

Online Stabilization of Unknown Networked Systems with Communication Constraints

Jing Yu¹, Dimitar Ho¹, and Adam Wierman¹

¹Department of Computing and Mathematical Science, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, USA

Abstract

We investigate the problem of stabilizing an unknown networked linear system under communication constraints and adversarial disturbances. We propose the first provably stabilizing algorithm for the problem. The algorithm uses a distributed version of nested convex body chasing to maintain a consistent estimate of the network dynamics and applies system level synthesis to determine a distributed controller based on this estimated model. Our approach avoids the need for system identification and accommodates a broad class of communication delay while being fully distributed and scaling favorably with the number of subsystems in the network.

1 Introduction

Large-scale networked dynamical systems play a crucial role in many emerging engineering systems such as the power grid (Fang et al., 2011), autonomous vehicle platoons (Li et al., 2015), and swarm robots (Morgan et al., 2014). Two salient features of such systems that lead to major challenges for controller design are scalability and information/communication constraints.

First, scalability is a significant challenge since the number of subsystems in large networked systems is growing exponentially for modern applications. As a result, designing local and distributed control algorithms is especially crucial. Extensive work has investigated scalable control algorithm design for large-scale systems (Wang et al., 2014; Zheng et al., 2017; Sturz et al., 2020; Matni and Chandrasekaran, 2016; Wang et al., 2018).

Second, a consequence of the growing scale is that information and communication constraints, e.g., resulting from delay, impose significant structural constraints on controller design (Fardad and Jovanović, 2014; Han and Skelton, 2003). Specifically, each subsystem only observes delayed partial state feedback as opposed to instantaneous global state feedback in large-scale networked systems. The structural constraints resulting from this are generally non-convex even for linear suboptimal controller design (Rotkowitz and Lall, 2005) and the optimal controller design problem for general information constraints remains open (Witsenhausen, 1968). Therefore, a large body of work has investigated the challenging problem of control design for communication constraints with convex reformulation under special cases (Zheng et al., 2020, & references therein), with System Level Synthesis (SLS) (Anderson et al., 2019) emerging as a promising approach.

Control methods seeking to address the two challenges above heavily rely on the knowledge of the system model. However, as engineering systems become more complex with larger scales, it is restrictive to assume perfect knowledge of the underlying model. Therefore, learning techniques are required. Recently there has been growing interest in learning distributed controllers for unknown networked linear time invariant (LTI) systems (Bu et al., 2019; Faradonbeh and Modi, 2022; Furieri et al., 2020; Ye et al., 2021; Li et al., 2021b). However, since most existing literature ports centralized learning-based control techniques over to the distributed case, they a priori assume that the underlying dynamics are stable, or that a stabilizing distributed controller is known. For a large-scale networked system, such assumptions are typically unrealistic, since designing stabilizing distributed controllers itself is a nontrivial task as described above. Further, until now, scalability and information constraints have only been considered separately; no general approach exists.

In this work, we address scalability and information constraints simultaneously for unknown networked systems and address the following fundamental question:

Is it possible to scalably stabilize an unknown networked system with communication delay under adversarial disturbances?

We remark that stability is one of the central goals for the control of dynamical systems. Many engineering problems, such as set point tracking in chemical process or altitude maintenance in flight control, can be cast and solved as stabilization problems. Therefore, the primary goal of control design is stabilization. Learning a stabilizing controller when the dynamics is unknown has been shown to be challenging even in the centralized case and many recent works focus on this sole issue, e.g., see [Zhang et al. \(2021\)](#); [Lamperski \(2020\)](#); [Perdomo et al. \(2021\)](#).

Contributions. In this paper, we propose the first online algorithm that provably stabilizes a networked LTI system under adversarial disturbances without any prior knowledge of the true dynamics (Theorem 1). The proposed algorithm (Algorithm 1) is fully distributed and handles a large class of information constraints, while also scaling favorably to the number of subsystems in the network.

In particular, this work presents the first distributed stabilization technique for unknown systems under adversarial disturbances, and does not require identifying the underlying system. As demonstrated in Appendix B, system identification-based stabilization methods incur prohibitively large state norm due to adversarial disturbances. On the other hand, our approach significantly improves the system behavior because it does not require full excitation of the system. The proposed algorithm is built on a distributed version of the nested convex body Steiner point chasing algorithm for selecting dynamics parameters that are consistent with online observations at each subsystem locally. The selected consistent parameters are then used for local distributed controller synthesis where we adopt SLS as the control strategy. Each local SLS synthesis problem is a low-dimensional optimization problem that uses delayed information. Previous applications of SLS in learning-based control problems have only leveraged the SLS parameterization result ([Boczar et al., 2018](#); [Dean et al., 2020a](#); [Umenberger and Schön, 2020](#)). Our work is the first to explore the controller realization result for SLS, where it is instrumental to the analysis and the scalability of the algorithm. Therefore we shed new light on the usefulness of SLS for learning and control problems with information constraints.

The main result of this paper is the following stability guarantee (Theorem 1),

$$\sup_t \{ \|x(t)\|_\infty, \|u(t)\|_\infty \} \leq O \left(e^{\text{poly}(\bar{n})\bar{d}} \cdot \left(e^{-t/H} x(0) + W \right) \right),$$

where \bar{d} and \bar{n} are local constants depending on the network connectivity and can be much smaller than the global dimensions. This result provides a first quantification of the effect of communication delay in fully-distributed learning-based control problems. Further, along the way, we prove a set of technical lemmas that are of independent interests when SLS controllers are used for learning-based control. In particular, we derive a sensitivity result for SLS synthesis (Theorem 2) that globally bounds the sensitivity of the optimal solution to the SLS synthesis problem with respect to the model, which is also applicable to a class of MPC problems.

Related work. This work contributes to a large and growing body of work on the topics related to learning-based control design, online control, and distributed control. We briefly review the literature most related to this work below.

Stabilization of unknown systems. The problem of stabilization for unknown linear systems has received considerable attention. Most works have developed methods either under the no-noise ([Lamperski, 2020](#); [Talebi et al., 2021b](#)) or stochastic-noise models ([Faradonbeh et al., 2018](#)). Many approaches are based on policy gradient and search over a stabilizing feedback gain matrix ([Perdomo et al., 2021](#); [Zhao et al., 2021](#)). In the adversarial noise setting, the only work that guarantees stabilization for unknown LTI system is [Chen and Hazan \(2021\)](#), where a model-based algorithm exponentially excites all directions of the state space in order to identify the underlying system with a small margin. Recently, [Ho et al. \(2021\)](#) proposes an online nonlinear robust control method that guarantees finite mistakes under adversarial disturbances. Inspired by

Ho et al. (2021), our approach proposes a novel stabilization technique under adversarial disturbances where no system identification is required.

Learning distributed controllers. Significant progress has been made on the design of learning-based centralized LQR controllers when the underlying dynamics are unknown (Dean et al., 2020a; Fazel et al., 2018; Simchowitz and Foster, 2020). As a result, work has begun to explore the problem for the distributed setting. Much of this work has adopted a centralized learning or computational approach with the objective of regret minimization, e.g., Fattahi et al. (2020); Bu et al. (2019); Ye et al. (2021); Faradonbeh and Modi (2022); Furieri et al. (2020). Among these, Fattahi et al. (2020) demonstrates a first use case of SLS theory in learning-based distributed controller learning. However, most prior work that considers distributed learning and control schemes use the stochastic noise or no-noise model, assume a known stabilizing distributed controller is given, and cannot handle general communication delay during learning, e.g., Li et al. (2021b); Alonso et al. (2021); Jing et al. (2021); Alemzadeh and Mesbahi (2019); Talebi et al. (2021a); Alemzadeh et al. (2021). Ho and Doyle (2019) presents an adaptive SLS controller but requires a known stabilizing controller and does not have guaranteed stability for large uncertainties. Here, we propose the first fully distributed learning-based control algorithm that handles general communication delay and adversarial disturbances.

Notation. Let $\|\cdot\|$ be the ℓ_2 norm and $\|\cdot\|_F$ the Frobenius norm. We denote the $(i, j)^{\text{th}}$ position of a matrix M as $M(i, j)$ and use $M(:, j), M(i, :)$ for the j^{th} column and i^{th} row of M respectively. We use $[N]$ for the set of positive integers up to N . Positive integers are denoted as \mathbb{N} . Bold face lower cases are reserved for vector signal of the form $\mathbf{x} := [x(0)^T, x(1)^T, \dots]^T$ with $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is an infinite sequence of vectors. A causal linear operator \mathbf{K} can be represented as an infinite-dimensional lower-triangular Toeplitz matrix with components $K[0], K[1], \dots$, where each $K[k] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. In particular, we write column operator $\mathbf{K}(:, i)$ to mean the operator that maps a sequence of scalars $\{\alpha_i\}$ to a sequence of vectors with components $\alpha_0 \cdot K[0](:, i), \alpha_1 \cdot K[1](:, i), \dots$, where $K[k](:, i)$ is the i^{th} column of $K[k]$. We write $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{K}\mathbf{x}$ to mean that $u(t) = \sum_{k=0}^t K[k]x(t-k)$. Given any binary matrix $\mathcal{C} \in \{1, 0\}^{N \times N}$, we say $M \in \mathcal{C}$ for a matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ if the sparsity of M is \mathcal{C} . We use $\{e_j\}_{j=1}^n$ for the standard basis in \mathbb{R}^n .

2 Preliminaries and Problem Setup

We consider the task of controlling an unknown networked system made up of N interconnected, heterogeneous linear time-invariant (LTI) subsystems, illustrated in Figure 1(a). For each subsystem $i \in [N]$, let $x^i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$, $u^i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$, $w^i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ be the local state, control, and disturbance vectors respectively. Each subsystem i has dynamics,

$$x^i(t+1) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} (A^{ij}x^j(t) + B^{ij}u^j(t)) + w^i(t), \quad (1)$$

where we write $j \in \mathcal{N}(i)$ if the states or control actions of subsystem j affect those of subsystem i through the open-loop network dynamics ($i \in \mathcal{N}(i)$). Concatenating all the subsystem dynamics, we can represent the global dynamics as

$$x(t+1) = Ax(t) + Bu(t) + w(t), \quad (2)$$

where $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$, $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$, $w(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$, with $n_x = \sum_{i=1}^N n_i$ and $n_u = \sum_{i=1}^N m_i$.

We assume that the dynamical connectivity among subsystems is known, *i.e.*, the sets $\mathcal{N}(i)$ for $i \in [N]$ are known. However, the parameters of the dynamics (entries of matrices A^{ij} , B^{ij}) are unknown. We denote the unknown parameters for A and B collectively as $\Theta := \bigcup_{i \in [N]} \theta^i$, where θ^i are the local parameters accounting for A^{ij} and B^{ij} component of the global model $A(\Theta)$, $B(\Theta)$. This is illustrated in Example 1. Due to (1), each subsystem i has a disjoint set of local parameters θ^i that make up the global parameter Θ , so $\theta^i \cap \theta^j = \emptyset$ for all $i \neq j$. We write $A(\Theta)$ and $B(\Theta)$ (equivalently $A^{ij}(\theta^i)$, $B^{ij}(\theta^i)$) to emphasize that A and B are matrices constructed with appropriate zeros according to the network structure (known), and nonzero entries decided by Θ (unknown).

Example 1. Consider the networked system in Figure 1(a) where each subsystem $i \in [6]$ has $x^i(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u^i(t) \in \mathbb{R}$. For each i , the set $\mathcal{N}(i)$ contains the subsystems that has a dashed arrow pointing towards x^i in




Figure 1: Example networked LTI system with information constraints.

the figure. For example, $\mathcal{N}(6) = \{1, 3, 5\}$. Each A^{ij} and B^{ij} for $j \in \mathcal{N}(i)$ is a scalar. The stacked global dynamics has matrix A and B with structure shown in Figure 1(b). The unknown global parameter Θ is a vector containing parameters corresponding to the $*$ entries in A and B . Local parameter θ^i corresponds to the $*$ entries of the i^{th} row of A and B . Since each θ^i accounts for one row of A and B , they are non-overlapping.

We now state the assumptions for the system.

Assumption 1 (Adversarial disturbance). For the global dynamics (2), $\|w(t)\|_\infty \leq W$.

Assumption 2 (Compact Parameter Set). The network structure $\mathcal{N}(i)$ for $i \in [N]$ is known. The true system parameter $\Theta^* := \bigcup_{i \in [N]} \theta^{i,*}$ is an element of a (potentially large) known compact convex set $\mathcal{P}_0 = \mathcal{P}_0^1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{P}_0^N$, which is a product space of local parameter sets where $\theta^{i,*} \in \mathcal{P}_0^i$. The known parameter set is bounded such that $\|A(\Theta)\|_F, \|B(\Theta)\|_F \leq \kappa$ for all $\Theta \in \mathcal{P}_0$.

Assumption 3 (Controllability). For all $\Theta \in \mathcal{P}_0$, $(A(\Theta), B(\Theta))$ is controllable.

Bounded adversarial disturbance is a common assumption in online learning problems (Agarwal et al., 2019; Hazan et al., 2020). Since we make no assumptions on how large W is, Assumption 1 can model a variety of disturbance models, such as bounded stochastic noise or linearization errors for nonlinear dynamics (Tu, 2019). Assumption 2 is standard in learning-based control literature (Cohen et al., 2019; Agarwal et al., 2019). Assumption 3 ensures the wellposedness of the learning-based control problem and is commonly employed (Ibrahimi et al., 2012; Abbasi-Yadkori and Szepesvári, 2011). If a parameter set \mathcal{P}_0 has a few singular points where (A, B) loses controllability such as when $B = 0$, a simple heuristic is to ignore these points in the algorithm since we assume the underlying system is controllable. We discuss the general case of nonconvex parameter sets in Appendix H. For a variety of networked systems such as robotic manipulation (Everett et al., 2021) and power systems (Pal and Chaudhuri, 2006), Assumption 1, 2, 3 hold reasonable.

2.1 Communication Constraints

A key feature of large-scale networked LTI systems is that information observed locally at each subsystem cannot be immediately available to the global network. Instead, information sharing among subsystems is constrained by communication limitations among subsystems. Such limitations lead to delayed partial observation and pose major challenges for learning and control. To formalize communication constraints, we define a communication graph $\mathcal{G}^C = (V^C, E^C)$ for (2), where $V^C = [N]$ and E^C is the set of directed communication link from one subsystem to the other. Self-loops at all vertices are included in \mathcal{G}^C and they represent zero delay. The communication graph is demonstrated by the solid blue lines in Figure 1(a). We now present two representations of the communication constraints induced by \mathcal{G}^C .

Definition 1 (Communication Matrix). A binary matrix $\mathcal{C} \in \{1, 0\}^{N \times N}$ is called the communication matrix of a network with N subsystems, where $\mathcal{C}(i, j) \neq 0$ if and only if $(j, i) \in E^C$.

Definition 2 (Communication Delay). The communication delay from subsystem i to subsystem j is defined to be the graph distance from i to j according to \mathcal{G}^C and is denoted as $d(i \rightarrow j)$.

The two definitions provide a global and local view of the communication constraints. Globally, matrix \mathcal{C}^k for $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ has nonzero (i, j) th entry if subsystem i gets k -delayed information from subsystem j . Locally, at each time step t , subsystem i has access to subsystem j 's full information up to time $t - d(j \rightarrow i)$. Moreover, $d(j \rightarrow i)$ is the smallest integer such that $\mathcal{C}^{d(j \rightarrow i)}(i, j) \neq 0$. With slight abuse of notation, we write \mathcal{C}^k to mean the support of the matrix such that $\mathcal{C}^k \in \{1, 0\}^{N \times N}$.

Given \mathcal{G}^C , we make a mild assumption on the communication constraints. This assumption ensures that the graph describing the global dynamics is a subgraph of the communication graph. Such an assumption is commonly referred to as information nestedness (Ho et al., 1972) and is used frequently in the distributed control literature (Lamperski and Lessard, 2015; Ye et al., 2021). It holds true for many modern engineering systems where communication operates at least as fast as the dynamical propagation. We discuss more about the communication constraints in Appendix E.

Assumption 4 (Communication Topology). $\mathcal{C}(i, j) = 1$ for all $j \in \mathcal{N}(i)$.

Finally, due to communication delay, each subsystem has access to asynchronous information about other subsystems. Therefore, we define $\mathcal{I}(i, t)$ to be the information available to subsystem i at time t . The set $\mathcal{I}(i, t)$ contains sets $\mathcal{I}(j, t - d(j \rightarrow i))$ from other subsystem j with delay $d(j \rightarrow i)$. We end the section by returning to our example.

Example 2. Consider the system in Figure 1(a) where the solid blue line denotes the communication among subsystems. The communication matrix \mathcal{C} is depicted in Figure 1(c). Observe that $\mathcal{C}(1, 3) = 0$ but $\mathcal{C}^2(1, 3) \neq 0$. Therefore, the delay from subsystem 2 to subsystem 1 is $d(2 \rightarrow 1) = 2$.

2.2 Locality for Scalable Implementation

Even though communication delay causes asynchronous partial information for each subsystem, eventually each subsystem can obtain the delayed global information. However, due to the scale of the global system, it can be prohibitively costly for subsystems to compute their local control actions using such delayed global information. Moreover, a larger delay between subsystems means, intuitively, that they are more dynamically decoupled due to Assumption 4. Therefore, by discarding information from far-away subsystems, each subsystem has a smaller and more up-to-date information set.

Following the above intuition, the proposed algorithm requires each subsystem i to only use delayed information from neighbors that are “at most \bar{d} away” for a fixed $\bar{d} \in \mathbb{N}$. Specifically, we define three sets that capture the notion of \bar{d} -neighbors. Formally, we define the set $\mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i) := \{j \in [N] : d(j \rightarrow i) \leq \bar{d}\}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\text{out}}(i) := \{j \in [N] : d(i \rightarrow j) \leq \bar{d}\}$ respectively as the \bar{d} -incoming and \bar{d} -outgoing neighbors of subsystem i according to \mathcal{G}^C . Further, we define a set $\mathcal{M}(i) = \{\ell \in [N] : j \in \mathcal{N}(\ell) \text{ for some } j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{out}}(i)\}$. The intuition behind $\mathcal{M}(i)$ is that subsystem $j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{out}}(i)$ makes decisions based on information from i , and these decisions at j influence ℓ through dynamics because $j \in \mathcal{N}(\ell)$. Therefore, any local decisions at subsystem i should take into account the information from ℓ 's who will be indirectly influenced by i in the future. Together, we call subsystems in $\mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i), \mathcal{D}_{\text{out}}(i), \mathcal{M}(i)$ the \bar{d} -neighbors of i .

The choice of \bar{d} is system-dependent. Given a communication graph, \bar{d} can be treated as a tunable parameter for performance. This form of local control is common, and has been studied both in multi-agent reinforcement learning (Qu et al., 2020b; Lin et al., 2020; Qu et al., 2020a) and distributed control (Alonso and Matni, 2020; Wang et al., 2018) as a method for ensuring a scalable implementation of the control policy in large-scale networked systems.

Our analysis relies on the following standard feasibility assumption regarding the communication and locality considerations.

Assumption 5 (Feasibility). The communication graph \mathcal{G}^C and $\bar{d} \in \mathbb{N}$ is chosen such that for all $\Theta \in \mathcal{P}_0$, there exists a conforming stabilizing distributed controller for $A(\Theta), B(\Theta)$.

A priori verification of this assumption can be performed because the dynamics connectivity and the initial parameter set is known per Assumption 2. Assumption 5 can be seen as the strengthening of Assumption 3 where in addition to controllability, control design for all $A(\Theta), B(\Theta)$ with $\Theta \in \mathcal{P}_0$ is assumed to be feasible for the prescribed communication and locality constraints. Similar to Assumption 3, if singularities exist in the parameter set \mathcal{P}_0 where Assumption 5 does not hold, we exclude these points in the algorithm because the true underlying system is assumed to be feasible.

The rest of the paper demonstrates and analyzes a fully-distributed algorithm that learns to stabilize (2) with unknown true parameter Θ^* subject to the communication and locality constraints under adversarial disturbances in the online setting (without system resets or offline data). We refer Appendix C for a formal definition of stability.

3 Algorithm

We propose a novel online algorithm, presented in Algorithm 1, that for the first time guarantees the stability of unknown interconnected LTI systems with information constraints under bounded adversarial disturbances. The algorithm combines ideas from an online learning method for nested convex body chasing (Bubeck et al., 2020) and the SLS control literature (Anderson et al., 2019). Our approach is distinguished from prior learning-based distributed control policies in that it assumes no knowledge about the underlying true system (such as a known stabilizing controller) and does not perform system identification as part of the algorithm. The algorithm is scalable with respect to the number of subsystems in the network and handles a broad class of communication constraints.

Algorithm 1 works as follows. After observing the latest dynamics transition (line 3), each subsystem uses its locally available information set (line 4) to select a **local consistent parameter** (line 5). It then computes its local control action in two steps (line 6). First, the subsystem synthesizes a **local sub-controller** based on the consistent parameter selected in the previous step. Next, a **local control action** is computed based on a global controller that is composed of the local sub-controllers synthesized at the previous step, together with the (delayed) sub-controllers from other subsystems. Though inspired by the approach

Algorithm 1: Distributed parameter selection and model-based control

```

Input: Parameter set  $\mathcal{P}_0$ 
Initialize:  $t = 0, u(0) = 0, \mathcal{I}(i, 0) = \emptyset$  for  $i \in [N]$ 
1 for  $t = 1, 2, \dots$  do
2   for Subsystem  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$  do
3     Observe  $x^i(t)$ 
4     Reads available information set  $\mathcal{I}(i, t) = \mathcal{I}(i, t-1) \cup$ 
        $\left\{ x^j(t-d(j \rightarrow i)), \theta_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^j, \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^j, u^j(t-d(j \rightarrow i)), \hat{w}^j(t-d(j \rightarrow i)) \right\}_{j \in \bar{d}\text{-neighbor}(i)}$ 
5      $\theta_t^i \leftarrow \text{CONSIST}(\mathcal{I}(i, t))$  with Algorithm 2 // Select local consistent parameter
6      $u^i(t) \leftarrow \text{CONTROL}(\mathcal{I}(i, t), \theta_t^i)$  with Algorithm 3 // Compute local control action
7   end
8 end

```

in Ho et al. (2021), our algorithm performs both the parameter selection and the model-based control design *distributedly* for each local subsystem with *delayed* information from other subsystems, whereas Ho et al. (2021) is a single-agent algorithm.

In what follows, we describe the three main components of the proposed algorithm in more detail. For ease of exposition, we let subsystems have scalar state and fully actuated control actions ($n_x = n_u = N$) in order to minimize notation. The general vector case can be found in Appendix K.

3.1 Local Consistent Parameter Selection

The first component of Algorithm 1 is for each subsystem i to select a local parameter θ_t^i that is consistent with the locally available observation at time t . We name this subroutine CONSIST, shown in Algorithm 2. CONSIST first constructs the set of all θ^i such that $A^{ij}(\theta^i), B^{ij}(\theta^i)$ satisfy (1) with some admissible disturbances defined in Assumption 1. Specifically, each locally observed transition, namely, the transition from $\{x^j(t-1), u^j(t-1)\}_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)}$ to $x^i(t)$, defines a linear constraint on θ^i and we construct the *local consistent*

Algorithm 2: CONSIST(\cdot) for Subsystem i

- Input:** Information set $\mathcal{I}(i, t)$
Output: Local consistent parameter θ_t^i
- 1 Compute local consistent parameter set \mathcal{P}_t^i with (3)
 - 2 Select local consistent parameter $\theta_t^i \leftarrow n_i \cdot \mathbb{E}_{v: \|v\|=1} \left[v \cdot \max_{q \in \mathcal{P}_t^i} (v \cdot q) \right]$
-

parameter set, \mathcal{P}_t^i , as

$$\mathcal{P}_t^i := \left\{ \theta^i \in \mathcal{P}_{t-1}^i \mid \left\| x^i(t) - \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} A^{ij}(\theta^i) x^j(t-1) + B^{ij}(\theta^i) u^j(t-1) \right) \right\|_{\infty} \leq W \right\}, \quad (3)$$

with \mathcal{P}_0^i as the local initial parameter set defined in Assumption 2. Note that the local consistent parameter set \mathcal{P}_t^i is always non-empty, convex, and nested within the parameter set \mathcal{P}_{t-1}^i recursively. The recursion is from the fact that the observed trajectory at t overlaps with the observed trajectory at $t-1$ up to $x^i(t-1)$.

With \mathcal{P}_t^i , we want to select a local parameter $\theta_t^i \in \mathcal{P}_t^i$ in order to perform model based control in later parts of Algorithm 1. In particular, the longer a particular parameter θ_t^i stays consistent for future observation, the more likely the controller constructed based on the current parameter will perform well. This intuition motivates us to select a θ_t^i that could remain an element of the (yet unknown) future consistent parameter set. This problem is an instance of the Nested Convex Body Chasing (NCBC) problem, where a selector is presented a sequence of nested convex bodies $\{\mathcal{K}_t\}_{t=1}^T \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ at each t and asked to select a point $q_t \in \mathcal{K}_t$ to minimize the total movement $\sum_{t=0}^T \|q_{t+1} - q_t\|$. The movement criteria formalizes a measure of *model consistency* in our case: the less the total movement a selector incurs, the longer the selected points stay consistent overall. A known selector for the NCBC problem is the Steiner point selector $\text{St}(\mathcal{K}) := n \cdot \mathbb{E}_{v: \|v\|=1} [v \cdot \max_{q \in \mathcal{K}} (v \cdot q)]$, of which the competitive property is crucial for the stability proof of Algorithm 1. (Bubeck et al., 2020). Therefore, each subsystem i selects the Steiner point of \mathcal{P}_t^i as its local consistent parameter. We remark there are efficient algorithms for approximating the Steiner point, e.g. Argue et al. (2021).

Treating the dynamics (1) that generates the observed state trajectory as a black box, CONSIST does not differentiate between the *true* parameter $\theta^{i,*}$ and true disturbances $\{w^*(k)\}_{k=0}^{t-1}$ from a *consistent* parameter θ_t^i and the corresponding admissible disturbances. The simple idea of *consistency* in CONSIST turns out to be sufficient for the task of online stabilization under adversarial disturbances. We emphasize this point with a numerical example in Appendix B that demonstrates the power of consistency compared with system identification.

3.2 Local Control action

After each subsystem i selects a local consistent parameter θ_t^i , it proceeds to compute a local control action based on θ_t^i and $\mathcal{I}(i, t)$. We name this subroutine CONTROL (Algorithm 3). At every time step, subsystem i first assembles a local estimate of the “global” model using delayed information from other subsystems (line 1) and uses it to generate a local SLS sub-controller (line 2). Then, subsystem i assembles a local SLS controller with the local sub-controller ϕ_t^i and the delayed sub-controllers from other subsystems (line 3). Finally, the local control action is computed using the locally assembled SLS controller (6) (line 4). Below we present an overview of the two components of CONSIST and defer detailed discussion of the algorithm in Appendix G.

Local Sub-controller Synthesis The first step in the CONTROL subroutine is to synthesize a local sub-controller. Specifically, subsystem i starts by accessing $\theta_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^j$ from the \bar{d} -neighbors of i , and assembles a local estimate of the “global” parameter $\hat{\Theta}_t^i$,

$$\hat{\Theta}_t^i := \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{M}(i)} \theta_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^j, \quad (4)$$

Algorithm 3: CONTROL(\cdot) for Subsystem i

Input: Information Set $\mathcal{I}(i, t)$, Local consistent parameter θ_t^i

Output: Local control action $u^i(t)$

- 1 Assemble local estimate of the global model $A(\hat{\Theta}_t^i), B(\hat{\Theta}_t^i)$ with (4)
 - 2 $\phi_t^i \leftarrow$ (5)
 - 3 Assemble delayed local sub-controllers $\bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)} \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^j$ from subsystems in $\mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)$
 - 4 Compute local control action $u^i(t)$ with (6)
-

where recall the set $\mathcal{M}(i)$ is defined to be $\{\ell \in [N] : j \in \mathcal{N}(\ell) \text{ for some } j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{out}}(i)\}$. In particular, $\mathcal{M}(i)$ represents the smallest set of “neighboring” subsystems of i whose model information is needed for sub-controller synthesis. We provide more intuition of $\mathcal{M}(i)$ in Appendix G.

Next, subsystem i synthesizes a *column* of the standard SLS controller (Anderson et al., 2019) based on its locally estimated “global” parameter $\hat{\Theta}_t^i$. We call this column the *sub-controller*. A standard SLS controller is made up of two causal linear operators $\Phi^{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\Phi^{\mathbf{u}}$ with components $\Phi^{\mathbf{x}}[k], \Phi^{\mathbf{u}}[k] \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. The operators $\Phi^{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\Phi^{\mathbf{u}}$ represents the mappings from disturbance \mathbf{w} to the state \mathbf{x} and control action \mathbf{u} , respectively, under some linear controller \mathbf{K} such that $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{K}\mathbf{x}$ for (2). We provide background and details of SLS in Appendix F.

It is known that the communication and locality constraints are convex sparsity constraints on $\Phi^{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\Phi^{\mathbf{u}}$ (Wang et al., 2018). Therefore, we follow standard SLS synthesis procedure and synthesize the i^{th} column of $\Phi^{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\Phi^{\mathbf{u}}$, respectively denoted as $\phi_t^{i,\mathbf{x}} := \Phi^{\mathbf{x}}(:, i)$, $\phi_t^{i,\mathbf{u}} := \Phi^{\mathbf{u}}(:, i)$ and collectively as ϕ_t^i , for subsystem i as follows:

$$\min_{\phi_t^i} \quad \|\phi_t^i\|_{\mathcal{H}_2}^2 \tag{5a}$$

$$\text{s.t. } \phi_t^{i,\mathbf{x}}[0] = e_i, \quad \phi_t^{i,\mathbf{x}}[H] = 0 \tag{5b}$$

$$\phi_t^{i,\mathbf{x}}[k+1] = A(\hat{\Theta}_t^i) \phi_t^{i,\mathbf{x}}[k] + B(\hat{\Theta}_t^i) \phi_t^{i,\mathbf{u}}[k], \quad \text{for } k = 0, 1, \dots, H-1 \tag{5c}$$

$$\phi_t^{i,\mathbf{x}}[k], \phi_t^{i,\mathbf{u}}[k] \in \mathcal{C}^k(:, i) \cap \mathcal{C}^{\bar{d}}(:, i), \quad \text{for } k = 0, 1, \dots, H-1, \tag{5d}$$

where (5b) and (5c) are the standard SLS closed-loop operators characterization, specialized to the i^{th} column of $\Phi^{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\Phi^{\mathbf{u}}$. This characterization has been extensively used in the learning-based control literature (Dean et al., 2020a; Umenberger and Schön, 2020; Bu et al., 2019; Xue and Matni, 2021). (5d) is the communication and scalability constraints from Section 2.1 expressed equivalently in terms of the i^{th} column of $\Phi^{\mathbf{x}}$, $\Phi^{\mathbf{u}}$. This problem is always feasible due to Assumption 3 and 5. Objective (5a) is chosen to minimize the \mathcal{H}_2 norm of column operator ϕ_t^i .

Local Control Action Computation The second and final step in CONTROL is to compute a local control action. To do so, each subsystem i assembles a local SLS controller with the sub-controller synthesized in the previous step and the delayed sub-controllers $\phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^j$ from its \bar{d} -neighbors j . This information is plugged into the following SLS controller (Wang et al., 2019) to compute a local control action $u^i(t)$ as

$$\hat{w}^i(t) = x^i(t) - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)} \sum_{k=1}^{H-1} \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,\mathbf{x}}[k](i) \cdot \hat{w}^j(t-k) \tag{6a}$$

$$u^i(t) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)} \sum_{k=0}^{H-1} \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,\mathbf{u}}[k](i) \cdot \hat{w}^j(t-k), \tag{6b}$$

where $x^i(t), u^i(t), \hat{w}^i(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ are the local state, control action, and estimated disturbance respectively. The local controllers are initiated with $\hat{w}^i(0) = x^i(0)$. The intuition behind (6) is that each subsystem i *counterfactually* assumes that the global closed loop of (2) behaves exactly as the columns $\phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^j$ prescribe. Recall (43), thus the i^{th} position of $\phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,\mathbf{x}}$ and $\phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,\mathbf{u}}$ maps the j^{th} position of disturbance

vector to the i^{th} position of \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{u} , *i.e.*, the state and control action of subsystem i . Therefore, (6a) estimates the local disturbances by comparing observed local state $x^i(t)$ and the counterfactual state computed with $\phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^j$. Then (6b) acts upon the computed disturbances.

4 Main Results

We now present the main result of this paper. This is the first stabilization result for a distributed policy (Algorithm 1) in a setting with unknown dynamics and adversarial disturbances.

Theorem 1 (Stability). *Under Assumptions 1-5, Algorithm 1 guarantees stability of the closed loop of (2) with*

$$\sup_t \{ \|x(t)\|_\infty, \|u(t)\|_\infty \} \leq O \left(e^{\text{poly}(\bar{n})\bar{d}} \cdot \left(e^{-t/H} x(0) + W \right) \right),$$

where $x(0)$ is the initial condition, W is the bound on the adversarial disturbance, and local dimension $\bar{n} = \max\{\|\mathcal{C}^{\bar{d}}\|_1, \|\mathcal{C}^{\bar{d}}\|_\infty, \max_j |\mathcal{M}(j)|\}$ represents the total state dimension in any \bar{d} -neighbors specified by communication matrix \mathcal{C} . \bar{d} is the largest local delay each subsystem considers for the algorithm, and H is the SLS controller horizon.

Theorem 1 makes explicit that communication delay adds an exponential factor of error on the state deviation from the desired steady state. Additionally, note that both the state dimension and delay in the result are *local* constants, which can remain small even when the number of subsystems in the network is large due to sparse connections in large-scale systems (Yazdani and Mehrizi-Sani, 2014; Wang and Matni, 2016). Observe that initial condition $x(0)$ exponentially decays, and the state norm is bounded by a constant relating to the bound on disturbance. Finally, the decay factor $e^{-t/H}$ corroborates the fact that H quantifies the controllability of the parameter set \mathcal{P}_0 . The smaller H can be for the SLS synthesis (5) to be feasible, the easier the systems in the set can be learned and controlled. We elaborate on this point in Appendix I.

Proof Outline. The remainder of this section gives an overview of the key lemmas that underlie our proof of Theorem 1. The intuition behind our proof follows from a characterization of the closed loop dynamics of *any* algorithms that apply SLS controllers (Lemma 1). We then derive a sufficient condition for stability of the closed-loop dynamics under adversarial disturbances (Lemma 2). Given communication delay, we need to carefully keep track of the errors caused by asynchronous information at different subsystems throughout the algorithm. We show that the errors caused by delay can be absorbed partly into the competitive ratio of CONSIST (Lemma 3) and partly into the sensitivity of the SLS synthesis procedure through a novel perturbation analysis (Theorem 2). We defer formal proofs to Appendix D.

To begin, we show that despite the fact that each subsystem in Algorithm 1 uses differently delayed information to compute the local parameter, sub-controller, and control actions, the closed loop for the global system under such distributed policy can be characterized with a simple global representation as follows.

Lemma 1 (Closed loop Dynamics). *The closed loop of (2) under Algorithm 1 is characterized as follows for all time $t \in \mathbb{N}$:*

$$x(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{H-1} \Phi_t^x[k] \hat{w}(t-k), \quad u(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{H-1} \Phi_t^u[k] \hat{w}(t-k) \quad (7a)$$

$$\hat{w}(t) = \sum_{k=1}^H (A_t \Phi_{t-1}^x[k-1] + B_t \Phi_{t-1}^u[k-1] - \Phi_t^x[k]) \hat{w}(t-k) + \tilde{w}(t-1). \quad (7b)$$

where $u(t)$, $\hat{w}(t)$ are concatenated control action and estimated disturbance from (6). Vector $\tilde{w}(t)$ has property $\|\tilde{w}(t)\|_\infty \leq W$ for all t . Matrices A_t, B_t are the global consistent parameter concatenated with local consistent parameters $A^{ij}(\theta_t^i), B^{ij}(\theta_t^i)$. Φ_t^x, Φ_t^u are shorthand for global closed-loop operators when (6) is implemented, with

$$\Phi_t^x[k](i, j) := \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,x}[k](i), \quad \Phi_t^u[k](i, j) := \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,u}[k](i).$$

This result is a strengthening of the original SLS theorem (Theorem 2.1 part 2 in (Anderson et al., 2019)) where we characterize the closed loop behaviour of SLS controllers constructed from *any* closed-loop operators (not necessarily satisfying characterization in Theorem 4). Therefore, Lemma 1 subsumes Theorem 2.1 part 2 in (Anderson et al., 2019). Lemma 1 gives an equivalent condition for stability of any closed loops under SLS controllers, which is the boundedness of $\hat{w}(t)$. In particular the following result can be used in conjunction with Lemma 1 to bound $\hat{w}(t)$.

Lemma 2 (Sufficient condition for H -convolution). *Let $W \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $H \in \mathbb{N}$. For $k \in [H]$, let $\{a_t[k]\}_{t=1}^\infty$ be a positive sequence. Let $\{s_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ be a positive sequence such that $s_t \leq \sum_{k=1}^H a_{t-1}[k] \cdot s_{t-k} + W$. Then $\{s_t\}$ is bounded if $\sum_{t=0}^\infty \sum_{k=1}^H a_t[k] \leq L$ for some $L \in \mathbb{R}_+$. In particular, for all t ,*

$$s_t \leq e^{-t/H} \cdot e^L s_0 + \frac{W(e^L + e - 1)}{e - 1}.$$

The above sufficient condition is suitable for analyzing dynamical evolution under adversarial inputs. Consider taking the norm on both sides of (14b). Then Lemma 2 is immediately applicable with $s_t = \|\hat{w}(t)\|_\infty$, $W = \|\tilde{w}(t-1)\|_\infty$, and

$$a_t[k] = \|A_t \Phi_t^x[k-1] + B_t \Phi_t^u[k-1] - \Phi_{t+1}^x[k]\|_\infty. \quad (8)$$

Therefore, a sufficient condition for stability is boundedness of (8) summing over time t and horizon k . This quantity represents the error of the implemented closed-loop operators synthesized from the learnt dynamics model and delayed information, with respect to the *correct* closed-loop operators generated from true dynamics without delay. The following lemma provides such a bound.

Lemma 3 (Bounded error for closed loop operators). *Let Φ_t^x, Φ_t^u denote the global closed loop operators concatenated from sub-controllers generated with Algorithm 3 where $\Phi_t^x[k](i, j) := \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,x}[k](i)$ and $\Phi_t^u[k](i, j) := \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,u}[k](i)$. Then we have*

$$\sum_{t=1}^\infty \sum_{k=1}^H \|A_t \Phi_{t-1}^x[k-1] + B_t \Phi_{t-1}^u[k-1] - \Phi_t^x[k]\|_\infty \leq O(\text{poly}(\bar{n})\bar{d}).$$

Note that Lemma 1 and Lemma 2 essentially reduce the stability analysis of general SLS controllers to bounding the error term (8), thus greatly reducing the complexity of the analysis. They are applicable to any SLS controllers of the form (6), regardless of how the closed-loop column operators ϕ_t^i are synthesized or whether they are implemented distributedly or centralized. Given the growing applications of SLS for learning and control (Dean et al., 2020b; Sun and Fazel, 2021; Lian and Jones, 2021), Lemma 1 and Lemma 2 could be of independent interest.

Our proof of Lemma 3 requires the following sensitivity result for SLS synthesis problem, where the formal statement and proof is presented in Appendix J.

Theorem 2 (Informal, Sensitivity bound). *Let $\phi^*(A, B) := [x^{*,T}, u^{*,T}]^T$ denote the optimal solution to the following optimization problem*

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x, u} \quad & \sum_{t=0}^H x(t)^T Q x(t) + u(t)^T R u(t) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & x(t+1) = Ax(t) + Bu(t), \quad x(0) = x_0, \quad x(H) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

with $Q, R \succ 0$. Let (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) be two system matrices such that (9) is feasible. Then the corresponding optimal solutions $\phi^*(A_1, B_1)$ and $\phi^*(A_2, B_2)$ satisfy

$$\|\phi^*(A_1, B_1) - \phi^*(A_2, B_2)\| \leq \frac{\max\{\sigma_{\max}(Q), \sigma_{\max}(R)\}}{\min\{\sigma_{\min}(Q), \sigma_{\min}(R)\}} (\Gamma_A \|A_1 - A_2\|_F + \Gamma_B \|B_1 - B_2\|_F)$$

where Γ_A, Γ_B involves the system theoretical quantities for A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2 .

Theorem 2 enables the first sensitivity analysis for the SLS synthesis problem (5), which we detail in Corollary 2 and Appendix F. In particular, Theorem 2 can be used to analyze a class of model predictive control (MPC) problems of the form (9), where one can quantify the sensitivity of optimal solution x^*, u^* with respect to the perturbation to the model A and B .

5 Concluding Remarks

We have proposed and analyzed the first learning-based algorithm that provably achieves online stabilization for networked LTI systems subject to communication delays under adversarial disturbances. Our approach is modular because one can replace the CONSIST component of Algorithm 1 with other model selecting subroutines targeted for different disturbance models, e.g., distributed system identification when disturbances are stochastic. Therefore, the proposed approach can serve as a template for generalizing centralized learning-to-control SLS-based algorithms to distributed settings with communication constraints. For example, a promising and challenging direction is to use our framework to generalize centralized SLS-based regret-optimal algorithms, such as the one in Dean et al. (2018), to the distributed setting. Many of the technical results in this paper can be leveraged to quantify the effect of delay in the analysis that would be needed for such an extension.

References

- Y. Abbasi-Yadkori and C. Szepesvári. Regret bounds for the adaptive control of linear quadratic systems. In *Proceedings of the 24th Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1–26. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2011.
- N. Agarwal, B. Bullins, E. Hazan, S. Kakade, and K. Singh. Online control with adversarial disturbances. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 111–119. PMLR, 2019.
- S. Alemzadeh and M. Mesbahi. Distributed q-learning for dynamically decoupled systems. In *2019 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pages 772–777. IEEE, 2019.
- S. Alemzadeh, S. Talebi, and M. Mesbahi. D3pi: Data-driven distributed policy iteration for homogeneous interconnected systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.11572*, 2021.
- C. A. Alonso and N. Matni. Distributed and localized closed loop model predictive control via system level synthesis. In *2020 59th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 5598–5605. IEEE, 2020.
- C. A. Alonso, F. Yang, and N. Matni. Data-driven distributed and localized model predictive control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.12229*, 2021.
- J. Anderson and N. Matni. Structured state space realizations for sls distributed controllers. In *2017 55th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton)*, pages 982–987. IEEE, 2017.
- J. Anderson, J. C. Doyle, S. H. Low, and N. Matni. System level synthesis. *Annual Reviews in Control*, 47: 364–393, 2019.
- C. Argue, A. Gupta, Z. Tang, and G. Guruganesh. Chasing convex bodies with linear competitive ratio. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 68(5):1–10, 2021.
- R. Boczar, N. Matni, and B. Recht. Finite-data performance guarantees for the output-feedback control of an unknown system. In *2018 IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 2994–2999. IEEE, 2018.
- J. Bu, A. Mesbahi, M. Fazel, and M. Mesbahi. Lqr through the lens of first order methods: Discrete-time case. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.08921*, 2019.
- S. Bubeck, B. Klartag, Y. T. Lee, Y. Li, and M. Sellke. Chasing nested convex bodies nearly optimally. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1496–1508. SIAM, 2020.
- G. Casalino, F. Davoli, R. Minciardi, P. Puliafito, and R. Zoppoli. Partially nested information structures with a common past. *IEEE transactions on automatic control*, 29(9):846–850, 1984.

- S. Chen, N. Matni, M. Morari, and V. M. Preciado. System level synthesis-based robust model predictive control through convex inner approximation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.05509*, 2021.
- X. Chen and E. Hazan. Black-box control for linear dynamical systems. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1114–1143. PMLR, 2021.
- A. Cohen, T. Koren, and Y. Mansour. Learning linear-quadratic regulators efficiently with only \sqrt{t} regret. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1300–1309. PMLR, 2019.
- S. Dean, H. Mania, N. Matni, B. Recht, and S. Tu. Regret bounds for robust adaptive control of the linear quadratic regulator. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31, 2018.
- S. Dean, S. Tu, N. Matni, and B. Recht. Safely learning to control the constrained linear quadratic regulator. In *2019 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pages 5582–5588. IEEE, 2019.
- S. Dean, H. Mania, N. Matni, B. Recht, and S. Tu. On the sample complexity of the linear quadratic regulator. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 20(4):633–679, 2020a.
- S. Dean, N. Matni, B. Recht, and V. Ye. Robust guarantees for perception-based control. In *Learning for Dynamics and Control*, pages 350–360. PMLR, 2020b.
- J. C. Doyle, B. A. Francis, and A. R. Tannenbaum. *Feedback control theory*. Courier Corporation, 2013.
- G. E. Dullerud and F. Paganini. *A course in robust control theory: a convex approach*, volume 36. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- M. Everett, B. Lütjens, and J. P. How. Certifiable robustness to adversarial state uncertainty in deep reinforcement learning. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2021.
- X. Fang, S. Misra, G. Xue, and D. Yang. Smart grid—the new and improved power grid: A survey. *IEEE communications surveys & tutorials*, 14(4):944–980, 2011.
- M. K. S. Faradonbeh and A. Modi. Joint learning-based stabilization of multiple unknown linear systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.01387*, 2022.
- M. K. S. Faradonbeh, A. Tewari, and G. Michailidis. Finite-time adaptive stabilization of linear systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 64(8):3498–3505, 2018.
- M. Fardad and M. R. Jovanović. On the design of optimal structured and sparse feedback gains via sequential convex programming. In *2014 American Control Conference*, pages 2426–2431. IEEE, 2014.
- S. Fattahi, N. Matni, and S. Sojoudi. Efficient learning of distributed linear-quadratic control policies. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 58(5):2927–2951, 2020.
- M. Fazel, R. Ge, S. Kakade, and M. Mesbahi. Global convergence of policy gradient methods for the linear quadratic regulator. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1467–1476. PMLR, 2018.
- L. Furieri, Y. Zheng, and M. Kamgarpour. Learning the globally optimal distributed lq regulator. In *Learning for Dynamics and Control*, pages 287–297. PMLR, 2020.
- A. Gattami. Control and estimation problems under partially nested information pattern. In *Proceedings of the 48th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC) held jointly with 2009 28th Chinese Control Conference*, pages 5415–5419. IEEE, 2009.
- J. Han and R. E. Skelton. An lmi optimization approach for structured linear controllers. In *42nd IEEE International Conference on Decision and Control (IEEE Cat. No. 03CH37475)*, volume 5, pages 5143–5148. IEEE, 2003.
- S. Han. Localized learning of robust controllers for networked systems with dynamic topology. In *Learning for Dynamics and Control*, pages 687–696. PMLR, 2020.

- E. Hazan, S. Kakade, and K. Singh. The nonstochastic control problem. In *Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 408–421. PMLR, 2020.
- D. Ho and J. C. Doyle. Scalable robust adaptive control from the system level perspective. In *2019 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pages 3683–3688, 2019. doi: 10.23919/ACC.2019.8814896.
- D. Ho, H. Le, J. Doyle, and Y. Yue. Online robust control of nonlinear systems with large uncertainty. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 3475–3483. PMLR, 2021.
- Y.-C. Ho et al. Team decision theory and information structures in optimal control problems—part i. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic control*, 17(1):15–22, 1972.
- M. Ibrahimi, A. Javanmard, and B. Roy. Efficient reinforcement learning for high dimensional linear quadratic systems. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 25, 2012.
- G. Jing, H. Bai, J. George, A. Chakraborty, and P. K. Sharma. Learning distributed stabilizing controllers for multi-agent systems. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 2021.
- S. Lale, K. Azizzadenesheli, B. Hassibi, and A. Anandkumar. Explore more and improve regret in linear quadratic regulators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.12291*, 2020.
- A. Lamperski. Computing stabilizing linear controllers via policy iteration. In *2020 59th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 1902–1907. IEEE, 2020.
- A. Lamperski and L. Lessard. Optimal decentralized state-feedback control with sparsity and delays. *Automatica*, 58:143–151, 2015.
- J. S. Li, C. A. Alonso, and J. C. Doyle. Frontiers in scalable distributed control: Sls, mpc, and beyond. In *2021 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pages 2720–2725. IEEE, 2021a.
- S. E. Li, Y. Zheng, K. Li, and J. Wang. An overview of vehicular platoon control under the four-component framework. In *2015 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, pages 286–291. IEEE, 2015.
- Y. Li, Y. Tang, R. Zhang, and N. Li. Distributed reinforcement learning for decentralized linear quadratic control: A derivative-free policy optimization approach. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2021b.
- Y. Lian and C. N. Jones. From system level synthesis to robust closed-loop data-enabled predictive control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.06553*, 2021.
- Y. Lin, G. Qu, L. Huang, and A. Wierman. Distributed reinforcement learning in multi-agent networked systems. *arXiv*, 2020.
- N. Matni and V. Chandrasekaran. Regularization for design. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 61(12):3991–4006, 2016.
- N. Matni and A. A. Sarma. Robust performance guarantees for system level synthesis. In *2020 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pages 779–786. IEEE, 2020.
- D. Morgan, S.-J. Chung, and F. Y. Hadaegh. Model predictive control of swarms of spacecraft using sequential convex programming. *Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics*, 37(6):1725–1740, 2014.
- B. Pal and B. Chaudhuri. *Robust control in power systems*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- J. Perdomo, J. Umenberger, and M. Simchowitz. Stabilizing dynamical systems via policy gradient methods. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34, 2021.
- G. Qu, Y. Lin, A. Wierman, and N. Li. Scalable multi-agent reinforcement learning for networked systems with average reward. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.06626*, 2020a.
- G. Qu, A. Wierman, and N. Li. Scalable reinforcement learning of localized policies for multi-agent networked systems. In *Learning for Dynamics and Control*, pages 256–266. PMLR, 2020b.

- M. Rotkowitz. On information structures, convexity, and linear optimality. In *2008 47th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 1642–1647. IEEE, 2008.
- M. Rotkowitz and S. Lall. A characterization of convex problems in decentralized control. *IEEE transactions on Automatic Control*, 50(12):1984–1996, 2005.
- P. Shah and P. A. Parrilo. H2-optimal decentralized control over posets: A state-space solution for state-feedback. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 58(12):3084–3096, 2013.
- J. Sieber, S. Bennani, and M. N. Zeilinger. A system level approach to tube-based model predictive control. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 6:776–781, 2021.
- M. Simchowitz and D. Foster. Naive exploration is optimal for online lqr. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8937–8948. PMLR, 2020.
- M. Simchowitz, H. Mania, S. Tu, M. I. Jordan, and B. Recht. Learning without mixing: Towards a sharp analysis of linear system identification. In *Conference On Learning Theory*, pages 439–473. PMLR, 2018.
- Y. R. Sturz, A. Eichler, and R. S. Smith. Distributed control design for heterogeneous interconnected systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2020.
- Y. Sun and M. Fazel. Learning optimal controllers by policy gradient: Global optimality via convex parameterization. In *2021 60th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 4576–4581. IEEE, 2021.
- S. Talebi, S. Alemzadeh, and M. Mesbahi. Distributed model-free policy iteration for networks of homogeneous systems. In *2021 60th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 6970–6975. IEEE, 2021a.
- S. Talebi, S. Alemzadeh, N. Rahimi, and M. Mesbahi. On regularizability and its application to online control of unstable lti systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2021b.
- S. L. Tu. *Sample complexity bounds for the linear quadratic regulator*. University of California, Berkeley, 2019.
- J. Umenberger and T. B. Schön. Optimistic robust linear quadratic dual control. In *Learning for Dynamics and Control*, pages 550–560. PMLR, 2020.
- Y.-S. Wang and N. Matni. Localized lqg optimal control for large-scale systems. In *2016 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pages 1954–1961. IEEE, 2016.
- Y.-S. Wang, N. Matni, and J. C. Doyle. Localized lqr optimal control. In *53rd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 1661–1668. IEEE, 2014.
- Y.-S. Wang, N. Matni, and J. C. Doyle. Separable and localized system-level synthesis for large-scale systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 63(12):4234–4249, 2018.
- Y.-S. Wang, N. Matni, and J. C. Doyle. A system-level approach to controller synthesis. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 64(10):4079–4093, 2019.
- P.-Å. Wedin. Perturbation theory for pseudo-inverses. *BIT Numerical Mathematics*, 13(2):217–232, 1973.
- H. S. Witsenhausen. A counterexample in stochastic optimum control. *SIAM Journal on Control*, 6(1):131–147, 1968.
- X. Xiong, Y. Chen, and A. Ames. Robust disturbance rejection for robotic bipedal walking: System-level-synthesis with step-to-step dynamics approximation. In *Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE, 2021.
- A. Xue and N. Matni. Data-driven system level synthesis. In *Learning for Dynamics and Control*, pages 189–200. PMLR, 2021.

- M. Yazdani and A. Mehrizi-Sani. Distributed control techniques in microgrids. *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, 5(6):2901–2909, 2014.
- L. Ye, H. Zhu, and V. Gupta. On the sample complexity of decentralized linear quadratic regulator with partially nested information structure. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.07112*, 2021.
- J. Yu, Y.-S. Wang, and J. Anderson. Localized and distributed h2 state feedback control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.02440*, 2020.
- T. T. Zhang, S. Tu, N. M. Boffi, J.-J. E. Slotine, and N. Matni. Adversarially robust stability certificates can be sample-efficient. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.10690*, 2021.
- F. Zhao, X. Fu, and K. You. Learning stabilizing controllers of linear systems via discount policy gradient. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.09294*, 2021.
- Y. Zheng, R. P. Mason, and A. Papachristodoulou. Scalable design of structured controllers using chordal decomposition. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 63(3):752–767, 2017.
- Y. Zheng, L. Furieri, A. Papachristodoulou, N. Li, and M. Kamgarpour. On the equivalence of youla, system-level, and input–output parameterizations. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 66(1):413–420, 2020.

A Notation Summary

The notations and constants used throughout the paper and the Appendix are summarized below.

Notation	Meaning
$x^i(t), u^i(t), w^i(t)$	Local state (\mathbb{R}^{n_i}), control action (\mathbb{R}^{m_i}), and disturbances (\mathbb{R}^{n_i}) at subsystem i ;
$x(0)$	Initial condition for system (2);
$\mathcal{N}(i)$	Dynamical neighbors of subsystem i where $x^j(t-1)$ affects $x^i(t)$ for $j \in \mathcal{N}(i)$;
$x(t), u(t), w(t)$	Global state, control action, and disturbance vector concatenated from the local ones in (1);
A^{ij}, B^{ij}	Local dynamics matrices describing how states and control action of subsystem j affects subsystem i for $j \in \mathcal{N}(i)$ in (1);
A, B	Concatenated global dynamics matrices from A^{ij} 's and B^{ij} 's;
θ^i	The parameters for the nonzero locations in local dynamics matrices and we write $A^{ij}(\theta^i)$, $B^{ij}(\theta^i)$. In particular, $\theta^i \cap \theta^j = \emptyset$ for all $i \neq j$;
Θ	The concatenated local parameters for the global dynamics with $\Theta := \bigcup_{i \in [N]} \theta^i$;
\mathcal{P}_0	The known initial compact convex parameter set where the true dynamics parameter lies;
\mathcal{G}^C	Communication graph defined over system (2) with vertices V^C corresponding to subsystems and directed edges E^C ;
\mathcal{C}	The communication matrix that contains binary entries where $\mathcal{C}(i, j) \neq 0$ if $(j, i) \in E^C$;
$d(i \rightarrow j)$	Communication delay from subsystem i to subsystem j defined as the graph distance from i to j according to \mathcal{G}^C ;
$\mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)$	\bar{d} -incoming neighbors of subsystem i where $\mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i) := \{j \in [N] : d(j \rightarrow i) \leq \bar{d}\}$. In particular, $j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)$ if $\mathcal{C}^{\bar{d}}(i, j) \neq 0$;
$\mathcal{D}_{\text{out}}(i)$	\bar{d} -outgoing neighbors of subsystem i where $\mathcal{D}_{\text{out}}(i) := \{j \in [N] : d(i \rightarrow j) \leq \bar{d}\}$. In particular, $j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{out}}(i)$ if $\mathcal{C}^{\bar{d}}(j, i) \neq 0$;
$\mathcal{M}(i)$	Subsystems whose model information is needed for sub-controller synthesis at subsystem i with Algorithm 3 where $\mathcal{M}(i) = \{\ell \in [N] : j \in \mathcal{N}(\ell) \text{ for some } j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{out}}(i)\}$;
\bar{d} -neighbor of i	The union of all subsystems in $\mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)$, $\mathcal{D}_{\text{out}}(i)$, $\mathcal{M}(i)$;
\mathcal{P}_t^i	Local consistent parameter set constructed by subsystem i at time t according to (3);
θ_t^i	Local consistent parameter for subsystem i for A^{ij} and B^{ij} constructed with Algorithm 2;
$\hat{\Theta}_t^i$	The assembled local estimate of the "global" parameter where $\hat{\Theta}_t^i := \bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{M}(i)} \theta_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^j$;
ϕ_t^i	Local sub-controller generated by subsystem i at time t from (5). It is a column operator that maps sequences of scalars to sequences of vectors, with components $\phi_t^i[k]$;
$\phi_t^{i,x}, \phi_t^{i,u}$	The x and u components of ϕ_t^i , respectively. They are synthesized from (5) satisfying (5c);
Θ_t	The collection of all local consistent parameters at time t where $\Theta_t = \bigcup_{i=1}^N \theta_t^i$;
$A_t, B_t, \tilde{w}(t)$	The global consistent matrices $A(\Theta_t)$, $B(\Theta_t)$, and corresponding admissible disturbance;
a_t^i, b_t^i	The i^{th} row of A_t , B_t respectively;
$\hat{w}(t)$	Concatenated global estimated disturbance from $\hat{w}^i(t)$ in (6);
Φ_t^x	Concatenated global closed loop operators where $\Phi_t^x[k](i, j) := \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,x}[k](i)$ from (6) ;
Φ_t^u	Concatenated global closed loop operators where $\Phi_t^u[k](i, j) := \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,u}[k](i)$ from (6) ;
$\Phi^{x,j}$	The j^{th} column of Φ_t^x ;
$\Phi^{u,j}$	The j^{th} column of Φ_t^u ;

Table 1: Notations and definitions for the model setup, algorithms, and proofs

Constants	Meaning
N	Number of subsystems in the global dynamics (2);
n_i, m_i	Local state and control action dimension for subsystem i in (1);
n_x, n_u	Global state and control dimension with $n_x = \sum_{i=1}^N n_i$ and $n_u = \sum_{i=1}^N m_i$;
W	The known bound on the true disturbances such that $\ w(t)\ _\infty \leq W$;
κ	The bound on all possible system matrices where $\ A(\Theta)\ _2, \ B(\Theta)\ _2 \leq \kappa$ for all $\Theta \in \mathcal{P}_0$;
\bar{d}	The localization parameter such that each subsystem is designed to only use information from its \bar{d} -neighbors in Algorithm 1;
\bar{n}	The largest total local state dimension for the \bar{d} -neighbors of the subsystems where $\bar{n} = \max\{\ C^d\ _1, \ C^{\bar{d}}\ _\infty, \max_j \mathcal{M}(j) \}$;
C, ρ	The assumed (Assumption 6) decay rate for the closed-loop columns ϕ_t^i synthesized in (5) such that $\ \phi_t^i[k]\ _2 \leq C\rho^k$;

Table 2: Constants used throughout the paper

B The Power of Consistency in CONSIST

A key aspect of Algorithm 1 is that we use *consistency* for selecting model to perform controller synthesis, instead of *system identification*. We name the model selecting algorithm CONSIST (Algorithm 2) for this reason.

An important consequence of selecting consistent parameters locally is that the collection of all *local* consistent parameters $\{\theta_t^i\}$ via (3) also constructs a *global* consistent parameter. In particular, denote $\Theta_t = \bigcup_{i=1}^N \theta_t^i$. Then Θ_t by definition satisfies *consistency* of the global trajectory up to time t :

$$\begin{aligned} x(k) &= A(\Theta_t)x(k-1) + B(\Theta_t)u(k-1) + \tilde{w}(k-1) && \text{(Known Consistent Dynamics)} \\ &= A(\Theta^*)x(k-1) + B(\Theta^*)u(k-1) + w^*(k-1), && \text{(Unknown True Dynamics)} \end{aligned}$$

for some admissible disturbance sequence $\{\tilde{w}(k)\}_{k=0}^t$ such that $\|\tilde{w}(k)\|_\infty \leq W$. This holds for all $k \in [t]$.

Due to this observation, for online stabilization under adversarial disturbances, selecting parameters that are consistent is all one needs to generate a stable state trajectory. To see this, consider an extreme case where the first selected parameter Θ_0 stays consistent for the entire online operation as we apply control actions generated using Θ_0 . Then we know the state trajectory could be represented as (Known Consistent Dynamics). Therefore, any control guarantees that our control actions have for Θ_0 will manifest in the state trajectory that we observe online, due to consistency of the parameter. In particular, if the controller designed for Θ_0 is stabilizing, then the observed online trajectory is guaranteed to be stable (disturbances entering at each time step is attenuated exponentially fast).

On the other hand, model-based reinforcement learning for LQR systems heavily rely on system identification under both stochastic (Simchowitz et al., 2018; Dean et al., 2020a; Lale et al., 2020) and adversarial disturbances (Chen and Hazan, 2021; Hazan et al., 2020). However, under adversarial disturbances, system-identification-based stabilization methods for black-box system can incur prohibitively large state norm even in the low-dimensional system. This is because in order to identify the system under adversarial disturbances, one needs to exponentially excite the system in order to “overpower” the effect of disturbances. Such approach is the exactly opposite of what consistency does, where consistency “leverages” disturbances to passively learn about the system.

As a simple illustration, consider the canonical double integrator dynamics,

$$\begin{bmatrix} x^1 \\ x^2 \end{bmatrix} (t+1) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x^1 \\ x^2 \end{bmatrix} (t) + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} u(t) + \begin{bmatrix} w^1 \\ w^2 \end{bmatrix} (t),$$

where $x(t) = [x^1, x^2]^T(t) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}$. $w(t) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is the adversarial disturbance with $\|w(t)\|_\infty \leq 1$. Using exact system theoretical constants, we instantiate a state-of-the-art system-identification-based method (Chen and Hazan, 2021). We simulate stochastic disturbances bounded between -1 and 1 for the first 20 time steps and let the system evolve without disturbances after $t = 20$, i.e., $w(t) \equiv 0$ for $t \geq 20$. The resulting state




Figure 2: Comparison of consistency-based approach with system identification-based approach for double integrator dynamics.

trajectory for identification-based method (“SysID”) and our proposed algorithm (“Consistency”) is shown in Figure 2¹. The results illustrate the impact of the order-of-magnitude improvement that a consistency-based approach can provide. This is a simple centralized example, but already the potential benefits are clear.²

C Stability

In this paper, we formally define stability as follows.

Definition 3 (Closed-loop Stability). *A closed-loop system $x(t+1) = Ax(t) + Bu(t) + w(t)$ under feedback control $u(t) = f_t(x(t), x(t-1), \dots, x(0))$ is said to be stable, if the unforced response, i.e., $w(t) = 0$ for all t with any $x(0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ satisfy $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|x(t)\|_\infty = 0$.*

This is the standard definition of stability for linear systems (Doyle et al., 2013; Dullerud and Paganini, 2013). We say a feedback control rule of the form $u(t) = f_t(x(t), x(t-1), \dots, x(0))$ is stabilizing if it achieves closed-loop stability. In our problem setting, $w(t)$ is assumed to be adversarial and bounded. Even though the stability definition is defined over unforced response, a stable closed-loop system will have bounded state and control norm under such disturbances. In particular, the effect of the disturbance $w(t)$ at each time step will be attenuated exponentially fast.

D Proof of Theorem 1

Before we state the proof of Theorem 1, we make a mild assumption on the decay rate of the closed loop operators synthesized from (5).

Assumption 6 (Decay rate of closed loop operators). *There exists constants $C > 0$, $\rho \in [0, 1)$ such that the solutions to (5) for all $\Theta \in \mathcal{P}_0$ satisfy $\|\phi_t^i[k]\|_2 \leq C\rho^k$.*

¹Code available at <https://colab.research.google.com/drive/1129fy4ClkA1LBzEj0DXbqE5mNg1cz4WQ?usp=sharing>

²Note that the oscillating effect for the identification-based trajectory is due to the fact that a *static* control gain was designed after the system was identified at $t=4$. Since the closed loop has poles with imaginary parts, the static control gain results in oscillating behavior.

Because ϕ_t^i 's are linear column operators with finite horizon H per constraint (5b), (5c), there always exists such C and ρ . This is a standard assumption in SLS-based works Dean et al. (2019, 2020a, 2018). Thanks to Assumption 2, 3, and 5, the constants C and ρ for any given initial parameter set \mathcal{P}_0 can be determined a priori. We state Assumption 6 for the sake of analysis but the constants C and ρ are not necessary for Algorithm 1 to run.

Theorem 3 (Stability, Scalar Subsystem). *Under assumption 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, Algorithm 1 guarantees stability of the closed loop of (2) with*

$$\sup_t \{ \|x(t)\|_\infty, \|u(t)\|_\infty \} \leq O \left(e^{\text{poly}(\bar{n})\bar{d}} \cdot \left(e^{-t/H} x(0) + W \right) \right),$$

where $\bar{n} = \max\{\|\mathcal{C}^{\bar{d}}\|_1, \|\mathcal{C}^{\bar{d}}\|_\infty, \max_j |\mathcal{M}(j)|\}$ represents the total state dimension in any \bar{d} -neighbors specified by communication matrix \mathcal{C} and \bar{d} is the largest local delay each subsystem considers for the algorithm, and H is SLS controller horizon.

Proof. We first characterize the closed loop dynamics of (2) under Algorithm 1. In particular, despite the fact that each subsystem uses differently delayed information to compute the local parameter, sub-controller, and control actions, the closed loop for the global system under such distributed policy can be simply characterized as

$$x(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{H-1} \Phi_t^x[k] \hat{w}(t-k), \quad u(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{H-1} \Phi_t^u[k] \hat{w}(t-k) \quad (10a)$$

$$\hat{w}(t) = \sum_{k=1}^H (A_t \Phi_{t-1}^x[k-1] + B_t \Phi_{t-1}^u[k-1] - \Phi_t^x[k]) \hat{w}(t-k) + \tilde{w}(t-1), \quad (10b)$$

by Lemma 4. Here $u(t)$, $\hat{w}(t)$ are concatenated control action and estimated disturbance from (6). A_t, B_t are the global consistent parameter concatenated with the local consistent parameters $A^{ij}(\theta_t^i), B^{ij}(\theta_t^i)$. Vector $\tilde{w}(t)$ are the admissible consistent disturbances corresponding to A_t, B_t with the property that $\|\tilde{w}(t)\|_\infty \leq W$ for all time t . Operators Φ_t^x, Φ_t^u are shorthand for global closed-loop operators when (6) is implemented, with

$$\Phi_t^x[k](i, j) := \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,x}[k](i), \quad \Phi_t^u[k](i, j) := \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,u}[k](i).$$

Therefore, stability is guaranteed if and only if $\hat{w}(t)$ is bounded for all time t . In particular, if $\|\hat{w}(t)\|_\infty \leq \hat{W}_\infty$ for some $\hat{W}_\infty > 0$, then we can bound the global state via (10a) as

$$\begin{aligned} \|x(t)\|_\infty &\leq \hat{W}_\infty \sum_{k=0}^{H-1} \|\Phi_t^x[k]\|_\infty \\ &= \hat{W}_\infty \sum_{k=0}^{H-1} \max_{i \in [N]} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)} \left| \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,x}[k](i) \right| \\ &\leq \hat{W}_\infty \sum_{k=0}^{H-1} \max_{i \in [N]} \left\| \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,x}[k] \right\|_2 \cdot \bar{n} \\ &\leq \hat{W}_\infty \sum_{k=0}^{H-1} C \rho^k \bar{n} \leq \hat{W}_\infty C \frac{1}{1-\rho} \bar{n}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

and $\|u(t)\|_\infty$ follows analogously. Indeed, $\|\hat{w}(t)\|_\infty$ can be bounded from (10b) where we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{w}(t)\|_\infty &\leq \sum_{k=1}^H \left\| A_t \Phi_{t-1}^x[k-1] + B_t \Phi_{t-1}^u[k-1] - \Phi_t^x[k] \right\|_\infty \|\hat{w}(t-k)\|_\infty + \|\tilde{w}(t-1)\|_\infty \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^H \left\| A_t \Phi_{t-1}^x[k-1] + B_t \Phi_{t-1}^u[k-1] - \Phi_t^x[k] \right\|_\infty \|\hat{w}(t-k)\|_\infty + W. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

By Lemma 5, as long as $\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^H \|A_t \Phi_{t-1}^x[k-1] + B_t \Phi_{t-1}^u[k-1] - \Phi_t^x[k]\|_{\infty} \leq L$ for some positive constant L , then we can bound (12) with

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{w}(t)\|_{\infty} &\leq e^{-t/H} \cdot e^L x(0) + \frac{W(e^L + e - 1)}{e - 1} \\ &=: \hat{W}_{\infty}. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

In particular, this means that $\hat{w}(t)$, and thus $x(t)$ and $u(t)$ exponentially decays in magnitude for any impulse disturbances. Plugging the explicit expression of \hat{W}_{∞} i.e., (13) into (11), we have

$$\|x(t)\|_{\infty}, \|u(t)\|_{\infty} \leq O\left(\bar{n}e^L \cdot \left(e^{-t/H}x(0) + W\right)\right),$$

by recalling that the internal state of SLS controller $\hat{w}(t)$ is initiated to be $x(0)$. Therefore, what's left is to show

$$\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^H \|A_t \Phi_{t-1}^x[k-1] + B_t \Phi_{t-1}^u[k-1] - \Phi_t^x[k]\|_{\infty} \leq L,$$

which is proved in Proposition 6 where $L = O(\text{poly}(\bar{n})\bar{d})$. This concludes the proof. \square

Below we re-state and prove the auxillary results used in the proof of Theorem 1.

Lemma 4 (Closed loop Dynamics). *The closed loop of (2) under Algorithm 1 is characterized as follows for all time $t \in \mathbb{N}$:*

$$x(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{H-1} \Phi_t^x[k] \hat{w}(t-k), \quad u(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{H-1} \Phi_t^u[k] \hat{w}(t-k) \quad (14a)$$

$$\hat{w}(t) = \sum_{k=1}^H (A_t \Phi_{t-1}^x[k-1] + B_t \Phi_{t-1}^u[k-1] - \Phi_t^x[k]) \hat{w}(t-k) + \tilde{w}(t-1). \quad (14b)$$

where $u(t)$, $\hat{w}(t)$ are concatenated control action and estimated disturbance from (6). Vector $\tilde{w}(t)$ has property $\|\tilde{w}(t)\|_{\infty} \leq W$ for all time t . Matrices A_t, B_t are the global consistent parameter concatenated with local consistent parameters $A^{ij}(\theta_t^i), B^{ij}(\theta_t^i)$. Operators Φ_t^x, Φ_t^u are shorthand for global closed-loop operators when (6) is implemented, with

$$\Phi_t^x[k](i, j) := \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,x}[k](i), \quad \Phi_t^u[k](i, j) := \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,u}[k](i).$$

Proof. First, we write out the global closed-loop dynamics of (2) under distributed controller (6) and obtain

$$x(t) = A(\Theta^*)x(t-1) + B(\Theta^*)u(t-1) + w(t-1) \quad (15a)$$

$$\hat{w}(t) = x(t) - \sum_{k=1}^{H-1} \Phi_t^x[k] \hat{w}(t-k) \quad (15b)$$

$$u(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{H-1} \Phi_t^u[k] \hat{w}(t-k), \quad (15c)$$

where (15a) is the global dynamics (2), (15b) and (15c) concatenates local variables $\hat{w}^i(t)$, $u^i(t)$ from (6) into $\hat{w}(t)$ and $u(t)$. Now, we use the consistency property of all the locally consistent parameters generated from CONSIST (Algorithm 2) and represent dynamics (15a) in terms of the global consistent parameter A_t, B_t , i.e.,

$$x(t) = A_t x(t-1) + B_t u(t-1) + \tilde{w}(t-1), \quad (16)$$

with admissible consistent disturbances $\|\tilde{w}(t)\|_{\infty} \leq W$ for all time t . As discussed in Appendix B, we can do so because the collection of all local consistent parameters construct globally consistent parameter that

can produce the trajectory of (15a) up to $x(t)$, hence the replacement of $(A(\Theta^*), B(\Theta^*), w(t))$ with $(A_t, B_t, \tilde{w}(t))$. Next, observe that by moving $x(t)$ to the left side, (15b) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} x(t) &= \sum_{k=1}^{H-1} \Phi_t^x[k] \hat{w}(t-k) + \hat{w}(t) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{H-1} \Phi_t^x[k] \hat{w}(t-k), \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where in the last equality we used the fact that each $\Phi_t^x[0] = I$ because each local sub-controller is synthesized in (5) to be $\phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,x}[0] = e_i$ no matter the delay. Now we substitute (16) into (15b) to get

$$\hat{w}(t) = x(t) - \sum_{k=1}^{H-1} \Phi_t^x[k] \hat{w}(t-k) \quad (18a)$$

$$= A_t x(t-1) + B_t u(t-1) - \sum_{k=1}^{H-1} \Phi_t^x[k] \hat{w}(t-k) + \tilde{w}(t-1) \quad (18b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= A_t \sum_{k=0}^{H-1} \Phi_{t-1}^x[k] \hat{w}(t-1-k) + B_t \sum_{k=0}^{H-1} \Phi_{t-1}^u[k] \hat{w}(t-1-k) - \sum_{k=1}^{H-1} \Phi_t^x[k] \hat{w}(t-k) \\ &\quad + \tilde{w}(t-1) \end{aligned} \quad (18c)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_{k=1}^{H-1} (A_t \Phi_{t-1}^x[k-1] + B_t \Phi_{t-1}^u[k-1] - \Phi_t^x[k]) \hat{w}(t-k) \\ &\quad + (A_t \Phi_{t-1}^x[H-1] + B_t \Phi_{t-1}^u[H-1] - \Phi_t^x[H]) \hat{w}(t-H) + \tilde{w}(t-1) \end{aligned} \quad (18d)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^H (A_t \Phi_{t-1}^x[k-1] + B_t \Phi_{t-1}^u[k-1] - \Phi_t^x[k]) \hat{w}(t-k) + \tilde{w}(t-1), \quad (18e)$$

where in (18c) we substituted (17) and (15c) into $x(t-1)$ and $u(t-1)$ respectively. In (18d), we grouped the terms according to $\hat{w}(t-k)$ and used the fact that the closed-loop columns are synthesized in (5) such that $\Phi_{t-1}^x[H] = 0$. Together, (15c), (17), and (18e) gives the stated result. \square

Lemma 5 (Sufficient condition for H -convolution). *Let $W \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $H \in \mathbb{N}$. For $k \in [H]$, let $\{a_t[k]\}_{t=1}^\infty$ be a non-negative sequence. Let $\{s_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ be a positive sequence such that*

$$s_t \leq \sum_{k=1}^H a_{t-1}[k] s_{t-k} + W. \quad (19)$$

Then $\{s_t\}$ is bounded if $\sum_{t=0}^\infty \sum_{k=1}^H a_t[k] \leq L$ for some $L \in \mathbb{R}_+$. In particular, for all t ,

$$s_t \leq e^{-t/H} \cdot e^L s_0 + \frac{W(e^L + e - 1)}{e - 1}. \quad (20)$$

Proof. Let $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and denote $\{z_{t_i}\}$ as a finite subsequence of $\{s_\tau\}_{\tau=0}^t$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} z_{t_N} &= s_t \\ z_{t_{i-1}} &= \max_{t_i - H \leq \tau \leq t_{i-1}} s_\tau, \quad \text{for } i = N, N-1, \dots, 1, \end{aligned}$$

with $t_N = t$ and $z_{t_i} = s_{t_i}$. This construction of the $\{z_{t_i}\}$ has to terminate at $z_{t_0} = s_0$. Therefore, N is at

least $\frac{t}{H}$ and at most t . By the recursive relationship of s_t in (19), we have for any i ,

$$\begin{aligned} z_{t_i} = s_{t_i} &\leq \sum_{k=1}^H a_{t_i-1}[k] s_{t_i-k} + W \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{k=1}^H a_{t_i-1}[k] \right) z_{t_i-1} + W \\ &= \hat{a}_{t_i-1} \cdot z_{t_i-1} + W, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where we use the fact that $a_t[k] \geq 0$ for all t and k . We also denote $\hat{a}_{t_i-1} = \left(\sum_{k=1}^H a_{t_i-1}[k] \right)$. By the recursion (21), we have

$$s_t = z_{t_N} \leq \prod_{i=1}^N \hat{a}_{t_i-1} \cdot z_{t_0} + W \left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^N \prod_{i=j}^N \hat{a}_{t_i-1} \right) \quad (22)$$

Now, $\prod_{i=j}^N \hat{a}_{t_i-1} = \prod_{i=j}^N ((\hat{a}_{t_i-1} - 1) + 1) \leq \prod_{i=j}^N e^{\hat{a}_{t_i-1}-1} = e^{\sum_{i=j}^N (\hat{a}_{t_i-1}-1)} \leq e^{L-(N-j+1)}$, where the last inequality is due to the hypothesis that $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \hat{a}_t \leq L$. Plug this inequality for $\prod_{i=j}^N \hat{a}_{t_i-1}$ back to (22), we continue with

$$\begin{aligned} s_t &\leq e^{-t/H} \cdot s_0 e^L + W \left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^N e^{L-(N-j)} \right) \\ &\leq e^{-t/H} \cdot s_0 e^L + W \left(1 + e^L \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} e^{-j} \right) \\ &\leq e^{-t/H} \cdot s_0 e^L + W \left(1 + e^L \frac{1}{e-1} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we used $z_{t_0} = s_0$ and that N is at least t/H . This is the required bound (20), which holds for any $t \in \mathbb{N}$. \square

Lemma 6 (Bounded error for closed loop operators). *Let Φ_t^x, Φ_t^u denote the global closed loop operators concatenated from sub-controllers generated with Algorithm 3 where $\Phi_t^x[k](i, j) := \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,x}[k](i)$ and $\Phi_t^u[k](i, j) := \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,u}[k](i)$. Denote matrices A_t, B_t as the global consistent parameter concatenated with local consistent parameters $A^{ij}(\theta_t^i), B^{ij}(\theta_t^i)$. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^H \|A_t \Phi_{t-1}^x[k-1] + B_t \Phi_{t-1}^u[k-1] - \Phi_t^x[k]\|_{\infty} \\ &\leq (\bar{d} + 3) \bar{n}^2 \text{diam}(\mathcal{P}_0) \left(\kappa \bar{n}^{\frac{3}{2}} \Gamma H + \frac{C}{1-\rho} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where $\bar{n} = \max\{\|\mathcal{C}^{\bar{d}}\|_1, \|\mathcal{C}^{\bar{d}}\|_{\infty}, \max_j |\mathcal{M}(j)|\}$, and \bar{d} is the largest local delay each subsystem considers for the algorithm, while H is SLS controller horizon. Here, Γ is a system-theoretical constant that does not depend on the global dynamics properties.

Proof. To ease notation, we use a_t^i and b_t^i to denote the i^{th} row of A_t and B_t respectively.

Our strategy is to bound each term in (23) for a fixed t and k . We will see that the summation of these terms over all k and t remain bounded. Each term in (23) can be bounded as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} &\|A_t \Phi_{t-1}^x[k-1] + B_t \Phi_{t-1}^u[k-1] - \Phi_t^x[k]\|_{\infty} \\ &= \max_{i \in [N]} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)} \left| (a_t^i)^T \Phi_{t-1}^x[k-1](:, j) + (b_t^i)^T \Phi_{t-1}^u[k-1](:, j) - \underbrace{\Phi_t^x[k](i, j)}_{\text{Defined to be } \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,x}[k](i)} \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

As discussed in Appendix F.3, due to sparsity constraints placed on the sub-controllers during synthesis (5), the only nonzero elements in a particular row i of $\Phi_t^x[k]$ are the positions at $j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)$. Hence, we can write sum of each row i as sum of the elements in position (i, j) where $j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)$ in (24). Recall that $\phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,x}$ are synthesized in (5) such that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,x}[k](i) &= \left(a_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)-d(i \rightarrow j)}^i \right)^T \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,x}[k-1] \\ &\quad + \left(b_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)-d(i \rightarrow j)}^i \right)^T \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,u}[k-1] \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

because $\phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,x}$ is synthesized by j at time $t - d(j \rightarrow i)$. The i^{th} position of $\phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,x}$ in particular uses model information from subsystem i , which is transmitted to j from i with delay $d(i \rightarrow j)$. Therefore, we substitute (25) into (24) to get

$$\begin{aligned} (24) &= \max_{i \in [N]} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)} \left| \left(a_t^i \right)^T \Phi_{t-1}^x[k-1](:, j) - \left(a_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)-d(i \rightarrow j)}^i \right)^T \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,x}[k-1] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(b_t^i \right)^T \Phi_{t-1}^u[k-1](:, j) - \left(b_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)-d(i \rightarrow j)}^i \right)^T \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,u}[k-1] \right| \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Adding and subtracting $\left(a_t^i \right)^T \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,x}[k-1]$ and $\left(b_t^i \right)^T \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,u}[k-1]$ in (26), we can group terms and get

$$\begin{aligned} (26) &\leq \max_{i \in [N]} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)} \left| \left(a_t^i \right)^T \left(\Phi_{t-1}^x[k-1](:, j) - \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,x}[k-1] \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(b_t^i \right)^T \left(\Phi_{t-1}^u[k-1](:, j) - \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,u}[k-1] \right) \right| \end{aligned} \quad (27a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &+ \max_{i \in [N]} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)} \left| \left(a_t^i - a_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)-d(i \rightarrow j)}^i \right)^T \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,x}[k-1] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(b_t^i - b_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)-d(i \rightarrow j)}^i \right)^T \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,u}[k-1] \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (27b)$$

We now consider (27a) and (27b) separately. For the remainder of the proof, we use $\Phi_t^{x,j}$ and $\Phi_t^{u,j}$ as

shorthand for the j^{th} column of $\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\Phi_{\mathbf{t}}^{\mathbf{u}}$ respectively. Apply Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$(27a) \leq \max_{i \in [N]} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)} \|a_i^j\|_2 \left\| \Phi_{t-1}^{x,j}[k-1] - \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,x}[k-1] \right\|_2 \\ + \|b_i^j\|_2 \left\| \Phi_{t-1}^{u,j}[k-1] - \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,u}[k-1] \right\|_2 \quad (28a)$$

$$\text{(by Assumption 2)} \leq \kappa \cdot \max_{i \in [N]} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)} \left\| \Phi_{t-1}^{x,j}[k-1] - \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,x}[k-1] \right\|_2 \\ + \left\| \Phi_{t-1}^{u,j}[k-1] - \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,u}[k-1] \right\|_2 \quad (28b)$$

$$= \kappa \cdot \max_{i \in [N]} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)} \left(\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{out}}(j)} \left| \Phi_{t-1}^{x,j}[k-1](\ell) - \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,x}[k-1](\ell) \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ + \left(\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{out}}(j)} \left| \Phi_{t-1}^{u,j}[k-1](\ell) - \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,u}[k-1](\ell) \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \quad (28c)$$

$$= \kappa \cdot \max_{i \in [N]} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)} \left(\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{out}}(j)} \left| \phi_{t-1-d(j \rightarrow \ell)}^{j,x}[k-1](\ell) - \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,x}[k-1](\ell) \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ + \left(\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{out}}(j)} \left| \phi_{t-1-d(j \rightarrow \ell)}^{j,u}[k-1](\ell) - \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,u}[k-1](\ell) \right|^2 \right)^{1/2}, \quad (28d)$$

where to arrive at (28c) we used the fact that the nonzero elements in any column/sub-controller synthesized or assembled at subsystem j corresponds to the elements in $\mathcal{D}_{\text{out}}(j)$. The last equality comes from the definition of $\Phi_{\mathbf{t}-1}^{\mathbf{x}}, \Phi_{\mathbf{t}-1}^{\mathbf{u}}$. Continuing, we bound any sum using the largest summand multiplied by the number of summands:

$$(27a) \leq (28d) \leq \kappa \cdot \max_{i \in [N]} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)} \left(\bar{n} \cdot \max_{\ell \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{out}}(j)} \left\| \phi_{t-1-d(j \rightarrow \ell)}^{j,x}[k-1] - \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,x}[k-1] \right\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ + \left(\bar{n} \cdot \max_{\ell' \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{out}}(j)} \left\| \phi_{t-1-d(j \rightarrow \ell')}^{j,u}[k-1] - \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,u}[k-1] \right\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2}, \quad (29a)$$

$$= \kappa \bar{n}^{3/2} \cdot \max_{i \in [N]} \max_{j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)} \left(\left(\max_{\ell \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{out}}(j)} \left\| \phi_{t-1-d(j \rightarrow \ell)}^{j,x}[k-1] - \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,x}[k-1] \right\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2} \right. \\ \left. + \left(\max_{\ell' \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{out}}(j)} \left\| \phi_{t-1-d(j \rightarrow \ell')}^{j,u}[k-1] - \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,u}[k-1] \right\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2} \right). \quad (29b)$$

Recall that $\phi_{t-1-d(j \rightarrow \ell)}^j$ are generated by subsystem j using model information $\hat{\Theta}_{t-1-d(j \rightarrow \ell)}^j$ during synthesis procedure ((4), Algorithm 3). Similarly, $\phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^j$ are generated using $\hat{\Theta}_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^j$. Therefore, we can invoke Corollary 2 and arrive at

$$(27a) \leq (28d) \leq (29b) \\ \leq \kappa \bar{n}^{3/2} \Gamma \max_{i \in [N]} \max_{j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)} \left(\left(\max_{\ell \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{out}}(j)} \left\| \hat{\Theta}_{t-1-d(j \rightarrow \ell)}^j - \hat{\Theta}_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^j \right\|_F^2 \right)^{1/2} \right. \\ \left. + \max_{\ell' \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{out}}(j)} \left(\left\| \hat{\Theta}_{t-1-d(j \rightarrow \ell')}^j - \hat{\Theta}_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^j \right\|_F^2 \right)^{1/2} \right) \quad (30)$$

For any fixed i, j, ℓ, ℓ' , the following holds true.

$$\begin{aligned}
(30) &= \kappa \bar{n}^{3/2} \Gamma \left(\left\| \hat{\Theta}_{t-1-d(j \rightarrow \ell)}^j - \hat{\Theta}_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^j \right\|_F + \left\| \hat{\Theta}_{t-1-d(j \rightarrow \ell')}^j - \hat{\Theta}_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^j \right\|_F \right) \\
&= \kappa \bar{n}^{3/2} \Gamma \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}(j)} \left\| \theta_{t-1-d(j \rightarrow \ell)-d(m \rightarrow j)}^m - \theta_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)-d(m \rightarrow j)}^m \right\|_F \\
&\quad + \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}(j)} \left\| \theta_{t-1-d(j \rightarrow \ell')-d(m \rightarrow j)}^m - \theta_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)-d(m \rightarrow j)}^m \right\|_F \\
&\leq \kappa \bar{n}^{3/2} \Gamma \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}(j)} \left(\sum_{p=\min(t_1, t_2)}^{\min(t_1, t_2)+\delta_t+1} \left\| \theta_{t-p+1}^m - \theta_{t-p}^m \right\|_F + \sum_{p=\min(t'_1, t_2)}^{\min(t'_1, t_2)+\delta'_t+1} \left\| \theta_{t-p+1}^m - \theta_{t-p}^m \right\|_F \right), \quad (31)
\end{aligned}$$

where we define $t_1 = 1 + d(j \rightarrow \ell) + d(m \rightarrow j)$, $t'_1 = 1 + d(j \rightarrow \ell') + d(m \rightarrow j)$, $t_2 = 1 + d(j \rightarrow i) + d(m \rightarrow j)$, and $\delta t = |d(j \rightarrow i) - d(j \rightarrow \ell) - 1|$, $\delta t' = |d(j \rightarrow i) - d(j \rightarrow \ell') - 1|$. We stop at (31) for the moment for our bound for (27a) and change course to bound the other term (27b) in (27). We start with cauchy-schwarz for (27b).

$$\begin{aligned}
(27b) &\leq \max_{i \in [N]} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)} \left\| a_t^i - a_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)-d(i \rightarrow j)}^i \right\|_2 \left\| \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,x}[k-1] \right\|_2 \\
&\quad + \left\| b_t^i - b_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)-d(i \rightarrow j)}^i \right\|_2 \left\| \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^{j,u}[k-1] \right\|_2 \\
&\leq C \rho^{k-1} \bar{n} \cdot \max_{i \in [N]} \max_{j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)} \left\| a_t^i - a_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)-d(i \rightarrow j)}^i \right\|_2 + \left\| b_t^i - b_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)-d(i \rightarrow j)}^i \right\|_2 \\
&= C \rho^{k-1} \bar{n} \cdot \max_{i \in [N]} \max_{j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)} \left\| \theta_t^i - \theta_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)-d(i \rightarrow j)}^i \right\|_2 \quad (32)
\end{aligned}$$

Here we have used Assumption 6 to bound the decay rate of the sub-controllers. The last equality holds by recalling that we have defined a_t^i and b_t^i to be the i^{th} row of the A_t and B_t respectively, which is constructed from the global consistent parameter $\Theta_t = \cup_{i=1}^N \theta_t^i$. Therefore, by definition, $[a_t^i, b_t^i] = \theta_t^i$.

We now return to bound $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^H \left\| A_t \Phi_{t-1}^x[k-1] + B_t \Phi_{t-1}^u[k-1] - \Phi_t^x[k] \right\|_{\infty}$. In particular, we have so far showed that

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^H \left\| A_t \Phi_{t-1}^x[k-1] + B_t \Phi_{t-1}^u[k-1] - \Phi_t^x[k] \right\|_{\infty} \leq \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^H (31) + (32). \quad (33)$$

Therefore, our goal is to bound each component of the right hand side. Specifically,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^H (31) \\
&\leq \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^H \kappa \bar{n}^{3/2} \Gamma \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}(j)} \left(\sum_{p=\min(t_1, t_2)}^{\min(t_1, t_2)+\delta_t+1} \left\| \theta_{t-p+1}^m - \theta_{t-p}^m \right\|_F + \sum_{p=\min(t'_1, t_2)}^{\min(t'_1, t_2)+\delta'_t+1} \left\| \theta_{t-p+1}^m - \theta_{t-p}^m \right\|_F \right), \quad (34)
\end{aligned}$$

for a different tuple of $(i \in [N], j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i), \ell \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{out}}(j), \ell' \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{out}}(j))$ at each t . However, for any (i, j, ℓ, ℓ') , the following holds.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^H (31) \\
&\leq \kappa \bar{n}^{3/2} \Gamma \sum_{k=1}^H \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}(j)} \left(\sum_{p=\min(t_1, t_2)}^{\min(t_1, t_2)+\delta_t+1} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \left\| \theta_{t-p+1}^m - \theta_{t-p}^m \right\|_F + \sum_{p=\min(t'_1, t_2)}^{\min(t'_1, t_2)+\delta'_t+1} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \left\| \theta_{t-p+1}^m - \theta_{t-p}^m \right\|_F \right), \\
&\leq 2\kappa \bar{n}^{9/2} \Gamma H \text{diam}(\mathcal{P}_0) \left(\max_{i \in [N], j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i), \ell \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{out}}(j)} (1 + 1 + |d(j \rightarrow i) - d(j \rightarrow \ell) - 1|) \right) \quad (35a) \\
&\leq 2\kappa \bar{n}^{9/2} \Gamma H \text{diam}(\mathcal{P}_0) (\bar{d} + 3). \quad (35b)
\end{aligned}$$

Here we have used in the competitiveness of each local Steiner point selector via Corollary 1 in (35a) with competitive ratio of $\bar{n}/2$. Furthermore, by definition of $\mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\text{out}}(j)$, we know that the largest delay for $d(j \rightarrow i)$ and $d(j \rightarrow \ell)$ for any choice of i, j, ℓ is less than \bar{d} .

Finally, we investigate the second component of the right hand side of (33).

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^H (32) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^H C \rho^{k-1} \bar{n} \cdot \max_{i \in [N]} \max_{j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)} \left\| \theta_t^i - \theta_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)-d(i \rightarrow j)}^i \right\|_2 \quad (36a)$$

$$\leq \sum_{k=1}^H C \rho^{k-1} \bar{n} \max_{i \in [N]} \max_{j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)} \sum_{p=0}^{d(j \rightarrow i)+d(i \rightarrow j)+1} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \left\| \theta_{t-p+1}^i - \theta_{t-p}^i \right\|_2 \quad (36b)$$

$$\leq C \bar{n}^3 \text{diam}(\mathcal{P}_0) (\bar{d} + 1) / (1 - \rho) \quad (36c)$$

where we once again used the competitive ratio of the local Steiner point selector (Corollary 1). Moreover, by definition of $\mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)$, the largest delay $d(i \rightarrow j)$ for any $j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)$ is less than \bar{d} .

Finally, we have the bound on the target quantity with (35b) and (36c) and conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^H \left\| A_t \Phi_{t-1}^x[k-1] + B_t \Phi_{t-1}^u[k-1] - \Phi_t^x[k] \right\|_{\infty} &\leq (35b) + (36c) \\ &\leq 2(\bar{d} + 3) \bar{n}^3 \text{diam}(\mathcal{P}_0) \left(\kappa \bar{n}^{\frac{3}{2}} \Gamma H + \frac{C}{1 - \rho} \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 1 (of Theorem 2.1 in Bubeck et al. (2020)). *for any (adversarial) sequence of convex bodies \mathcal{P}_t^i , and any number of rounds $T \in \mathbb{N}$, the points θ_t^i selected by Algorithm 2 achieves*

$$\sum_{t=0}^T \left\| \theta_{t+1}^i - \theta_t^i \right\| \leq \frac{n_i (n_i + m_i)}{2} \cdot \text{diam}(\mathcal{P}_0). \quad (37)$$

Corollary 2 (of Theorem 8, Structured SLS sensitivity). *Consider the optimal solutions ϕ, ϕ' to (5) with two different parameters input Θ, Θ' respectively. Then we have*

$$\left\| \phi - \phi' \right\|_2 \leq \Gamma \left\| \Theta - \Theta' \right\|_2,$$

with $\Gamma = O(\Gamma_A + \Gamma_B)$ where Γ_A and Γ_B are constants in Theorem 8.

Proof. The SLS synthesis problem that we consider in (5) has one additional sparsity constraints than general SLS synthesis presented in (49) to which Theorem 8 applies. Therefore, we need to de-constrain the synthesis problem (5) and turn it into a problem of the form (49) in order to apply Theorem 8. To do so, we follow the procedure in section IV.A of Yu et al. (2020), where a re-parameterization of $\phi_t^{j,u}$ is used to characterize all sparse $\phi_t^{j,u}$ which will result in sparse $\tilde{\phi}_t^{j,x}$ according to the dynamical evolution (5c). First, we rewrite (5c) with the nonzero variables grouped together as follows.

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\phi}_b^{j,x} \\ \tilde{\phi}_b^{j,u} \end{bmatrix} [k+1] = \begin{bmatrix} A_{nn}^{(j)} & A_{nb}^{(j)} \\ A_{bn}^{(j)} & A_{bb}^{(j)} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\phi}_b^{j,x} \\ \tilde{\phi}_b^{j,u} \end{bmatrix} [k] + \begin{bmatrix} B_n^{(j)} \\ B_b^{(j)} \end{bmatrix} \tilde{\phi}_b^{j,u}[k] \quad (38)$$

where $\tilde{\phi}^{j,x}$ denotes the vector of nonzero entries in $\phi_t^{j,x}$ and $\tilde{\phi}_b^{j,x}$ denotes the ‘‘boundary’’ positions of $\tilde{\phi}^{j,x}$. The ‘‘boundary’’ positions of $\tilde{\phi}^{j,x}$ corresponds to the positions in the vector that would become nonzero from zero due to the dynamical evolution (5c) in one time step. We refer interested reader to Yu et al. (2020) for detailed setup/derivation for (38). We also partition A, B in (5c) to correspond the entries that are associated with $\tilde{\phi}^{j,x}$ and $\tilde{\phi}_b^{j,x}$. $\tilde{\phi}_b^{j,u}$ denote the reduced vector with only non-zero entries of $\phi_t^{i,u}$.

Lemma 7 (Lemma 2, Yu et al. (2020)). *If $B_b^{(j)} B_b^{(j)\dagger} = I$, then the vectors $\{v^j[k]\}$ characterize all $\tilde{\phi}_b^{j,u}[k]$ via*

$$\tilde{\phi}_b^{j,u}[k] = -B_b^{(j),\dagger} A_{bn}^{(j)} \tilde{\phi}_b^{j,x}[k] + \left(I - B_b^{(j),\dagger} B_b^{(j)} \right) v^j[k]. \quad (39)$$

We remark that the pseudo-inverse condition in Lemma 7 is equivalently to Assumption 5, as observed in Alonso et al. (2021); Yu et al. (2020); Anderson and Matni (2017).

We can now substitute (39) into the synthesis problem (5) and obtain an SLS synthesis problem in the same form as (49) with transformed dynamical evolution in terms of the new variables $\tilde{\phi}^{j,x}[k]$ and $v^j[k]$. Consider the optimal solutions $\tilde{\phi}$ and $\tilde{\phi}'$ (concatenated from $\tilde{\phi}^{j,x}$ and v^j) computed from the de-constrained problem with two different model input Θ and Θ' . By Theorem 8, we have

$$\left\| \tilde{\phi} - \tilde{\phi}' \right\|_2 \leq (\Gamma_A + \Gamma_B) \|\Theta - \Theta'\|_F. \quad (40)$$

Observe that

$$\tilde{\phi}^{j,u} = \begin{bmatrix} -B_b^{(j),\dagger} A_{bn}^{(j)} & (I - B_b^{(j),\dagger} B_b^{(j)}) \end{bmatrix} \tilde{\phi}.$$

Therefore, we could bound the sensitivity of the solution to (5) via

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi - \phi'\|_2 &\leq \left\| \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ -B_b^{(j),\dagger} A_{bn}^{(j)} & (I - B_b^{(j),\dagger} B_b^{(j)}) \end{bmatrix} \tilde{\phi} - \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ -B_b'^{(j),\dagger} A_{bn}'^{(j)} & (I - B_b'^{(j),\dagger} B_b'^{(j)}) \end{bmatrix} \tilde{\phi}' \right\|_2 \\ &\leq \left\| \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ -B_b^{(j),\dagger} A_{bn}^{(j)} + B_b'^{(j),\dagger} A_{bn}'^{(j)} & -B_b^{(j),\dagger} B_b^{(j)} + B_b'^{(j),\dagger} B_b'^{(j)} \end{bmatrix} \tilde{\phi} \right\|_2 \\ &\quad + \left\| \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ -B_b'^{(j),\dagger} A_{bn}'^{(j)} & (I - B_b'^{(j),\dagger} B_b'^{(j)}) \end{bmatrix} (\tilde{\phi} - \tilde{\phi}') \right\|_2 \\ &\leq \frac{4C\kappa}{\sigma_{\min}(1-\rho)} + \left(2 + \frac{2\kappa}{\sigma_{\min}}\right) (\Gamma_A + \Gamma_B) \|\Theta - \Theta'\|_F \\ &= O(\Gamma_A + \Gamma_B) \|\Theta - \Theta'\|_F, \end{aligned}$$

where σ_{\min} denotes the minimum singular value of the matrix B_b for all $B(\theta^i)$ with $\theta^i \in \mathcal{P}_0^i$. Note that the left pseudo-inverse has the largest singular value of $1/\sigma_{\min}$ with σ_{\min} the smallest singular value of the original matrix. Due to Assumption 3 and Assumption 5, we know that B_b has to be bounded from below so that (5) is feasible. We have also used the fact that norm of an lower triangular block matrix is upperbounded by the sum of the norm of each component block. We invoke Assumption 6 to bound the decay rate of $\tilde{\phi}$ by relating the nonzero component of the solution to (5) and $\tilde{\phi}$ via (40). \square

E Communication constraints

In this paper, we consider communication constraints that result in partially nested information structure (Ho et al., 1972; Casalino et al., 1984) through Assumption 4. This information pattern enforces the existence of a communication link between two subsystems if their dynamics is coupled. Such information constraint is commonly assumed in distributed control literature (Lamperski and Lessard, 2015; Shah and Parrilo, 2013; Gattami, 2009), due to the fact that the optimal distributed controller is linear when the underlying dynamical system has partially nested information structure (Ho et al., 1972). We use the term ‘‘information’’ colloquially to mean all locally computed and observed information (such as local state, local disturbance estimate, and local consistent model) and all communicated information from other subsystems. We refer interested readers to Rotkowitz (2008) for a detailed discussion on information structures and their consequences for distributed control.

F System Level Synthesis

System Level Synthesis (SLS) theory is a recent breakthrough for designing distributed controllers (Anderson et al., 2019). SLS has seen application in many areas of control theory, including robotics (Xiong et al., 2021), perception and learning-based control (Dean et al., 2020b; Fattahi et al., 2020; Dean et al., 2019; Xue and Matni, 2021), adaptive control (Han, 2020; Ho and Doyle, 2019), model predictive control (Alonso and Matni, 2020; Sieber et al., 2021; Chen et al., 2021; Li et al., 2021a), distributed control (Wang et al., 2018;

Yu et al., 2020), and robust control (Matni and Sarma, 2020). Below we quickly review some core concepts from SLS.

We heavily use the operator/signal notation, so we review the notation first. Recall that bold-face lower cases denote vector signal of the form $\mathbf{x} := [x(0)^T, x(1)^T, \dots]^T$ with $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Signal \mathbf{x} is an infinite sequence of vectors indexed by time t . A causal linear operator has representation with components $K[k]$ for $k \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$:

$$\mathbf{K} := \begin{bmatrix} K[0] & 0 & \dots & \dots \\ K[1] & K[0] & 0 & \dots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \end{bmatrix}.$$

The convolution of a causal linear operator \mathbf{G} and a signal \mathbf{x} is written as $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{G}\mathbf{x}$, *i.e.*,

$$\mathbf{y} := \begin{bmatrix} y(0) \\ y(1) \\ y(2) \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{G}\mathbf{x} = \begin{bmatrix} G[0] & 0 & \dots & \dots \\ G[1] & G[0] & 0 & \dots \\ G[2] & G[1] & G[0] & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & & \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x(0) \\ x(1) \\ x(2) \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix}.$$

In particular, a compact way of representing the components $y(t)$ of the signal \mathbf{y} is by writing $y(t) := \sum_{k=0}^t G[k]x(t-k)$.

Now, consider the following LTI system

$$x(t+1) = Ax(t) + Bu(t) + w(t), \quad (41)$$

with $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$, $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ and $w(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$. A general goal of control is to design a feedback linear controller \mathbf{K} that maps \mathbf{x} to \mathbf{u} such that the closed loop dynamics is stable and performant. However, instead of directly designing a feedback controller, the key idea of SLS is to seek *causal linear operators* that map disturbances \mathbf{w} to \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{u} in the closed loop, *i.e.*, after some linear controller has been deployed on the system. In particular, we can derive such *closed-loop operators* as follows. First, observe that system dynamics (41) can be written in signal/operator notation as

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathcal{Z}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} + \mathcal{Z}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{w}, \quad (42)$$

where \mathcal{Z} is the block-downshift operator with identity matrices of size n_x by n_x in all the first block sub-diagonal positions and zeros everywhere else. Operator \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} are block diagonal matrices with matrix A and B on the diagonal respectively.

A linear feedback controller \mathbf{K} in its general form is a causal linear operator. Therefore, the closed loop of (42) under $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{K}\mathbf{x}$ then evolves as

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{K})\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{w}.$$

From this, we can derive the closed-loop operators that map \mathbf{w} to \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{u} as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{u} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} (I - \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{K}))^{-1} \\ \mathbf{K}(I - \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{K}))^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{w},$$

where the inverse is well-defined because $\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{K})$ is a strictly lower triangular block matrix. We denote the operators that map \mathbf{w} to \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{u} as $\Phi^{\mathbf{x}} := (I - \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{K}))^{-1}$ and $\Phi^{\mathbf{u}} := \mathbf{K}(I - \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{K}))^{-1}$ respectively, and call them the closed-loop operators. The closed-loop operators derived from the above satisfy

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{u} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \Phi^{\mathbf{x}} \\ \Phi^{\mathbf{u}} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{w} \quad (43)$$

by definition. Note (43) also implies $\Phi^{\mathbf{u}} = \mathbf{K}\Phi^{\mathbf{x}}$ since $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{K}\mathbf{x}$. Therefore, SLS uses the closed-loop operators $\Phi^{\mathbf{u}}$ as the alternative parameterization for controller \mathbf{K} . In particular, observe that $\mathbf{K} = \Phi^{\mathbf{u}}(\Phi^{\mathbf{x}})^{-1}$.

F.1 The SLS characterization result

A key piece of SLS theory is that it characterizes the space of all achievable operators Φ^x and Φ^u under some feedback linear controller \mathbf{K} . Therefore, under the SLS parameterization, one can optimize over Φ^x and Φ^u instead of designing for \mathbf{K} directly. We state this characterization theorem, which has been used extensively in learning-based control literature (Umenberger and Schön, 2020; Fattahi et al., 2020; Dean et al., 2020a; Xue and Matni, 2021) below.

Theorem 4 (Adapted from part 1 of Theorem 2.1 in Anderson et al. (2019)). *For system (41), closed-loop operators Φ^x, Φ^u satisfy (43) under a stabilizing controller \mathbf{K} if and only if*

$$\Phi^x[0] = I, \quad \Phi^x[H] = 0, \quad \Phi^x[k+1] = A\Phi^x[k] + B\Phi^u[k], \quad \text{for } k = 0, 1, \dots, H-1. \quad (44)$$

Theorem 4 provides an affine constraint on all achievable closed-loop operators and can be readily incorporated into any controller synthesis problem, such as optimal LQR control (Dean et al., 2019).

F.2 SLS controllers

Even though the SLS parameterization result (Theorem 4) has been broadly applied to learning-based control design, the SLS controller result shown below has received comparatively little attention. However, our algorithm heavily leverages this result for analysis. Therefore, we introduce the SLS controller and related results in this section.

Theorem 5 (Adapted from part 2 of Theorem 2.1 in Anderson et al. (2019)). *Given any closed-loop operators Φ^x, Φ^u that satisfy (44), the following SLS controller constructed using Φ^x, Φ^u*

$$\hat{w}(t) = x(t) - \sum_{k=1}^{H-1} \Phi^x[k] \hat{w}(t-k) \quad (45a)$$

$$u(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{H-1} \Phi^u[k] \hat{w}(t-k) \quad (45b)$$

with $\hat{w}(0) = x(0)$ achieves the desired closed-loop behavior prescribed by Φ^x, Φ^u .

We call controllers of the form (45) the *SLS controller*. In particular, SLS controllers are constructed from the closed-loop operators Φ^x, Φ^u and are thus modular.

The interpretation of (45) is intuitive. Because Φ^x, Φ^u by definition maps \mathbf{w} to \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{u} , (45a) estimates the disturbance entering the state in the last time step by computing the difference between the currently observed state $x(t)$ and the counterfactual state $\sum_{k=1}^{H-1} \Phi^x[k] \hat{w}(t-k)$ that should have been observed if there was no disturbance at the last step. Indeed, a simple calculation using substitution will reveal that $\hat{w}(t) = w(t-1)$, i.e., that the estimated disturbance from the SLS controller is the perfect one-step delayed estimation of the true disturbances. Then (45b) simply acts upon the estimated disturbances according to the closed-loop operator Φ^u prescribes.

F.3 SLS for communication and locality constraints

A significant application of SLS is *distributed controller design*. Thanks to the SLS parameterization and controller result presented above, a large class of communication and locality constraints (collectively called information constraints) for controller design immediately become convex (Wang et al., 2018, 2019)³. Furthermore, the structure of the SLS controller allows for distributed implementation. A canonical distributed SLS control algorithm (Anderson et al., 2019) is shown in Algorithm 4. For simplicity, here we consider $x^i(t), u^i(t)$ (i^{th} position of $x(t), u(t)$) as the scalar subsystem i in the global dynamics (41). During control

³There is a large body of works on control design with communication and locality constraints using convex reparameterization. We refer interested readers to Wang et al. (2019); Zheng et al. (2020) for detailed discussion. However, SLS stands out with its controller realization result Theorem 5, which we leverage in our distributed algorithm design as well as the stability analysis.

action computation (45), each subsystem only computes its own local disturbance estimation $\hat{w}^i(t)$ and local control action $u^i(t)$, i.e., subsystem i only does a row-vector computation using the i^{th} row of Φ^x, Φ^u to compute $\hat{w}^i(t)$ and $u^i(t)$. Furthermore, subsystem i relies on communication channel to access information about $\hat{w}^j(t-d(j \rightarrow i))$ from other subsystems j . With Theorem 4 and Theorem 5, this allows us to enforce

Algorithm 4: Distributed SLS Control Algorithm for Scalar Subsystem i

Input: Φ^x, Φ^u

- 1 **for** $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
- 2 Observe $x^i(t)$ and $\hat{w}^j(t-d(j \rightarrow i))$ for all $j \neq i$
- 3 Compute $\hat{w}^i(t) = x^i(t) - \sum_{k=1}^{H-1} \Phi^x[k](i, :) \cdot \hat{w}(t-k)$
- 4 Compute $u^i(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{H-1} \Phi^u[k](i, :) \cdot \hat{w}(t-k)$
- 5 **end**

the information constraints in a transparent and simple way for the distributed SLS control algorithm. We illustrate this with an example below.

Let \mathcal{C} be the communication matrix generated from a given communication graph. Observe that if we enforce

$$\Phi^x[k], \Phi^u[k] \in \mathcal{C}^k, \quad \text{for all } k \in [N] \cup \{0\}, \quad (46)$$

i.e., that $\Phi^x[k], \Phi^u[k]$ are sparse according to \mathcal{C}^k , during the synthesis of the closed-loop operators Φ^x, Φ^u , then the SLS controller (45) constructed from Φ^x, Φ^u *automatically* enforces the communication delay constraints prescribed by \mathcal{C} during the distributed implementation in Algorithm 4. To see this, rewrite the row-vector multiplication in Algorithm 4 as an element-wise multiplication and summation for each k :

$$\Phi^x[k](i, :) \cdot \hat{w}(t-k) = \sum_j \Phi^x[k](i, j) \cdot \hat{w}^j(t-k).$$

Recall from Definition 1 and 2 that $\mathcal{C}^k(i, j) \neq 0$ only if $d(j \rightarrow i) \leq k$. Because $\Phi^x[k](i, j)$ is synthesized to be nonzero if and only if $\mathcal{C}^k(i, j)$ is nonzero, the computation of $\Phi^x[k](i, :) \cdot \hat{w}(t-k)$ (left-hand side) only requires the knowledge of $\hat{w}^j(t-k)$ with $k \leq d(j \rightarrow i)$ (right-hand side); thus conforming to the communication delay prescribed by \mathcal{C} . The locality constraint described in Section 2.2 can be similarly enforced via sparsity constraints on Φ^x, Φ^u .

F.4 Distributed Synthesis for SLS

Another feature of SLS is that the closed-loop operators Φ^x, Φ^u can be synthesized in a distributed way. In particular, observe that both the characterization condition (44) and the information constraints placed on Φ^x, Φ^u are column-separable (Wang et al., 2018). This means that Φ^x, Φ^u satisfy (44) and (46) if and only if *each column* of Φ^x, Φ^u satisfy (44) and (46). This observation allows *distributed synthesis* of Φ^x, Φ^u , where each local subsystem only synthesizes a particular column(s) of Φ^x, Φ^u . Such distributed synthesis procedure is leveraged in many distributed control works, e.g., see Alonso and Matni (2020); Yu et al. (2020).

In particular, if the A, B matrix in (41) describes interconnected LTI systems with sparsity patterns, then the synthesis of each column of Φ^x and Φ^u does not require the full A, B matrix. Instead, only sub-matrices of A, B are required, corresponding to the nonzero entries of the columns of Φ^x and Φ^u .

G Connecting SLS and CONTROL (Algorithm 3)

We now discuss in detail how CONTROL (Algorithm 3) builds on SLS and the properties that it inherits from SLS. The CONTROL algorithm is copied below for ease of reference.

Line 1. The overall goal of CONSIST is for each subsystem to synthesize its local closed-loop columns and then compute a local control action. Therefore, the very first step is to assemble necessary model information in order to perform the synthesis task in (5). It turns out that the neighbors whose model information that i needs for synthesizing its local closed-loop column is exactly the subsystems in the set

Algorithm 5: CONTROL(\cdot) for Subsystem i

Input: Information Set $\mathcal{I}(i, t)$, Local consistent parameter θ_t^i

Output: Local control action $u^i(t)$

- 1 Assemble local estimate of the global model $A(\hat{\Theta}_t^i), B(\hat{\Theta}_t^i)$ with (4)
 - 2 $\phi_t^i \leftarrow$ (5)
 - 3 Assemble delayed local sub-controllers $\bigcup_{j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)} \phi_{t-d(j \rightarrow i)}^j$ from subsystems in $\mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)$
 - 4 Compute local control action $u^i(t)$ with (6)
-

$\mathcal{M}(i) := \{\ell \in [N] : j \in \mathcal{N}(\ell) \text{ for some } j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{out}}(i)\}$. A subsystem $\ell \in \mathcal{M}(i)$ is dynamically influence by subsystem j because $j \in \mathcal{N}(\ell)$. Furthermore, j makes local decisions such as $u^j(t)$ based on information from subsystem i because $j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{out}}(i)$. Therefore, it is sensible for subsystem i to take the model of ℓ into account since ℓ will be indirectly affected by decisions made at i .

To see why $\mathcal{M}(i)$ contains the minimal set of subsystems whose information is need for i to compute (5), consider (5c) for a fixed $k \geq \bar{d}$. Then, the sparsity of $\phi_t^{i,x}$ and $\phi_t^{i,u}$ is the same as the sparsity of the i^{th} column of $\mathcal{C}^{\bar{d}}$ due to constraint (5d). In other words, $j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{out}}(i)$ if $\mathcal{C}^{\bar{d}}$ has nonzero $(j, i)^{\text{th}}$ element. Therefore, when we perform the matrix vector multiplication of (5c), we need the j^{th} columns of the global model A, B for j such that the j^{th} position of ϕ_t^i is nonzero. This corresponds to $j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{out}}(i)$ part of the definition of $\mathcal{M}(i)$. However, due to the sparsity structure in the global model A, B , we can further reduce the model information requirement to only the ℓ^{th} rows of A, B that has nonzero element in its j^{th} position, i.e., ℓ 's such that $A(\ell, j)$ or $B(\ell, j) \neq 0$. This corresponds to $j \in \mathcal{N}(\ell)$ part of the definition of $\mathcal{M}(i)$. Therefore, $\mathcal{M}(i)$ contains the minimal set of subsystems whose (delayed) model information is needed for synthesis (5) at subsystem i .

Line 2. Synthesis (5) leverages Theorem 4 to compute the i^{th} column of some global closed-loop operators Φ^x and Φ^u , counterfactually assuming that the global model is indeed $A(\hat{\Theta}_t^i), B(\hat{\Theta}_t^i)$. We denote the corresponding columns as $\phi_t^{i,x} := \Phi^x(:, i)$, $\phi_t^{i,u} := \Phi^u(:, i)$ respectively and collectively as ϕ_t^i , for subsystem i with the locally assembled model estimate. This is to take advantage of the distributed SLS synthesis property described in Appendix F.4.

We leverage the SLS characterization result Theorem 4 in (5b), (5c) to synthesize closed-loop columns (named sub-controllers). However, a key difference is that the original Theorem in (Wang et al., 2019) makes no assumption on the horizon H for Φ^x, Φ^u , unlike the adapted version presented in (44). Thanks to the controllability assumption in Assumption 3, there exists control actions that can drive any state to zero within at most n_x steps. In terms of the closed loop, this means that there exists controller \mathbf{K} such that any disturbances will be attenuated to zero within n_x times steps. Therefore, we simplify our search over the closed loop operators to those that has finite response to \mathbf{w} of horizon H with $H \leq n_x$. This also reduces our search over the infinite-dimensional closed-loop operators to the search over H finite-dimensional matrices. In general, H can be much smaller than n_x due to underlying sparsity structure in A and B matrix for large-scale systems. We discuss more about the connection between horizon H , controllability and (44) in Appendix I.

We also see the impact of the delayed information in this step, manifested as the local estimate of the global model used in the synthesis problem (5). When no delay is present, all subsystems will use the same global model as input to the local synthesis problems and will output a column of the same global closed-loop operators Φ^x, Φ^u . This is the original SLS setup in section F.3 and F.4. However, in our algorithm, delay in local parameter information results in differently synthesized columns of different Φ^x, Φ^u for different subsystems. This is where delayed information introduces error for the first time in the proposed algorithm.

Line 3. Once local closed-loop columns are synthesized, subsystem i has to assemble other relevant columns from subsystem j from $\mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)$ in order to perform the downstream task of local control action computation. In particular, we adopt the distributed SLS control algorithm (Algorithm 4) described in Appendix F.3 in the next step. Therefore, we need to know the i^{th} element of every column j such that $\mathcal{C}^{\bar{d}}(i, j) \neq 0$. Note

that the set $\mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)$ corresponds to j 's such that $\mathcal{C}^{\bar{d}}$ has nonzero $(i, j)^{\text{th}}$ element. Thus, closed-loop column information from $j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)$ is required.

Line 4. The final step of CONTROL is to compute $u^i(t)$ in (6) using the row-vector multiplication analogous to that of Algorithm 4. The errors caused by the delayed information propagate a second time during (6) when each subsystem i computes $u^i(t)$ with assembled closed-loop operators from different sets of sub-controllers in (4). Without communication delay, all subsystems would have had access to the same sets of columns of the common closed-loop operators, which is the setting of Algorithm 4. In particular, observe that Algorithm 4 requires the globally agreed closed-loop operators Φ^x, Φ^u as inputs for every subsystem.

Thanks to the communication constraint (5d) enforced on $\phi_t^{i,x}[k]$ and $\phi_t^{i,u}[k]$, regardless of the model parameters used in (5), all closed-loop columns has the correct sparsity required by the communication and locality constraints. Consequently, any assembled closed loop columns used for (6) at each subsystem preserves the required sparsity structures as well.

Overall, because the task at hand is *online* stabilization, we need to learn consistent parameters, synthesize closed-loop columns, and compute local control actions, all in distributed fashion while handling delayed information every step along the way. Therefore, CONSIST can be considered as a generalization of the SLS pipeline described in Appendix F to the fully distributed case.

H Extensions to Non-Convex Parameter Set Setting

Representing model uncertainty as convex compact parameter sets is not always practical; sometimes potentially even impossible. Our approach can be readily extended to compact non-convex parameter sets \mathcal{S} , if those can be written as a finite union of convex sets $\bigcup_{i=1}^N \mathcal{P}_i$. This class of non-convex sets covers a large range of practical scenarios and the presented approach can be extended without losing stability guarantees. We can ensure by wrapping the CONSIST algorithm 2 in a high-level routine SETSELECT, which runs CONSISTS on the smaller convex sets \mathcal{P}_i until they become entirely inconsistent:

1. At $t = 0$, we select an arbitrary convex set \mathcal{P}_{k_0} and perform consistent model chasing with CONSIST as before.
2. If at some point \mathcal{P}_{k_0} becomes entirely inconsistent, we select an arbitrary set \mathcal{P}_{k_1} from the remaining collection $\{\mathcal{P}_1, \dots, \mathcal{P}_N\} \setminus \mathcal{P}_{k_0}$ and restart CONSIST with that set \mathcal{P}_{k_1} . If \mathcal{P}_{k_1} is also entirely inconsistent, repeat that selection process.

Per definition, the above algorithm never violates consistency. Because there are finitely many convex sets \mathcal{P}_{k_i} , the cost accrued due to restarting CONSIST scales up the total movement cost of CONSIST by a fixed constant. Overall, the stability proof in Appendix D is not impacted.

I Finite Time Controllability

Large-scale systems often consist of many sparsely interconnected small subsystems. If the overall system is controllable, we know that any initial condition $x(0)$ can be controlled to the origin within at most n_x time-steps where n_x is the global state dimension. However, this is often a conservative statement: If communication between subsystems is fast enough, interconnection is sparse and actuation is available in sufficiently many subsystems, it is possible to control arbitrary initial conditions to the origin within much fewer steps $H \ll n_x$.

Below, we will summarize some fundamental results from control theory literature needed for our analysis. In particular, we refine the definition of *controllability* to *finite-time controllability* of finite-impulse-response (FIR) horizon H .

Definition 4 (Controllability Grammians). *Let the pair (A, B) be the system matrices of the dynamical system $x(t+1) = Ax(t) + Bu(t) + w(t)$ with state $x(t)$, input $u(k)$ and disturbance $w(t)$. For non-negative integers k , the positive-semi definite matrix $W_k^u := \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} A^t B B^T (A^t)^T$ is called the k th controllability*

grammian of (A, B) . Equivalently, the controllability grammians are defined as the unique solutions to the following difference equations:

$$W_0^u = 0_{n \times n}, \quad W_t^u = AW_{t-1}^u A^T + BB^T. \quad (47)$$

Moreover, for fixed A we will denote the k th controllability grammian of the pair (A, I) as $W_k^w := \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} A^i (A^i)^T$, i.e.: the grammians we obtain, if we see the disturbance w_t as an input to the dynamical system.

Lemma 8. Let \mathcal{S} be a compact set of matrices where each element $(A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}) \in \mathcal{S}$ represents a controllable linear dynamical system with equations $x(t+1) = Ax(t) + Bu(t) + w(t)$, state $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, input $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and disturbance $w(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then, there exists an FIR Horizon $H \leq n$, and positive scalar constants $\bar{\sigma}^w, \underline{\sigma}^w, \bar{\sigma}^u, \underline{\sigma}^u$ such that the following statements hold:

- For any $(A, B) \in \mathcal{S}$ and any initial state, ζ_0 , there exists an input $u(0), u(1), \dots, u(H-1)$, such that the system trajectory $x(t+1) = Ax(t) + Bu(t), \forall t \leq H-1, x(0) = \zeta_0$ satisfies $x(H) = 0$ at time H .
- For any $(A, B) \in \mathcal{S}$, the matrix $P_H = [A^{H-1}B, A^{H-2}B, \dots, B] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times Hm}$ is full column rank.
- For any $(A, B) \in \mathcal{S}$, the following FIR-SLS-constraint is feasible:
There exist $\Phi^x[1], \dots, \Phi^x[H] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\Phi^u[0], \dots, \Phi^u[H-1] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ such that:

$$\Phi^x[0] = I, \quad \forall k = 0, \dots, H-1: \Phi^x[k+1] = A\Phi^x[k] + B\Phi^u[k], \text{ and } \Phi^x[H] = 0$$

- For any $(A, B) \in \mathcal{S}$, the corresponding grammians $W_H^u(A, B)$ and $W_H^w(A)$ are positive-definite and their singularvalues satisfy the inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\sigma}^u &\leq \sigma_{\min}(W_H^u(A, B)), & \sigma_{\max}(W_H^u(A, B)) &\leq \bar{\sigma}^u \\ \underline{\sigma}^w &\leq \sigma_{\min}(W_H^w(A)), & \sigma_{\max}(W_H^w(A)) &\leq \bar{\sigma}^w \end{aligned}$$

The above result is standard in linear control literature, e.g. [Dullerud and Paganini \(2013\)](#); [Doyle et al. \(2013\)](#).

J Perturbation Analysis of \mathcal{H}_2 -optimal SLS Synthesis

J.1 From \mathcal{H}_2 -optimal control to Least Squares

Due to notation overhead, we will drop time indices and suppress the horizon index $k \in [H]$ in closed-loop operators $\Phi^x[k], \Phi^u[k]$ and write Φ_k^x, Φ_k^u instead, since this section presents results about general SLS synthesis. Let $\Phi_i^x \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\Phi_i^u \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and consider the following canonical SLS synthesis problem for system matrices $[A, B]$ and weighting matrices $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, D \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$:

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \min \left\| \begin{bmatrix} C & 0 \\ 0 & D \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_1^x & \Phi_2^x & \dots & \Phi_T^x \\ \Phi_1^u & \Phi_2^u & \dots & \Phi_T^u \end{bmatrix} \right\|_F^2 \\ \text{s.t.: } &\Phi_1^x = I \\ &\Phi_{k+1}^x = A\Phi_k^x + B\Phi_k^u, \quad \forall k: 1 \leq k \leq H \\ &\Phi_{H+1}^x = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

The objective in (48) is equivalent to weighted \mathcal{H}_2 norm on the closed-loop operators Φ^x and Φ^u . Denote $\phi_k^{j,x} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \phi_k^{j,u} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ as the j -th column of $\Phi_k^x \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, \Phi_k^u \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and e_j the unit vector in the j -th coordinate axis. As described in [Appendix F.4](#), we can separate the problem by columns and can equivalently restate (48) in terms of each column $\phi_k^{j,x}$ and $\phi_k^{j,u}$:

$$\begin{aligned} S_j &:= \min \left\| \begin{bmatrix} C & D \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \phi_1^{j,x} & \phi_2^{j,x} & \dots & \phi_H^{j,x} \\ \phi_1^{j,u} & \phi_2^{j,u} & \dots & \phi_H^{j,u} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_F^2 \\ \text{s.t.: } &\phi_1^{j,x} = e_j \\ &\phi_{k+1}^{j,x} = A\phi_k^{j,x} + B\phi_k^{j,u}, \quad \forall 1 \leq k \leq H \\ &\phi_{H+1}^{j,x} = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

We will now fix j and rewrite (49) further and introduce new variables to avoid tedious notation. Define $u_k = \phi_k^{j,u}, \forall 1 \leq k \leq H$, $\mathbf{u} = [u_1^\top, \dots, u_H^\top]^\top$ and the block-lower-triangular matrix $\mathbf{G}_u \in \mathbb{R}^{Hn \times Hm}$, the vector $\xi_j \in \mathbb{R}^{Hn}$ and the lifted weight matrices \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D} as

$$\mathbf{G}_u = \begin{bmatrix} B & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ AB & B & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ A^2B & AB & B & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ A^{H-1}B & A^{H-2}B & A^{H-3}B & \dots & B \end{bmatrix} \quad \xi_j = \begin{bmatrix} -Ae_j \\ -A^2e_j \\ \vdots \\ -A^He_j \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathbf{C} = I_H \otimes C \quad \mathbf{D} = I_H \otimes D, \quad (50)$$

where I_k is the identity matrix in \mathbb{R}^k . Denote by $P_i, 1 \leq i \leq H$ the i -th block-row of \mathbf{G}_u :

$$P_i = [A^{i-1}B, A^{i-2}B, \dots, B, 0, \dots, 0] \quad (51)$$

Notice that with these variables, it holds that for any feasible $\phi_k^{j,u}, \phi_k^{j,x}$ holds $\forall 1 \leq k \leq H$:

$$\phi_{k+1}^{j,x} = -\xi_{j,k} + P_k \mathbf{u}$$

Now, if we separate out the state cost for the first time-step, we can rewrite the subproblem S_j as

$$S_j = \min_{\mathbf{u}} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C}\mathbf{G}_u \\ \mathbf{D} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{u} - \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C}\xi_j \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2^2 + (C^\top C)_{jj} \quad (52)$$

$$\text{s.t.:} \quad 0 = A^H e_j + P_H \mathbf{u} \quad (53)$$

For large systems which consist of many interconnected (sparsely) small systems, it is often the case that the overall system is H -controllable for some suitable choice of $H \ll n$:

J.2 Representation as a Least-Squares problem

From (52), define $\mathbf{u}_c^* := P_H^\top (P_H P_H^\top)^{-1} A^T e_j$, which is the solution to the optimization problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{u}} \|\mathbf{u}\|_2^2 \quad (54)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad 0 = -A^T e_j + P_H \mathbf{u} \quad (55)$$

We can interpret \mathbf{u}_c^* as the smallest control action, measured in ℓ_2 , that drives the system from the origin to $-A^T e_j$ in H time-steps. This relates to controllability grammians as described in [Dullerud and Paganini \(2013\)](#). Using M^+ to denote the Moore-Penrose Inverse of a matrix M , we can also write $\mathbf{u}_c^* := P_H^+ A^T e_j = P_H^\top W_H^{-1} A^T e_j$, where $W_H = P_H P_H^\top$.

Ignoring the constant term $(C^\top C)_{jj}$, we can reparametrize $\mathbf{u} = -\mathbf{u}_c^* + \mathbf{u}'$ where $\mathbf{u}' \in \text{null}N(P_H)$ and describe (52) as the optimization problem:

$$S_j := \min_{\mathbf{u}' \in \text{null}(P_H(A,B))} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{D} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{G}_u(A,B) \\ I \end{bmatrix} (\mathbf{u}' - \mathbf{u}_c^*(A,B)) \right\|_2^2 \quad (56)$$

The least-squares problem. Let H denote the FIR-Horizon of the problem, then define the matrices

$$\mathbf{G}_w(A) = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ A & I & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ A^2 & A & I & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ A^{H-1} & A^{H-2} & A^{H-3} & \dots & I \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{G}_u(A,B) = \begin{bmatrix} B & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ AB & B & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ A^2B & AB & B & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ A^{H-1}B & A^{H-2}B & A^{H-3}B & \dots & B \end{bmatrix}. \quad (57)$$

and denote $P_i(A,B)$ as the i th block matrix row of $\mathbf{G}_u(A,B)$:

$$P_i(A,B) = [A^{i-1}B, A^{i-2}B, \dots, B, 0, \dots, 0] \quad (58)$$

$\mathbf{G}_u(A, B)$ can be written as $\mathbf{G}_u(A, B) = \mathbf{G}_w(A)(I_H \otimes B)$, where I_H is the identity matrix in \mathbb{R}^H . Let $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times H}$ be defined as the nilpotent matrix

$$Z = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{H-1 \times 1} & I_{H-1} \\ 0 & \mathbf{0}_{1 \times H-1} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (59)$$

and notice its psuedo-inverse is $Z^+ = Z^\top$. Using Z , it is easy to verify that $\mathbf{G}_w(A)$ can be expressed as:

$$\mathbf{G}_w(A) = (I_H - Z^+ \otimes A)^{-1} \quad (60)$$

Recall our derivation of the reduced problem S_j (62) for a fixed j :

$$S_j := \min_{\mathbf{u} \in \text{null}(P_H(A, B))} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{D} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{G}_u(A, B) \\ I \end{bmatrix} (\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_c(A, B)) \right\|_2^2 \quad (61)$$

Where \mathbf{u}_c denotes $\mathbf{u}_c := P_H^+ A^H e_j = P_H^\top W_H^{-1} A^H e_j$. Let $\mathbf{u}^*(A, B)$ be a minimizer of the above problem for fixed A, B , we are interested in the SLS solutions

$$\phi^{*j}(A, B) := \begin{bmatrix} \phi_x^{*j}(A, B) \\ \phi_u^{*j}(A, B) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{G}_u(A, B) \\ I \end{bmatrix} (\mathbf{u}^*(A, B) - \mathbf{u}_c(A, B))$$

and how these solutions are perturbed with changes in A, B .

For the rest of the discussion, we will drop mentioning the explicit dependence on (A, B) to reduce the notational burden. First, we (over-)parametrize \mathbf{u} as

$$\mathbf{u} = (I - P_H^+ P_H) \boldsymbol{\eta},$$

to cast the above problem into an unconstrained one:

$$S_j := \min_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \left\| \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{D} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{G}_u(A, B) \\ I \end{bmatrix}}_{\mathbf{F}} (I - P_H^+ P_H) \boldsymbol{\eta} - \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{D} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{G}_u(A, B) \\ I \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}_c(A, B)}_{\mathbf{g}} \right\|_2^2 \quad (62)$$

The unique min-norm solution $\boldsymbol{\eta}^*$ to the above problem is $\boldsymbol{\eta}^* = \mathbf{F}^+ \mathbf{g}$ and therefore the optimal solution ϕ^* takes the form

$$\phi^* = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{D}^{-1} \end{bmatrix} (\mathbf{F} \mathbf{F}^+ \mathbf{g} - \mathbf{g}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{D}^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \underbrace{(\mathbf{F} \mathbf{F}^+ - I) \mathbf{g}}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}^*} =: \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{D}^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu}^* \quad (63)$$

J.3 Local lipshitzness of \mathcal{H}_2 -optimal closed-loop operators

Here, we perform perturbation analysis on the term $\boldsymbol{\nu}^* = (\mathbf{F} \mathbf{F}^+ - I) \mathbf{g}$. Throughout the discussion, we will make frequent use of the following identities:

Lemma 9. For arbitrary matrices $X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ and $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ holds:

- i) $A_1^k - A_2^k = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} A_1^{k-1-j} (A_1 - A_2) A_2^j$
- ii) $XX^+ - YY^+ = (I - XX^+)(X - Y)Y^+ + [(I - YY^+)(X - Y)X^+]^\top$
- iii) If A and B are invertible, then $A^{-1} - B^{-1} = A^{-1}(B - A)B^{-1}$.

The following is a corollary from Theorem 4.1 in [Wedin \(1973\)](#):

Theorem 6. Let X and Y be matrices with equal rank, let $\|\cdot\|_2$ denote the induced 2-norm and $\|\cdot\|_F$ denote the Frobenius norm. The following inequalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \|X^+ - Y^+\|_2 &\leq \varphi \|X^+\|_2 \|Y^+\|_2 \|X - Y\|_2 \\ \|X^+ - Y^+\|_F &\leq \sqrt{2} \|X^+\|_2 \|Y^+\|_2 \|X - Y\|_F \end{aligned}$$

where $\varphi = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$ denotes the golden ratio constant.

Next we present the core theorem of the perturbation analysis: Given two *arbitrary* controllable systems (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) , (Thm.7) bounds the worst-case difference in solutions $\|\phi_1^{*j} - \phi_2^{*j}\|_2$ in terms of the differences in parameters space $\|A_1 - A_2\|_F$ and $\|B_1 - B_2\|_2$ between both systems. This result is the first global (considering arbitrary pairs of A_1, A_2 and B_1, B_2) perturbation bound for \mathcal{H}_2 -optimal control with SLS.

Theorem 7. *Let $C, D \succ 0$, let (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) be two controllable pairs of system matrices with FIR horizon H and let ϕ_1^{*j} and ϕ_2^{*j} be the corresponding SLS-solutions to the subproblem S_j . Then, it holds that:*

$$\|\phi_1^{*j} - \phi_2^{*j}\|_2 \leq \Gamma_A \|A_1 - A_2\|_F + \Gamma_B \|B_1 - B_2\|_F \quad (64)$$

where the Lipschitz-constants Γ_A, Γ_B stand for

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_A &= \kappa_{CD} \Gamma'_1 + \kappa_{CD} \Gamma'_2 \|B_1\|_2 \|\mathbf{G}_w(A_1)\|_2, & \kappa_{CD} &= \frac{\max\{\sigma_{max}(C), \sigma_{max}(D)\}}{\min\{\sigma_{min}(C), \sigma_{min}(D)\}} \\ \Gamma_B &= \kappa_{CD} \Gamma'_2 \|\mathbf{G}_w(A_2)\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

and Γ'_1 and Γ'_2 are defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma'_1 &= \alpha_{H,1} \alpha_{H,2} H (1 + \|\mathbf{G}_{u,2}\|_2) \|P_{H,2}^+\|_2 \\ \Gamma'_2 &= \alpha_{H,1} \|P_{H,1}^+\|_2 \left(1 + \varphi \|P_{H,2}^+\|_2 + \varphi \|P_{H,2}^+\|_2 \|\mathbf{G}_{u,2}\|_2 \right) + \|\mathbf{g}\|_2 (\|\mathbf{F}_1^+\|_2 + \|\mathbf{F}_2^+\|_2) + \dots \\ &\quad + \varphi \|\mathbf{g}\|_2 (\|\mathbf{F}_1^+\|_2 + \|\mathbf{F}_2^+\|_2) \|P_{H,1}^+\|_2 \|P_{H,2}^+\|_2 (\|P_{H,1}\|_2 + \|P_{H,2}\|_2) (1 + \|\mathbf{G}_{u,1}\|_2). \end{aligned}$$

and $\varphi = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$ is the golden ratio.

Proof. Recall the identities of (Lem.9). Write $\nu_1^* - \nu_2^*$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_1^* - \nu_2^* &= (\mathbf{F}_1 \mathbf{F}_1^+ - I)(\mathbf{g}_1 - \mathbf{g}_2) + (\mathbf{F}_1 \mathbf{F}_1^+ - \mathbf{F}_2 \mathbf{F}_2^+) \mathbf{g}_2 \\ \|\nu_1^* - \nu_2^*\|_2 &\leq \|\mathbf{g}_1 - \mathbf{g}_2\|_2 + \|\mathbf{F}_1 \mathbf{F}_1^+ - \mathbf{F}_2 \mathbf{F}_2^+\|_2 \|\mathbf{g}\|_2, \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

where used the fact that $(\mathbf{F}_1 \mathbf{F}_1^+ - I)$ is a projection and therefore $\|\mathbf{F}_1 \mathbf{F}_1^+ - I\|_2 = 1$. Rewrite $\mathbf{F}_1 \mathbf{F}_1^+ - \mathbf{F}_2 \mathbf{F}_2^+$ as

$$(I - \mathbf{F}_1 \mathbf{F}_1^+) (\mathbf{F}_1 - \mathbf{F}_2) \mathbf{F}_2^+ + [(I - \mathbf{F}_2 \mathbf{F}_2^+) (\mathbf{F}_1 - \mathbf{F}_2) \mathbf{F}_1^+]^\top$$

to conclude that

$$\|\mathbf{F}_1 \mathbf{F}_1^+ - \mathbf{F}_2 \mathbf{F}_2^+\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{F}_1 - \mathbf{F}_2\|_2 (\|\mathbf{F}_1^+\|_2 + \|\mathbf{F}_2^+\|_2). \quad (66)$$

Substitution into (65) yields:

$$\|\nu_1^* - \nu_2^*\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{g}_1 - \mathbf{g}_2\|_2 + \|\mathbf{F}_1 - \mathbf{F}_2\|_2 (\|\mathbf{F}_1^+\|_2 + \|\mathbf{F}_2^+\|_2) \|\mathbf{g}\|_2, \quad (67)$$

1. Bounding $\|\mathbf{F}_1 - \mathbf{F}_2\|_2$: Rewrite $\mathbf{F}_1 - \mathbf{F}_2$ as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{D}^{-1} \end{bmatrix} (\mathbf{F}_1 - \mathbf{F}_2) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{G}_{u,1} \\ I \end{bmatrix} (I - P_{H,1}^+ P_{H,1}) - \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{G}_{u,2} \\ I \end{bmatrix} (I - P_{H,2}^+ P_{H,2}) \quad (68)$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{G}_{u,1} \\ I \end{bmatrix} (P_{H,2}^+ P_{H,2} - P_{H,1}^+ P_{H,1}) + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{G}_{u,1} & -\mathbf{G}_{u,2} \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix} (I - P_{H,2}^+ P_{H,2}) \quad (69)$$

From the above we can derive the inequality:

$$\frac{\|\mathbf{F}_1 - \mathbf{F}_2\|_2}{\max\{\|C\|_2, \|D\|_2\}} \leq (1 + \|\mathbf{G}_{u,1}\|_2) \|P_{H,2}^+ - P_{H,1}^+\|_2 (\|P_{H,1}\|_2 + \|P_{H,2}\|_2) + \|\mathbf{G}_{u,1} - \mathbf{G}_{u,2}\|_2 \quad (70)$$

Now we will use the result (Thm.6) to bound $\|P_{H,2}^+ - P_{H,1}^+\|_2$ as

$$\|P_{H,2}^+ - P_{H,1}^+\|_2 \leq \varphi \|P_{H,1}^+\|_2 \|P_{H,2}^+\|_2 \|P_{H,2} - P_{H,1}\|_2 \quad (71)$$

Furthermore, noticing $P_{H,2} - P_{H,1} = [\mathbf{0}, \dots, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_n](\mathbf{G}_{u,2} - \mathbf{G}_{u,1})$ we can conclude

$$\|P_{H,2}^+ - P_{H,1}^+\|_2 \leq \varphi \|P_{H,1}^+\|_2 \|P_{H,2}^+\|_2 \|\mathbf{G}_{u,2} - \mathbf{G}_{u,1}\|_2. \quad (72)$$

We combine this into (70) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\|\mathbf{F}_1 - \mathbf{F}_2\|_2}{\max\{\|C\|_2, \|D\|_2\}} \\ & \leq \left(1 + \varphi \|P_{H,1}^+\|_2 \|P_{H,2}^+\|_2 (1 + \|\mathbf{G}_{u,1}\|_2) (\|P_{H,1}\|_2 + \|P_{H,2}\|_2)\right) \|\mathbf{G}_{u,1} - \mathbf{G}_{u,2}\|_2 \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

2. Bounding $\|\mathbf{g}_1 - \mathbf{g}_2\|_2$: Introduce the constant $\alpha_H := \max_{0 \leq k \leq H} \|A^k\|_2$ and observe that $\|A_1^H - A_2^H\|_2$ can be bounded as:

$$\|A_1^H - A_2^H\|_2 = \left\| \sum_{j=0}^{H-1} A_1^{H-1-j} (A_1 - A_2) A_2^j \right\|_2 \leq H \alpha_{H,1} \alpha_{H,2} \|A_1 - A_2\|_2 \quad (74)$$

We can rewrite $\mathbf{g}_1 - \mathbf{g}_2$ as

$$\begin{bmatrix} C^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & D^{-1} \end{bmatrix} (\mathbf{g}_1 - \mathbf{g}_2) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{G}_{u,1} \\ I \end{bmatrix} P_{H,1}^+ A_1^H e_j - \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{G}_{u,2} \\ I \end{bmatrix} P_{H,2}^+ A_2^H e_j \quad (75)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & = \begin{bmatrix} (\mathbf{G}_{u,1} - \mathbf{G}_{u,2}) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} P_{H,1}^+ A_1^H e_j + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{G}_{u,2} \\ I \end{bmatrix} (P_{H,1}^+ - P_{H,2}^+) A_1^H e_j \\ & \quad \dots + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{G}_{u,2} \\ I \end{bmatrix} P_{H,2}^+ (A_1^H - A_2^H) e_j \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

and obtain the bound:

$$\frac{\|\mathbf{g}_1 - \mathbf{g}_2\|_2}{\max\{\|C\|_2, \|D\|_2\}} \leq \alpha_{H,1} \|\mathbf{G}_{u,1} - \mathbf{G}_{u,2}\|_2 \|P_{H,1}^+\|_2 + \alpha_{H,1} (1 + \|\mathbf{G}_{u,2}\|_2) \|P_{H,1}^+ - P_{H,2}^+\|_2 \quad (77)$$

$$\dots + \alpha_{H,1} \alpha_{H,2} H (1 + \|\mathbf{G}_{u,2}\|_2) \|P_{H,2}^+\|_2 \|A_1 - A_2\|_2 \quad (78)$$

$$\leq \alpha_{H,1} \|P_{H,1}^+\|_2 \left(1 + \varphi \|P_{H,2}^+\|_2 + \varphi \|P_{H,2}^+\|_2 \|\mathbf{G}_{u,2}\|_2\right) \|\mathbf{G}_{u,1} - \mathbf{G}_{u,2}\|_2 \quad (79)$$

$$\dots + \alpha_{H,1} \alpha_{H,2} H (1 + \|\mathbf{G}_{u,2}\|_2) \|P_{H,2}^+\|_2 \|A_1 - A_2\|_2 \quad (80)$$

We get the bound

$$\frac{\|\nu_1^* - \nu_2^*\|_2}{\max\{\|C\|_2, \|D\|_2\}} \leq \Gamma'_1 \|A_1 - A_2\|_2 + \Gamma'_2 \|\mathbf{G}_{u,1} - \mathbf{G}_{u,2}\|_2 \quad (81)$$

where Γ'_1 and Γ'_2 are the constants:

$$\Gamma'_1 = \alpha_{H,1} \alpha_{H,2} H (1 + \|\mathbf{G}_{u,2}\|_2) \|P_{H,2}^+\|_2 \quad (82)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma'_2 &= \alpha_{H,1} \|P_{H,1}^+\|_2 \left(1 + \varphi \|P_{H,2}^+\|_2 + \varphi \|P_{H,2}^+\|_2 \|\mathbf{G}_{u,2}\|_2\right) + \|\mathbf{g}\|_2 (\|\mathbf{F}_1^+\|_2 + \|\mathbf{F}_2^+\|_2) + \dots \\ & \quad + \varphi \|\mathbf{g}\|_2 (\|\mathbf{F}_1^+\|_2 + \|\mathbf{F}_2^+\|_2) \|P_{H,1}^+\|_2 \|P_{H,2}^+\|_2 (\|P_{H,1}\|_2 + \|P_{H,2}\|_2) (1 + \|\mathbf{G}_{u,1}\|_2) \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

Using (Lem.10), we obtain the final bound:

$$\|\phi_1^* - \phi_2^*\|_2 \leq \kappa_{CD} \|\nu_1^* - \nu_2^*\|_2 \leq \Gamma_A \|A_1 - A_2\|_2 + \Gamma_B \|B_1 - B_2\|_2 \quad (84)$$

with the constants Γ_A, Γ_B defined as:

$$\Gamma_A = \kappa_{CD} \Gamma'_1 + \kappa_{CD} \Gamma'_2 \|B_1\|_2 \|\mathbf{G}_w(A_1)\|_2 \|\mathbf{G}_w(A_2)\|_2 \quad (85)$$

$$\Gamma_B = \kappa_{CD} \Gamma'_2 \|\mathbf{G}_w(A_2)\|_2 \quad (86)$$

□

J.4 Global lipshitzness of \mathcal{H}_2 -optimal closed-loop operators over compact sets \mathcal{S}

For the next sections we will assume that we are given some fixed compact set \mathcal{S} of controllable systems. Recall the basic implications of (Lem.8); we define accordingly the FIR horizon H and the constants $\bar{\sigma}^w$, $\underline{\sigma}^w$, $\bar{\sigma}^u$, $\underline{\sigma}^u$ and assume that these quantities are all known.

This section derives a global Lipschitz bound for \mathcal{H}_2 -optimal SLS solutions over a compact set of controllable systems \mathcal{S} . As a starting point we consider the previous theorem (Thm.7). Our main proof strategy is to derive global bounds on the constants Γ_A and Γ_B . We proceed with a collection lemmas bounding individual terms in the equations (84), (85).

J.4.1 Auxiliary Lemmas

Lemma 10. *For any pair of system matrices (A_1, B_1) and (A_2, B_2) (with compatible dimensions) holds*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{G}_w(A_1) - \mathbf{G}_w(A_2)\|_2 &\leq \|\mathbf{G}_w(A_1)\|_2 \|\mathbf{G}_w(A_2)\|_2 \|A_1 - A_2\|_2 & (87) \\ \|\mathbf{G}_u(A_1, B_1) - \mathbf{G}_u(A_2, B_2)\|_2 &\leq \|B_1\|_2 \|\mathbf{G}_w(A_1)\|_2 \|\mathbf{G}_w(A_2)\|_2 \|A_1 - A_2\|_2 + \|\mathbf{G}_w(A_2)\|_2 \|B_1 - B_2\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Using (Lem.9) we can write Using $\mathbf{G}_u(A, B) = \mathbf{G}_w(A)(I_H \otimes B)$ and (Lem.9) we can write $\mathbf{G}_{u,1} - \mathbf{G}_{u,2}$ as

$$\mathbf{G}_{u,1} - \mathbf{G}_{u,2} = \mathbf{G}_w(A_1)(I_H \otimes B_1) - \mathbf{G}_w(A_2)(I_H \otimes B_2) \quad (88)$$

$$= (\mathbf{G}_w(A_1) - \mathbf{G}_w(A_2))(I_H \otimes B_1) + \mathbf{G}_w(A_2)(I_H \otimes (B_1 - B_2)) \quad (89)$$

It holds that

$$\mathbf{G}_w(A_1) - \mathbf{G}_w(A_2) = \mathbf{G}_w(A_1)(\mathbf{G}_w(A_2)^{-1} - \mathbf{G}_w(A_1)^{-1})\mathbf{G}_w(A_2) \quad (90)$$

$$= \mathbf{G}_w(A_1)(Z^+ \otimes (A_1 - A_2))\mathbf{G}_w(A_2) \quad (91)$$

which leads to the bound

$$\|\mathbf{G}_w(A_1) - \mathbf{G}_w(A_2)\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{G}_w(A_1)\|_2 \|A_1 - A_2\|_2 \|\mathbf{G}_w(A_2)\|_2 \quad (92)$$

□

In total, we need to global bounds on the quantities $\|\mathbf{G}_u\|_2, \|\mathbf{G}_w\|_2, \|P_H^+\|_2, \|P_H\|_2, \|\mathbf{F}^+\|_2, \|\mathbf{g}\|_2$.

Lemma 11. *Let (A, B) be pair of fixed system matrices, let $\mathbf{G}_u(A, B)$, $\mathbf{G}_w(A)$ be the matrices defined in (57), and let $W_H^u = \sum_{i=0}^{H-1} A^i B B^\top A^{i\top}$, $W_H^w = \sum_{i=0}^{H-1} A^i A^{i\top}$ be the H th controllability grammian w.r.t to the input u and the disturbance w , respectively. Then it holds:*

$$\|\mathbf{G}_u(A, B)\|_2 \leq \sqrt{H \sigma_{\max}(W_H^u(A, B))} \quad \|\mathbf{G}_w(A)\|_2 \leq \sqrt{H \sigma_{\max}(W_H^w(A))} \quad (93)$$

Proof. $\|\mathbf{G}_u\|_2$ is defined as $\|\mathbf{G}_u\|_2^2 := \max_{\|u\|_2=1} \|\mathbf{G}_u u\|_2^2$, by decomposing $u = [u_0^\top, \dots, u_{H-1}^\top]^\top$ we can rewrite this as

$$\|\mathbf{G}_u\|_2^2 = \max_{\|u\|_2=1} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} Bu_0 \\ ABu_0 + Bu_1 \\ \dots \\ A^{H-1}Bu_0 + \dots + Bu_{H-1} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2^2 = \max_{\|u\|_2=1} \sum_{k=1}^H \|P_k u\|_2^2 \quad (94)$$

$$\leq \sum_{k=1}^H \max_{\|u\|_2=1} \|P_k u\|_2^2 = \sum_{k=1}^H \|P_k\|_2^2 \leq H \|P_H\|_2^2 \leq H \|W_H^u\|_2 \quad (95)$$

Where we used the fact that $\|P_k\|_2^2$ increases in k and that $\|P_k\|_2^2$ is equal to the induced 2-norm of the corresponding controllability grammian $W_k^u = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} A^i B B^\top A^{i\top}$. Thus, we obtain the bound

$$\|\mathbf{G}_u(A, B)\|_2 \leq \sqrt{H \sigma_{\max}(W_H^u(A, B))},$$

and the bound on $\|\mathbf{G}_w(A)\|_2$ follows in the same way. \square

Lemma 12. *Let (A, B) be pair of H -controllable fixed system matrices, let $P_H(A, B)$ be the matrix defined in (58), and let $W_H^u = \sum_{i=0}^{H-1} A^i B B^\top A^{i\top}$ be the H th controllability grammian w.r.t to the input u . Then, the induced 2 norm of $P_H(A, B)$ and its Moore-Penrose Inverse $P_H^+(A, B)$ can be written as:*

$$\|P_H(A, B)\|_2 = (\sigma_{\max}(W_H^u(A, B)))^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \|P_H^+(A, B)\|_2 = (\sigma_{\min}(W_H^u(A, B)))^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad (96)$$

Proof. Because we assume a sufficient degree of controllability, $P_H(A, B)$ is full row-rank. This implies that

$$\|P_H(A, B)\|_2 = \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(P_H(A, B)P_H^\top(A, B))} = \sqrt{\sigma_{\max}(W_H^u(A, B))} \quad (97)$$

$$(\|P_H^+(A, B)\|_2)^{-1} = \sqrt{\lambda_{\min}(P_H(A, B)P_H^\top(A, B))} = \sqrt{\sigma_{\min}(W_H^u(A, B))} \quad (98)$$

\square

Lemma 13. *Let (A, B) be a fixed pair of H -controllable system matrices, and let $\mathbf{F}(A, B)$ denote the matrix*

$$\mathbf{F}(A, B) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{D} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{G}_u(A, B) \\ I \end{bmatrix} (I - P_H^+(A, B)P_H(A, B)). \quad (99)$$

Then, $\|\mathbf{F}^+(A, B)\|_2 \leq \sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\mathbf{D})$.

Proof. For an arbitrary matrix M , $(\|M^+\|_2)^{-1}$ is equal to the smallest non-zero singular eigenvalue of M (we will denote this quantity as $\sigma_{-1}(M)$). Thus, in order to bound $\|M^+\|_2$ from above, we have to bound $\sigma_{-1}(M)$ from below. Denote \mathbf{L} as the matrix

$$\mathbf{L} := \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{D} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{G}_u(A, B) \\ I \end{bmatrix}$$

and notice that it is full column rank and has rank of $H \times n_u$. The projection $\Pi_{\mathcal{N}(P_H)} := (I - P_H^+(A, B)P_H(A, B))$ has rank $H \times n_u - n_x$ due the assumption of H -controllability. Hence, $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{L}\Pi_{\mathcal{N}(P_H)}$ is full column rank with rank $r_{\mathbf{F}} := H \times n_u - n_x$ and has a null space $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{F})$ of dimension n_x . From these observations, we can equivalently say that $\sigma_{-1}(\mathbf{F})$ is the $r_{\mathbf{F}}$ th largest (or equivalently $n_x + 1$ smallest) singular eigenvalue of \mathbf{F} . Using the Minimax principle, we can therefore write:

$$\sigma_{-1}(\mathbf{F}) = \max_{\text{proj. } \Pi, \text{ s.t.: rank}(\Pi)=r_{\mathbf{F}}} \min_{x \text{ s.t.: } \|\Pi x\|=1} x^\top \Pi \mathbf{F}^\top \mathbf{F} \Pi x \quad (100)$$

$$= \max_{\text{proj. } \Pi, \text{ s.t.: rank}(\Pi)=r_{\mathbf{F}}} \min_{x \text{ s.t.: } \|\Pi x\|=1} x^\top \Pi \Pi_{\mathcal{N}(P_H)} \mathbf{L}^\top \mathbf{L} \Pi_{\mathcal{N}(P_H)} \Pi x \quad (101)$$

Now recall that $\Pi_{\mathcal{N}(P_H)}$ is of rank $r_{\mathbf{F}}$, hence it is a feasible choice for the variable Π of the outer optimization problem. This leads to the bound

$$\sigma_{-1}(\mathbf{F}) \geq \min_{x \text{ s.t.: } \|\Pi_{\mathcal{N}(P_H)} x\|=1} x^\top \Pi_{\mathcal{N}(P_H)} \mathbf{L}^\top \mathbf{L} \Pi_{\mathcal{N}(P_H)} x \quad (102)$$

$$\geq \min_{z \text{ s.t.: } \|z\|=1} z^\top \mathbf{L}^\top \mathbf{L} z = \sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{L}) \quad (103)$$

We obtain a simple, but possibly conservative, lower bound on $\sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{L})$ as follows:

$$\sigma_{\min}^2(\mathbf{L}) = \min_{z \text{ s.t.: } \|z\|=1} \|\mathbf{L}z\|_2^2 = \min_{z \text{ s.t.: } \|z\|=1} \|\mathbf{C}\mathbf{G}_u(A, B)z\|_2^2 + \|\mathbf{D}z\|_2^2 \geq \sigma_{\min}^2(\mathbf{C}\mathbf{G}_u(A, B)) + \sigma_{\min}^2(\mathbf{D})$$

$$\implies \sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{L}) \geq \sigma_{\min}(\mathbf{D})$$

Finally, this provides us with the final result: $\|\mathbf{F}^+(A, B)\|_2 = \sigma_{-1}^{-1}(\mathbf{F}) \leq \sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\mathbf{L}) \leq \sigma_{\min}^{-1}(\mathbf{D})$ \square

We obtain an upper bound for $\|\mathbf{g}\|_2$, as a corollary of the previous three Lemmas:

Lemma 14. *Let (A, B) be a fixed pair of H -controllable system matrices. Let $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{u}_c^*$, where \mathbf{L} and \mathbf{u}_c^* are defined as:*

$$\mathbf{L} := \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{D} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{G}_u(A, B) \\ I \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathbf{u}_c^* := P_H^+ A^H e_j = P_H^\top W_H^{-1} A^H e_j. \quad (104)$$

Then, it holds:

$$\|\mathbf{g}\|_2 \leq \left(\|C\|_2 \sqrt{H} \sigma_{\max}^{\frac{1}{2}}(W_H^u) + \|D\|_2 \right) \sigma_{\min}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(W_H^u) \alpha_H$$

where $\alpha_H := \max_{0 \leq k \leq H} \|A^k\|_2$

J.5 The final bound

With the results of the last section, we can now bound the constants Γ_A and Γ_B used in (Thm.7). Rather than writing the explicit form of the constants we shall only analyze how they scale with system parameters. Γ_A, Γ_B are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_A &= \kappa_{CD} \Gamma'_1 + \kappa_{CD} \Gamma'_2 \|B_1\|_2 \|\mathbf{G}_w(A_1)\|_2 \|\mathbf{G}_w(A_2)\|_2 \\ \Gamma_B &= \kappa_{CD} \Gamma'_2 \|\mathbf{G}_w(A_2)\|_2, \end{aligned}$$

where Γ'_1, Γ'_2 are dominated by the terms:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma'_1 &\sim \mathcal{O} \left(\alpha_{H,1} \alpha_{H,2} H \|\mathbf{G}_{u,2}\|_2 \|P_{H,2}^+\|_2 \right) \\ \Gamma'_2 &\sim \mathcal{O} \left(\|\mathbf{g}\|_2 (\|\mathbf{F}_1^+\|_2 + \|\mathbf{F}_2^+\|_2) \|P_{H,1}^+\|_2 \|P_{H,2}^+\|_2 (\|P_{H,1}\|_2 + \|P_{H,2}\|_2) (1 + \|\mathbf{G}_{u,1}\|_2) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Recall the FIR horizon H and the constants $\underline{\sigma}_u, \bar{\sigma}_u, \underline{\sigma}_w, \bar{\sigma}_w, \kappa_{CD}$ and revisit the collection of bounds we have derived:

- i) $\|\mathbf{G}_u(A, B)\|_2 \leq \sqrt{H \sigma_{\max}(W_H^u(A, B))}$, $\|\mathbf{G}_w(A)\|_2 \leq \sqrt{H \sigma_{\max}(W_H^w(A))}$
- ii) $\|P_H(A, B)\|_2 = (\sigma_{\max}(W_H^u(A, B)))^{\frac{1}{2}}$, $\|P_H^+(A, B)\|_2 = (\sigma_{\min}(W_H^u(A, B)))^{-\frac{1}{2}}$
- iii) $\|\mathbf{F}^+(A, B)\|_2 \leq \sigma_{\min}^{-1}(D)$
- iv) $\|\mathbf{g}\|_2 \leq \left(\|C\|_2 \sqrt{H} \sigma_{\max}^{\frac{1}{2}}(W_H^u) + \|D\|_2 \right) \sigma_{\min}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(W_H^u) \alpha_H$
- v) $\alpha_H := \max_{0 \leq k \leq H} \|A^k\|_2$
- vi) $\kappa_{CD} = \frac{\max\{\sigma_{\max}(C), \sigma_{\max}(D)\}}{\min\{\sigma_{\min}(C), \sigma_{\min}(D)\}}$

Per (Lem.8), we can bound the singular values of the arbitrary grammians using $\underline{\sigma}_u, \bar{\sigma}_u, \underline{\sigma}_w, \bar{\sigma}_w$:

$$\underline{\sigma}_u \leq \sigma_{\min}(W_H^u(A_1, B_1)), \sigma_{\min}(W_H^u(A_2, B_2)), \quad (105)$$

$$\sigma_{\max}(W_H^u(A_1, B_1)), \sigma_{\max}(W_H^u(A_2, B_2)) \leq \bar{\sigma}_u \quad (106)$$

$$\underline{\sigma}_w \leq \sigma_{\min}(W_H^w(A_1)), \sigma_{\min}(W_H^w(A_2)), \quad (107)$$

$$\sigma_{\max}(W_H^w(A_1)), \sigma_{\max}(W_H^w(A_2)) \leq \bar{\sigma}_w \quad (108)$$

Then, we obtain

$$\Gamma'_2 = \mathcal{O} \left(\alpha_H \kappa_{CD} H \left(\frac{\bar{\sigma}_u}{\underline{\sigma}_u} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \right) \quad \Gamma'_1 = \mathcal{O} \left(\alpha_H^2 H^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(\frac{\bar{\sigma}_u}{\underline{\sigma}_u} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \quad (109)$$

and finally

$$\Gamma_A = \mathcal{O} \left(\alpha_H^2 \kappa_{CD}^2 \|B_1\|_2 H^2 \left(\frac{\bar{\sigma}_u}{\underline{\sigma}_u} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \bar{\sigma}_w \right) \quad \Gamma_B = \mathcal{O} \left(\alpha_H \kappa_{CD}^2 H^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(\frac{\bar{\sigma}_u}{\underline{\sigma}_u} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \bar{\sigma}_w^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \quad (110)$$

Theorem 8. Let $C, D \succ 0$, and let \mathcal{S} be a compact set of controllable systems with known FIR horizon H and constants $\underline{\sigma}_u, \bar{\sigma}_u, \underline{\sigma}_w, \bar{\sigma}_w$ as defined in (Lem.8). Then there are fixed constants Γ_A, Γ_B , such that for any two pairs of system matrices $(A_1, B_1), (A_2, B_2) \in \mathcal{S}$ the corresponding \mathcal{H}_2 optimal SLS-solutions of problem S_j (j arbitrary), denoted ϕ_1^{*j} and ϕ_2^{*j} , satisfy the following inequality:

$$\|\phi_1^{*j} - \phi_2^{*j}\|_2 \leq \Gamma_A \|A_1 - A_2\|_F + \Gamma_B \|B_1 - B_2\|_F. \quad (111)$$

Furthermore, Γ_A and Γ_B satisfy

$$\Gamma_A = \mathcal{O} \left(\alpha_H^2 \kappa_{CD}^2 \beta H^2 \left(\frac{\bar{\sigma}_u}{\underline{\sigma}_u} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \bar{\sigma}_w \right) \quad \Gamma_B = \mathcal{O} \left(\alpha_H \kappa_{CD}^2 H^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(\frac{\bar{\sigma}_u}{\underline{\sigma}_u} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \bar{\sigma}_w^{\frac{1}{2}} \right), \quad (112)$$

where $\beta := \max_{(A,B) \in \mathcal{S}} \|B\|_2$ and κ_{CD} stands for

$$\kappa_{CD} = \frac{\max\{\sigma_{max}(C), \sigma_{max}(D)\}}{\min\{\sigma_{min}(C), \sigma_{min}(D)\}}$$

K Vector Subsystems

For ease of exposition, Algorithm 1 was stated for the case when each subsystem $i \in [N]$ in the network has scalar dynamics. Below we describe how Algorithm 1 can be implemented for general vector subsystems that are heterogeneous. Recall that we consider a network of N subsystems where each subsystem i has $x^i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ and $u^i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$.

Communication and locality constraints. The communication graph and the communication matrix $\mathcal{C} \in \{0, 1\}^{N \times N}$ can be identically defined for these vector subsystems as the scalar case in section 2.2, e.g., having vector subsystems does not change the communication graph and all definitions according to the communication graph. Similarly, the vector subsystems do not affect our definition of the locality constraints as described in Section 2.2.

When we write $\Phi^x[k] \in \mathcal{C}$, where $\Phi^x[k] \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_x}$ and $\mathcal{C} \in \{0, 1\}^{N \times N}$ with $n_x = \sum_{i=1}^N n_i$, we mean that the i, j^{th} block matrix of $\Phi^x[k]$ (of size n_i by n_j) is nonzero if and only if $\mathcal{C}(i, j) = 1$.

If the system is not fully actuated where $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_u}$ with $n_u < n_x$, then $\Phi^u[k] \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u \times n_x}$ and thus is a wide matrix. In this case, we write $\Phi^u[k] \in \mathcal{C}$ to mean that each i^{th} row of $\Phi^u[k]$ (corresponding to the actuated position $u^i(t)$) conforms to the sparsity pattern of the i^{th} row of \mathcal{C} , where if $u^i(t)$ belongs to the ℓ^{th} subsystem, $\Phi^u[k](i, k) \neq 0$ if and only if $\mathcal{C}(\ell, q) = 1$ with $x^k(t)$ belonging to subsystem q .

Algorithm. The CONSIST component (Algorithm 2) of Algorithm 1 does not change for the vector case, because (3) is general for any local state dimension. Instead of computing each row of A, B , each subsystem now computes multiple rows of A, B that corresponds to its local dynamics in (1).

The CONTROL component (Algorithm 3) of Algorithm 1 is where modification is required. Before we state how to generalize CONTROL to the vector case, we need a few more definitions. Specifically, define index set $\{i_k\}$ for $i \in [N]$ and $k \in [n_i]$ as the *state index for subsystem i* , where each i_k is the position of the k^{th} component of x^i in the global state vector x . A *control index* can be analogously defined for subsystem i .

In the first step of CONTROL where each subsystem synthesizes a *single* closed-loop column in the scalar case, each subsystem now synthesizes *multiple* closed-loop columns. In particular, subsystem i computes all i_k^{th} closed-loop columns using (5). During communication, all i_k columns from subsystem i is transmitted to its outgoing communication neighbors.

In the second step of CONTROL where each subsystem computes its local control action, subsystem i now computes $\hat{w}^{i_k}(t)$ and $u^{i_k}(t)$ for all its state and control index in (6), rather than the single index i in the scalar case. This also means that subsystem i uses multiple closed-loop columns transmitted from other subsystems. In terms of the distributed SLS controller implementation (described in Appendix F.3), this means that instead of performing a single row-vector multiplication during (6), subsystem i now performs

matrix-vector multiplication (equivalently, multiple row-vector multiplication) over each of its state and control index i_k . In particular, (6) now requires the closed-loop columns from subsystem j over all state and control index $\{j_k\}$ of subsystem j for $j \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{in}}(i)$.

Stability guarantee. It is straightforward to verify that the analysis in Section 4 can be carried through in near identical fashion. The effect of general vector subsystem manifests in the change of the constants such as \bar{n} , where the constants are larger than the scalar case. In general the size of each subsystem is still much smaller than the dimension of the global system.