} H^{3/4}}{\sqrt{\gamma}} \frac{2^{N_T 3/4} - 1}{2^{3/4} - 1} \\ &\quad + \frac{\lambda \|\theta^* - \hat{\phi}\|_F H^{1/2}}{\gamma_y} \frac{2^{N_T/2} - 1}{2^{1/2} - 1} \\ &\leq \frac{(32)^{1/4} \tilde{R} H^{3/4}}{\sqrt{\gamma}} \frac{2^{N_T 3/4}}{2^{3/4} - 1} + \frac{\lambda \|\theta^* - \hat{\phi}\|_F H^{1/2}}{\gamma_y} \frac{2^{N_T/2}}{2^{1/2} - 1} \\ &\leq \frac{(32)^{1/4} \tilde{R} T^{3/4}}{\sqrt{\gamma}(1 - 2^{-3/4})} + \frac{\lambda \|\theta^* - \hat{\phi}\|_F T^{1/2}}{\gamma_y(1 - 2^{-1/2})}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $N_T \leq \log T$, we get that with probability at-least $1 - O(\delta/(N^a(\log T)^{b-1}))$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^T \|\tilde{\theta}_k - \theta\|_F &\leq \frac{(32)^{1/4} \tilde{R} T^{3/4}}{\sqrt{\gamma}(1 - 1/2^{3/4})} \\ &\quad + \tilde{O} \left(\lambda \|\theta^* - \hat{\phi}\|_F T^{1/2} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

where we used the fact that $1/\gamma_y \leq 2H^{1/4}/(\gamma n^{1/4}) = O(\log(N^a(\log T)^b)) = \tilde{O}(1)$.

Recall that

$$\hat{\theta}_{l,j}^\top - \hat{\phi} = ((X_j^y)^\top X_j^y + \lambda I)^{-1} (X_j^y)^\top (Y_j^y - X_j^y \hat{\phi}^\top).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\theta}_{l,j}^\top - \hat{\phi} &= ((X_j^y)^\top X_j^y + \lambda I)^{-1} (X_j^y)^\top (X_j^y \theta^\top - X_j^y \hat{\phi}^\top) \\ &\quad + ((X_j^y)^\top X_j^y + \lambda I)^{-1} (\mathcal{E}_j^y - \mathcal{E}_j \theta^\top). \end{aligned}$$

That is

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\theta}_{l,j}^\top - \theta^\top &= ((X_j^y)^\top X_j^y + \lambda I)^{-1} (X_j^y)^\top (\mathcal{E}_j^y - \mathcal{E}_j \theta^\top) \\ &\quad + ((X_j^y)^\top X_j^y + \lambda I)^{-1} \lambda (\theta^\top - \hat{\phi}^\top). \end{aligned}$$

That is

$$\|\hat{\theta}_{l,j}^\top - \theta^\top\|_F \leq O\left(\frac{t_j}{\lambda}\right) + O(S).$$

That is

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=t_j^s}^{t_j} \|\tilde{\theta}_k - \theta\|_F &= \|\hat{\theta}_{j-1} - \theta\|_F H_j \\ &\leq O\left(\frac{t_{j-1} H_j}{\lambda}\right) + O(H_j) \leq O\left(\frac{H_j^2}{\lambda}\right) + O(H_j). \end{aligned}$$

That is

$$E_{\theta,T} = \sum_{k=1}^T \|\tilde{\theta}_k - \theta\|_F \leq O\left(\frac{T^2}{\lambda}\right) + O(T).$$

Combining the above equation and Eq. (42), we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[E_{\theta,T}] &\leq \tilde{O}(T^{3/4}) + \tilde{O}(\lambda \|\theta^* - \hat{\phi}\|_F T^{1/2}) \\ &\quad + \frac{\delta}{N^a(\log T)^{b-1}} \left(O\left(\frac{T^2}{\lambda}\right) + O(T) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Since $N \geq T$, $a \geq 1$, $b \geq 1$, we get that

$$\mathbb{E}[E_{\theta,T}] \leq \tilde{O}(T^{3/4}) + \tilde{O}\left(\lambda \|\theta^* - \hat{\phi}\|_F T^{1/2} + \frac{T}{\lambda}\right)$$

So the optimal scaling for λ is $\lambda = T^{1/4}$. Hence, from Eq. (42) we get that with probability at-least $1 - O(\delta/N)$

$$E_{\theta,T} \leq \tilde{O}\left(\left(1 + \|\theta^* - \hat{\phi}\|_F\right) T^{3/4}\right) \blacksquare$$

Proof for Theorem 2

First, we show that the scaling of $\{a, b\}$ is optimal for $a = b = 1$. From Eq. (43), it follows that the scaling of $\mathbb{E}[E_{\theta,T}]$

w.r.t T is limited by the first term and the scaling w.r.t a and b . Given how a and b appear in the first term, the scaling is optimal when a and b are minimal that is when $a = b = 1$; because then we can choose a λ such that the other terms are also $O(T^{3/4})$, which is the lowest that can be achieved. Then, from the proof of the previous theorem it then follows that the optimal scaling for λ is $\lambda = T^{1/4}$. Then, the first result of the theorem follows straightaway following the proof of Theorem 1 starting from Eq. (43)(see above).

We know from Theorem 1 that for an episode i with probability at-least $1 - O(\delta/N)$:

$$E_{\theta,T} \leq \tilde{O} \left(\left(1 + \|\theta^{*,i} - \hat{\phi}_i\|_F\right) T^{3/4} \right) \quad (44)$$

That is with probability at-least $1 - O(\delta)$:

$$\bar{E}_{\theta,N} \leq 1/N \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{O} \left(\left(1 + \|\theta^{*,i} - \hat{\phi}_i\|_F\right) T^{3/4} \right) \quad (45)$$

Note that, by definition the outer learner's per step loss is $l_i^o(\hat{\phi}) = \|\theta^{*,i} - \hat{\phi}\|_F$. The function $l_i^o(\hat{\phi})$ is convex in $\hat{\phi}$ and its globally Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant $L = 1$. Also, from the proof of Theorem 1 we know that θ_j^* is bounded under the same event where the previous equation holds. And by definition $\theta^{*,i} = \arg \max_j \|\theta_j^* - \hat{\phi}_i\|_F$. Hence, $\|\theta^{*,i}\|_F$ is bounded under such an event. Given that the outer learner follows the OGD algorithm (Eq. (19)) to update $\hat{\phi}$, using the above observations and Corollary 2.7. (Shalev-Shwartz et al., 2011), we get that under the same event, that is with probability at-least $1 - O(\delta)$:

$$\bar{E}_{\theta,N} \leq \tilde{O} \left(\left(1 + 1/\sqrt{N}\right) T^{3/4} \right). \quad (46)$$

■

Proof for Lemma 1

We first introduce a Lemma. Consider the following nonlinear system:

$$x_{t+1} = f(x_t, u_t) \quad (47)$$

Consider the MPC control law that sets the control input by $u_t = w_t^*$, where w_t^* is the first term of the control sequence $U_t^* = \{w_t^*, w_{t+1}^*, \dots, w_{M+t-1}^*\}$, and U_t^* is the solution of the following optimization:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{U_t} J_M(x_t, U_t), \\ J_M(x_t, U_t) &= \sum_{k=t}^{M+t-1} c_k(\tilde{x}_k, w_k), \quad w_k \in \mathcal{U}, \\ \tilde{x}_{k+1} &= f(\tilde{x}_k, w_k), \quad \tilde{x}_t = x_t, \\ U_t &= \{w_t, w_{t+1}, \dots, w_{M+t-1}\} \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Lemma 3 Consider the system in Eq. (47). Suppose the control input is given by $u_t = w_t^*$, where U_t^* is the solution to Eq. (48), $d(\cdot)$ is a terminal cost function for the system given by Eq. (47), the sequence of cost functions $\{c_t\}$ satisfy Assumption 3, $M > \bar{\alpha}^2/\alpha + 1$, then there exist constants $M_c \geq 1, \lambda_c > 0$ such that

$$\sigma(x_k) \leq M_c \exp^{-\lambda_c(k-t)} \sigma(x_t), \quad k \geq t.$$

Please see Corollary 3 in (Grimm et al., 2005) for the proof. We drop superscript i for convenience. Consider the state equation, Eq. (1), with the control input as \bar{u}_t :

$$x_{t+1} = Ax_t + B\bar{u}_t = \theta z_t. \quad (49)$$

Since \bar{u}_t is bounded and $\rho(A) < 1, \forall \theta \in \Theta, x_t$ is bounded. Let this bound be given by $\|z_t\|_2 \leq x_c$. We define the following dynamics for interval $j + 1$:

$$\tilde{x}_{t+1} = \hat{A}_j \tilde{x}_t + \hat{B}_j u_t, \quad \tilde{x}_{t_{j+1}^s} = x_{t_{j+1}^s}. \quad (50)$$

Let $\tilde{z}_t = [\tilde{x}_t^\top, u_t^\top]^\top$ and

$$\begin{aligned} x_{t+1}^{\delta u} &= \sum_{k=t_{j+1}^s}^t A^{t-k} B \delta u_k, \\ x_{t+1}^{\delta \theta} &= \sum_{k=t_{j+1}^s}^t A^{t-k} (\delta \theta_k) \tilde{z}_k, \quad \delta \theta_k = (\theta - \tilde{\theta}_k). \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

The claim is that within interval $j + 1$

$$x_t = \tilde{x}_t + x_t^{\delta u} + x_t^{\delta \theta}, \quad \text{where } \tilde{x}_{t+1} = \tilde{\theta}_t \tilde{z}_t.$$

We show this by induction. Let $x_t = \tilde{x}_t + x_t^{\delta u} + x_t^{\delta \theta}$ be true. Then

$$\begin{aligned} x_{t+1} &= Ax_t + B\bar{u}_t = Ax_t + Bu_t + B\delta u_t \\ x_{t+1} &= A(\tilde{x}_t + x_t^{\delta u} + x_t^{\delta \theta}) + Bu_t + B\delta u_t \\ x_{t+1} &= A(\tilde{x}_t + x_t^{\delta \theta}) + Bu_t + (Ax_t^{\delta u} + B\delta u_t) \\ x_{t+1} &= \theta \tilde{z}_t + Ax_t^{\delta \theta} + (Ax_t^{\delta u} + B\delta u_t) \\ x_{t+1} &= \tilde{\theta}_t \tilde{z}_t + (\delta \theta_t) \tilde{z}_t + Ax_t^{\delta \theta} + (Ax_t^{\delta u} + B\delta u_t) \\ x_{t+1} &= \tilde{\theta}_t \tilde{z}_t + (\delta \theta_t) \tilde{z}_t + (Ax_t^{\delta \theta} + B\delta u_t) \\ \text{i.e. } x_{t+1} &= \tilde{x}_{t+1} + x_{t+1}^{\delta u} + x_{t+1}^{\delta \theta}. \end{aligned}$$

The relation trivially holds for $t = 2$. Hence, by induction holds for all t . Then, using the fact that c_t is locally Lipschitz with a Lipschitz constant that is uniform for all t , the fact that $\|x_t\|_2 \leq x_c$ always and the fact that \bar{u}_t is always bounded, there exists a constant k_0 s.t.

$$c_t(x_t, \bar{u}_t) \leq c_t(\tilde{x}_t, u_t) + k_0 (\|x_t^{\delta \theta}\|_2 + \|x_t^{\delta u}\|_2 + \|\delta u_t\|_2). \quad (52)$$

Since $\rho(A) < 1$, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|A^k\|_2 \rightarrow 0$. Hence, there exists a constant n_ρ such that $\|A^{n_\rho}\|_2 < 1$. Hence, there exist constants c_ρ and $\gamma < 1$, where $\gamma^{n_\rho} = \|A^{n_\rho}\|_2 < 1$ such that $\|A^k\|_2 \leq c_\rho \gamma^k$ for all $k > 0$. Then, from Eq. (51) and triangle inequality it follows that within interval i

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{t+1}^{\delta\theta}\|_2 &\leq \sum_{k=t_j^s}^t \|A^{t-k}(\delta\theta_k)\tilde{z}_k\|_2 \\ &\leq \sum_{k=t_j^s}^t \|A^{t-k}\|_2 \|\delta\theta_k \tilde{z}_k\|_2 \leq c_\rho \sum_{k=t_j^s}^t \gamma^{t-k} \|\delta\theta_k \tilde{z}_k\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\delta\theta_k = \theta - \tilde{\theta}_k = \theta - \hat{\theta}_{j-1} = \delta\theta_{j-1}$ is a constant in interval j and $\hat{\theta}_{j-1} \in \hat{\Theta}_{j-1} \subseteq \Theta$, $\|\tilde{z}_t\| \leq x_c$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{t+1}^{\delta\theta}\|_2 &\leq c_\rho \sum_{k=t_j^s}^t \gamma^{t-k} \|\delta\theta_{j-1}\|_2 x_c \\ &\leq c_\rho \sum_{k=t_j^s}^t \gamma^{t-k} \|\delta\theta_{j-1}\|_2 x_c \leq c_\rho \|\delta\theta_{j-1}\|_2 x_c \sum_{k=t_j^s}^t \gamma^{t-k} \\ &= c_\rho \|\delta\theta_{j-1}\|_2 x_c \frac{1 - \gamma^{t-t_j^s+1}}{1 - \gamma} \leq c_\rho \|\delta\theta_{j-1}\|_2 \frac{x_c}{1 - \gamma}. \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

Similarly

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_{t+1}^{\delta u}\|_2 &\leq \sum_{k=t_j^s}^t \|A^{t-k} B \delta u_k\|_2 \leq \sum_{k=t_j^s}^t \|A^{t-k}\|_2 \|B \delta u_k\|_2 \\ &\leq c_\rho \sum_{k=t_j^s}^t \gamma^{t-k} \|B\|_2 \|\delta u_k\|_2 \leq c_\rho \sqrt{c_{p,j}} \frac{\|B\|_2}{1 - \gamma} \\ &\leq c_\rho \sqrt{c_{p,j}} \frac{S}{1 - \gamma}. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

From the definition of dynamics used for solving Eq. (9), i.e. Eq. (8), and the definition of dynamics used in this proof, Eq. (50), we get that

$$\bar{x}_t = \hat{A}_{j-1}^{t-t_j^s} (\hat{x}_j - x_{t_j^s}) + \tilde{x}_t.$$

Using the above expression, the fact that $\|\hat{x}_j - x_{t_j^s}\|_2 \leq 2\epsilon_c$ and Eq. (52), we get that

$$\begin{aligned} c_t(x_t, \bar{u}_t) &\leq c_t(\bar{x}_t, u_t) + k_0 \left(2\|\hat{A}_{j-1}^{t-t_j^s}\|_2 \epsilon_c + \|x_t^{\delta\theta}\|_2 \right) \\ &\quad + k_0 (\|x_t^{\delta u}\|_2 + \|\delta u_t\|_2). \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

Since $\rho(\hat{A}_{j-1}) < 1$, there exist constants \hat{c}_ρ and $\hat{\gamma} < 1$ such that $\|\hat{A}_{j-1}^k\|_2 \leq \hat{c}_\rho \hat{\gamma}^k$. Hence, $\sum_{k=1}^\infty \|\hat{A}_{j-1}^k\|_2 \leq \hat{c}$,

a constant. Using this and summing the expression in Eq. (55) over the interval j we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=t_j^s}^{t_j} c_t(x_t, \bar{u}_t) &\leq \sum_{t=t_j^s}^{t_j} c_t(\bar{x}_t, u_t) \\ &\quad + \sum_{t=t_j^s}^{t_j} k_0 \left(2\|\hat{A}_{j-1}^{t-t_j^s}\|_2 \epsilon_c + \|x_t^{\delta\theta}\|_2 \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{t=t_j^s}^{t_j} k_0 (\|x_t^{\delta u}\|_2 + \|\delta u_t\|_2) \\ &\leq \sum_{t=t_j^s}^{t_j} (c_t(\bar{x}_t, u_t) + k_0 (\|x_t^{\delta\theta}\|_2)) \\ &\quad + \sum_{t=t_j^s}^{t_j} k_0 (\|x_t^{\delta u}\|_2 + \|\delta u_t\|_2) + 2k_0 \hat{c} \epsilon_c. \end{aligned}$$

Then, using Eq. (54), Eq. (53), and the fact that $\|\delta u_t\|_2 = O(\sqrt{c_{p,j}})$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=t_j^s}^{t_j} c_t(x_t, \bar{u}_t) &\leq \sum_{t=t_j^s}^{t_j} (c_t(\bar{x}_t, u_t)) + O\left(\sum_{t=t_j^s}^{t_j} \|\delta\theta_{j-1}\|_2\right) \\ &\quad + O(\sqrt{c_{p,j}} H_j) + 2k_0 \hat{c} \epsilon_c. \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

Consider the following dynamics for the interval j :

$$\bar{x}_{t+1}^b = A \bar{x}_t^b + B \bar{u}_t^b, \bar{u}_t^b = \text{MPC}_t(\bar{x}_t^b, \theta), \bar{x}_{t_j^s}^b = x_{t_j^s}^b. \quad (57)$$

Under the event that $\theta = \hat{\Theta}_j$, given how \hat{x}_j and $\hat{\theta}_{j-1}$ are selected (Eq. (12)), we get that

$$\sum_{t=t_j^s}^{t_j} c_t(\bar{x}_t, u_t) \leq \sum_{t=t_j^s}^{t_j} c_t(\bar{x}_t^b, \bar{u}_t^b). \quad (58)$$

For the interval j , since all the conditions stated in Lemma 3 are satisfied by the dynamics given in Eq. (57) we have that

$$\sigma(\bar{x}_t^b) \leq M_c e^{-\lambda_c(k-t_j^s)} \sigma(x_{t_j^s}^b), \quad k \geq t_j^s. \quad (59)$$

From the global exponential controllability condition for the sequence of cost functions $\{c_t\}$ it follows that (see Section III.A., (Grimm et al., 2005)):

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{U_t} J_M(\bar{x}_t^b, U_t) &\leq \bar{\alpha} \sigma(\bar{x}_t^b), \quad \text{where } \bar{\alpha} = M_\lambda / (1 - e^{-\lambda_e}), \\ \text{i.e., } c_t(\bar{x}_t^b, \bar{u}_t^b) &\leq \min_{U_t} J_M(\bar{x}_t^b, U_t) \leq \bar{\alpha} \sigma(\bar{x}_t^b). \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

Then, using Eq. (60) and Eq. (59) in Eq. (58) we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=t_j^s}^{t_j} c_t(\bar{x}_t, u_t) &\leq \sum_{t=t_j^s}^{t_j} c_t(\bar{x}_t^b, \bar{u}_t^b) \\ &\leq \sum_{t=t_j^s}^{t_j} \bar{\alpha} M_c e^{-\lambda_c(k-t_j^s)} \sigma(x_{t_j^s}) = \frac{\bar{\alpha} M_c \sigma(x_{t_j^s})}{1 - e^{-\lambda_c}} = O(1). \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

Note that, by definition $c(x_t^b, u_t^b) \geq \alpha \sigma(x_t^b) \geq 0$. Hence

$$\sum_{t=t_j^s}^{t_j} c_t(\bar{x}_t, u_t) - \sum_{t=t_j^s}^{t_j} c_t(x_t^b, u_t^b) \leq \sum_{t=t_j^s}^{t_j} c_t(\bar{x}_t, u_t) \leq O(1). \quad (62)$$

Then, combining Eq. (62) and Eq. (56) we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=t_j^s}^{t_j} c_t(x_t, \bar{u}_t) - \sum_{t=t_j^s}^{t_j} c_t(x_t^b, u_t^b) &\leq O(1) + O(\sqrt{c_{p,j}} H_j) \\ &+ O\left(\sum_{t=t_j^s}^{t_j} \|\delta\theta_{j-1}\|_2\right). \end{aligned}$$

Summing the above over all intervals we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^T c_t(x_t, \bar{u}_t) - \sum_{t=1}^T c_t(x_t^b, u_t^b) &\leq O(N_T) + O(\mathbb{E}_{\theta, T}) \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^{N_t} O(\sqrt{c_{p,j}} H_j). \end{aligned}$$

Then, since $N_T \leq \log T$ (see the argument in the proof of Theorem 1), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^T c_t(x_t, \bar{u}_t) - \sum_{t=1}^T c_t(x_t^b, u_t^b) &\leq O(\log T) + O(\mathbb{E}_{\theta, T}) \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^{N_t} O(\sqrt{c_{p,j}} H_j). \end{aligned}$$

■

Proof for Theorem 3

To apply Theorem 1 to Lemma 1 we need to establish that the persistence of excitation holds. First, we present a Lemma that establishes the conditions under which the persistence of excitation holds. Let

$$W_t := [(u_t)^\top, \dots, (u_{t+n})^\top]^\top$$

where $(u_t, \dots, u_{t+n}, \dots)$ is a sequence of control inputs.

We first present Lemma 3.1. from (Moore, 1983). Denote a linear system by the matrices (A, B) . Denote the state and control input at time t by x_t and u_t .

Lemma 4 Suppose that the system given by (A, B) is controllable. Then, for arbitrary $x_k, u_k, u_{k+1}, \dots, u_{k+n-1}$ and an arbitrary non-zero n -vector ζ , there exists nonzero vectors β and ε of appropriate dimension, independent of $x_k, u_k, u_{k+1}, \dots, u_{k+n-1}$ but dependent on ζ , such that

$$\beta^T [u_k^\top, u_{k+1}^\top, \dots, u_{k+n-1}^\top]^\top = \zeta^\top [x_k, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_{k+n}] \varepsilon.$$

Please see Lemma 3.1., (Moore, 1983) for the proof. Next we present a Lemma that we later use in the main proof.

Lemma 5 Suppose the pair (A, B) is controllable. Then there exists a sequence of control inputs such that the matrix

$$[W_t, W_{t+1}, W_{t+2}, \dots, W_{t+q-1}],$$

is full row rank when $q = s((n+1)m)$, where s is any integer, and in this case the persistence of excitation condition holds for $p = q + n$.

Proof: To prove our result we use an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 3.1., (Moore, 1983). Consider an imaginary output y_k of the linear time invariant system given by the dynamics $x_{k+1} = Ax_k + Bu_k$:

$$y_k = \zeta^\top [x_k^\top \ u_k^\top]^\top, \quad (63)$$

where ζ is arbitrary. Let $\zeta^\top = [\zeta_x^\top \ \zeta_u^\top]$. The corresponding transfer function of this system (with McMillan degree $\leq n$) for the output in Eq. (63) is of the form

$$\mathcal{H}(z) = \frac{C_0 + C_1 z^{-1} + \dots + C_n z^{-n}}{d_0 + d_1 z^{-1} + \dots + d_n z^{-n}}, d_0 = 1, \quad (64)$$

where the coefficients $[d_0, d_1, \dots, d_n]$ correspond to the characteristic polynomial. The terms C_0, C_1, \dots, C_n have a specific form given by (see (Green & Moore, 1986))

$$C_j = \sum_{l=0}^j d_{j-l} P_l, P_l = \zeta_x^\top A^{l-1} B, P_0 = \zeta_u^\top.$$

Let

$$\beta := [C_n, C_{n-1}, \dots, C_0]^\top, \varepsilon := [d_n, \dots, d_1, d_0]^\top \quad (65)$$

Then, from Eq. (64), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \beta^T [u_k^\top, u_{k+1}^\top, \dots, u_{k+n}^\top]^\top &= \zeta^\top \times \\ &\left[\begin{bmatrix} x_k \\ u_k \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{k+1} \\ u_{k+1} \end{bmatrix}, \dots, \begin{bmatrix} x_{k+n} \\ u_{k+n} \end{bmatrix} \right] \varepsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

We can rewrite β^T as

$$\beta^T = \zeta^T G_\theta, G_\theta = \begin{bmatrix} Q_\theta & 0 \\ H_\theta & I \end{bmatrix} \quad (67)$$

where $Q_\theta = [q_n, q_{n-1}, \dots, q_1]$, $q_j = \sum_{l=1}^j d_{j-l} A^{l-1} B$, $H_\theta = [d_n I, d_{n-1} I, \dots, d_1 I]$, $I = I_m$, the identity matrix of size m . Since the pair (A, B) is controllable, G_θ is a full row rank matrix. Consider Q_θ . The term with the highest power of A in q_j is $A^{j-1} B$ and its coefficient is $d_0 = 1$ for all j . Thus $\text{span}\{[B, AB, A^2 B, \dots, A^{n-1} B]\} = \text{span}\{[q_n, q_{n-1}, \dots, q_1]\}$. Hence, for a non-zero ζ there exists a non-zero element in β and ε is non-zero because $d_0 = 1$.

Next, we show that if the matrix $[W_t, W_{t+1}, \dots, W_{t+q-1}]$ is a full row rank matrix then the persistence of excitation holds for $p = q + n$. Let the matrix $[W_t, W_{t+1}, \dots, W_{t+q-1}]$ be a full row rank matrix and let

$$\sum_{k=t}^{t+q-1} W_k W_k^T \geq c_p \gamma q > 0, \quad (68)$$

where γ is a positive constant and a matrix

$$X \geq c_p \iff v^T X v \geq c_p \forall v \text{ s.t. } \|v\|_2 = 1.$$

From Eq. (66) it follows that

$$\|\beta^T W_k\|_2^2 \leq \left\| \zeta^T \left[\begin{bmatrix} x_k \\ u_k \end{bmatrix}, \dots, \begin{bmatrix} x_{k+n} \\ u_{k+n} \end{bmatrix} \right] \right\|_2^2 \|\varepsilon\|_2^2.$$

Summing from $k = t$ to $k = t + q - 1$ on both sides we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \beta^T \left(\sum_{k=t}^{t+q-1} W_k W_k^T \right) \beta \\ & \leq \|\varepsilon\|_2^2 \zeta^T \sum_{k=t}^{t+q-1} \left[\begin{bmatrix} x_k \\ u_k \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{k+1} \\ u_{k+1} \end{bmatrix}, \dots, \begin{bmatrix} x_{k+n} \\ u_{k+n} \end{bmatrix} \right] \times \\ & \left[\begin{bmatrix} x_k \\ u_k \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{k+1} \\ u_{k+1} \end{bmatrix}, \dots, \begin{bmatrix} x_{k+n} \\ u_{k+n} \end{bmatrix} \right]^T \zeta \\ & \leq (n+1) \|\varepsilon\|_2^2 \zeta^T \sum_{k=t}^{t+q+n-1} \begin{bmatrix} x_k \\ u_k \end{bmatrix} [x_k^T, u_k^T] \zeta. \end{aligned}$$

Then, using Eq. (68) in the previous equation we get that

$$\zeta^T \sum_{k=t}^{t+q+n-1} \begin{bmatrix} x_k \\ u_k \end{bmatrix} [x_k^T, u_k^T] \zeta \geq \frac{\gamma c_p q \beta^T \beta}{((n+1) \|\varepsilon\|_2^2)}. \quad (69)$$

Since the elements of ε are the coefficients of the minimal polynomial of A , each element of ε is a polynomial

function of the eigenvalues of the system matrix A . Denote the roots (or the eigenvalues) of A by r_1, \dots, r_n . Let $r = \max\{|r_1|, |r_2|, |r_3|, \dots, |r_n|\}$. It is clear that r is finite because $\theta \in \Theta$, and Θ is compact. Then, using Vieta's formula we get that

$$(-1)^k d_{n-k} = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 \leq i_2 \leq \dots \leq i_{n-k} \leq n} \prod_{j=1}^{n-k} r_{i_j}, \forall k < n.$$

Applying binomial theorem we get that $|d_k| \leq (1+r)^n$ and $\|\varepsilon\|_2^2 \leq n(1+r)^{2n} + 1$. Using this relation in Eq. (69) we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \zeta^T \sum_{k=t}^{t+q+n-1} \begin{bmatrix} x_k \\ u_k \end{bmatrix} [x_k^T, u_k^T] \zeta \\ & \geq \frac{\gamma c_p q (\beta^T \beta)}{((n+1)(n(1+r)^{2n} + 1))}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\lambda_{\min}(G_\theta G_\theta^T) = c_g$. Since (A, B) is a controllable pair $c_g > 0$. Applying this fact to the previous equation we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=t}^{t+q+n-1} \begin{bmatrix} x_k \\ u_k \end{bmatrix} [x_k^T, u_k^T] \geq \frac{\gamma c_p q c_g}{((n+1)(n(1+r)^{2n} + 1))} \\ & = \tilde{\gamma} c_p q \geq \tilde{\gamma} c_p p / 2 > 0, \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

where $\tilde{\gamma} = \gamma c_g / ((n+1)(n(1+r)^{2n} + 1))$. Next, we show that we can construct a sequence of inputs such that the condition in Eq. (68) is satisfied for $q = s((n+1)m)$. Let e_i^m be the unit vector along the i th dimension of \mathbb{R}^m . Consider

$$\begin{aligned} & u_k = e_j^m, \text{ where } j = \max_{\tilde{j} \leq m} \tilde{j} \\ & \text{s.t. } k - 1 \bmod (n+1)\tilde{j} = 0, \\ & u_k = 0, \text{ if } \nexists \tilde{j} \leq m \\ & \text{s.t. } k - 1 \bmod (n+1)\tilde{j} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

For this construction, the matrix

$$M_k = [W_k, W_{k+1}, \dots, W_{k+q-1}]$$

can also be written as

$$M_k = \Pi([e_1, e_2, \dots, e_q]),$$

for any k , where Π denotes a permutation of the columns of the input matrix, and e_j are unit vectors along each dimension in $\mathbb{R}^{(n+1)m}$. By construction, Eq. (68) is satisfied. Then, following the argument outlined above we get that the persistence of excitation is satisfied for $p = q + n$ when the sequence of control inputs is given by Eq. (71) and $q = s((n+1)m)$. ■

Now we prove the main theorem. We drop the superscript i for convenience. Take any arbitrary interval. We first establish that there exist δu_t for all t as defined in Eq. (11) such that the matrix

$$M_t = [W_t, W_{t+1}, \dots, W_{t+(n+1)m-1}]$$

where $W_t = [(\bar{u}_t)^\top, \dots, (\bar{u}_{t+n})^\top]^\top$,

is full rank. We prove this by induction. For the first part we show that if M_{t-1} is full rank then M_t is full rank when the control input $\bar{u}_{t+(n+1)m+n-1}$ is generated according to Eq. (10) and Eq. (11). We prove this on a case by case basis. Let $t_c := t + (n+1)m + n - 1$.

Case $e_{t_c}^\perp \neq 0$: denote the matrix after removing the first column of M_{t-1} by M_{t-1}^{-1} . Since M_{t-1} is full rank and a square matrix, M_{t-1}^{-1} is one rank less than M_{t-1} . By definition, the unit vector along the dimension of null space of $(M_{t-1}^{-1})^\top$ is $W_{t+(n+1)m-1}^\perp$. To ensure that M_t is full rank it is sufficient to ensure that

$$(W_{t+(n+1)m-1}^\perp)^\top W_{t+(n+1)m-1} \neq 0,$$

i.e. $\sum_{k=t+(n+1)m-1}^{k=t_c} (u_k^\perp)^\top \bar{u}_k \neq 0$

i.e. $\sum_{k=t+(n+1)m-1}^{k=t_c-1} ((u_k^\perp)^\top \bar{u}_k) + (u_{t_c}^\perp)^\top \bar{u}_{t_c} \neq 0.$

Let

$$\sum_{k=t+(n+1)m-1}^{k=t_c-1} ((u_k^\perp)^\top \bar{u}_k) = g.$$

Then, it is sufficient to ensure that

$$g + (u_{t_c}^\perp)^\top \bar{u}_{t_c} \neq 0.$$

Let

$$g^\perp = (u_{t_c}^\perp)^\top u_{t_c}, e_{t_c} = \frac{u_{t_c}}{\|u_{t_c}\|}, g_s = \frac{g^\perp + g}{|g^\perp + g| |g^\perp|}.$$

Consider

$$\delta u_{t_c} = \begin{cases} \frac{g}{|g|} \sqrt{c_p} e_{t_c}^\perp & \text{if } g^\perp = 0, \\ g_s \sqrt{c_p} e_{t_c} & \text{if } g^\perp \neq 0, g_s < 0, \\ 2g_s \sqrt{c_p} e_{t_c} & \text{if } \|u_{t_c}\|_2 - \sqrt{c_p} \geq \sqrt{c_p}, \\ & \text{if } g^\perp \neq 0, g_s < 0, \\ \sqrt{c_p} e_{t_c} & \text{if } \|u_{t_c}\|_2 - \sqrt{c_p} < \sqrt{c_p}, \\ & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For this choice of δu_{t_c} , Eq. (72) is always valid because the sign of $(u_{t_c}^\perp)^\top \delta u_{t_c}$ will always be aligned with the sign of $g + g^\perp$. In addition, there exists a unit vector v_e , where

$$v_e = \begin{cases} e_{t_c}^\perp & \text{if } g^\perp = 0 \\ e_{t_c} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \text{ s.t. } v_e^\top \bar{u}_{t_c} \geq \sqrt{c_p}.$$

This implies that, for the above choice of δu_{t_c}

$$\|W_{t+(n+1)m-1}\|_2 \geq \sqrt{c_p}.$$

Case $e_{t_c}^\perp = 0$: in this case we show that the matrix M_t is full rank for any arbitrary $\delta u_{t+(n+1)m-1}$. As in the previous case, the null space of $(M_{t-1}^{-1})^\top$ is one-dimensional space. And, by definition the unit vector along this dimension is $W_{t+(n+1)m-1}^\perp$. Let

$$\tilde{W}^\perp := [0^\top, W_{t+(n+1)m-1}^\perp (1 : nm)^\top]^\top,$$

where $W_{t+(n+1)m-1}^\perp (1 : nm)$ is the vector of the first nm elements of $W_{t+(n+1)m-1}^\perp$. Because $e_{t_c}^\perp = 0$ and $W_{t+(n+1)m-1}^\perp$ is non-zero, $W_{t+(n+1)m-1}^\perp (1 : nm)$ is non-zero. Hence, the vector \tilde{W}^\perp is non-zero. First, we show by contradiction that

$$(W_{t+(n+1)m-1}^\perp)^\top W_{t+(n+1)m-1} \neq 0.$$

If this condition is violated then $W_{t+(n+1)m-1}^\perp$ is orthogonal to all the columns of $[W_t, W_{t+1}, \dots, W_{t+(n+1)m-1}]$. This implies that the non-zero vector \tilde{W}^\perp is orthogonal to all the columns of M_{t-1} because, as per construction, the control input vectors (each of dimension m) that constitute the column vectors of M_t are the same control input vectors that are one position below in the corresponding columns of M_{t-1} . This is a contradiction because by assumption M_{t-1} is full rank. Thus, in this case

$$(W_{t+(n+1)m-1}^\perp)^\top W_{t+(n+1)m-1} \neq 0,$$

always. And, since $e_{t_c}^\perp = 0$ in this case, δu_{t_c} can be set as any vector. Consider the perturbation $\delta u_{t_c} = \sqrt{c_p} e_{t_c}$. For this choice of δu_{t_c} ,

$$\|W_{t+(n+1)m-1}\|_2 \geq \sqrt{c_p}.$$

This completes the first part of the proof by induction. Next, we observe that we can construct a $M_{t_s}^s$ following the same procedure outlined above such that $M_{t_s}^s$ is full rank. Hence, by induction it follows that M_t is full rank for all t within an interval. We note that the constant c_p can be specified based on the interval and the norm of the columns are at the least $\sqrt{c_p}$ by construction.

Next, we show that

$$\sum_{k=t}^{t+(n+1)m-1} W_k W_k^\top \geq c_p > 0.$$

Let $W_k = \beta_k \hat{W}_k$, where $\|\hat{W}_k\| = 1$ and $\beta_k = \|W_k\|_2$. Denote $\hat{W}_l^\top \hat{W}_r$ by $\delta_{l,r}$. Consider an arbitrary vector $v \in$

$\mathbb{R}^{n(m+1)}$, which satisfies $\|v\|_2 = 1$. Since M_t is full rank, there exists $\alpha_k \in \mathbb{R}$ not all zero such that $v = \sum_k \alpha_k \hat{W}_k$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} v^\top \left(\sum_{k=t}^{t+(n+1)m-1} W_k W_k^\top \right) v &= \sum_{k=t}^{t+(n+1)m-1} v^\top W_k W_k^\top v \\ &= \sum_{k=t}^{t+(n+1)m-1} \beta_k^2 v^\top \hat{W}_k \hat{W}_k^\top v \\ &= \sum_{k=t}^{t+(n+1)m-1} \beta_k^2 v^\top \hat{W}_k \hat{W}_k^\top v. \end{aligned}$$

By construction, $\|W_k\|_2 = \beta_k \geq \sqrt{c_p}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} v^\top \left(\sum_{k=t}^{t+(n+1)m-1} W_k W_k^\top \right) v &\geq c_p \sum_k \left(\sum_l \alpha_l \hat{W}_l \right)^\top \hat{W}_k \hat{W}_k^\top \left(\sum_l \alpha_l \hat{W}_l \right) \\ &= c_p \sum_k \sum_l \sum_r \alpha_l \alpha_r \delta_{l,k} \delta_{r,k} \\ &= c_p \sum_l \sum_r \alpha_l \alpha_r \delta_{l,r} + c_p \sum_{k \neq r} \sum_l \sum_r \alpha_l \alpha_r \delta_{l,k} \delta_{r,k} \\ &= 2c_p \sum_l \sum_r \alpha_l \alpha_r \delta_{l,r} + c_p \sum_{k \neq r, k \neq l} \sum_l \sum_r \alpha_l \alpha_r \delta_{l,k} \delta_{r,k} \\ &= 2c_p \sum_l \sum_r \alpha_l \alpha_r \delta_{l,r} + c_p \sum_k \sum_{l \neq k} \sum_{r \neq k} \alpha_l \alpha_r \delta_{l,k} \delta_{r,k}. \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{l \neq k} \sum_{r \neq k} \alpha_l \alpha_r \delta_{l,k} \delta_{r,k} \\ &= \left(\sum_{l \neq k} \alpha_l V_l \right)^\top W_k W_k^\top \left(\sum_{l \neq k} \alpha_l V_l \right) \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

Then, using Eq. (73) and the fact that $\|v\|_2 = \sum_l \sum_r \alpha_l \alpha_r \delta_{l,r} = 1$ in Eq. (72), we get that

$$v^\top \left(\sum_{k=t}^{t+(n+1)m-1} W_k W_k^\top \right) v \geq 2c_p > c_p. \quad (74)$$

Then, from Eq. (74) and given that $q = n_c = (n+1)m$, for any t s.t. $t_j^s \leq t \leq t_j$, we get

$$v^\top \left(\sum_{k=t}^{t+j^*n_c-1} W_k W_k^\top \right) v \geq 1/n_c c_{p,j}(j^*n_c).$$

Set $\gamma = 1/n_c$. Then, following the argument in the proof of Lemma 5 we get that

$$\sum_{k=t}^{t+j^*n_c+n-1} \begin{bmatrix} x_k \\ u_k \end{bmatrix} [x_k^\top, u_k^\top] \geq \tilde{\gamma} c_{p,j}(j^*n_c) > 0,$$

By definition, $H = j^*n_c + n$. And so, from Eq. (17) it follows that $n \leq H/2$, which in turn implies that $j^*n_c \geq H/2$. Hence,

$$\sum_{k=t}^{t+H-1} \begin{bmatrix} x_k \\ u_k \end{bmatrix} [x_k^\top, u_k^\top] \geq \tilde{\gamma} c_{p,j} H/2.$$

Extending this sum over the duration of the interval j , which contains 2^{j-1} periods of length H , each of which by design satisfies the previous equation, we get

$$\sum_{k=t_j^s}^{t+H_j-1} \begin{bmatrix} x_k \\ u_k \end{bmatrix} [x_k^\top, u_k^\top] \geq \tilde{\gamma} c_{p,j}(2^{j-1}H)/2.$$

This establishes persistence of excitation. Then, the final result follows from the application of Theorem 2 to Lemma 1. ■