

Kernel-Based Identification with Frequency Domain Side-Information

M. Khosravi and R. S. Smith

Abstract—In this paper, we discuss the problem of system identification when frequency domain side information is available on the system. Initially, we consider the case where the prior knowledge is provided as being the \mathcal{H}_∞ -norm of the system bounded by a given scalar. This framework provides the opportunity of considering various forms of side information such as the dissipativity of the system as well as other forms of frequency domain prior knowledge. We propose a nonparametric identification method for estimating the impulse response of the system under the given side information. The estimation problem is formulated as an optimization in a reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) endowed with a stable kernel. The corresponding objective function consists of a term for minimizing the fitting error, and a regularization term defined based on the norm of the impulse response in the employed RKHS. To guarantee the desired frequency domain features defined based on the prior knowledge, suitable constraints are imposed on the estimation problem. The resulting optimization has an infinite-dimensional feasible set with an infinite number of constraints. We show that this problem is a well-defined convex program with a unique solution. We propose a heuristic that tightly approximates this unique solution. The proposed approach is equivalent to solving a finite-dimensional convex quadratically constrained quadratic program. The efficiency of the discussed method is verified by several numerical examples.

I. INTRODUCTION

System identification problem, initially introduced in [1], deals with the theory and techniques for estimating suitable mathematical models describing dynamical systems using measurement data. The topic has received substantial attention according to its broad applicability in numerous phenomena in science and technology [2]–[4]. In many situations, identifying a dynamical system is beyond fitting a mathematical model to the input-output measurement data. More precisely, we may additionally need to integrate a specific attribute or a known feature of the system into the model. This side information is possibly provided from our general understanding of the behavior of the system based on its inherent physical nature, or acquired from qualitative characteristics and phenomena observed from historical or experimental data. For example, in the identification of nonlinear dynamics various forms of side information such as stability, region of attraction, dissipativity and many other ones are incorporated [5]–[10].

The incorporation of side information has been considered in the identification of linear dynamics, e.g., the low complexity of the model is imposed by considering sparsity promoting regularizations [11]–[15]. For penalizing the order of systems, the rank and the nuclear norm of the corresponding Hankel

matrix are utilized in [14]–[17]. For the same purpose, the notion of atomic transfer functions and regularization based on the atomic norm are employed [11], [13]. Identification with the prior knowledge involving positivity features of the system such as compartmental structure and the internal or external positivity are discussed as well in the literature [18]–[23]. Other forms of side information are studied in [24]–[29], e.g., including information on the location of the eigenvalues is discussed in [26], [27], positive-realness is studied in [24], [25], and utilizing prior knowledge on the moments of the transfer function is discussed in [28]. The subspace identification method is employed to include information on the steady-state behavior [30]–[32] such as the stability of the system [32].

Starting from the seminal work Pilonetto and De Nicolao [33], a paradigm shift known as *kernel-based* approach has been emerged in system identification and also the idea of integrating prior knowledge [34]–[37]. In the proposed framework, the identification problem is formulated as a regularized regression in a reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) [38] where the regularization term is defined based on the norm of RKHS to penalize the feasible solutions not following the prior knowledge. Indeed, by suitable choice of the kernel function or imposing appropriate constraints in the regression problem, one can incorporate various prior knowledge such as the stability of the system, the resonant frequencies, gain, the smoothness of the impulse response, and internal or external positivity of the system [18], [22], [39]–[42]. Moreover, employing a Tikhonov-like regularization in this framework leads in improvement of the bias-variance trade-off [35].

Input-output behavioral properties such as the \mathcal{H}_∞ -norm of the plant, or more generally frequency domain properties like the dissipativity of the system [43], can be strongly useful in feedback controller design [44], [45]. These features are a priori known for many systems due to their inherent physical nature, e.g., the electrical circuits where the energy is dissipated by the resistors [43]. Also, they can be verified using recently developed data-driven methods [46]–[50]. Accordingly, knowledge on these valuable attributes are potentially available or can be extracted to be used later as side information. However, in the existing research studies on the identification of LTI systems with prior knowledge [29], the question on efficient integration of the aforementioned frequency domain side information has not suitably addressed. For example, in the standard implementation of subspace and kernel-based identification methods, the information on the bound of system's \mathcal{H}_∞ -norm is not encoded in the identified model (see the example in Section III).

The main goal of this paper is to develop identification methods utilizing frequency domain side information in a numerically tractable fashion and also providing suitable theo-

Mohammad Khosravi is with Delft Center for Systems and Control, Delft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands (email: Mohammad.khosravi@tudelft.nl).

Roy S. Smith is with Automatic Control Laboratory, ETH Zürich, Switzerland (email: rsmith@control.ee.ethz.ch).

retical guarantees. First, we consider the case where the prior knowledge is provided as being the \mathcal{H}_∞ -norm of the system bounded by a given scalar. This framework provides the opportunity of considering various forms of side information such as the dissipativity of the system as well as other types of frequency domain prior knowledge like the DC-gain of the system. We propose a nonparametric identification method for estimating the impulse response of the system under the given side information. Since kernel-based approach provides a powerful framework, the identification problem is formulated as a constrained regularized optimization problem regression in an RKHS endowed with a stable kernel [35], [51], [52]. The objective function of the optimization problem consists of a term for minimizing the fitting error, and a regularization term defined based on the norm of the impulse response in the employed RKHS. To guarantee the desired frequency domain prior knowledge, suitable constraints are imposed on the estimation problem. Accordingly, we obtain a regularized optimization problem in an infinite-dimensional space with an infinite number of constraints. Following this, we show that this problem is a convex program that attains a unique solution, and consequently, it is well-posed. Then, towards deriving a tractable scheme, we consider a suitable finite set of frequencies, and subsequently, a new optimization is formulated as an approximate estimation problem with the same objective function but with constraints defined on the given finite set. We show that the new problem attains a unique solution with an especial parametric form. Subsequently, an equivalent finite-dimensional convex optimization is derived as a convex quadratically constrained quadratic program (QCQP). More precisely, by solving this optimization problem, the coefficients in the parametric form are estimated, and hence, the solution of the approximate problem is obtained. We derive suitable bounds on the tightness of this approximation. Moreover, we provide theoretical guarantees on the convergence of the approximate solution to the solution of the original problem. The efficiency of the discussed method is verified by several numerical examples.

II. NOTATIONS AND PRELIMINARIES

The set of natural numbers, the set of non-negative integers, the set of real numbers, the set of non-negative real numbers, the set of complex numbers, the n -dimensional Euclidean space, the space of n by m real matrices, and the space of n by n real symmetric matrices are denoted by \mathbb{N} , \mathbb{Z}_+ , \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{R}_+ , \mathbb{C} , \mathbb{R}^n , $\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, and \mathbb{S}^n , respectively. For any $z \in \mathbb{C}$, the real and imaginary part of z are denoted by $\text{real}(z)$ and $\text{imag}(z)$, respectively. The inner product and norm of Hilbert space \mathcal{H} is denoted by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $\| \cdot \|_{\mathcal{H}}$, respectively, and when it is clear from the context, we drop the subscript. To handle discrete and continuous time in the same formulation, \mathbb{T} denotes either \mathbb{Z}_+ or \mathbb{R}_+ , and \mathbb{T}_\pm is the set of scalars t where either $t \in \mathbb{T}$ or $-t \in \mathbb{T}$. Given measure space \mathcal{X} , the space of measurable functions $g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is denoted by $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{X}}$. The element $u \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{X}}$ is shown entry-wise as $u = (u_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$, or equivalently as $u = (u(x))_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$. Depending on the context of discussion, \mathcal{L}^∞ refers either to

$\ell^\infty(\mathbb{Z})$ or $L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$. Similarly, \mathcal{L}^1 is either $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_+)$ or $L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$. For $p \in \{1, \infty\}$, the norm in \mathcal{L}^p is denoted by $\| \cdot \|_p$. Let $(\mathbb{X}, \| \cdot \|_{\mathbb{X}})$ and $(\mathbb{Y}, \| \cdot \|_{\mathbb{Y}})$ be two normed vector spaces. The set of linear bounded (continuous) operators $A : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}$, denoted by $\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y})$, is a normed vector space with the norm defined as $\|A\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y})} := \sup_{x \in \mathbb{X}, \|x\|_{\mathbb{X}} \leq 1} \|Ax\|_{\mathbb{Y}}$. The identity matrix/operator and the zero vector are denoted by \mathbb{I} and $\mathbf{0}$ respectively. Given $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathbb{X}$, the linear span of \mathcal{V} , denoted by $\text{span}\mathcal{V}$, is a linear subspace of \mathbb{X} containing linear combination of the elements of \mathcal{V} . Let \mathcal{Y} be a set and $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$. We define the function $\delta_{\mathcal{C}}$ as $\delta_{\mathcal{C}}(y) = 0$, if $y \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\delta_{\mathcal{C}}(y) = \infty$, otherwise. Similarly, function $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}}$ is defined as $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}}(y) = 1$, if $y \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}}(y) = 0$, otherwise.

III. SYSTEM IDENTIFICATION WITH FREQUENCY DOMAIN SIDE INFORMATION

Consider a stable LTI system \mathcal{S} described with impulse response $g^{(s)} := (g_t^{(s)})_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{T}}$ and transfer function $G^{(s)}$. For the case of discrete-time and the case of continuous-time, we have here respectively $\mathbb{T} := \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $\mathbb{T} := \mathbb{R}_+$. Let the system be actuated with a bounded input signal denoted by $u = (u_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \in \mathcal{L}^\infty$. Accordingly, for any $t \in \mathbb{T}$, one can define linear map L_t^u over the space of stable impulse responses, for the discrete-time case, as

$$L_t^u(g) := \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_+} g_s u_{t-s}, \quad (1)$$

and similarly, for the case of continuous-time, as

$$L_t^u(g) := \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} g_s u_{t-s} ds. \quad (2)$$

Let the output of the system be measured at time instants $\mathcal{T} := \{t_i \mid i = 0, \dots, n_{\mathcal{D}} - 1\}$, for a given $n_{\mathcal{D}} \in \mathbb{N}$. More precisely, define y_t as

$$y_t := L_t^u(g^{(s)}) + w_t, \quad t \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (3)$$

where, for any $t \in \mathcal{T}$, w_t denotes the measurement uncertainty. Subsequently, let \mathcal{D} be the set of input-output pairs, i.e., \mathcal{D} is defined as $\mathcal{D} = \{(u_t, y_t) \mid t \in \mathcal{T}\}$.

Let assume we know that the \mathcal{H}_∞ -norm of system \mathcal{S} is bounded by a given scalar $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_+$. The question is whether this side-information is naturally encoded in the identification problem. The following example elaborates this issue by demonstrating that the information on the bound of the system's \mathcal{H}_∞ -norm is not included in the models identified by the standard identification approaches such as the subspace and the kernel-based methods.

Example. Let \mathcal{S} be a discrete-time system described by the following transfer function

$$G^{(s)}(z) = \frac{1}{2z-1} + \frac{3}{100} \frac{z-1}{z^2+z+0.9}. \quad (4)$$

This can be a model of a low-pass filter where its frequency response has a deformity in high frequencies potentially due to the impact of aging, or possible mistakes in design and implementation. To obtain set of data \mathcal{D} , we actuate the system with a random white Gaussian signal of length $n_{\mathcal{D}} = 150$, and




Figure 1: The estimated models \hat{G}_1 and \hat{G}_2 for the system (4) are compared with the true transfer function.

then, the output of system is measured where SNR = 14.5 [dB] (see Figure 1). Additionally, let assume we are given the side-information $\|G^{(S)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} \leq 1$ which can be due to the filter nature of \mathcal{S} . We employ MATLAB's SYSTEM IDENTIFICATION TOOLBOX [53] to estimate models \hat{G}_1 and \hat{G}_2 for the system using `impulseest` and `n4sid`, respectively. The results are shown in Figure 1 where we have $\|\hat{G}_1\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} = 1.24$ and $\|\hat{G}_2\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} = 1.38$. One can see that the models estimated by the mentioned standard identification methods do not comply the side-information.

Motivated by this example, we introduce the main problem discussed in this paper as the system identification with side-information on the \mathcal{H}_∞ -norm of the system.

Problem 1. *Given the set of input-output data \mathcal{D} , estimate the impulse response of system \mathcal{S} satisfying the side-information $\|G^{(S)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} \leq \rho$, where ρ is a given non-negative real scalar.*

This problem can be extended to the identification problem with more general sense of dissipativity side-information. More precisely, let $Q \in \mathbb{S}^2$ be an indefinite matrix and assume that in addition to the given set of data \mathcal{D} , we know that the system \mathcal{S} is *dissipative* [54] with respect to quadratic supply rate function $s_Q(u, y)$ defined as

$$\begin{aligned} s_Q(u, y) &:= \begin{bmatrix} u & y \end{bmatrix} Q \begin{bmatrix} u \\ y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} u & y \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} q_u & q_{uy} \\ q_{uy} & q_y \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u \\ y \end{bmatrix} \\ &= q_u u^2 + 2q_{uy} u y + q_y y^2, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $q_y < 0$ [54], [55]. For the case of $s_Q(u, y) = \rho^2 u^2 - y^2$ where $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_+$, this dissipativity prior knowledge is equivalent to being \mathcal{L}_2 -gain or \mathcal{H}_∞ -norm of the system not larger than ρ . Given the above side-information on the dissipativity of system \mathcal{S} , a desired identification procedure for estimating the impulse response of the system should suitably utilize this information and also guarantee that the identified model satisfies the given feature. More precisely, one has to address the following problem:

Problem 2. *Given the set of data \mathcal{D} and considering the side-information on the dissipativity of system with respect to the supply rate $s_Q(u, y)$, estimate the impulse response of system \mathcal{S} satisfying the provided side-information.*

¹In other words, given that the system is initially at rest, for any input-output pairs $(u_t, y_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$ and any $\tau \in \mathbb{T}$, we have $\int_0^\tau s_Q(u_t, y_t) dt \geq 0$, if $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+$, and $\sum_{t=0}^\tau s_Q(u_t, y_t) \geq 0$, if $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+$.

Note that we have

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} q_u & q_{uy} \\ q_{uy} & q_y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} l_1 & l_2 \\ 0 & l_3 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} l_1 & 0 \\ l_2 & l_3 \end{bmatrix} \quad (6)$$

where $l_1 = (\det Q / q_y)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, $l_2 = -q_{uy} / (-q_y)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, and $l_3 = (-q_y)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, and subsequently, one can define system $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ with input $v = l_1 u$ and output $z = l_2 u + l_3 y$ as shown in Figure 2. Then, $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ is a dissipative system with respect to supply rate function $s(v, z) = u^2 - y^2$, or equivalently, we have $\|G^{(\tilde{\mathcal{S}})}\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} \leq 1$ where $G^{(\tilde{\mathcal{S}})}$ is the transfer function of system $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$. Meanwhile, using the introduced change of variables and based on \mathcal{D} , we can define set of data $\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}} := \{(v_t, z_t) \mid t \in \mathcal{T}\}$, where $v_t := l_1 u_t$ and $z_t := l_2 u_t + l_3 y_t$, for $t \in \mathcal{T}$. Accordingly, the problem is equivalent to identifying system $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ given the set of data $\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}$ and the side-information $\|G^{(\tilde{\mathcal{S}})}\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} \leq 1$. Therefore, in order to address Problem 2 it is enough to find a solution approach for Problem 1.




Figure 2: The equivalent system $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$ with \mathcal{H}_∞ -norm less than or equal to 1.

The Problem 1 can be further extended to the case where system \mathcal{S} is approximately known. More precisely, let $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ be a known system with transfer function $G^{(\bar{\mathcal{S}})}$ and we are given that $\|G^{(S)} - G^{(\bar{\mathcal{S}})}\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} \leq \rho$, for a known $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_+$. This can be the case in various situations, e.g., the system might be identified previously as $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$, while it has been changed later due to aging or possible modifications of the plant; or towards a specific application, the model of the system has been estimated as $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ using a particular identification approach, and additionally, we would like to obtain an improved version of the model for some other purpose like prediction. Based on this discussion, one can propose the following identification problem:

Problem 3. *Given the set of input-output data \mathcal{D} , estimate the impulse response of system \mathcal{S} satisfying the side-information $\|G^{(S)} - G^{(\bar{\mathcal{S}})}\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} \leq \rho$, where $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ is a known system with transfer function $G^{(\bar{\mathcal{S}})}$ and $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is a given scalar.*

Let $\Delta\mathcal{S}$ be the system with the transfer function $G^{(\Delta\mathcal{S})} := G^{(S)} - G^{(\bar{\mathcal{S}})}$ and the impulse response $g^{(\Delta\mathcal{S})} := g^{(S)} - g^{(\bar{\mathcal{S}})}$, where $g^{(\bar{\mathcal{S}})}$ is the impulse response of system $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$. Since $g^{(\bar{\mathcal{S}})}$ is known, one can obtain $L_t^u(g^{(\bar{\mathcal{S}})})$, and subsequently, define d_t as $d_t := y_t - L_t^u(g^{(\bar{\mathcal{S}})})$, for any $t \in \mathcal{T}$. Due to (3) and the linearity of L_t^u , we have

$$d_t = L_t^u(g^{(S)}) + w_t - L_t^u(g^{(\bar{\mathcal{S}})}) = L_t^u(g^{(\Delta\mathcal{S})}) + w_t, \quad t \in \mathcal{T}. \quad (7)$$

Accordingly, we can define $\mathcal{D}_{\Delta\mathcal{S}} := \{(u_t, d_t) \mid t \in \mathcal{T}\}$ as the input-output pairs of data for the system $\Delta\mathcal{S}$. Therefore, the Problem 3 is equivalent to identifying system $\Delta\mathcal{S}$ given the set of data $\mathcal{D}_{\Delta\mathcal{S}}$ and the side-information $\|G^{(\Delta\mathcal{S})}\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} \leq \rho$, which is in form of Problem 1.

Let $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+$, $\mathcal{T} := \{i = 0, \dots, n_{\mathcal{D}} - 1\}$, and consider the following identification problem:

Problem 4. *Given the set of input-output data \mathcal{D} , estimate the impulse response of system \mathcal{S} satisfying the frequency domain side-information $\|WG^{(s)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} \leq \rho$, where $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is a given scalar, and weight W is a known stable transfer function with stable casual inverse.*

Let the output signal $y = (y_t)_{t=0}^{n_{\mathcal{D}}-1}$ be filtered by system W and $p := (p_t)_{t=0}^{n_{\mathcal{D}}-1}$ be the resulting filtered signal. One can see that $\mathcal{D}_H := \{(u_t, p_t) | t \in \mathcal{T}\}$ is a set of input-output data for the system with transfer function $H := WG^{(s)}$, where we know that $\|H\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} \leq \rho$. Let \hat{H} be the solution of Problem 1 for this setting. Then, $\hat{G} := W^{-1}\hat{H}$ is a solution to Problem 4.

Considering the above discussion, a solution approach for Problem 1 leads to addressing Problem 2, Problem 3, and Problem 4. In the remainder of the paper, we discuss solving Problem 1.

IV. THE ESTIMATION PROBLEM: EXISTENCE AND UNIQUENESS OF THE SOLUTION

In this section, an optimization problem is introduced to address the estimation Problem 1. Additionally, we investigate the existence and uniqueness properties for the solution of this problem.

Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{T}}$ be a suitable functional space of stable impulse responses taken as the hypothesis set for the estimation Problem 1. Given bounded signal $u \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{T}}$, with respect to each $t \in \mathbb{T}$, we have the linear map $L_t^u : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as defined in (1) and (2). Based on this definition and the set of data \mathcal{D} , one can define the *empirical loss* function or the fitting error function, $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}} : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, as the sum of squared error. In other words, for a given candidate impulse response $g \in \mathcal{F}$, we have that

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}(g) := \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} (L_t^u(g) - y_t)^2. \quad (8)$$

Define $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{L}_1$ as the set of impulse responses corresponding to the systems with \mathcal{H}_∞ -norm less than or equal to ρ . More precisely, we have

$$\mathcal{G} := \left\{ g = (g_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \in \mathcal{L}_1 \left| \sup_{\omega \in [0, \pi]} \left| \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} g_t e^{-j\omega t} \right| \leq \rho \right. \right\}, \quad (9)$$

and

$$\mathcal{G} := \left\{ g = (g_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \in \mathcal{L}_1 \left| \sup_{\omega \in \mathbb{R}_+} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} g_t e^{-j\omega t} dt \right| \leq \rho \right. \right\}, \quad (10)$$

respectively for $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+$. Note that since each element of \mathcal{G} belongs to \mathcal{L}_1 the summation in (9) and the integration in (10) are well-defined. Accordingly, in order to address Problem 1, it is enough to solve the following optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{g \in \mathcal{F}} \quad & \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}(g) + \lambda \mathcal{R}(g) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & g \in \mathcal{G}, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $\mathcal{R} : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a suitable regularization function and $\lambda > 0$ is the regularization weight. Due to the definition of set \mathcal{G} in (9) and (10), the constraint in (11) is essentially

equivalent to uncountably infinite number of inequalities. Consequently, the optimization problem (11) is an infinite-dimensional program with uncountably infinite number of constraints which is not tractable at the current form. Therefore, we should address the following questions:

- 1) *What is a suitable candidate for hypothesis set \mathcal{F} ?*
- 2) *Does optimization problem (11) admit an optimal solution? Is this solution unique?*
- 3) *How can we obtain the solution of (11) or a tight approximation for it?*

In the remainder of this section, we address these questions except the last one which is postponed to Section V.

A. Stable Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Spaces

The hypothesis space taken for estimating the unknown impulse response is a type of Hilbert spaces known as *reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces* (RKHS) which are introduced briefly below (see [38], [56] for more details). The structure of RKHS provides a suitable framework for investigating the problem and obtaining a tractable scheme for solving (11).

Definition 1 ([56]). *Let $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{T}}$ be a Hilbert space endowed with inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$ and induced norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}$. Then, \mathcal{H} is a reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) if for any $t \in \mathbb{T}$, we have $\sup \{|g_t| \mid g := (g_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \in \mathcal{H}, \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}} \leq 1\} < \infty$.*

Along with the RKHS, the notion of Mercer kernel is introduced which is provided in the next definition.

Definition 2 ([56]). *The continuous function $\mathbb{k} : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Mercer kernel or positive-definite kernel when for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $t, s, t_1, \dots, t_m \in \mathbb{T}$ and $a_1, \dots, a_m \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $\mathbb{k}(t, s) = \mathbb{k}(s, t)$ and $\sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq m} a_i a_j \mathbb{k}(t_i, t_j) \geq 0$. For each $t \in \mathbb{T}$, the section of kernel \mathbb{k} at t is defined as the function $\mathbb{k}(t, \cdot) : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and denoted by \mathbb{k}_t .*

The next theorem shows the connection between RKHS introduced in Definition 1 and the notion of Mercer kernel defined in Definition 2.

Theorem 1 ([56]). *Given Mercer kernel $\mathbb{k} : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, there exists a RKHS $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{T}}$, endowed with inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}}$ and norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}}$, such that for any $t \in \mathbb{T}$, we have $\mathbb{k}_t \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}$, and $\langle g, \mathbb{k}_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}} = g_t$, for all $g = (g_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}$. The second feature is called reproducing property.*

Based on Theorem 1, we know that a RKHS is uniquely characterized with a Mercer kernel. Therefore, in the current context, the kernel \mathbb{k} is supposed to be chosen suitably such that each impulse response $g \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}$ represents a stable system in the bounded-input-bounded-output (BIBO) sense. More precisely, we should have $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}} \subseteq \mathcal{L}^1$. When kernel \mathbb{k} satisfies this feature, it is called a *stable kernel* [51]. The following theorem provides a necessary and sufficient condition for the stability of a given kernel.

Theorem 2 ([51], [57]). *Let $\mathbb{k} : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Mercer kernel. Then, \mathbb{k} is stable if and only if, when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+$, we have $\sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \left| \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_+} u_s \mathbb{k}(t, s) \right| < \infty$, and, when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+$, we have $\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} u_s \mathbb{k}(t, s) ds \right| dt < \infty$, for any $u = (u_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \in \mathcal{L}^\infty$.*

The most common stable kernel in the literature [35] is the *tuned/correlated* (TC) kernel defined as follows

$$\mathbb{k}(s, t) = \begin{cases} \alpha^{\max(s, t)} & \text{if } \mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+, \\ e^{-\beta \max(s, t)} & \text{if } \mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+, \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

where $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ and $\beta > 0$. By setting α as $e^{-\beta}$, one can obtain same definition for both cases in (12). This is the default kernel employed in `impulseeest` function of MATLAB's SYSTEM IDENTIFICATION TOOLBOX. One can easily see that if for kernel \mathbb{h} is *dominated* by TC kernel \mathbb{k} , i.e., there exists $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that for any $s, t \in \mathbb{T}$ we have $|\mathbb{h}(s, t)| \leq \gamma \mathbb{k}(s, t)$, then \mathbb{h} is a stable kernel. This highlights the importance of TC kernels.

B. The Estimation Problem in Stable Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Spaces

Let \mathbb{k} be a stable kernel and $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}$ be the corresponding RKHS. Motivated by [33]–[35] and the above discussion, we set $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}$ as the hypothesis space for the estimation problem, i.e., $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}$. Subsequently, we can introduce a suitable kernel-based regularization. More precisely, let the regularization function $\mathcal{R} : \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be defined as $\mathcal{R}(g) := \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}}^2$. Therefore, in correspondence with the estimation Problem 1, we have the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{g \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}} \quad & \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} (\mathbb{L}_t^u(g) - y_t)^2 + \lambda \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}}^2, \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & |G(j\omega)| \leq \rho, \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega_{\mathbb{T}}, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where G denotes the transfer function corresponding to the impulse response g , $\Omega_{\mathbb{T}} := [0, \pi]$ when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+$, and $\Omega_{\mathbb{T}} := \mathbb{R}_+$ when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+$. Note that by abuse of notation, for both cases of discrete-time and continuous-time, we employ same expression $G(j\omega)$ for the transfer function of the system.

The constraints introduced in (13) are the Fourier transform of the impulse response g at different frequencies. Since g belongs to RKHS $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}$, one should study the corresponding notion and its properties in the domain of RKHS $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}$.

Definition 3. *With respect each $\omega \in \Omega_{\mathbb{T}}$, we define maps $\mathcal{F}_{\omega}^{(r)} : \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\omega}^{(i)} : \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that for any $g = (g_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}$, we have*

$$\mathcal{F}_{\omega}^{(r)}(g) := \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} g_t \cos(\omega t), \quad \mathcal{F}_{\omega}^{(i)}(g) := - \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} g_t \sin(\omega t), \quad (14)$$

when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+$, and

$$\mathcal{F}_{\omega}^{(r)}(g) := \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} g_t \cos(\omega t) dt, \quad \mathcal{F}_{\omega}^{(i)}(g) := - \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} g_t \sin(\omega t) dt, \quad (15)$$

when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+$. Also $\mathcal{F}_{\omega} : \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is defined as $\mathcal{F}_{\omega}(g) = \mathcal{F}_{\omega}^{(r)}(g) + j\mathcal{F}_{\omega}^{(i)}(g)$, for any $g \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}$.

Based on the definition of \mathcal{F}_{ω} , for any $g \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}$ and $\omega \in \Omega_{\mathbb{T}}$, we have $G(j\omega) = \mathcal{F}_{\omega}(g)$, where G is the transfer function corresponding to the impulse response g . Accordingly, the problem (13) can be re-written in the following form

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{g \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}} \quad & \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} (\mathbb{L}_t^u(g) - y_t)^2 + \lambda \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}}^2, \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & |\mathcal{F}_{\omega}(g)| \leq \rho, \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega_{\mathbb{T}}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Remark 1. *One can see that \mathcal{F}_{ω} is the Fourier transform restricted on the RKHS $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}$ evaluated for the frequency $\omega \in \Omega_{\mathbb{T}}$. However, we should note that it does not necessarily inherit the same properties of standard Fourier transform. More precisely, the structure of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}$ plays a key role.*

Before proceeding further, we need to introduce a notion based on the kernel \mathbb{k} . For any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, define $\mu_n \in [0, \infty]$ as

$$\mu_n := \begin{cases} \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} t^n \mathbb{k}(t, t)^{\frac{1}{2}}, & \text{if } \mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} t^n \mathbb{k}(t, t)^{\frac{1}{2}} dt, & \text{if } \mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+. \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

The next lemma introduces properties of $\mathcal{F}_{\omega}^{(r)}$, $\mathcal{F}_{\omega}^{(i)}$ and \mathcal{F}_{ω} .

Lemma 3. *Let $\mu_0 < \infty$. Then, the followings hold:*

- 1) *The maps $\mathcal{F}_{\omega}^{(r)}, \mathcal{F}_{\omega}^{(i)} : \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\omega} : \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ are linear continuous with $\|\mathcal{F}_{\omega}^{(r)}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}, \mathbb{R})}, \|\mathcal{F}_{\omega}^{(i)}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}, \mathbb{R})} \leq \mu_0$.*
- 2) *There exist unique elements $\varphi_{\omega}^{(r)} = (\varphi_{\omega, t}^{(r)})_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$ and $\varphi_{\omega}^{(i)} = (\varphi_{\omega, t}^{(i)})_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$ in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}$ such that, for any $g \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}$, we have*

$$\mathcal{F}_{\omega}^{(r)}(g) = \langle \varphi_{\omega}^{(r)}, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}}, \quad \mathcal{F}_{\omega}^{(i)}(g) = \langle \varphi_{\omega}^{(i)}, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}}, \quad (18)$$

- 3) *For any $t \in \mathbb{T}$, when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+$, we have*

$$\varphi_{\omega, t}^{(r)} = \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \mathbb{k}(t, s) \cos(\omega s), \quad \varphi_{\omega, t}^{(i)} = - \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \mathbb{k}(t, s) \sin(\omega s), \quad (19)$$

and, when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+$, we have

$$\varphi_{\omega, t}^{(r)} = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{k}(t, s) \cos(\omega s) ds, \quad \varphi_{\omega, t}^{(i)} = - \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{k}(t, s) \sin(\omega s) ds, \quad (20)$$

Proof. See Appendix A. ■

Let $\Omega \subseteq \Omega_{\mathbb{T}}$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Define set $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{k}}(\rho, \Omega)$ as

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{k}}(\eta, \Omega) := \left\{ g \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}} \mid |\mathcal{F}_{\omega}(g)| \leq \eta, \forall \omega \in \Omega \right\}. \quad (21)$$

One can see that the feasible set in (16) is an especial case of this set. Based on Lemma 3, we study the main properties of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{k}}(\eta, \Omega)$ in the next theorem.

Theorem 4. *Let $\mu_0 < \infty$. Then, $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{k}}(\eta, \Omega)$ is non-empty, closed and convex.*

Proof. From (21), one can see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{k}}(\eta, \Omega) &= \{g \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}} \mid |\mathcal{F}_{\omega}(g)| \leq \eta, \forall \omega \in \Omega\} \\ &= \bigcap_{\omega \in \Omega} \{g \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}} \mid |\mathcal{F}_{\omega}(g)| \leq \eta\} = \bigcap_{\omega \in \Omega} \mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{k}}(\eta, \{\omega\}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it is enough to show that, for any $\omega \in \Omega_{\mathbb{T}}$, $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{k}}(\eta, \{\omega\})$ is a closed and convex subset of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}$. Since $|\mathcal{F}_{\omega}(g)|^2 = |\mathcal{F}_{\omega}^{(r)}(g)|^2 + |\mathcal{F}_{\omega}^{(i)}(g)|^2$, we have that

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{k}}(\eta, \{\omega\}) = \left\{ g \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}} \mid |\mathcal{F}_{\omega}^{(r)}(g)|^2 + |\mathcal{F}_{\omega}^{(i)}(g)|^2 \leq \eta^2 \right\}. \quad (22)$$

Due to Lemma 3, we know that $\mathcal{F}_{\omega}^{(r)}(g) = \langle \varphi_{\omega}^{(r)}, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\omega}^{(i)}(g) = \langle \varphi_{\omega}^{(i)}, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}}$, for any $g \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}$. With respect to each $\theta \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$, define set $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{k}}(\eta, \omega, \theta)$ as

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{k}}(\eta, \omega, \theta) := \{g \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}} \mid |\langle \varphi_{\omega}^{(r)}, g \rangle| \leq \eta \cos \theta, |\langle \varphi_{\omega}^{(i)}, g \rangle| \leq \eta \sin \theta\}.$$

Note that $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{k}}(\eta, \omega, \theta)$ is the intersection of

$$\begin{aligned}
& \{g \in \mathcal{H}_k \mid \langle \varphi_\omega^{(r)}, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k} \leq \eta \cos \theta\}, \\
& \{g \in \mathcal{H}_k \mid \langle \varphi_\omega^{(r)}, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k} \geq -\eta \cos \theta\}, \\
& \{g \in \mathcal{H}_k \mid \langle \varphi_\omega^{(i)}, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k} \leq \eta \sin \theta\}, \\
& \{g \in \mathcal{H}_k \mid \langle \varphi_\omega^{(i)}, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k} \geq -\eta \sin \theta\},
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

which are closed half-spaces in \mathcal{H}_k . Therefore, $\mathcal{G}_k(\eta, \omega, \theta)$ is a closed and convex set. Since we have $\mathcal{G}_k(\eta, \{\omega\}) = \bigcap_{\theta \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2}]} \mathcal{G}_k(\eta, \omega, \theta)$, the set $\mathcal{G}_k(\eta, \{\omega\})$ is closed and convex as well. Note that for $\mathbf{0} \in \mathcal{H}_k$ and any $\omega \in \Omega$, we have $\mathcal{F}_\omega(\mathbf{0}) = 0$. Therefore, $|\mathcal{F}_\omega(\mathbf{0})| = 0 \leq \eta$ and subsequently, $\mathbf{0} \in \mathcal{G}(\eta, \Omega)$. This shows that $\mathcal{G}(\eta, \Omega)$ is a non-empty set and concludes the proof. ■

Before proceeding to the main theorem of this section, we need to present an auxiliary lemma.

Lemma 5. *Let $\mu_0 < \infty$ and $u \in \mathcal{L}_\infty$. Then, for any $t \in \mathbb{T}$, the map $L_t^u : \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, defined in (1) and (2), is linear and continuous with $\|L_t^u\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_k, \mathbb{R})} \leq \mu_0 \|u\|_\infty$. Also, there exists unique $\varphi_t^{(u)} := (\varphi_{t,s}^{(u)})_{s \in \mathbb{T}} \in \mathcal{H}_k$ such that $L_t^u(g) = \langle \varphi_t^{(u)}, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k}$, for any $g \in \mathcal{H}_k$. Moreover, for any $s \in \mathbb{T}$, we have*

$$\varphi_{t,s}^{(u)} = \begin{cases} \sum_{\tau \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \mathbb{k}(s, \tau) u_{t-\tau}, & \text{if } \mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{k}(s, \tau) u_{t-\tau} d\tau, & \text{if } \mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+. \end{cases} \tag{24}$$

Proof. See Appendix B. ■

Theorem 6. *Let $\mu_0 > 0$ and consider the following program*

$$\min_{g \in \mathcal{G}_k(\eta, \Omega)} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} (L_t^u(g) - y_t)^2 + \lambda \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}^2. \tag{25}$$

Then, (25) is a convex optimization problem with a unique solution g_Ω^ . Moreover, we have*

$$\|g_\Omega^*\|_{\mathcal{H}_k} \leq \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} y_t^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{26}$$

Proof. Define $\mathcal{J} : \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ such that for any $g \in \mathcal{H}_k$ we have

$$\mathcal{J}(g) = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} (L_t^u(g) - y_t)^2 + \lambda \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}^2 + \delta_{\mathcal{G}_k(\eta, \Omega)}(g). \tag{27}$$

Since $\mathbf{0} \in \mathcal{G}_k(\eta, \Omega)$, we have $\delta_{\mathcal{G}_k(\eta, \Omega)}(\mathbf{0}) = 0$. Due to the definition of L_t^u in (1) and (2), one has that $L_t^u(\mathbf{0}) = 0$, for each $t \in \mathcal{T}$, and subsequently, we have $\mathcal{J}(\mathbf{0}) = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} y_t^2 < \infty$. From Theorem 4, we know that $\mathcal{G}_k(\eta, \Omega)$ is a convex and closed set, and consequently, $\delta_{\mathcal{G}_k(\eta, \Omega)}$ is a proper lower semi-continuous convex function [58]. Due to Lemma 5, we know that $L_t^u : \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous linear map, for each $t \in \mathcal{T}$. Therefore, function $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}} : \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, defined in (8), is a convex and continuous function. Since $\lambda > 0$, we know that \mathcal{J} is a proper and lower semi-continuous strongly convex function. Therefore, $\min_{g \in \mathcal{H}_k} \mathcal{J}(g)$ has a unique (finite) solution [58], and subsequently, (25) is a convex program with a unique solution g_Ω^* with finite cost. Since $\mathbf{0} \in \mathcal{G}_k(\eta, \Omega)$ and due to optimality of g_Ω^* , we have $\mathcal{J}(g_\Omega^*) \leq \mathcal{J}(\mathbf{0})$. Subsequently, one can see

$$\lambda \|g_\Omega^*\|^2 \leq \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} (L_t^u(g_\Omega^*) - y_t)^2 + \lambda \|g_\Omega^*\|^2 \leq \mathcal{J}(\mathbf{0}) = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} y_t^2,$$

which induces (26). This concludes the proof. ■

Corollary 7. *Let assume $\mu_0 < \infty$. Then, (16) is a convex optimization with a unique solution denoted by g^* . Moreover, g^* satisfies inequality (26). Similar property holds for (13).*

Proof. In Theorem 6, set Ω and η respectively to $\Omega_{\mathbb{T}}$ and ρ . Then, the convexity of (16) as well as the existence and uniqueness of its solution is directly concluded. Since (13) and (16) are equivalent, the same claim holds for (13). ■

In the above discussion, we have assumed that $\mu_0 < \infty$. The next theorem shows that the boundedness of μ_0 is a valid assumption for most of the stable kernels introduced in the literature, especially it holds for TC kernel.

Theorem 8. *Consider kernel \mathbb{k} and assume there exist $\beta, \gamma > 0$ such that $|\mathbb{k}(s, t)| \leq \gamma e^{-\beta \max(s, t)}$, for any $s, t \in \mathbb{T}$. Then, for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, we have $\mu_n \leq \gamma^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{2}{\beta}\right)^{n+1} n!$, where $n! := \prod_{k=1}^n k$, when $n \geq 1$, and, $0! := 1$.*

Proof. See Appendix C. ■

Based on Corollary 7, we know that the optimization problem (13) has a unique solution addressing Problem 1. Since this optimization problem is defined over an infinite-dimensional space with uncountably infinite number of constraints, obtaining this solution does not seem to be tractable at the current form. This is discussed in the next section.

V. TOWARDS A TRACTABLE SCHEME

In this section, we present a tractable approach to derive the solution of the nonparametric estimation problem introduced in Section IV.

Consider optimization problem (16). For the ease of discussion and without loss of generality, we assume $\rho = 1$. More precisely, one can use a change of variable and replace y_t with $\rho^{-1} y_t$ in \mathcal{D} and then, set $\rho = 1$ in Problem 1 as well as in (16), or equivalently in (13). With respect to each $\omega \in \Omega_{\mathbb{T}}$, there exists a constraint in (16). Thus, we have uncountably infinite number of constraints which makes the problem intractable. One possible approach to resolve this issue is approximating the problem by considering a only a suitable finite subset of $\Omega_{\mathbb{T}}$. In order to investigate this possibility, we need the notion of *partition* introduced in the next definition.

Definition 4. *We say \mathcal{P} is a partition of interval $[a, b]$ if \mathcal{P} is a finite subset of $[a, b]$ as $\mathcal{P} = \{\omega_i \mid i = 0, \dots, n_{\mathcal{P}}\}$ where*

$$a = \omega_0 < \omega_1 < \dots < \omega_{n_{\mathcal{P}}} = b. \tag{28}$$

With respect to partition \mathcal{P} , the mesh of \mathcal{P} , denoted by $\text{mesh}(\mathcal{P})$, is defined as

$$\text{mesh}(\mathcal{P}) := \max\{|\omega_i - \omega_{i-1}| \mid i = 1, 2, \dots, n_{\mathcal{P}}\}. \tag{29}$$

Now, let $\mathcal{P} = \{\omega_i \mid i = 0, \dots, n_{\mathcal{P}}\}$ be a given partition. One can see that satisfying the constraints $|\mathcal{F}_\omega(g)| \leq 1$, for all $w \in \mathcal{P}$, does not necessarily imply that the desired feature $\sup_{\omega \in \Omega_{\mathbb{T}}} |\mathcal{F}_\omega(g)| \leq 1$. More precisely, these constraints do not guarantee that for all $\omega \in \Omega_{\mathbb{T}} \setminus \mathcal{P}$ we have $|\mathcal{F}_\omega(g)| \leq 1$ as well. Accordingly, in order to approximate problem (16),

we take $\epsilon > 0$ and consider the following problem as our approximation

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{g \in \mathcal{H}_k} \quad & \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} (L_t^u(g) - y_t)^2 + \lambda \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}^2, \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & |\mathcal{F}_\omega(g)|^2 \leq 1 - \epsilon, \quad \forall \omega \in \mathcal{P}. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

In the following, we provide appropriate conditions on partition \mathcal{P} and $\epsilon > 0$ for ensuring that the solution of (30) satisfies $\sup_{\omega \in \Omega_{\mathbb{T}}} |\mathcal{F}_\omega(g)| \leq 1$. These conditions depend on the bandwidth of system g and the rate of changes for $|\mathcal{F}_\omega(g)|$ with respect to ω . Accordingly, first we need to introduce necessary definitions and preliminaries.

Definition 5. Let $g \in \mathcal{H}_k$ be a given impulse response. With respect to g , we define magnitude function $m_g : \Omega_{\mathbb{T}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as $m_g(\omega) = |\mathcal{F}_\omega(g)|^2$.

Given impulse response g , the function m_g shows the squared magnitude of transfer function corresponding to g at different frequencies. The following lemma introduces a bound for the rate of changes of m_g in terms of its Lipschitz constant. This will be used later in the analysis of problem (30).

Lemma 9. Let $\mu_1, \mu_2 < \infty$. Then, for any $g \in \mathcal{H}_k$ and $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \Omega_{\mathbb{T}}$, we have

$$|m_g(\omega_2) - m_g(\omega_1)| \leq L_g |\omega_2 - \omega_1|, \quad (31)$$

where $L_g := 4\mu_1\mu_2\|g\|^2$.

Proof. See Appendix D. \blacksquare

For the case of discrete-time systems, i.e., $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+$, the frequency range $\Omega_{\mathbb{T}}$ is the bounded interval $[0, \omega_{\max}]$, where $\omega_{\max} = \pi$. In order to introduce analogous of ω_{\max} for the continuous-time systems, we need the next assumption.

Assumption 1. For the case $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+$, we have

$$\lim_{\omega \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{k}(s, t) e^{-j\omega(s-t)} ds dt = 0. \quad (32)$$

This assumption says that the bandwidth of kernel \mathbb{k} is bounded. Moreover, from (32), we know that there exists $\omega_{\max} \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{k}(s, t) e^{-j\omega(s-t)} ds dt \right| \leq \frac{\lambda}{\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} y_t^2}, \quad (33)$$

for all $\omega > \omega_{\max}$. In the followings, it is shown that the frequency value ω_{\max} plays the role of an upper bound for the bandwidth of the system of interest. The next theorem shows that for TC kernels Assumption 1 holds. One may show similar result for other stable kernels in the literature.

Theorem 10. Let $\beta > 0$ and $\mathbb{k} : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be the TC kernel $\mathbb{k}(s, t) = e^{-\beta \max(s, t)}$. Then, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{k}(s, t) e^{-j\omega(s-t)} ds dt = \frac{2}{\omega^2 + \beta^2}. \quad (34)$$

Proof. See Appendix E. \blacksquare

Based on the introduced notions and facts, we can present the main theorem of this section.

Theorem 11. Let $\mu_0, \mu_1 < \infty$, \mathcal{P} be a given partition of $[0, \omega_{\max}]$ and $\epsilon > 0$. Then, optimization problem (30) is a convex program with a unique solution $g^{(\star, \epsilon)}$. For $g^{(\star, \epsilon)}$, we have

$$\|g^{(\star, \epsilon)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_k} \leq \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} y_t^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (35)$$

Moreover, if $\text{mesh}(\mathcal{P}) \leq \frac{2\epsilon}{L}$ where $L := \frac{1}{\lambda} 4\mu_0\mu_1 \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} y_t^2$, then we have

$$\|G^{(\star, \epsilon)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} = \sup_{\omega \in \Omega_{\mathbb{T}}} |\mathcal{F}_\omega(g^{(\star, \epsilon)})| \leq 1. \quad (36)$$

where $G^{(\star, \epsilon)}$ is the transfer function corresponding to $g^{(\star, \epsilon)}$.

Proof. Due to the definition of set \mathcal{G}_k in (21), we know that the feasible set of optimization problem (30) is $\mathcal{G}_k((1-\epsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \mathcal{P})$. Subsequently, problem (30) can be written as

$$\min_{g \in \mathcal{G}_k((1-\epsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \mathcal{P})} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} (L_t^u(g) - y_t)^2 + \lambda \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}^2. \quad (37)$$

Then, according to Theorem 6, the optimization problem (37) as well as (30), is a convex program with unique solution, denoted by $g^{(\star, \epsilon)}$, which satisfies (35).

Let $\omega \in [0, \omega_{\max}]$. If $\omega \in \mathcal{P}$, then $|\mathcal{F}_\omega(g^{(\star, \epsilon)})| \leq (1-\epsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq 1$. If $\omega \notin \mathcal{P}$, then there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, such that $\omega \in (\omega_{i-1}, \omega_i)$. If $|\mathcal{F}_\omega(g^{(\star, \epsilon)})| > 1$, then, due to Lemma 9 and $|\mathcal{F}_{\omega_{i-1}}(g^{(\star, \epsilon)})|^2, |\mathcal{F}_{\omega_i}(g^{(\star, \epsilon)})|^2 \leq 1 - \epsilon$, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon &< \left| |\mathcal{F}_{\omega_i}(g^{(\star, \epsilon)})|^2 - |\mathcal{F}_\omega(g^{(\star, \epsilon)})|^2 \right| \\ &= |m_{g^{(\star, \epsilon)}}(\omega_i) - m_{g^{(\star, \epsilon)}}(\omega)| \leq L_{g^{(\star, \epsilon)}} |\omega_i - \omega|, \\ \epsilon &< \left| |\mathcal{F}_\omega(g^{(\star, \epsilon)})|^2 - |\mathcal{F}_{\omega_{i-1}}(g^{(\star, \epsilon)})|^2 \right| \\ &= |m_{g^{(\star, \epsilon)}}(\omega) - m_{g^{(\star, \epsilon)}}(\omega_{i-1})| \leq L_{g^{(\star, \epsilon)}} |\omega - \omega_{i-1}|, \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

where $L_{g^{(\star, \epsilon)}} = 4\mu_0\mu_1\|g^{(\star, \epsilon)}\|^2$. Therefore, since $|\omega_i - \omega_{i-1}| \leq \text{mesh}(\mathcal{P})$, we have that $2\epsilon < L_{g^{(\star, \epsilon)}} \text{mesh}(\mathcal{P})$. Subsequently, it follows that

$$\text{mesh}(\mathcal{P}) > \frac{2\epsilon}{L_{g^{(\star, \epsilon)}}} = \frac{2\epsilon}{4\mu_0\mu_1\|g^{(\star, \epsilon)}\|^2} \geq \frac{2\epsilon\lambda}{4\mu_0\mu_1\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} y_t^2} = \frac{2\epsilon}{L},$$

which contradicts with $\text{mesh}(\mathcal{P}) \leq \frac{2\epsilon}{L}$. Therefore, we have $|\mathcal{F}_\omega(g^{(\star, \epsilon)})| \leq 1$. This shows that $\|G^{(\star, \epsilon)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} = \sup_{\omega \in [0, \omega_{\max}]} |\mathcal{F}_\omega(g^{(\star, \epsilon)})| \leq 1$, which concludes the proof for the case $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+$ where we have $\omega_{\max} = \pi$. Now, we consider the case $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+$ and let $\omega > \omega_{\max}$. Due to Lemma 3 and the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{F}_\omega(g^{(\star, \epsilon)})|^2 &= |\langle g^{(\star, \epsilon)}, \varphi_\omega^{(r)} \rangle|^2 + |\langle g^{(\star, \epsilon)}, \varphi_\omega^{(i)} \rangle|^2 \\ &\leq \|g^{(\star, \epsilon)}\|^2 \left[\|\varphi_\omega^{(r)}\|^2 + \|\varphi_\omega^{(i)}\|^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

On other hand, from (18), (15), and (33), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi_\omega^{(r)}\|^2 + \|\varphi_\omega^{(i)}\|^2 &= \langle \varphi_\omega^{(r)}, \varphi_\omega^{(r)} \rangle^2 + \langle \varphi_\omega^{(i)}, \varphi_\omega^{(i)} \rangle^2 \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \varphi_{\omega, t}^{(r)} \cos(\omega t) dt + \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \varphi_{\omega, t}^{(i)} \sin(\omega t) dt \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{k}(t, s) \cos(\omega s) \cos(\omega t) ds dt \\ &\quad + \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{k}(t, s) \sin(\omega s) \sin(\omega t) ds dt \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{k}(t, s) e^{-j\omega(s-t)} ds dt \leq \frac{\lambda}{\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} y_t^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where the last equality is due to the fact that $\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{k}(t, s) \sin(\omega(s - t)) ds dt = 0$ which is a result of $\mathbb{k}(t, s) = \mathbb{k}(s, t)$ and $\sin(\omega(s - t)) = -\sin(\omega(t - s))$. Accordingly, due to (39) and (35), we have $|\mathcal{F}_\omega(g^{(\star, \epsilon)})|^2 \leq 1$. This shows that $\|G^{(\star, \epsilon)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} = \sup_{\omega \in \Omega_T} |\mathcal{F}_\omega(g^{(\star, \epsilon)})| \leq 1$ and concludes the proof. ■

Due to Theorem 11, we know that (30) admits a unique solution. While this optimization problem is defined over the infinite-dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_k , we can find its unique solution $g^{(\star, \epsilon)}$ by solving an equivalent convex finite-dimensional program. This feature which makes (30) a tractable problem, is due to the structure of the RKHS \mathcal{H}_k and the *Representer Theorem*, provided below.

Theorem 12 (Representer Theorem, [59], [60]). *Let $e : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ and $r : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be functions such that r is an increasing function. Also, let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space with inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$. Consider the optimization problem*

$$\min_{w \in \mathcal{H}} e(\langle w_1, w \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}, \dots, \langle w_m, w \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}) + r(\|w\|_{\mathcal{H}}), \quad (41)$$

where $w_1, \dots, w_m \in \mathcal{H}$ are given vectors. Then, if (41) admits a solution, it has also a solution in $\mathcal{W} := \text{span}\{w_i\}_{i=1}^m$.

In order to present the tractable finite-dimensional optimization problem equivalent to (30), additional definitions are required. Define $m := n_{\mathcal{P}} + 2n_{\mathcal{P}} + 2$ and the index sets $\mathcal{I}^{(u)} := \{0, 1, \dots, n_{\mathcal{P}} - 1\}$, $\mathcal{I}^{(\mathcal{P})} := \{0, 1, \dots, n_{\mathcal{P}}\}$, and $\mathcal{I} := \{0, 1, \dots, m - 1\}$. Let $\{\varphi_i\}_{i=0}^{m-1}$ be vectors defined as

$$\begin{cases} \varphi_i := \varphi_{t_i}^{(u)}, & \text{for } i \in \mathcal{I}^{(u)}, \\ \varphi_{n_{\mathcal{P}}+2j} := \varphi_{\omega_j}^{(r)}, & \text{for } j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\mathcal{P})}, \\ \varphi_{n_{\mathcal{P}}+2j+1} := \varphi_{\omega_j}^{(l)}, & \text{for } j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\mathcal{P})}. \end{cases} \quad (42)$$

Let $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ be a symmetric matrix such that its entry at the i^{th} row and the j^{th} column is $\langle \varphi_{i-1}, \varphi_{j-1} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k}$, for $i, j = 1, \dots, m$. One can see that Φ is the Gram matrix of vectors $\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_{m-1}$. Moreover, for $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(u)}$, we define vector $a_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$ as the $(i+1)^{\text{th}}$ column of Φ . Similarly, vectors $b_j \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $c_j \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are defined respectively as the $(n_{\mathcal{P}}+2j+1)^{\text{th}}$ and the $(n_{\mathcal{P}}+2j+2)^{\text{th}}$ column of Φ , for $j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\mathcal{P})}$. In the followings, without loss of generality, we assume that $\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_{m-1}$ are linearly independent. Indeed, if for some $i \in \mathcal{I}$, the vector φ_i belongs to $\text{span}\{\varphi_j | j \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \{i\}\}$, it does not have any additional information and one can replace it with a linear combination of $\{\varphi_j | j \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \{i\}\}$.

Based on the introduced notations, we can present the theorem on the equivalent tractable finite-dimensional program.

Theorem 13. *The unique solution of optimization problem (30), $g^{(\star, \epsilon)}$, is in the following linear form*

$$g^{(\star, \epsilon)} = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} x_i \varphi_i, \quad (43)$$

where $x := [x_0 \ x_1 \ \dots \ x_{m-1}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the unique solution of the following convex program

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^m} \quad & \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{(u)}} (a_i^T x - y_i)^2 + \lambda x^T \Phi x \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & (b_j^T x)^2 + (c_j^T x)^2 \leq 1 - \epsilon, \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\mathcal{P})}. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Proof. Define $\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ as

$$\mathcal{E}(g) := \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} (\mathbb{L}_t^u(g) - y_t)^2 + \sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{P}} \delta_{\{|\mathcal{F}_\omega|^2 \leq 1 - \epsilon\}}(g). \quad (45)$$

Since $\mathcal{P} = \{\omega_0, \dots, \omega_{n_{\mathcal{P}}}\}$ is a finite set, the summation in (45) is well-defined. We know that optimization problem (30) is equivalent to $\min_{g \in \mathcal{H}_k} \mathcal{E}(g) + \lambda \mathcal{R}(g)$, where $\mathcal{R} : \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined as $\mathcal{R}(g) = \|g\|^2$ (see Section IV-B). Let function $e : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be defined such that for any $z = (z_i)_{i=0}^{m-1} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ we have

$$e(z) := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{(u)}} (z_i - y_{t_i})^2 + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\mathcal{P})}} \delta_{\mathcal{A}_j}(z), \quad (46)$$

where, for each $j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\mathcal{P})}$, $\mathcal{A}_j \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ is the following set

$$\mathcal{A}_j := \left\{ (z_i)_{i=0}^{m-1} \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid z_{n_{\mathcal{P}}+2j}^2 + z_{n_{\mathcal{P}}+2j+1}^2 \leq 1 - \epsilon \right\}, \quad (47)$$

Also, let $r : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function defined as $r(z) = \lambda z^2$, which is an increasing function. For $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(u)}$ and $j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\mathcal{P})}$, we know that $\mathbb{L}_{t_i}^u(g) = \langle \varphi_i, g \rangle$, $\mathcal{F}_{\omega_j}^{(r)}(g) = \langle \varphi_{n_{\mathcal{P}}+2j}, g \rangle$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\omega_j}^{(l)}(g) = \langle \varphi_{n_{\mathcal{P}}+2j+1}, g \rangle$. Accordingly, we have

$$\mathcal{E}(g) + \lambda \mathcal{R}(g) = e(\langle \varphi_0, g \rangle, \dots, \langle \varphi_{m-1}, g \rangle) + r(\|g\|).$$

From Theorem 11, it follows that $\min_{g \in \mathcal{H}_k} \mathcal{E}(g) + \lambda \mathcal{R}(g)$ has a unique solution denoted by $g^{(\star, \epsilon)}$. Therefore, due to Theorem 12, it has a solution which belongs to $\mathcal{W} = \text{span}\{\varphi_i\}_{i=0}^{m-1}$. From the uniqueness of the solution of (30), it follows that $g^{(\star, \epsilon)}$ belongs to \mathcal{W} . Therefore, in order to find $g^{(\star, \epsilon)}$, we need to obtain the corresponding coefficients in linear representation (43). Accordingly, we replace g in $\min_{g \in \mathcal{H}_k} \mathcal{E}(g) + \lambda \mathcal{R}(g)$, or equivalently in (30), by $g = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} x_i \varphi_i$, and solve the problem for $x := [x_i]_{i=0}^{m-1} \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Due to the linearity of inner product and the definition of matrix Φ , we have

$$\mathcal{R}(g) = \langle g, g \rangle = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} x_i x_j \langle \varphi_i, \varphi_j \rangle = x^T \Phi x. \quad (48)$$

Also, for each $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(u)}$, due to the definition of a_i , one has

$$\mathbb{L}_{t_i}^u(g) = \langle \varphi_i, \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} x_k \varphi_k \rangle = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} x_k \langle \varphi_i, \varphi_k \rangle = a_i^T x. \quad (49)$$

Similarly, from the definition of vectors b_j and c_j , one has $\mathcal{F}_{\omega_j}^{(r)}(g) = b_j^T x$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\omega_j}^{(l)}(g) = c_j^T x$, for each $j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\mathcal{P})}$. Therefore, from (45), it follows that

$$\mathcal{E}(g) = \mathcal{E}\left(\sum_{k=0}^{m-1} x_k \varphi_k\right) = \sum_{i=0}^{n_{\mathcal{P}}-1} (a_i^T x - y_i)^2 + \sum_{j=0}^{n_{\mathcal{P}}} \delta_{\mathcal{B}_j}(x),$$

where, for each $j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\mathcal{P})}$, $\mathcal{B}_j \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ is the set defined as

$$\mathcal{B}_j := \left\{ x = (x_i)_{i=0}^{m-1} \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid (b_j^T x)^2 + (c_j^T x)^2 \leq 1 - \epsilon \right\}.$$

Accordingly, solving $\min_{g \in \mathcal{H}_k} \mathcal{E}(g) + \lambda \mathcal{R}(g)$ reduces to

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^m} \sum_{i=0}^{n_{\mathcal{P}}-1} (a_i^T x - y_i)^2 + \sum_{j=0}^{n_{\mathcal{P}}} \delta_{\mathcal{B}_j}(x) + \lambda x^T \Phi x, \quad (50)$$

which is equivalent to (44). Since $\mathbf{x}^\top \Phi \mathbf{x} = \|\sum_{i=0}^{m-1} x_i \varphi_i\|^2$ and $\{\varphi_i\}_{i=0}^{m-1}$ are linearly independent, Φ is a positive definite matrix. Therefore, the cost function in (44) is strongly convex. Also, for each $j = 0, \dots, n_\varphi$, we have

$$(\mathbf{b}_j^\top \mathbf{x})^2 + (\mathbf{c}_j^\top \mathbf{x})^2 = \mathbf{x}^\top (\mathbf{b}_j \mathbf{b}_j^\top + \mathbf{c}_j \mathbf{c}_j^\top) \mathbf{x}, \quad (51)$$

and $\mathbf{b}_j \mathbf{b}_j^\top + \mathbf{c}_j \mathbf{c}_j^\top$ is a positive semi-definite matrix. Consequently, the feasible set in (44) is a convex and closed set. Moreover, since $\epsilon < 1$, we know that $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{0}$ is a feasible point of (44). Therefore, the optimization problem (44) is a convex program with a unique solution. This concludes the proof. ■

Before proceeding further, we present a corollary which is useful in the implementation of the proposed approach. Let $\overline{\mathcal{P}} := \{\overline{\omega}_i\}_{i=0}^{n_\varphi} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{I}(\overline{\mathcal{P}}) := \{0, 1, \dots, n_\varphi\}$ and $\overline{m} := n_\varphi + 2n_\varphi + 2$. Accordingly, similar to Φ and $\{\varphi_i\}_{i=0}^{m-1}$, we define $\overline{\Phi}$ and $\{\overline{\varphi}_i\}_{i=0}^{\overline{m}-1}$. Also, for $i \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{u})$ and $j \in \mathcal{I}(\overline{\mathcal{P}})$, let \overline{a}_i , \overline{b}_j and \overline{c}_j be defined similar to a_i , b_j and c_j , respectively.

Corollary 14. Consider the following optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{H}_k} \quad & \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} (\mathbf{L}_t^\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{g}) - y_t)^2 + \lambda \|\mathbf{g}\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}^2, \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & |\mathcal{F}_\omega(\mathbf{g})|^2 \leq 1 - \epsilon, \quad \forall \omega \in \overline{\mathcal{P}}. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

Then, (52) has a unique solution denoted by $\overline{\mathbf{g}}^{(\star, \epsilon)}$. This solution satisfies (35), and admits a parametric form as $\overline{\mathbf{g}}^{(\star, \epsilon)} = \sum_{i=0}^{\overline{m}-1} x_i \overline{\varphi}_i$ where $\mathbf{x} = [x_i]_{i=0}^{\overline{m}-1}$ is the solution of the following convex program

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{\overline{m}}} \quad & \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{u})} (\overline{a}_i^\top \mathbf{x} - y_i)^2 + \lambda \mathbf{x}^\top \overline{\Phi} \mathbf{x} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & (\overline{\mathbf{b}}_j^\top \mathbf{x})^2 + (\overline{\mathbf{c}}_j^\top \mathbf{x})^2 \leq 1 - \epsilon, \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{I}(\overline{\mathcal{P}}). \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

Moreover, if $|\mathcal{F}_\omega(\overline{\mathbf{g}}^{(\star, \epsilon)})|^2 \leq 1 - \epsilon$, for all $\omega \in \overline{\mathcal{P}}$, then $\overline{\mathbf{g}}^{(\star, \epsilon)}$ coincides with $\mathbf{g}^{(\star, \epsilon)}$.

Proof. Using similar lines of arguments for the proof of Theorem 11, one can show the existence and uniqueness of the solution of (52). The parametric form of $\overline{\mathbf{g}}^{(\star, \epsilon)}$ and the fact that \mathbf{x} is the solution of (53) can be concluded based on a proof similar to the proof of Theorem 13.

Since, for each $\omega \in \overline{\mathcal{P}}$, one has $|\mathcal{F}_\omega(\overline{\mathbf{g}}^{(\star, \epsilon)})|^2 \leq 1 - \epsilon$, we know that $\overline{\mathbf{g}}^{(\star, \epsilon)}$ is feasible for optimization (30). Therefore, being $\mathbf{g}^{(\star, \epsilon)}$ the optimal solution of (30), it follows that $\mathcal{L}_\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{g}^{(\star, \epsilon)}) + \lambda \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{g}^{(\star, \epsilon)}) \leq \mathcal{L}_\mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbf{g}}^{(\star, \epsilon)}) + \lambda \mathcal{R}(\overline{\mathbf{g}}^{(\star, \epsilon)})$, where $\mathcal{L}_\mathcal{D}$ is defined in (8). Also, we know that the feasible set in (30) is a subset of feasible set of (52). Accordingly, since $\overline{\mathbf{g}}^{(\star, \epsilon)}$ is the optimal solution for (52), we have $\mathcal{L}_\mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbf{g}}^{(\star, \epsilon)}) + \lambda \mathcal{R}(\overline{\mathbf{g}}^{(\star, \epsilon)}) \leq \mathcal{L}_\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{g}^{(\star, \epsilon)}) + \lambda \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{g}^{(\star, \epsilon)})$. Therefore, $\overline{\mathbf{g}}^{(\star, \epsilon)}$ is an optimizer of (30). Consequently, from the uniqueness of the solution of (30), we have $\overline{\mathbf{g}}^{(\star, \epsilon)} = \mathbf{g}^{(\star, \epsilon)}$, and concludes the proof. ■

Theorem 13 introduces finite-dimensional convex program (44) as a tractable problem equivalent to optimization (30). Accordingly, in order to solve (30) it is enough to solve (44) which is more discussed in the next section. Nevertheless, first we should verify that solving optimization problem (30), for small enough $\epsilon > 0$, provides a close approximation to the solution of the main optimization problem (16). This is addressed by the next theorem.

Theorem 15. Let $\mathbf{L}^\mathbf{u} : \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_\varphi}$ be a linear operator defined as $\mathbf{L}^\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{g}) := [\mathbf{L}_t^\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{g})]_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$, for any $\mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{H}_k$. Then, we have

$$\|\mathbf{g}^{(\star, \epsilon)} - \mathbf{g}^\star\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}^2 \leq 4\epsilon(\|\mathbf{L}^\mathbf{u}\|^2 + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} y_t^2 \right). \quad (54)$$

Moreover, we have $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{g}^{(\star, \epsilon)} = \mathbf{g}^\star$ in \mathcal{H}_k . Furthermore, if $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \mathbb{k}(t, t)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty$, one has $\mathbf{g}_t^{(\star, \epsilon)} \xrightarrow{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{g}_t^\star$, uniformly in \mathbb{T} .

Proof. See Appendix F. ■

Remark 2. The property $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \mathbb{k}(t, t)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty$ is satisfied by the TC kernel and other common kernels in the literature, such as the diagonally/correlated (DC) kernel and the stable spline (SS) kernel [35].

Remark 3. In the case of incorrect side-information, we have $\mathbf{g}^{(s)} \notin \mathcal{G}_k(1, \Omega_\mathbb{T})$. Let $\mathbf{g}_\perp^{(s)} \in \mathcal{H}_k$ be the projection of $\mathbf{g}^{(s)}$ on $\mathcal{G}_k(1, \Omega_\mathbb{T})$, i.e., $\mathbf{g}_\perp^{(s)}$ is defined as

$$\mathbf{g}_\perp^{(s)} := \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{G}_k(1, \Omega_\mathbb{T})} \|\mathbf{g} - \mathbf{g}^{(s)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}, \quad (55)$$

which exists uniquely (due to Theorem 4 and [58]). Due to the definition of $\mathbf{g}_\perp^{(s)}$ and since $\mathbf{g}^\star, \mathbf{g}^{(\star, \epsilon)} \in \mathcal{G}_k(1, \Omega_\mathbb{T})$ (see Theorem 11), we have

$$0 < \|\mathbf{g}^{(s)} - \mathbf{g}_\perp^{(s)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_k} \leq \|\mathbf{g}^{(s)} - \mathbf{g}^\star\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}, \quad (56)$$

and

$$0 < \|\mathbf{g}^{(s)} - \mathbf{g}_\perp^{(s)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_k} \leq \|\mathbf{g}^{(s)} - \mathbf{g}^{(\star, \epsilon)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}. \quad (57)$$

In other words, we have a systematic bias in the estimated impulse response \mathbf{g}^\star , and also, in its approximation $\mathbf{g}^{(\star, \epsilon)}$, for all $\epsilon > 0$. Accordingly, in this situation, not including the side-information may result in a more accurate identified model.

VI. OPTIMIZATION ALGORITHM

Due to Theorem 13, the problem to be solved is

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m} \quad & \|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|^2 + \lambda \mathbf{x}^\top \Phi \mathbf{x} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{x}^\top (\mathbf{b}_j \mathbf{b}_j^\top + \mathbf{c}_j \mathbf{c}_j^\top) \mathbf{x} \leq 1 - \epsilon, \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{I}(\overline{\mathcal{P}}), \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

where $\mathbf{A} := [a_0, \dots, a_{n_\varphi-1}]^\top$ and $\mathbf{y} := [y_t]_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$. From the definition of matrix \mathbf{A} , we know that \mathbf{A} is the first n_φ rows of Φ . Also, \mathbf{b}_j and \mathbf{c}_j are respectively the $(n_\varphi + 2j + 1)$ th and the $(n_\varphi + 2j + 2)$ th column of Φ , for $j \in \mathcal{I}(\overline{\mathcal{P}})$. Therefore, being matrix Φ given is sufficient for setting up the optimization problem (58). To this end, for each $i, j \in \mathcal{I}$, we need to obtain the value of $\langle \varphi_i, \varphi_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k}$, which demands calculating an infinite double summation, when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+$, or an improper double integral, when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+$. In general, to obtain these values one should employ numerical methods which are essentially inexact and also computationally demanding. Meanwhile, one can derive these values analytically in specific but rather general situations, e.g., when the TC kernel is employed (see Appendix G for more details). Note that (58) is a convex *quadratically constrained quadratic program* program, for which there exist various efficient methods [61]. For example, we can utilize methods which are based on *log-barrier functions* [61] and adapt them suitably to the current settings (see Appendix H for more details).

Algorithm 1 Kernel-Based Identification with Frequency Domain Side Information $\|G^{(S)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} \leq 1$

- 1: **input:** data set \mathcal{D} , partition set \mathcal{P} , kernel \mathbb{k} , $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, matrix Φ , unconstrained estimation g_0
 - 2: $k \leftarrow 0$ and $g_k \leftarrow g_0$.
 - 3: $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_k \leftarrow \emptyset$ and get $\Delta_k \mathcal{P}$ due to (60).
 - 4: **while** $\Delta_k \mathcal{P} \neq \emptyset$ **do**
 - 5: $\overline{\mathcal{P}} \leftarrow \overline{\mathcal{P}}_k \cup \Delta_k \mathcal{P}$.
 - 6: update $\overline{\Phi}$, \overline{a}_i for $i \in \mathcal{I}^{(\overline{\mathcal{P}})}$, \overline{b}_j and \overline{c}_j , for $j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\overline{\mathcal{P}})}$.
 - 7: solve optimization problem (53) and $g_k \leftarrow \sum_i x_i \overline{\varphi}_i$.
 - 8: $\mathcal{P}_k \leftarrow \overline{\mathcal{P}}$ and get $\Delta_k \mathcal{P}$ due to (60).
 - 9: **end**
 - 10: **Output:** $g^{(\star, \epsilon)}$
-

In many situations, such as in the example given in Section III, the constraint $|G(j\omega)| = |\mathcal{F}_\omega(g)|^2 \leq 1 - \epsilon$ is not binding on the whole frequency range $\Omega_{\mathbb{T}}$. Accordingly, it is not required to impose this constraint for each $\omega \in \mathcal{P}$. Motivated by this fact and Corollary 14, we can introduce an iterative scheme. More precisely, let $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_0 := \emptyset$, and at iteration k , let \mathcal{P}_k be a given subset of \mathcal{P} . Consider the optimization problem (30) where only the constraints corresponding to the frequencies in \mathcal{P}_k are imposed, i.e., we have the following program

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{g \in \mathcal{H}_k} \quad & \sum_{t \in \mathcal{P}} (L_t^i(g) - y_t)^2 + \lambda \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}^2, \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & |\mathcal{F}_\omega(g)|^2 \leq 1 - \epsilon, \quad \forall \omega \in \overline{\mathcal{P}}_k. \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

Due to Corollary 14, we know that (59) has a unique solution, denoted by g_k , which can be obtained by solving an equivalent finite-dimensional convex program as in (53). Given g_k , one can check whether the constraint $|\mathcal{F}_\omega(g_k)|^2 \leq 1 - \epsilon$ is violated on the remaining frequencies in \mathcal{P} . Accordingly, one can obtain the following set

$$\Delta_k \mathcal{P} := \left\{ \omega \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \overline{\mathcal{P}}_k \mid |\mathcal{F}_\omega(g_k)|^2 > 1 - \epsilon \right\}, \quad (60)$$

Subsequently, we update the frequency set as $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_{k+1} := \overline{\mathcal{P}}_k \cup \Delta_k \mathcal{P}$, and proceed to the iteration $k+1$. The iterative scheme stops when $\Delta_k \mathcal{P} = \emptyset$. This happens either when $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_k = \mathcal{P}$ or the solution g_k satisfies the constraint $|\mathcal{F}_\omega(g_k)|^2 \leq 1 - \epsilon$ for all $\omega \in \mathcal{P}$. Consequently, due to Corollary 14, we have $g_k = g^{(\star, \epsilon)}$ when the stopping condition is met. It is noteworthy that given matrix Φ , one can extract $\overline{\Phi}_k$ as a sub-matrix of Φ , and subsequently, the corresponding vectors \overline{a}_i , \overline{b}_j and \overline{c}_j in (53) are obtained as columns of $\overline{\Phi}_k$. This fact improves the computational tractability of the proposed approach. The Algorithm 1 summarizes the introduced iterative scheme.

This procedure generates a strictly increasing sequence of sets $\emptyset = \overline{\mathcal{P}}_0 \subset \overline{\mathcal{P}}_1 \subset \overline{\mathcal{P}}_2 \subset \dots \subset \mathcal{P}$. Since \mathcal{P} is a finite set, this sequence needs to be finite and therefore, Algorithm 1 stops after finite number of iterations.

VII. NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

In this section, we provide numerical examples demonstrating the performance of the proposed scheme in Algorithm 1.

Example 1. We consider the settings of the example given in Section III. We set $\epsilon = 10^{-5}$ and take partition set $\mathcal{P} =$




Figure 3: The transfer function of system (4), the model estimated using the proposed approach, $G^{(\star, \epsilon)}$, and the estimated models \hat{G}_1 , \hat{G}_2 and \hat{G}_3 .

$\{\omega_i \mid i = 0, \dots, n_{\mathcal{P}}\}$ for interval $[0, \pi]$ such that $\omega_i = \frac{\pi}{n_{\mathcal{P}}}i$, for $i = 0, \dots, n_{\mathcal{P}}$, with $n_{\mathcal{P}} = 3141$. We employ TC kernel and apply the Algorithm 1. In order to tune the hyperparameters, we utilize Bayesian optimization with lower-confidence-bound acquisition function [62] to find the hyperparameters minimizing an objective function defined based on a cross-validation procedure. More precisely, for a choice of hyperparameters, the first 100 points of \mathcal{D} are used for training the model and following this, the cost function in be optimized by Bayesian optimization is defined as the validation error calculated using the remaining points of \mathcal{D} . Starting from $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_0 = \emptyset$, we estimate g_0 as the solution of the unconstrained problem. This solution violates the constraints on $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_1 := \{\omega_i \mid i = 36, \dots, 140\}$. Proceeding from this partition set, we obtain g_1 which satisfies the constraints for all of the frequencies in \mathcal{P} . Therefore, $\Delta_1 \mathcal{P} = \emptyset$ and the algorithm terminates with $g^{(\star, \epsilon)} = g_1$.

Figure 3 shows the transfer function of $G^{(\star, \epsilon)}$ along with the estimated models \hat{G}_1 and \hat{G}_2 , obtained in Section III, and also the estimated model \hat{G}_3 resulted from the method in [29] which is briefly reviewed later in this section. One can see that the result of proposed scheme satisfies the desired feature, and also, fits better to the true transfer function $G^{(S)}$. For quantitative evaluation and comparison of the estimated impulse response, we use *coefficient of determination*, also known as *R-squared*, which is defined as following

$$\text{fit}(g) = 100 \times \left(1 - \frac{\|g - g^{(S)}\|_2}{\|g^{(S)}\|_2} \right) \quad (61)$$

where g is the estimated impulse response. Here, we have $\text{fit}(\hat{g}_1) = 87.13\%$, $\text{fit}(\hat{g}_2) = 87.15\%$, and $\text{fit}(\hat{g}_3) = 79.08\%$, where \hat{g}_i is the impulse responses corresponding to \hat{G}_i , for $i = 1, 2, 3$. On the other hand, we have $\text{fit}(g^{(\star, \epsilon)}) = 90.84\%$ which shows an improvement in the estimation as well as satisfying the given side information. Note that while \hat{G}_3 also satisfies this feature, the proposed approach outperforms significantly in terms of fitting performance. \triangle

The next example compares the proposed approach with the method in [29] which is a variant of subspace identification scheme incorporating frequency domain side information, and accordingly, it is denoted by FDI_{sub} in the followings. In this approach, initially a sequence of state variables is estimated, and then, a formulation of subspace identification method is presented where matrix inequalities, coming from the Kalman-Yakubovich-Popov (KYP) lemma, are imposed to estimation

problem for the incorporation of the side information. Following this, the resulting nonlinear program is reduced to a convex one using appropriate transformations.

Example 2. In this example, we perform numerical experiments to compare the proposed method with [29]. We generate randomly four sets of 150 stable systems using `drss` MATLAB's function with orders in the range of $\{10, \dots, 30\}$ and poles not larger than 0.98. Following this, the systems are normalized with their \mathcal{H}_∞ -norm, and then, actuated with a realization of standard random white Gaussian signal $u = (u_t)_{t=0}^{n_\varphi-1}$, i.e., $u_0, \dots, u_{n_\varphi-1}$ are i.i.d. samples of $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. The output of system is corrupted with additive Gaussian noise. The variance of output noise is chosen such that we have 10dB, 20dB, 30dB and 40dB signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) in the respective sets of the systems. Similar to the previous example, we tune the hyperparameters of both the proposed approach and the FDI_{sub} using Bayesian optimization [62] and cross-validation. The settings for the proposed approach are similar to ones employed in Example 1. The box plots of results are shown in Figure 4. While, we can see that the performance of the both of these approaches improves when SNR increases, the kernel-based approach significantly outperforms the subspace-based method FDI_{sub} .




Figure 4: The performance of FDI_{sub} [29] is compared with the proposed method, FDI_{RKHS} .

Discussion: The FDI_{sub} approach [29] suffers from the well-known model order selection issue [34]. On the other hand, the proposed scheme is a derivation of kernel-based regularization methods, and therefore, tuning the complexity of model is performed by the powerful concept of estimating continuous regularization hyperparameters rather than picking an integer order based on a selection rule [34], [35]. Moreover, while the proposed approach works directly with input-output data, FDI_{sub} employs an estimation of the state trajectory which leads to model estimation prone to high variance and noisy results. \triangle

The next example is adapted from [29] and demonstrate employing the proposed method for solving a joint case of Problem 3 and Problem 4 introduced in Section III.

Example 3. Consider *unknown* system $G(z)$ defined as

$$G(z) = \frac{0.1204z + 0.1184}{z^2 - 1.7114z + 0.9502}, \quad (62)$$

which is actuated with $u := (u_t)_{t=0}^{n_\varphi-1}$, a standard random Gaussian signal of length $n_\varphi = 150$, and the output of system, $y := (y_t)_{t=0}^{n_\varphi-1}$, corrupted with additive Gaussian noise, is measured with SNR = 20dB.




Figure 5: Left: transfer function of G , W and H . Right: The performance of different approaches is compared for the estimation of impulse response of G .

Let assume that we are given information on the dc-gain of system, i.e., we know that $\alpha_{\text{dc}} := G(e^{j0}) = 1$. To incorporate this information in the estimation of the impulse response of system, g , one can propose two approaches, *filter-based* (FB) and *directly constrained* (DC), which are discussed in the following. In the *filter-based* approach, we identify system $G_W := W(G - \alpha_{\text{dc}})$ with constraint $\|G_W\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} \leq \gamma$, where W is a suitably designed stable and inverse-stable transfer function, and γ is a scalar chosen appropriately. Following this, G is estimated as $W^{-1}\hat{G}_W + \alpha_{\text{dc}}$. To impose the constraint only on the low frequencies, W should be a low-pass filter with cut-off frequency close to $\omega = 0$ and with comparatively large gain in low frequencies. Here, we employ $W(z) = a \left(\frac{z-1+b}{z-1+a} \right)^2$, where $a = 10^{-4}$ and $b = 10^{-3}$. Following this, the outputs of system is modified to $y - \alpha_{\text{dc}}u$, and then, we apply filter W on them to obtain data points $p := (p_t)_{t=0}^{n_\varphi-1}$. The input-output pairs $\{(u_t, p_t) | t = 0, \dots, n_\varphi - 1\}$ correspond to the system F to be estimated with constraint $\|F\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} \leq \gamma = 10^{-3}$. Figure 5 shows bode plots of G , W and system H defined as $H := \gamma^{-1}G_W$ for which one can see that $\|H\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} \leq 1$. For the estimation of G_W , we can either employ the subspace method developed in [29], or the proposed identification scheme. We denote these methods respectively by FB_{sub} and FB_{RKHS} . In the *directly constrained* approach, we estimate system $K := G - \alpha_{\text{dc}}$ from the input-output data $((u_t, y_t - \alpha_{\text{dc}}u_t)_{t=0}^{n_\varphi-1})$ subject to constraint $|K(e^{j\omega})| \leq \gamma$, which is a special case of problem (13) where $\Omega_{\mathbb{T}}$ is the singleton set $\{0\}$. Here, we consider two cases of $\gamma = 10^{-3}$ and $\gamma = 10^{-4}$. We generate 150 realizations of noise and apply the introduced approaches to estimate g with given side information. Figure 5 shows the boxplot for the estimation performance of the estimated impulse responses, \hat{g} . The histogram of the resulting dc-gain, $\hat{\alpha}_{\text{dc}}$, is shown in Figure 6. For further quantitative evaluation and comparison of the estimated values, the bias, variance and mean squared error (MSE) of the estimations are presented in Table I.

Discussion: The numerical experiment shows that the FB_{RKHS} and directly constrained methods have similar performance in the estimation of impulse response. Moreover, they provide considerably more accurate estimation of g comparing to the FB_{sub} method, which is expected due to Example 2. Additionally, comparing the dc-gain calculated from the results, one can see that the values obtained from the directly constrained method with $\gamma = 10^{-4}$ are significantly closer to




Figure 6: The histogram of the estimated values of the dc-gain.

	FB _{sub}	FB _{RKHS}	DC _{10⁻³}	DC _{10⁻⁴}
Bias ² (ĝ)	0.338	0.027	0.024	0.025
Var (ĝ)	0.227	0.059	0.057	0.060
MSE (ĝ)	0.564	0.086	0.081	0.085
Bias ² (â _{dc}) [$\times 10^{-6}$]	0.214	0.151	0.418	0.003
Var (â _{dc}) [$\times 10^{-6}$]	0.478	81.691	0.306	0.003
MSE (â _{dc}) [$\times 10^{-6}$]	0.692	81.842	0.724	0.006

Table I: Bias, variance and MSE for the estimations

the given dc-gain of system. The directly constrained method with $\gamma = 10^{-3}$ and FB_{sub} method behave similarly accurate regarding the calculated dc-gain in the sense of MSE, which is potentially due to the same choice for γ . On the other hand, the former method, which is based on the proposed approach, estimates the impulse response g significantly more accurate. Due to the current choice of W , employing smaller values of γ is not feasible in the filter-based approach as one can see from the transfer function H shown in Figure 5, where we have $\|H\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} = 0.9984$. Meanwhile, the employed W still does not impose the desired constraint on the low frequencies strong enough, which results in a considerable degree of freedom for the dc-gain. Consequently, while the FB_{RKHS} method estimates the impulse response more precisely than FB_{sub}, the corresponding calculated dc-gain values are not as accurate as the ones provided by FB_{sub} method. The better performance of FB_{sub} method regarding the calculated dc-gain is potentially due to being the original system low order. To improve the FB_{RKHS} from this aspect, we need to design low-pass filter W with narrower band and higher gain, which results in large order filters with poles and zeros close to $z = 1$. This can lead to numerical instability and necessity of larger set of data. On the other hand, the directly constrained methods do not depend on the choice of W and perform well, especially for small enough values of γ like $\gamma = 10^{-4}$. \triangle

The next example concerns Problem 1 for the case of continuous-time and demonstrates the role of proposed approach for the continuous-time systems.

Example 4. Consider the *unknown* continuous-time system S with transfer function $G^{(s)}(s)$ defined [63] as

$$G^{(s)}(s) = -\frac{2s^3 + 3.6s^2 + 2.095s + 0.396s}{0.461s^4 + 2.628s^3 + 4.389s^2 + 2.662s + 0.519}, \quad (63)$$

with side information $\|G^{(s)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} \leq 1$. Let the system be initially at rest and actuated with a random switching pulse signal as shown in Figure 7. Then, the output of system is measure at $n_\varphi = 250$ time instants $t_0, \dots, t_{n_\varphi-1} \in [0, 10]$, where $t_k = kT_s + \delta_k$, for $k = 0, \dots, n_\varphi - 1$, with $T_s = 0.04$ and $\delta_k \sim \text{Uniform}([0, T_s])$. The output measurements, $\{y_{t_i}\}_{i=0}^{n_\varphi-1}$, are subject to additive white Gaussian noise such that SNR is 20dB. We interpolate the output values at time instants $\bar{t}_k = (k+1)T_s$, for $k = 0, \dots, n_\varphi - 1$, using shape-preserving piecewise cubic interpolation available in MATLAB's function `interp1` and `pchip` option. The SNR in the interpolated outputs, $\{\bar{y}_{t_i}\}_{i=0}^{n_\varphi-1}$, is 20.68dB. This slight improvement in SNR is potentially due to being the initial point almost regularly distributed in the sampling time interval.

We employ CONTSID TOOLBOX [64] and obtain transfer function estimations \hat{G}_1 and \hat{G}_2 , respectively using `tfstrivc` and `rivc` functions with known orders of system. Furthermore, we identify the system through *indirect* approaches, i.e., first a discrete-time impulse response is estimated using the interpolated data, and then, the continuous-time version is derived by shape-preserving piecewise cubic interpolation method as discussed above. To this end, we use the subspace method [29] explained in Example 2 and also, the discrete-time version of the proposed method. Let the corresponding transfer functions be denoted respectively by $\hat{G}_{\text{sub}}^{(*)}$ and $\hat{G}_{\text{ind}}^{(*)}$. In obtaining $\hat{G}_{\text{ind}}^{(*)}$, ϵ is set to 10^{-3} and the rest of settings are taken similar to Example 1. Starting from $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_0 = \emptyset$, the algorithm terminates in the second iteration with $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_1 := \{\omega_i | i = 50, \dots, 76\}$.

In addition to the above methods, we identify the system in a *direct* approach based on the proposed algorithm for the case of continuous-time, and using original measurement data. Accordingly, we apply Algorithm 1 where ϵ is chosen as 10^{-3} , the partition set is taken as $\mathcal{P} = \{\omega_i = 10^{-2}i | i = 0, \dots, n_\varphi = 10^4\}$, TC kernel is employed, and hyperparameters are tuned similar to Example 1. Initially, we have $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_0 = \emptyset$ where the resulting solution, g_0 , violates the constraints on $\Delta \overline{\mathcal{P}}_0 := \{\omega_i | i = 159, \dots, 205\}$. In the next iteration, $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_1$ is $\Delta \overline{\mathcal{P}}_0$ for which we obtain solution g_1 . The result satisfies the constraints for the frequencies in \mathcal{P} , and, hence, $\Delta_1 \overline{\mathcal{P}} = \emptyset$, i.e., the algorithm terminates in the second iteration. Denote the estimated impulse response and the corresponding transfer function respectively by $g_{\text{dir}}^{(*)}$ and $G_{\text{dir}}^{(*)}$.

In Figure 7, the estimated transfer functions \hat{G}_1 , \hat{G}_2 , \hat{G}_{sub} , $G_{\text{ind}}^{(*)}$ and $G_{\text{dir}}^{(*)}$ are shown and graphically compared with $G^{(s)}$. From the figure, one can see that the side information is preserved only for the estimated transfer functions \hat{G}_{sub} , $G_{\text{ind}}^{(*)}$ and $G_{\text{dir}}^{(*)}$, and it is violated by \hat{G}_1 and \hat{G}_2 . Indeed, we have $\|\hat{G}_1\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} = 1.11$ and $\|\hat{G}_2\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} = 1.17$. Furthermore, we can see that the proposed method significantly outperforms other schemes. To evaluate quantitatively the estimation results, we employ *R-squared* metric defined in (61). Accordingly, the fitting results are $\text{fit}(\hat{g}_1) = 78.93\%$, $\text{fit}(\hat{g}_2) = 63.37\%$, $\text{fit}(\hat{g}_{\text{sub}}) = 73.76\%$, $\text{fit}(g_{\text{ind}}^{(*)}) = 87.15\%$, and $\text{fit}(g_{\text{dir}}^{(*)}) = 91.86\%$, where \hat{g}_1 , \hat{g}_2 , \hat{g}_{sub} and $g_{\text{ind}}^{(*)}$ are the impulse responses corresponding \hat{G}_1 , \hat{G}_2 , \hat{G}_{sub} and $G_{\text{ind}}^{(*)}$.

For further comparison, we perform a Monte Carlo experi-




Figure 7: Top: the input and output of system, output measurements and interpolations. Bottom: the transfer function of system (63), the model estimated using the proposed approach, $G_{dir}^{(*, \epsilon)}$, and the estimated models \hat{G}_1 , \hat{G}_2 , \hat{G}_{sub} and $G_{ind}^{(*, \epsilon)}$.




Figure 8: The performance of different estimation for the cases with regular sampling (left) and irregular sampling (right).

ment with two sets of 100 runs, where the settings are similar to the numerical experiment above with the only difference that regular sampling is employed in the first set. In the case of regular sampling, the original measurement samples coincide with the interpolated ones. On the other hand, for the irregular case, the interpolation of output measurements differs from the original ones, however the resulting SNR is in the interval 19.8dB to 21.6dB, with average SNR equal to 20.8dB. This is due to being the time instants of output measurements close to regular and the fact that the response of system is fairly smooth. Using the previously mentioned direct and indirect approaches, we estimate the impulse response of system in each run, i.e., we obtain impulse response estimations \hat{g}_{sub} , $g_{ind}^{(*, \epsilon)}$ and $g_{dir}^{(*, \epsilon)}$, which are satisfying the given side information. Figure 8 shows the boxplot comparing the estimation performance of the results. Also, Table II provides the bias, variance and mean squared error (MSE) of the estimations.

Discussion: The first and most important observation is that direct method significantly outperforms the indirect approaches. This observation is in confirmation with the literature on continuous-time system identification [65] and highlights the importance of developing the proposed scheme for the case of continuous-time impulse responses. Furthermore, one can see that the proposed methods shows better estimation performance comparing to the subspace method, which is expected

due to Example 2. Comparing the estimation results for the regularly and irregularly sampling cases, the minor improvement of the subspace method [29] for the case of irregular measurement samples is potentially due to slightly higher SNR in the interpolation data. Meanwhile, for other two approaches we observe almost similar behavior, and the current numerical experiments does not reveal further aspects. Finally, we should note that when the sampling is highly irregular or the output of system is wiggles significantly, the interpolation either provides erroneous results or it is infeasible. In this situation, one can only employ the direct approach, i.e., the proposed method for the case of continuous-time. This issue again highlights the importance of the developed scheme for the estimation of continuous-time impulse responses. \triangle

VIII. CONCLUSION

The problem identification with side information on the dissipativity of the system has been studied in this paper. We have employed a RKHS framework allowing considering both of the discrete-time and continuous-time dynamics. The problem is initially formulated as an infinite-dimensional optimization problem estimating a stable impulse response fitting to the data and satisfying an \mathcal{H}_∞ -norm constraint. We have shown that the problem is well-defined and convex with a unique solution. To obtain the solution, we have proposed a heuristic tightly approximating the solution. It is shown that the proposed approach is equivalent to solve a finite-dimensional convex quadratically constrained quadratic programming. The efficiency of the discussed method is verified by several numerical examples.

APPENDIX

A. Proof of Lemma 3

Consider the case $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+$ and let $g^{(1)} := (g_t^{(1)})_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$, $g^{(2)} := (g_t^{(2)})_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \in \mathcal{H}_k$ and $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{C}$. Since $\mathcal{H}_k \subseteq \mathcal{L}_1$, we know that $\|g^{(1)}\|_1$ and $\|g^{(2)}\|_1$ are finite. Also, for any $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and any $\omega \in \mathbb{R}_+$, from triangle inequality, we have $|(\alpha_1 g_t^{(1)} + \alpha_2 g_t^{(2)}) e^{-j\omega t}| \leq |\alpha_1| |g_t^{(1)}| + |\alpha_2| |g_t^{(2)}|$. Hence, $((\alpha_1 g_t^{(1)} + \alpha_2 g_t^{(2)}) e^{-j\omega t})_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ is absolutely integrable. Therefore, the improper integral $\mathcal{F}_\omega(\alpha_1 g^{(1)} + \alpha_2 g^{(2)}) := \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} (\alpha_1 g_t^{(1)} + \alpha_2 g_t^{(2)}) e^{-j\omega t} dt$ converges and we have

$$\mathcal{F}_\omega(\alpha_1 g^{(1)} + \alpha_2 g^{(2)}) := \alpha_1 \mathcal{F}_\omega(g^{(1)}) + \alpha_2 \mathcal{F}_\omega(g^{(2)}). \quad (64)$$

Therefore, $\mathcal{F}_\omega(\alpha_1 g^{(1)} + \alpha_2 g^{(2)})$ is a well-defined \mathbb{C} -valued linear map. Moreover, from $e^{-j\omega t} = \cos(\omega t) - j \sin(\omega t)$, one can easily see that $\mathcal{F}_\omega^{(r)}(g) = \text{real}(\mathcal{F}_\omega(g))$, $\mathcal{F}_\omega^{(i)}(g) = \text{imag}(\mathcal{F}_\omega(g))$,

samples	method	$\text{Bias}^2(\hat{g})$ [$\times 10^{-6}$]	$\text{Var}(\hat{g})$ [$\times 10^{-6}$]	$\text{MSE}(\hat{g})$ [$\times 10^{-6}$]
regular	\hat{G}_{sub}	6.39	7.97	14.36
	$G_{ind}^{(*, \epsilon)}$	5.33	1.73	7.07
	$G_{dir}^{(*, \epsilon)}$	2.25	0.63	2.88
	$G_{sub}^{(*, \epsilon)}$	7.40	6.36	13.76
irregular	$G_{ind}^{(*, \epsilon)}$	5.48	1.79	7.27
	$G_{dir}^{(*, \epsilon)}$	2.16	0.67	2.83
	$G_{sub}^{(*, \epsilon)}$	7.40	6.36	13.76

Table II: Bias, variance and MSE for the estimations

and $\mathcal{F}_\omega(g) = \mathcal{F}_\omega^{(r)}(g) + j\mathcal{F}_\omega^{(i)}(g)$, for any $g \in \mathcal{H}_k$. Let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and compare the real and imaginary parts of the left-hand side and right-hand side of (64). Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_\omega^{(r)}(\alpha_1 g^{(1)} + \alpha_2 g^{(2)}) &= \alpha_1 \mathcal{F}_\omega^{(r)}(g^{(1)}) + \alpha_2 \mathcal{F}_\omega^{(r)}(g^{(2)}), \\ \mathcal{F}_\omega^{(i)}(\alpha_1 g^{(1)} + \alpha_2 g^{(2)}) &= \alpha_1 \mathcal{F}_\omega^{(i)}(g^{(1)}) + \alpha_2 \mathcal{F}_\omega^{(i)}(g^{(2)}),\end{aligned}$$

and also $|\mathcal{F}_\omega^{(r)}(\alpha_1 g^{(1)} + \alpha_2 g^{(2)})|, |\mathcal{F}_\omega^{(i)}(\alpha_1 g^{(1)} + \alpha_2 g^{(2)})| < \infty$. This shows that $\mathcal{F}_\omega^{(r)}$ and $\mathcal{F}_\omega^{(i)}$ are well-defined linear maps.

Since $\mathcal{F}_\omega^{(r)}(g) = \text{real}(\mathcal{F}_\omega(g))$, from triangle inequality and the definition of \mathcal{F}_ω , one can see

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathcal{F}_\omega^{(r)}(g)| &= |\text{real}(\mathcal{F}_\omega(g))| \\ &\leq |\mathcal{F}_\omega(g)| = \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} g_t e^{-j\omega t} dt \right| \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} |g_t| dt,\end{aligned}\quad (65)$$

for any $g \in \mathcal{H}_k$. Subsequently, due to the reproducing property and the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we have $|\mathcal{F}_\omega^{(r)}(g)| \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} |\langle g, \mathbb{k}_t \rangle| dt \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \|g\| \|\mathbb{k}_t\| dt$. From $\|\mathbb{k}_t\|^2 = \langle \mathbb{k}_t, \mathbb{k}_t \rangle = \mathbb{k}(t, t)$ and the definition of μ_0 , one can see $|\mathcal{F}_\omega^{(r)}(g)| \leq \mu_0 \|g\|$, and hence, we have

$$\|\mathcal{F}_\omega^{(r)}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_k, \mathbb{R})} := \sup_{\substack{g \in \mathcal{H}_k \\ \|g\| \leq 1}} |\mathcal{F}_\omega^{(r)}(g)| \leq \sup_{\substack{g \in \mathcal{H}_k \\ \|g\| \leq 1}} \mu_0 \|g\| = \mu_0.$$

Similarly, one can show that $\|\mathcal{F}_\omega^{(i)}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_k, \mathbb{R})} \leq \mu_0$. Therefore, $\mathcal{F}_\omega^{(r)}$ and $\mathcal{F}_\omega^{(i)}$ are linear bounded functionals, i.e., $\mathcal{F}_\omega^{(r)}, \mathcal{F}_\omega^{(i)} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_k, \mathbb{R})$. Since \mathcal{H}_k is a Hilbert space, due to the Riesz's representation theorem, we have that there exist unique $\varphi_\omega^{(r)} := (\varphi_{\omega, t}^{(r)})_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \in \mathcal{H}_k$ and $\varphi_\omega^{(i)} := (\varphi_{\omega, t}^{(i)})_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \in \mathcal{H}_k$ such that, for any $g \in \mathcal{H}_k$, one has $\mathcal{F}_\omega^{(r)}(g) = \langle \varphi_\omega^{(r)}, g \rangle$ and $\mathcal{F}_\omega^{(i)}(g) = \langle \varphi_\omega^{(i)}, g \rangle$. Subsequently, from the reproducing property of kernel, for any $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_{\omega, t}^{(r)} &= \langle \varphi_\omega^{(r)}, \mathbb{k}_t \rangle = \mathcal{F}_\omega^{(r)}(\mathbb{k}_t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{k}(t, s) \cos(\omega s) ds, \\ \varphi_{\omega, t}^{(i)} &= \langle \varphi_\omega^{(i)}, \mathbb{k}_t \rangle = \mathcal{F}_\omega^{(i)}(\mathbb{k}_t) = -\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{k}(t, s) \sin(\omega s) ds.\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof for the case $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+$. Similar lines of arguments hold when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+$ and the proof is concluded. ■

B. Proof of Lemma 5

Let assume $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+$. For any $g := (g_s)_{s \in \mathbb{R}_+} \in \mathcal{H}_k$, from the triangle inequality and *reproducing property*, one has

$$|\mathbb{L}_t^u(g)| \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} |g_s| |u_{t-s}| ds = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} |\langle g, \mathbb{k}_s \rangle| |u_{t-s}| ds.$$

Then, due to the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and since $u \in \mathcal{L}_\infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathbb{L}_t^u(g)| &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \|g\| \mathbb{k}(s, s)^{\frac{1}{2}} |u_{t-s}| ds \\ &\leq \|g\| \|u\|_\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{k}(s, s)^{\frac{1}{2}} ds,\end{aligned}\quad (66)$$

where we have used the fact that $\|\mathbb{k}_s\| = \mathbb{k}(s, s)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, for any $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$. This shows that $(g_s u_{t-s})_{s \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ is absolutely integrable, for any $g = (g_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \in \mathcal{H}_k$, and therefore \mathbb{L}_t^u is a well-defined linear map. Moreover, from the definition of $\|\mathbb{L}_t^u\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_k, \mathbb{R})}$ and (66), we have

$$\|\mathbb{L}_t^u\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_k, \mathbb{R})} \leq \|u\|_\infty \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{k}(s, s)^{\frac{1}{2}} ds = \mu_0 \|u\|_\infty.$$

Therefore, \mathbb{L}_t^u is a bounded functional. Subsequently, due to Riesz's representation theorem, there exists a unique element $\varphi_t^{(u)} = (\varphi_{t, s}^{(u)})_{s \in \mathbb{R}_+} \in \mathcal{H}_k$ such that $\mathbb{L}_t^u(g) = \langle \varphi_t^{(u)}, g \rangle$, for any $g \in \mathcal{H}_k$. From reproducing property of kernel, we know that $\varphi_{t, s}^{(u)} = \langle \varphi_t^{(u)}, \mathbb{k}_s \rangle$, for any $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Since $\langle \varphi_t^{(u)}, \mathbb{k}_s \rangle = \mathbb{L}_t^u(\mathbb{k}_s)$ and due to the definition of \mathbb{L}_t^u , we have

$$\varphi_{t, s}^{(u)} = \mathbb{L}_t^u(\mathbb{k}_s) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{k}_s(\tau) u_{t-\tau} d\tau = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{k}(s, \tau) u_{t-\tau} d\tau.$$

Similar arguments hold for $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+$. ■

C. Proof of Theorem 8

When $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+$, from the upper bound of kernel, we have

$$\mu_n \leq \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} t^n \mathbb{k}(t, t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} t^n (\gamma e^{-\beta t})^{\frac{1}{2}} dt,$$

where the second inequality is due to being $f(t) := e^{-\frac{1}{2}\beta t}$ a non-increasing function. This inequality holds for the case of $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+$ as well. Using change of variable $s = \frac{\beta}{2}t$, we have

$$\mu_n \leq \gamma^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{2^{n+1}}{\beta^{n+1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} s^n e^{-s} ds = \gamma^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{2^{n+1}}{\beta^{n+1}} \Gamma(n+1),$$

where the equality is due to the definition of Gamma function. The claim follows from $\Gamma(k+1) = k!$, for $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. ■

D. Proof of Lemma 9

Given $g := (g_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \in \mathcal{H}_k$, since $\mathcal{F}_\omega^{(r)}(g)$ and $\mathcal{F}_\omega^{(i)}(g)$ are functions of ω , we define functions $m_g^{(r)}, m_g^{(i)} : \Omega_{\mathbb{T}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\begin{aligned}m_g^{(r)}(\omega) &:= \mathcal{F}_\omega^{(r)}(g) = \langle \varphi_\omega^{(r)}, g \rangle, \\ m_g^{(i)}(\omega) &:= \mathcal{F}_\omega^{(i)}(g) = \langle \varphi_\omega^{(i)}, g \rangle,\end{aligned}$$

for any $\omega \in \Omega_{\mathbb{T}}$. We know that $\frac{d}{d\omega}(g_t \cos(\omega t)) = -tg_t \sin(\omega t)$ and $\frac{d}{d\omega}(g_t \sin(\omega t)) = tg_t \cos(\omega t)$. From the reproducing property and the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left| \frac{d}{d\omega}(g_t \cos(\omega t)) \right| &= |tg_t \sin(\omega t)| \leq t|g_t| = t|\langle \mathbb{k}_t, g \rangle| \\ &\leq t\|\mathbb{k}_t\| \|g\| = t\langle \mathbb{k}_t, \mathbb{k}_t \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} \|g\| = t\mathbb{k}(t, t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|g\|.\end{aligned}\quad (67)$$

Similarly, one can see

$$\left| \frac{d}{d\omega}(g_t \sin(\omega t)) \right| \leq t \mathbb{k}(t, t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|g\|. \quad (68)$$

Due to $\mu_1 < \infty$ and the Weierstrass M-test theorem, we have the uniform and absolute convergence for the series $\sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \frac{d}{d\omega}(g_t \cos(\omega t))$ and $\sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \frac{d}{d\omega}(g_t \sin(\omega t))$, when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+$, as well as for the improper integrals $\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \frac{d}{d\omega}(g_t \cos(\omega t)) dt$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \frac{d}{d\omega}(g_t \sin(\omega t)) dt$, when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+$. Consequently, from the definition of $m_g^{(r)}, m_g^{(i)}$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{d\omega} m_g^{(r)}(\omega) &= \frac{d}{d\omega} \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} g_t \cos(\omega t) = -\sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} tg_t \sin(\omega t), \\ \frac{d}{d\omega} m_g^{(i)}(\omega) &= \frac{d}{d\omega} \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} g_t \sin(\omega t) = \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} tg_t \cos(\omega t),\end{aligned}$$

when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+$, and

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{d\omega}m_g^{(r)}(\omega) &= \frac{d}{d\omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} g_t \cos(\omega t) dt = - \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} t g_t \sin(\omega t) dt, \\ \frac{d}{d\omega}m_g^{(i)}(\omega) &= \frac{d}{d\omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} g_t \sin(\omega t) dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} t g_t \cos(\omega t) dt,\end{aligned}$$

when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+$. Subsequently, from (67), (68), the triangle inequality and the definition of μ_1 in (17), it follows

$$\left| \frac{d}{d\omega}m_g^{(r)}(\omega) \right| \leq \mu_1 \|g\|, \quad \left| \frac{d}{d\omega}m_g^{(i)}(\omega) \right| \leq \mu_1 \|g\|.$$

From $m_g(\omega) = (m_g^{(r)}(\omega))^2 + (m_g^{(i)}(\omega))^2$, it follows that m_g is a differentiable function with derivative given as following

$$\frac{d}{d\omega}m_g(\omega) = 2\mathcal{F}_\omega^{(r)}(g) \frac{d}{d\omega}m_g^{(r)}(\omega) + 2\mathcal{F}_\omega^{(i)}(g) \frac{d}{d\omega}m_g^{(i)}(\omega). \quad (69)$$

Due to Lemma 3, we know that

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathcal{F}_\omega^{(r)}(g)| &\leq \|\mathcal{F}_\omega^{(r)}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_k, \mathbb{R})} \|g\| \leq \mu_0 \|g\|, \\ |\mathcal{F}_\omega^{(i)}(g)| &\leq \|\mathcal{F}_\omega^{(i)}\|_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_k, \mathbb{R})} \|g\| \leq \mu_0 \|g\|.\end{aligned}$$

Subsequently, from (69), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left| \frac{d}{d\omega}m_g(\omega) \right| &\leq 2 \left[\|\mathcal{F}_\omega^{(r)}(g)\| \left| \frac{d}{d\omega}m_g^{(r)}(\omega) \right| + \|\mathcal{F}_\omega^{(i)}(g)\| \left| \frac{d}{d\omega}m_g^{(i)}(\omega) \right| \right] \\ &\leq 2 [\mu_0 \|g\| \mu_1 \|g\| + \mu_0 \|g\| \mu_1 \|g\|] = 4\mu_0 \mu_1 \|g\|^2.\end{aligned}$$

Now, let $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in [0, \pi]$. Without loss of generality, we assume $\omega_2 > \omega_1$. Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|m_g(\omega_2) - m_g(\omega_1)| &= \left| \int_{\omega_1}^{\omega_2} \frac{d}{d\omega}m_g(\omega) d\omega \right| \\ &\leq \int_{\omega_1}^{\omega_2} \left| \frac{d}{d\omega}m_g(\omega) \right| d\omega \leq 4\mu_0 \mu_1 \|g\|^2 |\omega_2 - \omega_1|.\end{aligned}$$

In other words, we have $|m_g(\omega_2) - m_g(\omega_1)| \leq L_g |\omega_2 - \omega_1|$ where $L_g = 4\mu_0 \mu_1 \|g\|^2$. ■

E. Proof of Theorem 10

We know that $\max(s, t) = \frac{1}{2}(s + t + |s - t|)$. Accordingly, using change of variable $\tau = s - t$, it follows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{k}(s, t) e^{-j\omega(s-t)} ds dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} e^{-\beta t} \int_{-t}^{\infty} e^{-\beta \tau^+ - j\omega \tau} d\tau dt, \quad (70)$$

where $\tau^+ := \frac{1}{2}(\tau + |\tau|)$. Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{-t}^{\infty} e^{-\beta \tau^+ - j\omega \tau} d\tau &= \int_{-t}^0 e^{-j\omega \tau} d\tau + \int_0^{\infty} e^{-\beta \tau - j\omega \tau} d\tau \\ &= \left[-\frac{1}{j\omega} + \frac{e^{j\omega t}}{j\omega} \right] + \frac{1}{\beta + j\omega} = \frac{e^{j\omega t}}{j\omega} - \frac{\beta}{j\omega(\beta + j\omega)}.\end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

Subsequently, by replacing the right-hand side of (71) in (70) and simplifying the integrals, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{k}(s, t) e^{-j\omega(s-t)} ds dt \\ = -\frac{1}{j\omega(-\beta + j\omega)} - \frac{1}{j\omega(\beta + j\omega)} = \frac{2}{\beta^2 + \omega^2}.\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. ■

F. Proof of Theorem 15

Let $\mathcal{V}_k := \mathbb{R}^{n_{\mathcal{P}}} \times \mathcal{H}_k$ be the Hilbert space endowed with the inner product defined as

$$\langle (x_1, g_1), (x_2, g_2) \rangle_{\mathcal{V}_k} := x_1^T x_2 + \lambda \langle g_1, g_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k}, \quad (72)$$

for all (x_1, g_1) and (x_2, g_2) in \mathcal{V}_k . Given $\Omega \subseteq \Omega_{\mathbb{T}}$ and $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_+$, define set $\mathcal{U}_k(\rho, \Omega) \subseteq \mathcal{V}_k$ as

$$\mathcal{U}_k(\rho, \Omega) := \left\{ (x, g) \mid L^1(g) - x = y, |\mathcal{F}_\omega(g)| \leq \rho, \forall \omega \in \Omega \right\},$$

where $y := [y_t]_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\mathcal{P}}}$. Let $\mathcal{U}_\epsilon := \mathcal{U}_k(1 - \epsilon, [0, \pi])$ and $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{P}} := \mathcal{U}_k(1 - \epsilon, \mathcal{P})$. Accordingly, replacing η with ρ , (25) is equivalent to the following optimization problem

$$\min_{(x, g) \in \mathcal{U}_k(\rho, \Omega)} \|(x, g)\|_{\mathcal{V}_k}^2, \quad (73)$$

and therefore, it is a convex optimization with the same unique solution. Let $v^{(\epsilon)} := (x^{(\epsilon)}, g^{(\epsilon)})$ be the solution for (73) for \mathcal{U}_ϵ for $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$. When $\epsilon = 0$, we simply write $v^* := (x^*, g^*)$. Also, let $v^{(\star, \epsilon)} := (x^{(\star, \epsilon)}, g^{(\star, \epsilon)})$ is the solution of (73) for $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{P}}$. These notations is consistent with our previous ones due to the equivalency of (25) and (73) and the uniqueness of the solution. One can easily see that $\mathcal{U}_\epsilon \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{P}}$. Also, based on the arguments provided in the proof of Theorem 11, we know that $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{P}} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_0$. Accordingly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{w \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{P}}} \min_{v \in \mathcal{U}_\epsilon} \|v - w\|_{\mathcal{V}_k} &\leq \sup_{w \in \mathcal{U}_0} \min_{v \in \mathcal{U}_\epsilon} \|v - w\|_{\mathcal{V}_k}, \\ \sup_{w \in \mathcal{U}_0} \min_{v \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{P}}} \|v - w\|_{\mathcal{V}_k} &\leq \sup_{w \in \mathcal{U}_0} \min_{v \in \mathcal{U}_\epsilon} \|v - w\|_{\mathcal{V}_k}.\end{aligned}$$

Let $v_1 \in \mathcal{V}_k$ be defined as

$$v_1 := \text{proj}_{\mathcal{U}_\epsilon}(v^*) = \text{argmin}_{v \in \mathcal{U}_\epsilon} \|v - v^*\|_{\mathcal{V}_k}. \quad (74)$$

Since $v_1 \in \mathcal{U}_\epsilon$ and $\mathcal{U}_\epsilon \subseteq \mathcal{U}_0$, due to the definition of $v^{(\epsilon)}$, we know that $\|v^{(\epsilon)}\|_{\mathcal{V}_k} \leq \|v_1\|_{\mathcal{V}_k}$. Therefore, from triangle inequality and (74), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|v^{(\epsilon)}\|_{\mathcal{V}_k} &\leq \|v_1\|_{\mathcal{V}_k} \\ &\leq \|v_1 - v^*\|_{\mathcal{V}_k} + \|v^*\|_{\mathcal{V}_k} \\ &= \min_{v \in \mathcal{U}_\epsilon} \|v - v^*\|_{\mathcal{V}_k} + \|v^*\|_{\mathcal{V}_k} \\ &\leq \sup_{w \in \mathcal{U}_0} \min_{v \in \mathcal{U}_\epsilon} \|v - w\|_{\mathcal{V}_k} + \|v^*\|_{\mathcal{V}_k}.\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, it follows that

$$0 \leq \|v^{(\epsilon)}\|_{\mathcal{V}_k} - \|v^*\|_{\mathcal{V}_k} \leq \sup_{w \in \mathcal{U}_0} \min_{v \in \mathcal{U}_\epsilon} \|v - w\|_{\mathcal{V}_k}.$$

Due to the convexity of \mathcal{U}_0 and $\mathcal{U}_\epsilon \subseteq \mathcal{U}_0$, we know that $\frac{1}{2}(v^{(\epsilon)} + v^*) \in \mathcal{U}_0$, and therefore, we have $\|v^*\|_{\mathcal{V}_k} \leq \frac{1}{2}\|v^{(\epsilon)} + v^*\|_{\mathcal{V}_k}$. Subsequently, one can see that

$$\begin{aligned}\|v^{(\epsilon)} - v^*\|_{\mathcal{V}_k}^2 &= 2\|v^{(\epsilon)}\|_{\mathcal{V}_k}^2 + 2\|v^*\|_{\mathcal{V}_k}^2 - \|v^{(\epsilon)} + v^*\|_{\mathcal{V}_k}^2 \\ &\leq 2\|v^{(\epsilon)}\|_{\mathcal{V}_k}^2 + 2\|v^*\|_{\mathcal{V}_k}^2 - 4\|v^*\|_{\mathcal{V}_k}^2 \\ &= 2\|v^{(\epsilon)}\|_{\mathcal{V}_k}^2 - 2\|v^*\|_{\mathcal{V}_k}^2 \\ &= 2(\|v^{(\star, \epsilon)}\|_{\mathcal{V}_k} - \|v^*\|_{\mathcal{V}_k})(\|v^{(\star, \epsilon)}\|_{\mathcal{V}_k} + \|v^*\|_{\mathcal{V}_k}) \\ &\leq 2(\sup_{w \in \mathcal{U}_0} \min_{v \in \mathcal{U}_\epsilon} \|v - w\|_{\mathcal{V}_k})(\|v^{(\star, \epsilon)}\|_{\mathcal{V}_k} + \|v^*\|_{\mathcal{V}_k}).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbf{0}$ belongs to \mathcal{U}_ϵ , $\mathcal{U}_\mathcal{P}$ and \mathcal{U}_0 , one has $\|y\| \leq \|g^{(\epsilon)}\|$, $\|y\| \leq \|g^{(\star, \epsilon)}\|$ and $\|y\| \leq \|g^\star\|$. Therefore, we have

$$\|v^{(\epsilon)} - v^\star\|_{\mathcal{Y}_k}^2 \leq 4 \left(\sup_{w \in \mathcal{U}_0} \min_{v \in \mathcal{U}_\epsilon} \|v - w\|_{\mathcal{Y}_k} \right) \|y\|.$$

Similarly, one can show the following inequalities

$$\|v^{(\epsilon)} - v^{(\star, \epsilon)}\|_{\mathcal{Y}_k}^2 \leq 4 \left(\sup_{w \in \mathcal{U}_\mathcal{P}} \min_{v \in \mathcal{U}_\epsilon} \|v - w\|_{\mathcal{Y}_k} \right) \|y\|, \quad (75)$$

$$\|v^{(\star, \epsilon)} - v^\star\|_{\mathcal{Y}_k}^2 \leq 4 \left(\sup_{w \in \mathcal{U}_0} \min_{v \in \mathcal{U}_\mathcal{P}} \|v - w\|_{\mathcal{Y}_k} \right) \|y\|. \quad (76)$$

Now, let $v = (x, g)$ be an arbitrary element of \mathcal{U}_0 . Then, we know that $(1 - \epsilon)g \in \mathcal{G}(1 - \epsilon, \Omega_\mathbb{T})$. Also, we have

$$L^u((1 - \epsilon)g) - (x - \epsilon L^u(g)) = L^u(g) - x = y.$$

Therefore $w := (x - \epsilon L^u(g), (1 - \epsilon)g)$ is an element of \mathcal{U}_0 . Moreover, we have

$$\|v - w\|_{\mathcal{Y}_k}^2 = \epsilon(\|L^u(g)\|^2 + \|g\|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \epsilon(\|L^u\|^2 + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|g\|^2.$$

Accordingly, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{w \in \mathcal{U}_0} \min_{v \in \mathcal{U}_\epsilon} \|v - w\|_{\mathcal{Y}_k} &\leq \sup_{(x, g) \in \mathcal{U}_0} \epsilon(\|L^u\|^2 + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|g\|^2 \\ &\leq \epsilon(\|L^u\|^2 + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|y\|. \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

Since $\mathcal{U}_\epsilon \subseteq \mathcal{U}_\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_0$, we know that

$$\sup_{w \in \mathcal{U}_0} \min_{v \in \mathcal{U}_\mathcal{P}} \|v - w\|_{\mathcal{Y}_k} \leq \sup_{w \in \mathcal{U}_0} \min_{v \in \mathcal{U}_\epsilon} \|v - w\|_{\mathcal{Y}_k}.$$

Subsequently, due to (76) and (77), we have

$$\|v^{(\star, \epsilon)} - v^\star\|_{\mathcal{Y}_k}^2 \leq \epsilon(\|L^u\|^2 + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|y\|. \quad (78)$$

Consequently, it follows that

$$\|g^{(\star, \epsilon)} - g^\star\|^2 \leq \|v^{(\star, \epsilon)} - v^\star\|_{\mathcal{Y}_k}^2 \leq 4\epsilon(\|L^u\|^2 + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|y\|^2.$$

This also shows that $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} g^{(\star, \epsilon)} = g^\star$ in \mathcal{H}_k . Note that, for any $t \in \mathbb{T}$, we have $g_t^{(\star, \epsilon)} = \langle g^{(\star, \epsilon)}, \mathbb{k}_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k}$ and $g_t^\star = \langle g^\star, \mathbb{k}_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k}$. Therefore, from the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and the reproducing property, one has

$$|g_t^{(\star, \epsilon)} - g_t^\star| = |\langle g^{(\star, \epsilon)} - g^\star, \mathbb{k}_t \rangle| \leq \|g^{(\star, \epsilon)} - g^\star\| \|\mathbb{k}_t\|.$$

Accordingly, from $\|\mathbb{k}_t\| = \mathbb{k}(t, t)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, it follows that

$$|g_t^{(\star, \epsilon)} - g_t^\star| \leq \|g^{(\star, \epsilon)} - g^\star\| \sup_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \mathbb{k}(t, t)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Since $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \mathbb{k}(t, t)^{\frac{1}{2}} < \infty$ and $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \|g^{(\star, \epsilon)} - g^\star\| = 0$, we have $g_t^{(\star, \epsilon)} \xrightarrow{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} g_t^\star$, uniformly in \mathbb{T} , and proof concludes. \blacksquare

G. Setting Up the Optimization Problem for TC Kernel

Let $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\mathbb{k}(s, t) := e^{-\beta \max(s, t)}$, for $s, t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, where β is a positive real scalar. Accordingly, we define $\varphi_{\omega, t}$ as $\varphi_{\omega, t} := \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{k}(t, s) e^{-j\omega s} ds$, for $\omega, t \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

Lemma 16. For any $\omega, t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, we have

$$\varphi_{\omega, t} = \begin{cases} e^{-\beta t} \left[\frac{1 - e^{-j\omega t}}{j\omega} + \frac{e^{-j\omega t}}{\beta + j\omega} \right], & \text{if } \omega \neq 0, \\ e^{-\beta t} \left(t + \frac{1}{\beta} \right), & \text{if } \omega = 0. \end{cases} \quad (79)$$

Proof. When $\omega \neq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{\omega, t} &= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{k}(t, s) e^{-j\omega s} ds \\ &= \int_0^t e^{-\beta \max(t, s)} e^{-j\omega s} ds + \int_t^\infty e^{-\beta \max(t, s)} e^{-j\omega s} ds \\ &= \int_0^t e^{-\beta t} e^{-j\omega s} ds + \int_t^\infty e^{-\beta s} e^{-j\omega s} ds \\ &= e^{-\beta t} \int_0^t e^{-j\omega s} ds + \int_t^\infty e^{-(\beta + j\omega)s} ds \\ &= e^{-\beta t} \frac{1 - e^{-j\omega t}}{j\omega} + \frac{e^{-(\beta + j\omega)t}}{\beta + j\omega} \\ &= e^{-\beta t} \left[\frac{1 - e^{-j\omega t}}{j\omega} + \frac{e^{-j\omega t}}{\beta + j\omega} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The case $\omega = 0$ follows from similar line of arguments. \blacksquare

Proposition 17. For any $\omega, t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{\omega, t}^{(r)} &= \begin{cases} e^{-\beta t} \operatorname{real}\left(\frac{1 - e^{-j\omega t}}{j\omega} + \frac{e^{-j\omega t}}{\beta + j\omega}\right), & \text{if } \omega \neq 0, \\ e^{-\beta t} \left(t + \frac{1}{\beta}\right), & \text{if } \omega = 0, \end{cases} \\ \varphi_{\omega, t}^{(i)} &= \begin{cases} e^{-\beta t} \operatorname{imag}\left(\frac{1 - e^{-j\omega t}}{j\omega} + \frac{e^{-j\omega t}}{\beta + j\omega}\right), & \text{if } \omega \neq 0, \\ 0, & \text{if } \omega = 0. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

Proof. From Lemma 3 and definition of $\varphi_{\omega, t}^{(r)}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{\omega, t}^{(r)} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{k}(t, s) \cos(\omega s) ds \\ &= \operatorname{real}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{k}(t, s) e^{-j\omega s} ds\right) = \operatorname{real}(\varphi_{\omega, t}). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, one has $\varphi_{\omega, t}^{(i)} = \operatorname{imag}(\varphi_{\omega, t})$. Following these, the claim concluded from Lemma 16. \blacksquare

For any $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+$, define $\zeta_r(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ and $\zeta_i(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_r(\omega_1, \omega_2) &:= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \varphi_{\omega_2, t}^{(r)} e^{-j\omega_1 t} dt, \\ \zeta_i(\omega_1, \omega_2) &:= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \varphi_{\omega_2, t}^{(i)} e^{-j\omega_1 t} dt. \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

Lemma 18. Let $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+$. If $\omega_2 \neq 0$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_r(\omega_1, \omega_2) &= \frac{\beta}{2} \left[\frac{1}{(\omega_2^2 - j\omega_2\beta)(\beta + j\omega_1 + j\omega_2)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{(\omega_2^2 + j\omega_2\beta)(\beta + j\omega_1 - j\omega_2)} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_i(\omega_1, \omega_2) &= \frac{\beta}{2j} \left[\frac{1}{(\omega_2^2 - j\omega_2\beta)(\beta + j\omega_1 + j\omega_2)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{(\omega_2^2 + j\omega_2\beta)(\beta + j\omega_1 - j\omega_2)} \right] - \frac{1}{\omega_2} \frac{1}{(\beta + j\omega_1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

If $\omega_2 = 0$, then $\zeta_i(\omega_1, \omega_2) = 0$ and

$$\zeta_r(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \frac{2\beta + j\omega_1}{\beta(\beta + j\omega_1)^2}. \quad (84)$$

Proof. Note that for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$, we have $\text{real}(z) = \frac{1}{2}(z + z^*)$, where z^* denotes the complex conjugate of z . Accordingly, when $\omega_2 \neq 0$, from (80) and the definition of ζ_r , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta_r(\omega_1, \omega_2) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left[\frac{e^{-\beta t}}{j\omega_2} + \left(\frac{1}{\beta + j\omega_2} - \frac{1}{j\omega_2} \right) e^{-(\beta + j\omega_2)t} \right] \\ &\quad + \left[-\frac{e^{-\beta t}}{j\omega_2} + \left(\frac{1}{\beta - j\omega_2} + \frac{1}{j\omega_2} \right) e^{-(\beta - j\omega_2)t} \right] e^{-j\omega_1 t} dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left[\left(\frac{1}{\beta + j\omega_2} - \frac{1}{j\omega_2} \right) e^{-(\beta + j\omega_1 + j\omega_2)t} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\frac{1}{\beta - j\omega_2} + \frac{1}{j\omega_2} \right) e^{-(\beta + j\omega_1 - j\omega_2)t} \right] dt.\end{aligned}$$

Accordingly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta_r(\omega_1, \omega_2) &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\beta + j\omega_2} - \frac{1}{j\omega_2} \right) \frac{1}{\beta + j\omega_1 + j\omega_2} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\beta - j\omega_2} + \frac{1}{j\omega_2} \right) \frac{1}{\beta + j\omega_1 - j\omega_2}.\end{aligned}$$

Subsequently, we have (82). The claim for the other cases can be proved based on similar line of arguments. ■

Proposition 19. For any $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \varphi_{\omega_1}^{(r)}, \varphi_{\omega_2}^{(r)} \rangle &= \text{real}(\zeta_r(\omega_1, \omega_2)), \quad \langle \varphi_{\omega_1}^{(r)}, \varphi_{\omega_2}^{(i)} \rangle = \text{real}(\zeta_i(\omega_1, \omega_2)), \\ \langle \varphi_{\omega_1}^{(i)}, \varphi_{\omega_2}^{(r)} \rangle &= \text{imag}(\zeta_r(\omega_1, \omega_2)), \quad \langle \varphi_{\omega_1}^{(i)}, \varphi_{\omega_2}^{(i)} \rangle = \text{imag}(\zeta_i(\omega_1, \omega_2)).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. This is a straightforward result from (18), (15), and the definition of ζ_r and ζ_i . ■

Proposition 20. Define $z_u(\omega, \tau)$ as

$$z_u(\omega, \tau) := \begin{cases} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left(\frac{e^{-\beta t}}{j\omega} + \frac{\beta e^{-(\beta + j\omega)t}}{\omega^2 - j\omega\beta} \right) u_{\tau-t} dt, & \text{if } \omega \neq 0, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} e^{-\beta t} \left(t + \frac{1}{\beta} \right) u_{\tau-t} dt, & \text{if } \omega = 0. \end{cases} \quad (85)$$

for $\omega, \tau \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Then, we have

$$\langle \varphi_{\omega}^{(r)}, \varphi_{\tau}^{(u)} \rangle = \text{real}(z_u(\beta, \omega, \tau)), \quad (86)$$

$$\langle \varphi_{\omega}^{(i)}, \varphi_{\tau}^{(u)} \rangle = \text{imag}(z_u(\beta, \omega, \tau)). \quad (87)$$

Proof. When $\omega \neq 0$, from (80), (2) and Lemma 5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \varphi_{\omega}^{(r)}, \varphi_{\tau}^{(u)} \rangle &= \int_0^{\infty} \varphi_{\omega, t}^{(r)} u_{\tau-t} dt \\ &= \int_0^{\infty} e^{-\beta t} \text{real} \left(\frac{1 - e^{-j\omega t}}{j\omega} + \frac{e^{-j\omega t}}{\beta + j\omega} \right) u_{\tau-t} dt \\ &= \text{real} \left(\int_0^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{j\omega} e^{-\beta t} + \frac{\beta}{\omega^2 - j\omega\beta} e^{-(\beta + j\omega)t} \right) u_{\tau-t} dt \right).\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, when $\omega = 0$, one has

$$\langle \varphi_{\omega}^{(r)}, \varphi_{\tau}^{(u)} \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \varphi_{\omega, t}^{(r)} u_{\tau-t} dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} e^{-\beta t} \left(t + \frac{1}{\beta} \right) u_{\tau-t} dt.$$

The other equality can be shown in a similar way. ■

Remark 4. When $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+$, using similar lines of arguments, one can introduce results analogous to Lemma 16, Proposition 17, Lemma 18, Proposition 19 and Proposition 20.

Remark 5. For the case of $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+$, for $z_u(\omega, \tau)$, we have a finite summation in a similar form to (85), when the system is initially at rest, that is $u_t = 0$, for $t < 0$.

The set of piecewise constant functions are dense in \mathcal{L}_p , i.e., one can approximate precisely almost any signal of interest using a piecewise constant signal. Motivated by this fact, let assume the input signal $u = (u_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ is given as a piecewise constant function defined as

$$u_t = \sum_{i=0}^{n_s-1} \xi_{i+1} \mathbf{1}_{[s_i, s_{i+1})}(t), \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}_+, \quad (88)$$

where $n_s \in \mathbb{N}$, $\xi_i \in \mathbb{R}$, for $i = 0, \dots, n_s$, and $(s_0, s_1, \dots, s_{n_s})$ is a finite increasing sequence in \mathbb{R}_+ such that $s_0 = 0$.

Proposition 21. Let $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Then, if $\omega \neq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}z_u(\omega, \tau) &= \sum_{i=0}^{n_s-1} \xi_{i+1} \left[\frac{e^{-\beta \bar{s}_{i+1}(\tau)} - e^{-\beta \bar{s}_i(\tau)}}{j\omega\beta} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\beta e^{-(\beta + j\omega)\bar{s}_{i+1}(\tau)} - \beta e^{-(\beta + j\omega)\bar{s}_i(\tau)}}{(\omega^2 - j\omega\beta)(\beta + j\omega)} \right].\end{aligned} \quad (89)$$

and, if $\omega = 0$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}z_u(\omega, \tau) &= \sum_{i=0}^{n_s-1} \frac{\xi_{i+1}}{\beta^2} \left[(\beta \bar{s}_{i+1}(\tau) + 2) e^{-\beta \bar{s}_{i+1}(\tau)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - (\beta \bar{s}_i(\tau) + 2) e^{-\beta \bar{s}_i(\tau)} \right],\end{aligned} \quad (90)$$

where $\bar{s}_i(\tau) := \max(\tau - s_i, 0)$, for $i = 0, \dots, n_s$.

Proof. From (88) and (85), if $\omega \neq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}z_u(\omega, \tau) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left[\frac{e^{-\beta t}}{j\omega} + \frac{\beta e^{-(\beta + j\omega)t}}{\omega^2 - j\omega\beta} \right] \sum_{i=0}^{n_s-1} \xi_{i+1} \mathbf{1}_{[s_i, s_{i+1})}(\tau - t) dt \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{n_s-1} \xi_{i+1} \int_{\bar{s}_{i+1}(\tau)}^{\bar{s}_i(\tau)} \frac{e^{-\beta t}}{j\omega} dt + \int_{\bar{s}_{i+1}(\tau)}^{\bar{s}_i(\tau)} \frac{\beta e^{-(\beta + j\omega)t}}{\omega^2 - j\omega\beta} dt,\end{aligned}$$

which concludes (89) when we replace the integrals with their closed-form values. Similarly, one can show (90). ■

Note that using (89) and (90), the inner products in Proposition 20 can be obtained as a finite sum rather than an improper integral.

Define $\psi : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(t, a, b) &:= \frac{1}{\beta} (e^{-\beta \max(\min(t, b), a)} - e^{-\beta b}) \\ &\quad + \left[\max(\min(t, b), a) - a \right] e^{-\beta t}.\end{aligned} \quad (91)$$

for any $a, b, t \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

Lemma 22. For any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $a \leq b$, we have

$$\psi(t, a, b) = \int_a^b e^{-\beta \max(t, s)} ds. \quad (92)$$

Proof. Considering three cases of $t < a$, $t > b$ and $t \in [a, b]$ and then evaluating the integral $\int_a^b e^{-\beta \max(t, s)} ds$, one can obtain (91) by comparing the resulting values. ■

Proposition 23. For any $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, we have

$$\varphi_{\tau, t}^{(u)} = \sum_{i=0}^{n_s-1} \xi_{i+1} \psi(t, \bar{s}_{i+1}(\tau), \bar{s}_i(\tau)). \quad (93)$$

Proof. From (88) and Lemma 5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi_{\tau,t}^{(u)} &= \langle \varphi_{\tau}^{(u)}, \mathbb{k}_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k} \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{k}(t,s) u(\tau-s) ds \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{k}(t,s) \sum_{i=0}^{n_s-1} \xi_{i+1} \mathbf{1}_{[s_i, s_{i+1})}(\tau-s) ds \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{n_s-1} \xi_{i+1} \int_{\bar{s}_{i+1}(\tau)}^{\bar{s}_i(\tau)} e^{-\beta \max(t,s)} ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{94}$$

Subsequently, the claim follows from Lemma 22. ■

Lemma 24. Define function $\nu : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\nu(x,y) := \int_0^x \int_0^y \mathbb{k}(s,t) dt ds. \tag{95}$$

Then, we have

$$\nu(x,y) = \frac{1}{\beta^2} \left[2 - 2e^{-\beta \min(x,y)} - \beta \min(x,y) (e^{-\beta x} + e^{-\beta y}) \right]. \tag{96}$$

Proof. Since $\mathbb{k}(s,t) = \mathbb{k}(t,s)$, without loss of generality, let assume $x \leq y$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu(x,y) &= \int_0^x \int_0^y \mathbb{k}(s,t) dt ds \\
&= \int_0^x \int_0^y e^{-\beta \max(s,t)} dt ds \\
&= \int_0^x \int_0^s e^{-\beta \max(s,t)} dt ds + \int_0^x \int_s^y e^{-\beta \max(s,t)} dt ds \\
&= \int_0^x \int_0^s e^{-\beta s} dt ds + \int_0^x \int_s^y e^{-\beta t} dt ds \\
&= \int_0^x s e^{-\beta s} ds + \int_0^x \frac{1}{\beta} (e^{-\beta s} - e^{-\beta y}) ds \\
&= \int_0^x s e^{-\beta s} ds + \frac{1}{\beta^2} (1 - e^{-\beta x}) - \frac{x}{\beta} e^{-\beta y} \int_0^x s e^{-\beta s} ds \\
&= \frac{1}{\beta^2} - \frac{1}{\beta} \left(x + \frac{1}{\beta} \right) e^{-\beta x} + \frac{1}{\beta^2} (1 - e^{-\beta x}) - \frac{x}{\beta} e^{-\beta y} \\
&= \frac{1}{\beta^2} \left(2 - 2e^{-\beta x} - x\beta (e^{-\beta x} + e^{-\beta y}) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Accordingly, since $x = \min(x,y)$ and $y = \max(x,y)$, one has (96). ■

For each $i, j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n_s - 1\}$, define function $\kappa_{ij} : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ such that, for any $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa_{ij}(\tau_1, \tau_2) &= \nu(\bar{s}_i(\tau_1), \bar{s}_j(\tau_2)) - \nu(\bar{s}_{i+1}(\tau_1), \bar{s}_j(\tau_2)) \\
&\quad - \nu(\bar{s}_i(\tau_1), \bar{s}_{j+1}(\tau_2)) + \nu(\bar{s}_{i+1}(\tau_1), \bar{s}_{j+1}(\tau_2)).
\end{aligned} \tag{97}$$

Proposition 25. For any $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+$, we have

$$\langle \varphi_{\tau_1}^{(u)}, \varphi_{\tau_2}^{(u)} \rangle = \sum_{i=0}^{n_s-1} \sum_{j=0}^{n_s-1} \xi_{i+1} \xi_{j+1} \kappa_{ij}(\tau_1, \tau_2). \tag{98}$$

Proof. Due to (95), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \mathbb{k}(s,t) \mathbf{1}_{[s_j, s_{j+1})}(\tau_2 - t) \mathbf{1}_{[s_i, s_{i+1})}(\tau_1 - s) dt ds \\
&= \int_{\bar{s}_{i+1}(\tau_1)}^{\bar{s}_i(\tau_1)} \int_{\bar{s}_{j+1}(\tau_2)}^{\bar{s}_j(\tau_2)} \mathbb{k}(s,t) dt ds \\
&= \nu(\bar{s}_i(\tau_1), \bar{s}_j(\tau_2)) - \nu(\bar{s}_{i+1}(\tau_1), \bar{s}_j(\tau_2)) \\
&\quad - \nu(\bar{s}_i(\tau_1), \bar{s}_{j+1}(\tau_2)) + \nu(\bar{s}_{i+1}(\tau_1), \bar{s}_{j+1}(\tau_2)).
\end{aligned} \tag{99}$$

From other hand, due to Lemma 5 and (88), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \varphi_{\tau_1}^{(u)}, \varphi_{\tau_2}^{(u)} \rangle &= \int_0^\infty \varphi_{\tau_2, s}^{(u)} \sum_{i=0}^{n_s-1} \xi_{i+1} \mathbf{1}_{[s_i, s_{i+1})}(\tau_1 - s) ds \\
&= \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \mathbb{k}(s,t) \sum_{j=0}^{n_s-1} \xi_{j+1} \mathbf{1}_{[s_j, s_{j+1})}(\tau_2 - t) \\
&\quad \sum_{i=0}^{n_s-1} \xi_{i+1} \mathbf{1}_{[s_i, s_{i+1})}(\tau_1 - s) dt ds \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{n_s-1} \sum_{j=0}^{n_s-1} \xi_{i+1} \xi_{j+1} \left[\int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \mathbb{k}(s,t) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \mathbf{1}_{[s_j, s_{j+1})}(\tau_2 - t) \mathbf{1}_{[s_i, s_{i+1})}(\tau_1 - s) dt ds \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Accordingly, one can conclude (98) due to (99). ■

Proposition 26. Let $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+$ and the system be initially at rest, i.e., we have $u_t = 0$, for $t < 0$. Also, let assume that $t_i = i$, for $i = 0, \dots, n_\varphi - 1$. Define matrix $\mathbf{K} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\varphi \times n_\varphi}$ as $\mathbf{K} := [\mathbb{k}(t-1, s-1)]_{t=1, s=1}^{n_\varphi, n_\varphi}$ and Toeplitz matrix $\mathbf{T}_u \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\varphi \times n_\varphi}$ as $\mathbf{T}_u := [u_{t-s}]_{t=1, s=1}^{n_\varphi, n_\varphi}$. Then, we have

$$\left[\langle \varphi_{i-1}^{(u)}, \varphi_{j-1}^{(u)} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k} \right]_{i=1, j=1}^{n_\varphi, n_\varphi} = \mathbf{T}_u \mathbf{K} \mathbf{T}_u^\top. \tag{100}$$

Proof. The claim is a straightforward result of (24) and the definition of matrices \mathbf{K} and \mathbf{T}_u . ■

H. Utilizing Barrier Method

Let $p : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $p_j : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, for $j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\mathcal{P})}$, be respectively defined as $p(x) := \frac{1}{2} \|Ax - y\|^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} x^\top \Phi x$ and $p_j(x) := \frac{1}{2} x^\top (b_j b_j^\top + c_j c_j^\top) x - \frac{1}{2} (1 - \epsilon)$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Then, the optimization problem (58) can be written as

$$\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^m} p(x) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\mathcal{P})}} \mathcal{I}(p_j(x)), \tag{101}$$

where $\mathcal{I} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\}$ is defined as $\mathcal{I}(x) := \delta_{(-\infty, 0]}(x)$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. The solution approach utilizing logarithmic barrier function approximates \mathcal{I} in (101) successively and solves the resulting convex program to obtain a sequence in \mathbb{R}^m converging to the solution of (101). More precisely, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $b_n : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\}$ be the function defined as $b_n(x) := -\theta_n \ln(-x)$, for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, where $\{\theta_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is a decreasing sequence such that $\theta_n \downarrow 0$. Define function $f_n : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\}$ as following

$$f_n(x) := p(x) - \theta_n \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\mathcal{P})}} \ln(-p_j(x)), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^m, \tag{102}$$

for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The gradient of f_n is

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla f_n(x) &= A^\top Ax + \lambda \Phi x + q \\ &\quad - \theta_n \sum_{j=0}^{n_\varphi} \frac{(b_j^\top x)b_j + (c_j^\top x)c_j}{r + \frac{1}{2}(b_j^\top x)^2 + \frac{1}{2}(c_j^\top x)^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (103)$$

and, the Hessian of f_n is

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^2 f_n(x) &= A^\top A + \lambda \Phi - \theta_n \sum_{j=0}^{n_\varphi} \frac{b_j b_j^\top + c_j c_j^\top}{r + \frac{1}{2}(b_j^\top x)^2 + \frac{1}{2}(c_j^\top x)^2} \\ &\quad + \theta_n \sum_{j=0}^{n_\varphi} \frac{((b_j^\top x)b_j + (c_j^\top x)c_j) ((b_j^\top x)b_j + (c_j^\top x)c_j)^\top}{(r + \frac{1}{2}(b_j^\top x)^2 + \frac{1}{2}(c_j^\top x)^2)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (104)$$

Given the gradient and the Hessian of f_n in (103) and (104), one may employ an iterative optimization scheme such as Newton method or (L-)BFGS method [61] to find x_n , the solution of the convex program $\min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^m} f_n(x)$. Note that $x = \mathbf{0}$ is feasible in (58). Also, one can see that the feasible set in (58) is a convex set with non-empty interior, and consequently, it is guaranteed [61] that $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ converges to the solution of (101).

Given Φx , we have the value of Ax as well as $b_j^\top x$ and $c_j^\top x$, for $j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\varphi)}$. Accordingly, by obtaining the vector Φx , one can calculate the value in (103) efficiently. Moreover, one can see from (104) that the matrices $A^\top A + \lambda \Phi$ and $b_j b_j^\top + c_j c_j^\top$, for $j \in \mathcal{I}^{(\varphi)}$, can be calculated only once in the optimization procedure. Note that since (L-)BFGS only employs the gradients of f_n , it is preferred when n_φ is large.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Zadeh, "On the identification problem," *IRE Transactions on Circuit Theory*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 277–281, 1956.
- [2] L. Ljung, *System identification: Theory for the user*. Prentice Hall, 1999.
- [3] —, "Perspectives on system identification," *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 1–12, 2010.
- [4] J. Schoukens and L. Ljung, "Nonlinear system identification: A user-oriented road map," *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, vol. 39, no. 6, pp. 28–99, 2019.
- [5] J. Umenberger and I. R. Manchester, "Specialized interior-point algorithm for stable nonlinear system identification," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 64, no. 6, pp. 2442–2456, 2018.
- [6] M. Khosravi and R. S. Smith, "Nonlinear system identification with prior knowledge on the region of attraction," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 1091–1096, 2021.
- [7] K. Hara, M. Inoue, and N. Sebe, "Learning Koopman operator under dissipativity constraints," *arXiv:1911.03884*, 2019.
- [8] M. Khosravi and R. S. Smith, "Convex nonparametric formulation for identification of gradient flows," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 1097–1102, 2021.
- [9] A. A. Ahmadi and B. El Khadir, "Learning dynamical systems with side information (short version)," *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 120, pp. 718–727, 2020.
- [10] M. Khosravi, "Representer theorem for learning Koopman operators," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.01681*, 2021 (to appear in *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*).
- [11] M. Khosravi, M. Yin, A. Iannelli, A. Parsi, and R. S. Smith, "Low-complexity identification by sparse hyperparameter estimation," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 412–417, 2020, IFAC World Congress 2020.
- [12] M. Khosravi, A. Iannelli, M. Yin, A. Parsi, and R. S. Smith, "Regularized system identification: A hierarchical Bayesian approach," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 406–411, 2020, IFAC World Congress 2020.
- [13] P. Shah, B. N. Bhaskar, G. Tang, and B. Recht, "Linear system identification via atomic norm regularization," in *Conference on Decision and Control*, 2012, pp. 6265–6270.
- [14] G. Pillonetto, T. Chen, A. Chiuso, G. D. Nicolao, and L. Ljung, "Regularized linear system identification using atomic, nuclear and kernel-based norms: The role of the stability constraint," *Automatica*, vol. 69, pp. 137–149, 2016.
- [15] R. S. Smith, "Frequency domain subspace identification using nuclear norm minimization and Hankel matrix realizations," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 59, no. 11, pp. 2886–2896, 2014.
- [16] M. Fazel, T. K. Pong, D. Sun, and P. Tseng, "Hankel matrix rank minimization with applications to system identification and realization," *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 946–977, 2013.
- [17] K. Mohan and M. Fazel, "Reweighted nuclear norm minimization with application to system identification," in *American Control Conference*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 2953–2959.
- [18] M. Khosravi and R. S. Smith, "Kernel-based identification of positive systems," in *Conference on Decision and Control*, 2019, pp. 1740–1745.
- [19] C. Grussler, J. Umenberger, and I. R. Manchester, "Identification of externally positive systems," in *Conference on Decision and Control*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 6549–6554.
- [20] J. Umenberger and I. R. Manchester, "Scalable identification of stable positive systems," in *Conference on Decision and Control*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 4630–4635.
- [21] A. De Santis and L. Farina, "Identification of positive linear systems with Poisson output transformation," *Automatica*, vol. 38, no. 5, pp. 861–868, 2002.
- [22] M. Zheng and Y. Ohta, "Positive FIR system identification using maximum entropy prior," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 51, no. 15, pp. 7–12, 2018.
- [23] L. Benvenuti, A. De Santis, and L. Farina, "On model consistency in compartmental systems identification," *Automatica*, vol. 38, no. 11, pp. 1969–1976, 2002.
- [24] I. Goethals, T. Van Gestel, J. Suykens, P. Van Dooren, and B. De Moor, "Identification of positive real models in subspace identification by using regularization," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 48, no. 10, pp. 1843–1847, 2003.
- [25] J. B. Hoagg, S. L. Lacy, R. S. Erwin, and D. S. Bernstein, "First-order-hold sampling of positive real systems and subspace identification of positive real models," in *American control conference*, vol. 1. IEEE, 2004, pp. 861–866.
- [26] M. Okada and T. Sugie, "Subspace system identification considering both noise attenuation and use of prior knowledge," in *Conference on Decision and Control*, vol. 4. IEEE, 1996, pp. 3662–3667.
- [27] D. N. Miller and R. A. De Callafon, "Subspace identification with eigenvalue constraints," *Automatica*, vol. 49, no. 8, pp. 2468–2473, 2013.
- [28] M. Inoue, "Subspace identification with moment matching," *Automatica*, vol. 99, pp. 22–32, 2019.
- [29] Y. Abe, M. Inoue, and S. Adachi, "Subspace identification method incorporated with a priori information characterized in frequency domain," in *European Control Conference*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 1377–1382.
- [30] A. Alenany, H. Shang, M. Soliman, and I. Ziedan, "Improved subspace identification with prior information using constrained least squares," *IET Control Theory and Applications*, vol. 5, no. 13, pp. 1568–1576, 2011.
- [31] S. Yoshimura, A. Matsubayashi, and M. Inoue, "System identification method inheriting steady-state characteristics of existing model," *International Journal of Control*, vol. 92, no. 11, pp. 2701–2711, 2019.
- [32] S. L. Lacy and D. S. Bernstein, "Subspace identification with guaranteed stability using constrained optimization," *IEEE Transactions on automatic control*, vol. 48, no. 7, pp. 1259–1263, 2003.
- [33] G. Pillonetto and G. De Nicolao, "A new kernel-based approach for linear system identification," *Automatica*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 81–93, 2010.
- [34] L. Ljung, T. Chen, and B. Mu, "A shift in paradigm for system identification," *International Journal of Control*, vol. 93, no. 2, pp. 173–180, 2020.
- [35] G. Pillonetto, F. Dinuzzo, T. Chen, G. De Nicolao, and L. Ljung, "Kernel methods in system identification, machine learning and function estimation: A survey," *Automatica*, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 657–682, 2014.
- [36] A. Chiuso and G. Pillonetto, "System identification: A machine learning perspective," *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, vol. 2, pp. 281–304, 2019.
- [37] M. Khosravi and R. S. Smith, "On robustness of kernel-based regularized system identification," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 54, no. 7, pp. 749–754, 2021, IFAC Symposium on System Identification.
- [38] N. Aronszajn, "Theory of reproducing kernels," *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 68, no. 3, pp. 337–404, 1950.
- [39] T. Chen, "On kernel design for regularized LTI system identification," *Automatica*, vol. 90, pp. 109–122, 2018.

- [40] M. Khosravi and R. S. Smith, "Kernel-based impulse response identification with side-information on steady-state gain," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.00409*, 2021.
- [41] A. Marconato, M. Schoukens, and J. Schoukens, "Filter-based regularisation for impulse response modelling," *IET Control Theory and Applications*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 194–204, 2016.
- [42] M. Khosravi and R. S. Smith, "Regularized identification with internal positivity side-information," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.00407*, 2021.
- [43] J. C. Willems, "Dissipative dynamical systems part I: General theory," *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, vol. 45, no. 5, pp. 321–351, 1972.
- [44] G. Zames, "On the input-output stability of time-varying nonlinear feedback systems part one: Conditions derived using concepts of loop gain, conicity, and positivity," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 228–238, 1966.
- [45] B. Brogliato, R. Lozano, B. Maschke, and O. Egeland, *Dissipative Systems Analysis and Control*. Springer, 2007.
- [46] M. I. Müller, P. E. Valenzuela, A. Proutiere, and C. R. Rojas, "A stochastic multi-armed bandit approach to nonparametric \mathcal{H}_∞ -norm estimation," in *Conference on Decision and Control*, 2017, pp. 4632–4637.
- [47] A. Romer, J. M. Montenbruck, and F. Allgöwer, "Determining dissipation inequalities from input-output samples," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 7789–7794, 2017.
- [48] A. Romer, J. Berberich, J. Köhler, and F. Allgöwer, "One-shot verification of dissipativity properties from input–output data," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 709–714, 2019.
- [49] A. Koch, J. M. Montenbruck, and F. Allgöwer, "Sampling strategies for data-driven inference of input-output system properties," *arXiv:1910.08919*, 2019.
- [50] A. Koch, J. Berberich, and F. Allgöwer, "Provably robust verification of dissipativity properties from data," *arXiv:2006.05974*, 2020.
- [51] T. Chen and G. Pillonetto, "On the stability of reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces of discrete-time impulse responses," *Automatica*, vol. 95, pp. 529–533, 2018.
- [52] M. Khosravi and R. S. Smith, "The existence and uniqueness of solutions for kernel-based system identification," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.08092*, 2021 (to appear in *Automatica*).
- [53] L. Ljung and R. Singh, "Version 8 of the MATLAB system identification toolbox," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 45, no. 16, pp. 1826–1831, 2012.
- [54] A. C. Antoulas, *Approximation of Large-scale Dynamical Systems*. SIAM, 2005.
- [55] W. M. Haddad and V. Chellaboina, *Nonlinear Dynamical Systems and Control*. Princeton University Press, 2011.
- [56] A. Berlinet and C. Thomas-Agnan, *Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Spaces in Probability and Statistics*. Springer Science and Business Media, 2011.
- [57] C. Carmeli, E. De Vito, and A. Toigo, "Vector valued reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces of integrable functions and Mercer theorem," *Analysis and Applications*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 377–408, 2006.
- [58] J. Peypouquet, *Convex Optimization in Normed Spaces: Theory, Methods and Examples*. Springer, 2015.
- [59] B. Schölkopf, R. Herbrich, and A. J. Smola, "A generalized representer theorem," in *International Conference on Computational Learning Theory*. Springer, 2001, pp. 416–426.
- [60] F. Dinuzzo and B. Schölkopf, "The representer theorem for Hilbert spaces: A necessary and sufficient condition," in *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2012, pp. 189–196.
- [61] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge university press, 2004.
- [62] N. Srinivas, A. Krause, S. M. Kakade, and M. W. Seeger, "Information-theoretic regret bounds for Gaussian process optimization in the bandit setting," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 58, no. 5, pp. 3250–3265, 2012.
- [63] M. Scandella, M. Mazzoleni, S. Formentin, and F. Previdi, "Kernel-based identification of asymptotically stable continuous-time linear dynamical systems," *International Journal of Control*, pp. 1–14, 2021.
- [64] H. Garnier and M. Gilson, "CONTSID: a MATLAB toolbox for standard and advanced identification of black-box continuous-time models," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 51, no. 15, pp. 688–693, 2018.
- [65] H. Garnier, L. Wang, and P. C. Young, "Direct identification of continuous-time models from sampled data: Issues, basic solutions and relevance," in *Identification of continuous-time models from sampled data*. Springer, 2008, pp. 1–29.