

# A Two-Step Quasi-Newton Identification Algorithm for Stochastic Systems with Saturated Observations

Lantian Zhang<sup>a</sup>, Lei Guo<sup>b,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Key Laboratory of Systems and Control, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China (zhanglantian@amss.ac.cn)

<sup>b</sup>Key Laboratory of Systems and Control, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China (lguo@amss.ac.cn)

## Abstract

This paper investigates the identification and prediction problems for stochastic dynamical systems with saturated observations, which arise from various fields in engineering and social systems, but still lack comprehensive theoretical studies up to now. The main contributions of this paper are: (i) To introduce a two-step Quasi-Newton (TSQN) identification algorithm which is applicable to a typical class of nonlinear stochastic systems with outputs observed under possibly varying saturations. (ii) To establish the convergence of both the parameter estimators and adaptive predictors and to prove the asymptotic normality, under a weakest possible non-persistent excitation (PE) condition, which can be applied to stochastic feedback systems with general non-stationary and correlated system signals or data. (iii) To establish probabilistic estimation error bounds for any given finite number of data, by using either martingale inequalities or Monte Carlo experiments. A numerical example is also provided to illustrate the performance of our identification algorithm.

**Keywords**— Stochastic systems; Saturated observations; Quasi-Newton algorithm; Convergence; Asymptotic normality; Non-PE condition

## 1 Introduction

Identifying the input-output relationship and predicting the future behavior of dynamical systems based on observation data are fundamental problems in various fields including control systems, signal processes and machine learning, etc. This paper considers identification and prediction problems for stochastic dynamical systems with saturated observations. At each time, the noise-corrupted output can be observed only when its value lies in a certain range, while those observations outside this range are blind. The relationship between the system output and observation is illustrated in Fig.1, where  $v_{k+1}$  and  $y_{k+1}$  represent the system output and observation respectively, the interval  $[l_k, u_k]$  is the observation range, when the system output exceed this range, the only possible observation is a constant, either  $L_k$  or  $U_k$ . We call the observations produced by such a mechanism as saturated observations. Note that if we take  $L_k = l_k = 0$ ,  $u_k = U_k = \infty$ , then the saturation function will become the ReLu function widely used in machine learning; and if we take  $L_k = l_k = u_k = 0$ ,  $U_k = 1$ , the saturation function will turn to be a binary-valued function widely used in classification problems([1], [2]).

---

\*Corresponding author: Lei Guo.




Figure 1: Saturated observations.

Saturated observations in stochastic dynamical systems exist widely in various fields including engineering ([4]-[6]), economics ([7]-[8],[17],[29]) and social systems[9]. We only mention several examples in three different application areas. The first example is in sensor networks ([4]), where the observations of each sensor are saturated observations due to power and bandwidth limitations; The second example is in economics ([7]), where  $v_k$  is interpreted as an index of consumer's intensity of desire to purchase a durable,  $y_k$  is the true purchase which can be regarded as an saturated observation, because the intensity  $v_k$  can be observed only if it exceeds a certain threshold where the true purchase takes place; The third example is in sentencing ([9]), where  $y_k$  is the pronounced penalty which can also be regarded as a saturated observation, since it is constrained within the statutory range of penalty according to the related basic criminal facts.

From a theoretical standpoint, various identification methods with saturated observations have been studied intensively with both asymptotic and non-asymptotic results, on which we give a brief review separately in the following:

First, most of the existing theoretical results are asymptotic in nature, where the number of observations need to increase unboundedly or at least to be sufficiently large. A great deal of research efforts has been devoted to asymptotic analyses of identification algorithms for linear or nonlinear stochastic dynamical systems with uncensored or unsaturated observations([12], [3], [10]-[13]). Particularly, Ljung (1977) [12] introduced the ODE method to establish the convergence of a wide class of nonlinear recursive algorithms, and Lai and Wei (1982) [13] gave the weakest possible excitation condition for strong consistency of the classical least square algorithm for linear regression stochastic models. When the observations of stochastic dynamical systems are saturated, the investigation goes to be more complicated due to the saturated nonlinearity of the system observations. The least absolute deviation methods were considered in [15], and the strong consistency and asymptotic normality of the estimators were proven for independent signals satisfying the usual persistent excitation (PE) condition where the condition number of the information matrix is bounded. Besides, the maximum likelihood (ML) method was considered in [16], where the consistency and asymptotic efficiency were established for independent or non-random signals satisfying a stronger PE condition. Moreover, a two-stage procedure was proposed in [17], called Heckman two-step estimator, which first calculates the ML estimates of Probit model parameters ([7]) and then implements the least squares method on the ML estimates obtained in the first procedure. Furthermore, empirical measure approach was employed in [18]-[20], where the strong consistency and asymptotic efficiency were established under periodic signals with binary-valued observations. Such observations were also considered in [21], where a strongly consistent recursive projection algorithm was given under a condition stronger than the usual PE condition.

Second, there are also a number of non-asymptotic estimation results in the literature. Despite the importance of the asymptotic estimation results as mentioned above, non-asymptotic results appear to be more practical, because one usually only has finite number of data available for identification in practice. Non-asymptotic identification results are usually given under high probability. We first mention a few related contributions on non-asymptotic analysis with uncensored observations. The mixing-time methods were considered in [23] and related studies for linear dynamical systems, which rely on the assumed fast convergence to a stationary distribution that allows dependent samples to be treated roughly as if they were independent. In another line of studies, see [24]-[26], the probabilistic error bounds were given by a conditional PE condition which is similar to that used previously in [31] for estimating time-varying parameters. However, non-asymptotic identification results for stochastic models with saturated observations are mostly established under assumptions that the system data are independently and identically distributed (i.i.d), e.g., the analysis of the stochastic gradient descent methods in [27]-[28], and the study of the ML method in [29]. Moreover, an online Newton method was proposed in [30], where a probabilistic error-bound was given for linear stochastic dynamical systems where the usual PE condition is satisfied. The main technique in [30] are the Lyapunov function method and the use of Markov inequalities.

In summary, almost all of the existing identification results for stochastic dynamical systems with saturated observations need at least the usual PE condition on the system data, and actually, most need i.i.d assumptions. Though these idealized conditions are convenient for theoretical investigation, they are hardly satisfied or verified for general stochastic dynamical systems with feedback signals (see, e.g. [14]). This inevitably brings challenges for establishing an identification theory on either asymptotic or non-asymptotic results with saturated observations under more general (non-PE) signal conditions.

The first paper that established the strong consistency of estimators for general stochastic regression models with binary-valued observations under non-PE condition appears to be [22], where a recursive projection Quasi-Newton type algorithm was proposed and analyzed. The non-PE condition used in [22] is similar to the weakest possible signal condition for stochastic linear regression model with uncensored observations (see [13]), which can be applied to non-stationary stochastic dynamical systems with feedback control. However, there are still some unresolved fundamental problems, for instances, a) How should a globally fast convergent estimation algorithm be designed for stochastic systems with general saturated observations? b) What is the asymptotic distribution of the estimation error under non-PE condition? c) How to get a useful and computable probabilistic estimation error bound under non-PE condition when the number of data is finite? The main purpose of this paper is to solve these problems, by introducing a two-step Quasi-Newton type adaptive identification algorithm, by refining the stochastic Lyapunov function approach, and by applying some martingale inequalities and convergence theorems. Monte Carlo method is also found quite useful in computing the estimation error bound. As we mentioned in the introduction, binary-valued observations are only special cases of saturated observations, and in this sense, the current investigation may be regarded as a continuation of the authors' work [22], but with considerably different contents in the proposed algorithms, the main theorems and the theoretical analyses.

The main contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows:

- We propose a two-step Quasi-Newton (TSQN) adaptive identification algorithm for stochastic dynamical systems with saturated observations. The first step is to produce adaptive parameter estimates by a projected Quasi-Newton method, which are then used to construct the adaptation gains together with “noise variance” estimates in the second step for designing the accelerated adaptive identification algorithm.
- Asymptotic results on the proposed new identification algorithm, including strong consistency and asymptotic normality, are established for stochastic dynamical systems with saturated observations under quite general non-PE conditions. The optimality of adaptive prediction or regrets is also established without resorting to any excitation conditions. To the best of the authors knowledge, these results appear to be the first ones in the literature for stochastic dynamical systems with saturated observations under general non-PE conditions.

- Non-asymptotic error bounds for both parameter estimation and output prediction are also provided, when only finite number of data is available, for stochastic dynamical systems with saturated observations and no PE conditions. Such bounds have been successfully applied to sentencing computation based on practical judicial data [9].

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give the problem formulation; The main results are stated in Section 3; Section 4 presents the proofs of the main results together with some key technical lemmas. A numerical example is provided in Section 5. Finally, we conclude the paper with some remarks.

## 2 Problem Formulation

Let us consider the following piecewise linear regression model:

$$y_{k+1} = S_k(\phi_k^T \theta + e_{k+1}), \quad (1)$$

where  $\theta \in R^m$  is an unknown parameter vector to be estimated;  $y_{k+1} \in R^1$ ,  $\phi_k \in R^m$ ,  $e_{k+1} \in R^1$ ,  $k = 0, 1, \dots$  represent the system observation, stochastic regressor and random noise, respectively.  $S_k(\cdot) : R \rightarrow R$  is a time-varying saturation function defined as follows:

$$S_k(x) = \begin{cases} L_k & x < l_k \\ x & l_k \leq x \leq u_k \\ U_k & x > u_k \end{cases}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots \quad (2)$$

where  $[l_k, u_k]$  is the given observable range,  $L_k$  and  $U_k$  are the only observations when the output exceeds this observable range.

### 2.1 Notations and Assumptions

**Notations.** By  $\|\cdot\|$ , we denote the Euclidean-norm of vectors or matrices. The spectrum of a matrix  $M$  is denoted by  $\{\lambda_i\{M\}\}$ , where the maximum and minimum eigenvalues are denoted by  $\lambda_{max}\{M\}$  and  $\lambda_{min}\{M\}$  respectively.

To carry out our theoretical analyses, we need the following basic assumptions:

**Assumption 1.** *The stochastic regressor  $\phi_k$  is  $\mathcal{F}_k$ -measurable and bounded for all  $k \geq 0$ , where  $\{\mathcal{F}_k, k \geq 0\}$  is a non-decreasing sequence of  $\sigma$ -algebras. Besides, the true parameter  $\theta$  belongs to a known compact convex set  $D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ .*

We remark that Assumption 1 on stochastic regressors is quite general, since it does not require stringent statistical conditions like stationarity and ergodicity, and can include complicated signals or data generated from stochastic feedback control systems.

**Assumption 2.** *The thresholds  $\{l_k, \mathcal{F}_k\}$ ,  $\{u_k, \mathcal{F}_k\}$ ,  $\{L_k, \mathcal{F}_k\}$ ,  $\{U_k, \mathcal{F}_k\}$  are known bounded and square integrable adapted stochastic sequences, satisfying*

$$L_k \leq l_k \leq u_k \leq U_k, \quad a.s. \quad \forall k \geq 0. \quad (3)$$

**Assumption 3.** *The noise  $e_k$  is  $\mathcal{F}_k$ -measurable for any  $k \geq 0$ , and there exists a constant  $\eta > 2$ , such that*

$$\sup_{k \geq 0} E[|e_{k+1}|^\eta | \mathcal{F}_k] < \infty, \quad a.s. \quad (4)$$

Besides, the function  $G_k(x)$ , defined by  $G_k(x) = E[S(x + e_{k+1}) | \mathcal{F}_k]$  is differentiable and its derivative  $G'_k(\cdot)$  satisfies

$$0 < \underline{g} = \inf_{|x| \leq M_k, k \geq 0} G'_k(x) \leq \sup_{|x| \leq M_k, k \geq 0} G'_k(x) = \bar{g} < \infty. \quad (5)$$

where  $\{M_k, k \geq 0\}$  can be taken as a bounded sequence by Assumption 1.

It is worth to mention that under condition (4), the function  $G_k(\cdot)$  in Assumption 3 is well-defined for any  $k \geq 0$ , and can be calculated given the conditional probability distribution of the noise  $e_k$ . In Appendix A, we have provided a typical example to illustrate how to concretely calculate the function  $G_k(\cdot)$ .

## 2.2 Algorithm

Because of its ‘‘optimality’’ and fast convergence rate, the classical LS algorithm is one of the most basic and widely used ones in the adaptive estimation and adaptive control of linear stochastic systems. Inspired by the analysis of the LS recursive algorithm, we have introduced a Quasi-Newton type algorithm to estimate the parameters in linear stochastic regression models with binary-valued observations in [22]. However, we find that a direct extension of the Quasi-Newton algorithm introduced in [22] from binary-valued observations to saturated observations does not give satisfactory speed of convergence, which motivates us to introduce a two-step Quasi-Newton identification algorithm as described shortly.

In the first step of our new algorithm, we need to introduce a suitable projection operator. For the linear space  $\mathbb{R}^m$  ( $m \geq 1$ ), we define a norm  $\|\cdot\|_Q$  associated with a positive definite matrix  $Q$  as  $\|x\|_Q^2 = x^T Q x$ ,  $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . Let  $D_k \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$  be a convex compact set defined by

$$D_k = \{x \in D : \|\phi_k^T x\| \leq M_k\}. \quad (6)$$

**Definition 1.** For the convex compact set  $D_k$  defined by (6), the projection operator  $\Pi_Q^k(\cdot)$  is defined as

$$\Pi_Q^k(x) = \arg \min_{w \in D_k} \|x - w\|_Q, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^p. \quad (7)$$

The new two-step Quasi-Newton (TSQN) identification algorithm is defined as follows:

---

### Algorithm 1 Two-Step Quasi-Newton (TSQN) Algorithm

---

**Step 1.** Recursively calculate the preliminary estimate  $\bar{\theta}_k$  for  $k \geq 1$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\theta}_{k+1} &= \Pi_{\bar{P}_{k+1}}^k \left\{ \bar{\theta}_k + \frac{1}{1 + \bar{\beta}_k^2 \phi_k^T \bar{P}_k \phi_k} \bar{\beta}_k \bar{P}_k \phi_k [y_{k+1} - G_k(\phi_k^T \bar{\theta}_k)] \right\}, \\ \bar{P}_{k+1} &= \bar{P}_k - \frac{1}{1 + \bar{\beta}_k^2 \phi_k^T \bar{P}_k \phi_k} \bar{\beta}_k^2 \bar{P}_k \phi_k \phi_k^T \bar{P}_k, \\ \bar{\beta}_k &= \min \left\{ \underline{g}, \frac{1}{2\bar{g} \phi_k^T \bar{P}_k \phi_k + 1} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where  $\underline{g}$ ,  $\bar{g}$  and  $G_k(\cdot)$  are defined in Assumption 3,  $\Pi_{\bar{P}_{k+1}}^k$  is the projection operator defined as in Definition 1, the initial values  $\bar{\theta}_0$  and  $\bar{P}_0$  can be chosen arbitrarily in  $D$  and with  $\bar{P}_0 > 0$ , respectively.

**Step 2.** Recursively define the accelerated estimate  $\hat{\theta}_k$  based on  $\bar{\theta}_k$  for  $k \geq 1$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\theta}_{k+1} &= \hat{\theta}_k + \frac{1}{\mu_k + \beta_k^2 \phi_k^T P_k \phi_k} \beta_k P_k \phi_k [y_{k+1} - G_k(\phi_k^T \hat{\theta}_k)], \\ P_{k+1} &= P_k - \frac{1}{\mu_k + \beta_k^2 \phi_k^T P_k \phi_k} \beta_k^2 P_k \phi_k \phi_k^T P_k, \\ \beta_k &= \frac{G_k(\phi_k^T \bar{\theta}_k) - G_k(\phi_k^T \hat{\theta}_k)}{\phi_k^T \bar{\theta}_k - \phi_k^T \hat{\theta}_k} I_{\{\phi_k^T \hat{\theta}_k - \phi_k^T \bar{\theta}_k \neq 0\}} + G'_k(\phi_k^T \hat{\theta}_k) I_{\{\phi_k^T \hat{\theta}_k - \phi_k^T \bar{\theta}_k = 0\}}, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where  $\{\mu_k\}$  can be any positive random process adapted to  $\{\mathcal{F}_k\}$  with  $0 < \inf_{k \geq 1} \{\mu_k\} \leq \sup_{k \geq 1} \{\mu_k\} < \infty$ ,  $\hat{\theta}_0$  and  $P_0$  can be chosen arbitrarily in  $D$  and with  $P_0 > 0$ , respectively.

---

**Remark 1.** As described above, our identification algorithm is actually defined by two successive steps, between which the main difference is the construction of the adaptation gains besides the use of projection operator in the first step. In the first step, the scalar adaptation gain  $\bar{\beta}_k$  is constructed by using the bounds  $\underline{g}$  and  $\bar{g}$  defined in (5), in a similar way as that constructed in the identification algorithm of [22]. Though the strong consistency of the preliminary estimate  $\bar{\theta}_k$  in the first step may be established following a similar arguments as in [22], its convergence speed appears to be not so good, and its asymptotic normality also appears to be hard to establish, because the scalar adaptation gain  $\bar{\beta}_k$  is simply constructed by using the “worst case” information  $\underline{g}$  and  $\bar{g}$ . To overcome these shortcomings, the second step estimation is introduced with the following two features: (i) To accelerate the strong convergence of the estimation algorithm, the sclar adaptation gain  $\beta_k$  is defined in an adaptive way by using the preliminary estimates  $\bar{\theta}_k$  generated in the first step, and (ii) To ensure the asymptotic normality of the estimation errors under non-PE condition, the regularization factor  $\mu_k$  is taken as a “noise variance” estimate constructed by using the preliminary estimates  $\bar{\theta}_k$  in the first step (see Theorem 3). Simulations in Section 5 also demonstrate that the convergence speed of the parameter estimates given in the second step outperforms that of the first step.

### 3 Main results

In this section, we give some asymptotic results of the TSQN identification algorithm. To be specific, we will establish asymptotic upper bounds for both the parameter estimation errors and the adaptive prediction errors in Section 3.1, study the asymptotic normality of the TSQN algorithm in Section 3.2 and give high probabilistic error bounds for any given finite number of data in Section 3.3. For convenience, we introduce the following notations to be used throughout the sequel:

$$w_{k+1} = y_{k+1} - G_k(\phi_k^T \theta), \quad (10)$$

$$\bar{\psi}_k = G_k(\phi_k^T \theta) - G_k(\phi_k^T \bar{\theta}_k), \quad \psi_k = G_k(\phi_k^T \theta) - G_k(\phi_k^T \hat{\theta}_k) \quad (11)$$

$$\bar{a}_k = \frac{1}{1 + \beta_k^2 \phi_k^T P_k \phi_k}, \quad a_k = \frac{1}{\mu_k + \beta_k^2 \phi_k^T P_k \phi_k}. \quad (12)$$

#### 3.1 Asymptotic error bounds

**Theorem 1.** Under Assumptions 1-3, the estimator  $\hat{\theta}_k$  given by the TSQN Algorithm has the following upper bound almost surely as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ :

$$\|\tilde{\theta}_{k+1}\|^2 = O\left(\frac{\log k}{\lambda_{\min}(k)}\right), \quad a.s. \quad (13)$$

where  $\tilde{\theta}_k = \theta - \hat{\theta}_k$ ,  $\lambda_{\min}(k)$  is the minimum eigenvalue of the matrix  $\sum_{i=1}^k \phi_i \phi_i^T + \lambda_0 I$  with the initial value  $\lambda_0 > \|P_0^{-1}\|$ .

From Theorem 1, it is easy to see that the algorithm will converge to the true parameter almost surely if the right-hand side (RHS) of (13) converges to 0 almost surely. This condition does not need the independence and stationarity conditions on the system regressors and hence applicable to stochastic feedback control systems, and is much weaker than the traditional PE condition.

**Remark 2.** If the excitation condition (13) is strengthened to the well-known PE condition, i.e.  $n = O(\lambda_{\min}\{\sum_{i=1}^n \phi_i \phi_i^T\})$ , then the convergence rate of the TSQN algorithm can be improved to the following iterated logarithm rate:

$$\|\tilde{\theta}_k\|^2 = O\left(\frac{\log \log k}{k}\right), \quad a.s., \quad (14)$$

which is known to be the best rate of convergence of the classical least squares in the linear case. It is worth noting that we do not know how to establish such a best possible convergence rate for the preliminary estimate given in the first step by the projected Quasi-Newton algorithm.

Given the parameter estimate  $\hat{\theta}_k$  by the above TSQN algorithm, one can define the adaptive predictor for the output as follows:

$$\hat{y}_{k+1} = G_k(\phi_k^T \hat{\theta}_k).$$

Usually, the difference between the best predictor and the adaptive predictor along the sample path, can be measured by the regret defined as follows:

$$R_k = [E[y_{k+1} | \mathcal{F}_k] - \hat{y}_{k+1}]^2. \quad (15)$$

One of the goals of this paper is to give both asymptotic and non-asymptotic results for the regret  $R_k$ .

**Theorem 2.** *Let Assumptions 1-3 hold. Then the sample paths of the accumulated regrets will have the following upper bound:*

$$\sum_{i=1}^k R_i = O(\log k), \quad a.s. \quad (16)$$

The convergence of the accumulated regrets in Theorem 1 does not require any excitation condition to hold, and thus can be easily applied to closed-loop control systems. We remark that the order  $\log k$  is known to be the best possible order in the linear case (see [33]).

### 3.2 Asymptotic normality

In this subsection, we study the asymptotic distribution properties of the estimation, and show that the asymptotic variance of the estimation error can reach the Cramér–Rao lower bound in some typical cases.

For this, we need the following additional assumptions on the noise sequence:

**Assumption 4.** *The derivative function of  $G_k(\cdot)$  is Lipschitz continuous with the Lipschitz constant  $\rho$ .*

Let us now take the regulation factor sequence  $\{\mu_k\}$  in the second step of the TSQN algorithm as

$$\mu_k = \sigma_k(\phi_k^T \bar{\theta}_k), \quad (17)$$

where  $\bar{\theta}_k$  is the preliminary estimate given in the first step of the TSQN algorithm, and the function  $\sigma_k(\cdot)$  is defined by

$$\sigma_k(x) = E \left[ [S_k(x + e_{k+1}) - E[S_k(x + e_{k+1}) | \mathcal{F}_k]]^2 | \mathcal{F}_k \right]. \quad (18)$$

We are now in a position to present a theorem on asymptotic normality of the parameter estimate  $\hat{\theta}_k$  under a general non-PE condition.

**Theorem 3.** *Let Assumptions 1-4 be satisfied. Assume that  $\{\phi_k, k \geq 0\}$  satisfies as  $k \rightarrow \infty$*

$$\frac{\log^2 k}{\lambda_{\min}(k)} \rightarrow 0, \quad a.s. \quad (19)$$

where  $\lambda_{\min}(k)$  is same as that in Theorem 1. Assume also that for each  $k$ , there exists a non-random positive definite matrix  $\Delta_k$  such that as  $k \rightarrow \infty$

$$\Delta_k^{-1} Q_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} \xrightarrow{p} I, \quad (20)$$

where  $Q_k^{-1} = \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{(G'_i(\phi_i^T \theta))^2}{\sigma_i(\phi_i^T \theta)} \phi_i \phi_i^T$ . Then the estimate  $\hat{\theta}_k$  given by the TSQN algorithm has the following asymptotically normal property as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ :

$$Q_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\theta}_k \xrightarrow{d} N(0, I), \quad (21)$$

where  $\tilde{\theta}_k = \theta - \hat{\theta}_k$ ,  $\xrightarrow{p}$  and  $\xrightarrow{d}$  mean convergence in probability and in distribution, respectively.

Notice that if  $\{\phi_k\}$  is a determined sequence, then  $\Delta_k$  can be simply chosen as  $Q_k^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ . Moreover, if  $\{\phi_k\}$  is a stationary and ergodic random sequence with positive covariance matrix and  $\{e_k\}$  is a stationary sequence, then  $\Delta_k$  can be taken as  $\sqrt{k}\{E[\frac{(G'_1(\phi_1^T\theta))^2}{\sigma_1(\phi_1^T\theta)}\phi_1\phi_1^T]\}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ .

**Remark 3.** If our nonlinear models degenerate to linear regression models with binary-valued observations, e.g.,  $y_k = 0$  or  $1$  when the saturation function satisfies  $L_k = l_k = u_k = 0$ ,  $U_k = 1$ . The fisher information matrix  $I_k$  given data  $\{(y_k, \phi_k), 1 \leq k \leq n\}$  can be calculated as follows:

$$I_k = -E\left[\frac{\partial^2[\log p(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n)]}{\partial\theta^2}\right] = Q_k^{-1}. \quad (22)$$

where  $\{\phi_k\}$  is a deterministic sequence,  $\{e_k\}$  is an independent sequence. Thus our TSQN algorithm is asymptotically efficient in the sense of

$$I_k^{\frac{1}{2}}\tilde{\theta}_k \xrightarrow{d} N(0, I). \quad (23)$$

**Remark 4. Asymptotic confidence interval.** When the sample size  $n$  tends to  $\infty$ , the  $1-\alpha$  asymptotically correct confidence sets usually take the following form ([35],[34]):

$$C = \{\theta : \|\hat{Q}_n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\tilde{\theta}_n\|^2 \leq \chi_{m,\alpha}^2\}, \quad (24)$$

where  $\hat{Q}_n$  is an estimate of  $Q_n$  and can be taken as  $(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(G'_i(\phi_i^T\hat{\theta}_n))^2}{\sigma_i(\phi_i^T\hat{\theta}_n)}\phi_i\phi_i^T)^{-1}$  in our current case,  $\chi_{m,\alpha}^2$  is the  $\alpha$ -quantile of the standard  $\chi_m^2$  distribution with parameter  $m$ , where  $m$  is the dimension of the parameter  $\theta$ . Based on Theorem 3, the confidence set  $C$  may be computed approximately when  $n$  is large enough. Moreover, since

$$\|\epsilon_j^T\tilde{\theta}_n\| = \|\epsilon_j^T\hat{Q}_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\hat{Q}_n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\tilde{\theta}_n\| \leq \|\epsilon_j^T\hat{Q}_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\| \cdot \|\hat{Q}_n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\tilde{\theta}_n\|, \quad (25)$$

where  $\epsilon_j$  is the  $j^{\text{th}}$  column of the identity matrix, from which we can get a more detailed  $1-\alpha$  asymptotically correct confidence intervals for the components of the estimation error vector as follows:

$$C'^{(j)} = \left(\hat{\theta}^{(j)} - \sqrt{\hat{Q}^{(j)}\chi_{m,\alpha}^2}, \hat{\theta}^{(j)} + \sqrt{\hat{Q}^{(j)}\chi_{m,\alpha}^2}\right) \quad (26)$$

where  $\hat{Q}^{(j)}$  is the  $j^{\text{th}}$  diagonal element of  $\hat{Q}$ .

### 3.3 Non-asymptotic analysis

Though an asymptotic bound can be given based on Theorem 3 as discussed in Remark 4 which, however, requires that the number of data samples is sufficiently large. As a result, the asymptotic bound is hard to apply in real situations where one only has finite number of data samples. In this subsection, we will provide some upper bounds for the estimation errors with high probability when the number of data samples is given and finite.

#### 3.3.1 Lyapunov function-based confidence interval

In this subsection, we give a Lyapunov function-based confidence interval based on the analysis of a Lyapunov function used in the proof of Lemma 1. For convenience, we introduce the following notations to be used:

$$\sigma_k = E[\omega_{k+1}^2 | \mathcal{F}_k], \quad \bar{\sigma}_k^2 = E[(w_{k+1}^2 - E(w_{k+1}^2 | \mathcal{F}_k))^2 | \mathcal{F}_k]. \quad (27)$$

**Theorem 4.** Under Assumptions 1-3, assume the noise satisfies  $\sup_{k \geq 0} E[|e_{k+1}|^4 | \mathcal{F}_k] < \infty$ . Then for any  $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{2}$  and any given  $n \geq 1$ , with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta$  and  $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$ , we have

$$|\tilde{\theta}_{n+1}^{(j)}|^2 \leq P_{n+1}^{(j)}[\sigma_b^2(\log |P_{n+1}^{-1}| + 6\bar{\gamma}_n^{-1} \log |\bar{P}_{n+1}^{-1}|) + T_n + 6\bar{\gamma}_n^{-1}\bar{\Gamma}_n], \quad (28)$$



$$R_n \leq 2(1 + c_n)[\sigma_b^2(\log |P_{n+1}^{-1}| + 6\bar{\gamma}_n^{-1} \log |\bar{P}_{n+1}^{-1}|) + T_n + 6\bar{\gamma}_n^{-1}\bar{\Gamma}_n] \quad (29)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} T_n &= V_0 + \sigma_b^2 \log |P_0^{-1}| + \frac{\Phi_n \text{tr}(P_0) \bar{\sigma}_b^2}{2\sigma_b^2} + 18\sigma_b^2 \frac{1 - \delta}{\delta}, \\ \bar{\Gamma}_n &= \bar{V}_0 + \sigma_a^2 \log |\bar{P}_0^{-1}| + \frac{\bar{\Phi}_n \text{tr}(\bar{P}_0) \bar{\sigma}_a^2}{4\sigma_a^2} + 10\sigma_a^2 \frac{1 - \delta}{\delta}. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Besides,  $P_{n+1}^{(j)}$  is the  $i^{\text{th}}$  diagonal component of  $P_{n+1}$ , and  $\sigma_a^2 = \sup_{0 \leq k \leq n} \{\sigma_k^2\}$ ,  $\bar{\sigma}_a^2 = \sup_{0 \leq k \leq n} \{\bar{\sigma}_k^2\}$ ,  $\sigma_b^2 = \sup_{0 \leq k \leq n} \{\sigma_k^2 \mu_k^{-1}\}$ ,  $\bar{\sigma}_b^2 = \sup_{0 \leq k \leq n} \{\bar{\sigma}_k^2 \mu_k^{-2}\}$ ,  $\bar{\gamma}_n = \sup_{0 \leq k \leq n} \{\frac{\mu_k^{-1} \bar{\sigma}_k^2}{\sigma_k^2 \beta_k^2}\}$ ,  $\Phi_n = \sup_{1 \leq k \leq n} \{\mu_k^{-1} \beta_k^2 \|\phi_k\|^2\}$ ,  $\bar{\Phi}_n = \sup_{1 \leq k \leq n} \{\bar{\beta}_k^2 \|\phi_k\|^2\}$ ,  $c_n = \sup_{0 \leq k \leq n} \{\mu_k + \beta_k^2 \phi_k^T P_k \phi_k\}$ .

The detailed proofs of Theorem 4 are supplied in the next section.

In contrast to Remark 4 where the number of data samples is sufficiently large, the above Theorem 4 can provide a concrete confidence interval for any given finite number of data samples. Next, we provide an alternative confidence interval by using the Monte Carlo method, which turns out to have some advantages also in the case of finite data samples.

### 3.3.2 Monte Carlo-based confidence interval

In this subsection, we give a Monte Carlo-based confidence interval by designing a Monte Carlo experiment.

Consider the nonlinear stochastic system defined by (1)-(2) and the adaptive nonlinear TSQN algorithm defined by (8)-(9). Suppose that the unknown system parameter  $\theta \in D$  is a random vector with uniform distribution  $U$ , that the system noise  $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$  is an i.i.d sequence which is independent of  $\theta$  with distribution  $F$ , and that both the saturation functions  $\{S_i(\cdot)\}_{i=1}^n$  and system regressors  $\{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^n$  are deterministic sequence, where  $n$  is a given fixed data length. It is easy to see that the vector  $X = (\theta^T, e_1, \dots, e_n)$  has a joint distribution  $P = U \times F^n$ .

To construct the Monte Carlo-based confidence interval, let  $\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_K\}$  be  $K$  samples taken from the joint distribution  $P$ , and generate the corresponding  $n$ -dimensional observation set  $\{Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_K\}$  by the model (1)-(2) together with the given data of regressors  $\{\phi_i\}_{i=1}^n$ . From the TSQN algorithm, it is easy to see that there is an measurable function  $H_j : R^{n+m} \rightarrow R$  and a probabilistic distribution function  $F^{(j)}$ , such that the  $j^{\text{th}}$  component of the parameter estimation error  $\tilde{\theta}_{n,i}^{(j)}$  can be expressed as follows for any  $1 \leq i \leq K$  and  $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$ :

$$\tilde{\theta}_{n,i}^{(j)} = H_j(X_i) \sim F^{(j)}. \quad (31)$$

Let the empirical distribution function of the generated samples for the  $j^{\text{th}}$  component be

$$F_K^{(j)}(x) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K I_{\{(H_j(X_i)) \leq x\}}, \quad \forall x \in R, \quad j = 1, \dots, m.$$

Under the above mentioned assumptions and notations, we have the following proposition on the confidence interval with finite data length:

**Proposition 1.** *For any positive  $\alpha$  and  $t$  with  $\alpha + t < 1$ , and any  $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$ , the  $j^{\text{th}}$  component of the estimation error  $\tilde{\theta}_n^{(j)}$  generated by the TSQN algorithm belongs to the following confidence interval with probability at least  $1 - \alpha - t$ :*

$$\tilde{\theta}_n^{(j)} \in [z_K^{(j)}(\frac{\alpha}{2} - \sqrt{\frac{\ln 2 - \ln t}{2K}}), z_K^{(j)}(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2} + \sqrt{\frac{\ln 2 - \ln t}{2K}})], \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, m. \quad (32)$$

where  $z_K^{(j)}(\alpha)$  and  $z^{(j)}(\alpha)$  are the  $\alpha$  quantiles of the distribution  $F_K^{(j)}$  and  $F^{(j)}$  respectively.

It is obvious that the confidence interval of the estimation error given in Proposition 1 will decrease asymptotically, as the number of random samplings  $K$  used in Proposition 1 increases. We remark that there are at least two advantages of Proposition 1, one is that it is applicable to the case where the data length  $n$  is given and finite, another is that the confidence interval maybe better than that given in Theorem 4 in some applications.

## 4 Proofs of the main results

To prove the main results, we need to establish the following lemmas first.

**Lemma 1.** *Let Assumptions 1-3 be satisfied. Then the parameter estimate  $\hat{\theta}_k$  given by TSQN Algorithm has the following property as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ :*

$$\tilde{\theta}_{k+1}^T P_{k+1}^{-1} \tilde{\theta}_{k+1} + \sum_{i=0}^k a_k \psi_k^2 = O(\log k). \quad (33)$$

where  $\tilde{\theta}_k$  is defined as  $\theta - \hat{\theta}_k$ .

### Proof of Lemma 1.

Following the analysis ideas of the classical least-squares for linear stochastic regression models (see e.g., [11], [13], [32]), we consider the following stochastic Lyapunov function:

$$V_{k+1} = \tilde{\theta}_{k+1}^T P_{k+1}^{-1} \tilde{\theta}_{k+1}. \quad (34)$$

By (9), we know that

$$P_{k+1}^{-1} = P_k^{-1} + \mu_k^{-1} \beta_k^2 \phi_k \phi_k^T. \quad (35)$$

Hence, multiplying  $a_k \phi_k^T P_k$  from the left hand side and noticing the definition of  $a_k$ , we know that

$$\begin{aligned} & a_k \phi_k^T P_k P_{k+1}^{-1} \\ &= a_k \phi_k^T (I + \mu_k^{-1} \beta_k^2 P_k \phi_k \phi_k^T) = \mu_k^{-1} \phi_k^T. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Also by (11) and the definition of  $\beta_k$  in (9), we know that

$$\begin{aligned} & G_k(\phi_k^T \theta) - G_k(\phi_k^T \bar{\theta}_k) \\ &= G_k(\phi_k^T \theta) - G_k(\phi_k^T \hat{\theta}_k) + G_k(\phi_k^T \hat{\theta}_k) - G_k(\phi_k^T \bar{\theta}_k) \\ &= \psi_k + \beta_k \phi_k^T (\hat{\theta}_k - \bar{\theta}_k) = \psi_k + \beta_k \phi_k^T (\theta - \bar{\theta}_k - \tilde{\theta}_k) \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Hence,

$$\psi_k - \beta_k \phi_k^T \tilde{\theta}_k = \bar{\psi}_k - \beta_k \phi_k^T \tilde{\theta}_k. \quad (38)$$

Moreover, by (36), we know that

$$\begin{aligned} V_{k+1} &= [\tilde{\theta}_k - a_k \beta_k P_k \phi_k (\psi_k + w_{k+1})]^T P_{k+1}^{-1} [\tilde{\theta}_k - a_k \beta_k P_k \phi_k (\psi_k + w_{k+1})] \\ &= V_k + \mu_k^{-1} \beta_k^2 (\phi_k^T \tilde{\theta}_k)^2 - 2a_k \beta_k \phi_k^T P_k P_{k+1}^{-1} \tilde{\theta}_k \psi_k + a_k^2 \beta_k^2 \phi_k^T P_k P_{k+1}^{-1} P_k \phi_k \psi_k^2 \\ &\quad - 2a_k \beta_k \phi_k^T P_k P_{k+1}^{-1} \tilde{\theta}_k w_{k+1} + 2a_k^2 \beta_k^2 \phi_k^T P_k P_{k+1}^{-1} P_k \phi_k \psi_k w_{k+1} + \beta_k^2 a_k^2 \phi_k^T P_k P_{k+1}^{-1} P_k \phi_k w_{k+1}^2 \\ &= V_k - \mu_k^{-1} \psi_k^2 + \mu_k^{-1} (\psi_k - \beta_k \phi_k^T \tilde{\theta}_k)^2 + \mu_k^{-1} a_k \beta_k^2 \phi_k^T P_k \phi_k \psi_k^2 - 2\mu_k^{-1} \psi_k w_{k+1} \\ &\quad + 2\mu_k^{-1} (\psi_k - \beta_k \phi_k^T \tilde{\theta}_k) w_{k+1} + 2\mu_k^{-1} a_k \beta_k^2 \phi_k^T P_k \phi_k \psi_k w_{k+1} + \mu_k^{-1} a_k \beta_k^2 \phi_k^T P_k \phi_k \psi_k w_{k+1}^2 \\ &= V_k - a_k \psi_k^2 + \mu_k^{-1} (\bar{\psi}_k - \beta_k \phi_k^T \tilde{\theta}_k)^2 - 2a_k \psi_k w_{k+1} + 2\mu_k^{-1} (\psi_k - \beta_k \phi_k^T \tilde{\theta}_k) w_{k+1} + \mu_k^{-1} a_k \beta_k^2 \phi_k^T P_k \phi_k w_{k+1}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Summing up both sides of (39) from 0 to  $n$  and using (38), we have

$$\begin{aligned} V_{n+1} = & V_0 - \sum_{k=1}^n a_k \psi_k^2 + \sum_{k=1}^n \mu_k^{-1} (\bar{\psi}_k - \beta_k \phi_k^T \tilde{\theta}_k)^2 - \sum_{k=1}^n 2a_k \psi_k w_{k+1} \\ & + \sum_{k=1}^n 2\mu_k^{-1} (\bar{\psi}_k - \beta_k \phi_k^T \tilde{\theta}_k) w_{k+1} + \sum_{k=1}^n \mu_k^{-1} a_k \beta_k^2 \phi_k^T P_k \phi_k w_{k+1}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

We now analyze the RHS of (40) term by term. First, by Lemma 4 in Appendix B, we know that

$$\sum_{k=1}^n 2a_k \psi_k w_{k+1} = O\left(\sum_{k=1}^n a_k \psi_k^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}+\zeta} = o\left(\sum_{k=1}^n a_k \psi_k^2\right) + O(1), \quad a.s., \quad \forall \zeta > 0, \quad (41)$$

and similarly that

$$\sum_{k=1}^n 2\mu_k^{-1} [\bar{\psi}_k - \beta_k \phi_k^T (\theta - \bar{\theta}_k)] w_{k+1} = o\left(\sum_{k=1}^n \mu_k^{-1} [\bar{\psi}_k - \beta_k \phi_k^T (\theta - \bar{\theta}_k)]^2\right) + O(1), \quad a.s. \quad (42)$$

For the last noise term on the RHS of (40), let us take  $X_k = \beta_k \phi_k$  in Lemma 5 in Appendix B, we get

$$\sum_{k=0}^n a_k \beta_k^2 \phi_k^T P_k \phi_k = O(\log n), \quad a.s. \quad (43)$$

Moreover, from Lyapunov inequality, we have for any  $\delta \in (2, \min(\eta, 4))$

$$\sup_k E[|w_{k+1}^2 - E(w_{k+1}^2 | \mathcal{F}_k)|^{\frac{\delta}{2}} | \mathcal{F}_k] < \infty, \quad a.s. \quad (44)$$

Denote  $\Lambda_n = \left(\sum_{k=0}^n (a_k \beta_k^2 \phi_k^T P_k \phi_k)^{\frac{\delta}{2}}\right)^{\frac{2}{\delta}}$ , by Lemma 4 in Appendix B with  $\alpha = \frac{\delta}{2}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=0}^n a_k \beta_k^2 \phi_k^T P_k \phi_k \{w_{k+1}^2 - \mathbb{E}[w_{k+1}^2 | \mathcal{F}_k]\} \\ & = O\left(\Lambda_n \log^{\frac{1}{2}+\zeta}(\Lambda_n^2 + e)\right) \\ & = o(\log n) + O(1), \quad a.s. \quad \forall \zeta > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

Hence, from (43) and (44)

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=0}^n a_k \beta_k^2 \phi_k^T P_k \phi_k w_{k+1}^2 \\ & \leq \sum_{k=0}^n a_k \beta_k^2 \phi_k^T P_k \phi_k (w_{k+1}^2 - \mathbb{E}[w_{k+1}^2 | \mathcal{F}_k]) \\ & \quad + \sup_k \mathbb{E}[w_{k+1}^2 | \mathcal{F}_k] \left(\sum_{k=0}^n a_k \beta_k^2 \phi_k^T P_k \phi_k\right) \\ & = O(\log n) \quad a.s. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

Note that the third term on the RHS of (40) can be estimated following a similar proof as that for Lemma 5 in [22] as follows:

$$\sum_{k=1}^n (\bar{\psi}_k - \beta_k \phi_k^T \tilde{\theta}_k)^2 = O(\log n). \quad (47)$$

Finally, combine (40), (41), (66), (46) and (47), we get the desired result

$$V_n = V_0 - \sum_{k=1}^n a_k \psi_k^2 + O(\log n) \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (48)$$

□

**Proof of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2.** For the proof of Theorem 1, note that

$$\tilde{\theta}_{n+1}^T P_{n+1}^{-1} \tilde{\theta}_{n+1} \geq \inf_{k \geq 0} \{\mu_k^{-1}\} \underline{g}^2 (\lambda_{\min}(n) - \|P_0^{-1}\|) \|\tilde{\theta}_{n+1}\|^2, \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Theorem 1 follows immediately from Lemma 1, because  $\lambda_{\min}(n) \geq \lambda_0 > \|P_0^{-1}\|$  and  $\inf_{k \geq 0} \{\mu_k^{-1}\} > 0$ .

For the proof of Theorem 2, from the definition of  $\psi_k$ , we have  $\psi_k \geq \underline{g}(\phi_k^T \tilde{\theta}_k)^2$ . Besides, Since  $\{\mu_k\}$ ,  $\{\beta_k\}$  and  $\{\|\phi_k\|\}$  are bounded, we obtain that

$$\inf_{k \geq 0} \{a_k\} = \inf_{k \geq 0} \left\{ \frac{1}{\mu_k + \beta_k^2 \phi_k^T P_k \phi_k} \right\} > \inf_{k \geq 0} \left\{ \frac{1}{\mu_k + \beta_k^2 \phi_k^T P_0 \phi_k} \right\} > 0, \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Thus Theorem 2 also follows from Lemma 1. □

**Proof of Theorem 3.**

Similar result has been proven in [13] for linear stochastic regression models, where some key ideas may also be used here to prove Theorem 3 for our current nonlinear stochastic regression models, and the details will be presented elsewhere.

**Proof of Theorem 4.**

To establish the high probability convergence result of the estimate  $\hat{\theta}_k$ , we need the following inequality for martingales:

**Lemma 2.** ([37]) *If  $\{S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i, \mathcal{F}_n, n \geq 1\}$  is a square interable martingale with  $E[S_1] = 0$  and  $\mathcal{F}_0 = (\emptyset, w)$ , then for any positive constants  $a, b$*

$$P\{S_n \leq a \sum_{j=1}^n E[X_j^2 | \mathcal{F}_{j-1}] + b, \text{ any } n \geq 1\} \geq 1 - (1 + ab)^{-1} \quad (49)$$

**Proof of Theorem 4.** Let

$$Y_{k+1} = -2a_k \psi_k w_{k+1} + \mu_k^{-1} a_k \beta_k^2 \phi_k P_k \phi_k [w_{k+1}^2 - E(w_{k+1}^2 | \mathcal{F}_k)] + 2\mu_k^{-1} (\psi_k - \beta_k \phi_k^T \tilde{\theta}_k) w_{k+1}, \quad (50)$$

then  $\sum_{i=1}^k Y_{i+1}$  is a square integrable martingale. Moreover,

$$E[Y_{k+1}^2 | \mathcal{F}_k] \leq 9a_k \mu_k^{-1} \psi_k^2 \sigma_k^2 + 9\mu_k^{-2} (a_k \beta_k^2 \phi_k P_k \phi_k)^2 \bar{\sigma}_k^2 + 9\mu_k^{-2} (\psi_k - \beta_k \phi_k^T \tilde{\theta}_k)^2 \sigma_k^2 \quad (51)$$

where  $\sigma_k = E[w_{k+1}^2 | \mathcal{F}_k]$ ,  $\bar{\sigma}_k^2 = E[(w_{k+1}^2 - E(w_{k+1}^2 | \mathcal{F}_k))^2 | \mathcal{F}_k]$ . By Lemma 2 with  $a = \frac{1}{18\sigma_b^2}$  and  $b = 18\sigma_b^2 \frac{1-\delta}{\delta}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & P\left\{ \sum_{k=1}^n Y_{k+1} \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^n a_k \psi_k^2 + \sum_{k=1}^n \left[ \frac{\bar{\sigma}_b^2}{2\sigma_b^2} (a_k \beta_k^2 \phi_k^T P_k \phi_k)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \mu_k^{-1} (\psi_k - \beta_k \phi_k^T \tilde{\theta}_k)^2 \right] + 18\sigma_b^2 \frac{1-\delta}{\delta}, \text{ any } n \geq 1 \right\} \\ & \geq P\left\{ \sum_{k=1}^n Y_{k+1} \leq \frac{1}{18\sigma_b^2} \sum_{k=1}^n E[Y_{k+1}^2 | \mathcal{F}_k] + 18\sigma_b^2 \frac{1-\delta}{\delta}, \text{ any } n \geq 1 \right\} \geq 1 - \delta. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

where  $\sigma_b^2 = \sup_{0 \leq k \leq n} \{\frac{\sigma_k^2}{\mu_k}\}$ ,  $\bar{\sigma}_b^2 = \sup_{0 \leq k \leq n} \{\frac{\bar{\sigma}_k^2}{\mu_k^2}\}$ . Moreover, following the similar proof idea of Remark 3.2 in [32], we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^n (a_k \beta_k^2 \phi_k^T P_k \phi_k)^2 &= \sum_{k=1}^n a_k (\beta_k \phi_k^T) (P_k - P_{k+1}) (\beta_k \phi_k) \\ &\leq \Phi_n \sum_{k=1}^n \text{tr}(P_k - P_{k+1}) \leq \Phi_n \text{tr}(P_0), \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

where  $\Phi_n = \sup_{1 \leq k \leq n} \{\mu_k^{-1} \beta_k^2 \|\phi_k\|^2\}$ . Thus, by (40), (52) and (53), we know that the following holds with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ :

$$V_{n+1} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^n a_k \psi_k^2 \leq \sigma_b^2 \log |P_{n+1}^{-1}| + T_n + S_n, \quad \forall n \geq 1. \quad (54)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} T_n &= V_0 + \sigma_b^2 \log |P_0^{-1}| + \frac{\Phi_n \text{tr}(P_0) \bar{\sigma}_b^2}{2\sigma_b^2} + 18\sigma_b^2 \frac{1 - \delta}{\delta}, \\ S_n &= \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{3}{2} \mu_k^{-1} (\psi_k - \beta_k \phi_k \tilde{\theta}_k)^2 = \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{3}{2} \mu_k^{-1} (\bar{\psi}_k - \beta_k \phi_k^T \tilde{\theta}_k)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

To analyze the term  $S_n$  above, we need to analyze the preliminary estimation error  $\tilde{\theta}_k$ , for this we denote the Lyapunov function  $\bar{V}_k$  as  $\bar{V}_k = \tilde{\theta}_k^T \bar{P}_k^{-1} \tilde{\theta}_k$ . Using the similar analysis above and the Lyapunov function analysis as in [22], we know that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ ,

$$\bar{V}_{n+1} + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{k=1}^n \bar{a}_k \bar{\beta}_k^2 (\phi_k^T \tilde{\theta}_k)^2 \leq \sigma_a^2 \log |\bar{P}_{n+1}^{-1}| + \bar{\Gamma}_n, \quad \forall n \geq 1. \quad (56)$$

where  $\sigma_a^2 = \sup_{0 \leq k \leq n} \{\sigma_k^2\}$ ,  $\bar{\sigma}_a^2 = \sup_{0 \leq k \leq n} \{\bar{\sigma}_k^2\}$ , and

$$\bar{\Gamma}_n = \bar{V}_0 + \sigma_a^2 \log |\bar{P}_0^{-1}| + \frac{\bar{\Phi}_n \text{tr}(\bar{P}_0) \bar{\sigma}_a^2}{4\sigma_a^2} + 10\sigma_a^2 \frac{1 - \delta}{\delta}, \quad (57)$$

where  $\bar{\Phi}_n = \sup_{1 \leq k \leq n} \{\bar{\beta}_k^2 \|\phi_k\|^2\}$ . Let

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 &= \left\{ \frac{1}{4} \sum_{k=1}^n \bar{a}_k \bar{\beta}_k^2 (\phi_k^T \tilde{\theta}_k)^2 \geq \sigma_a^2 \log |\bar{P}_{n+1}^{-1}| + \bar{\Gamma}_n, \forall n \geq 1 \right\}, \\ E_2 &= \left\{ V_{n+1} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^n a_k \psi_k^2 \geq \sigma_b^2 \log |P_{n+1}^{-1}| + T_n + S_n, \forall n \geq 1 \right\}, \\ E_3 &= \left\{ V_{n+1} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^n a_k \psi_k^2 \geq \sigma_b^2 \log |P_{n+1}^{-1}| + 6\sigma_a^2 \gamma_n^{-1} \log |\bar{P}_{n+1}^{-1}| + T_n + 6\gamma_n^{-1} \bar{\Gamma}_n, \forall n \geq 1 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

where  $\gamma_n^{-1} = \sup_{0 \leq k \leq n} \left\{ \frac{\mu_k^{-1} \bar{\sigma}^2}{\bar{a}_k^2 \bar{\beta}_k^2} \right\}$ . From (56) and (54), we thus have  $P(E_1) \leq \delta$  and  $P(E_2) \leq \delta$ . Moreover, note that  $(\bar{\psi}_k - \beta_k \phi_k^T \tilde{\theta}_k)^2 \leq \bar{\sigma}^2 (\phi_k^T \tilde{\theta}_k)^2$  by (11). Hence for  $S_n$  defined by (55), we have  $S_n \leq 6\sigma_a^2 \gamma_n^{-1} \log |\bar{P}_{n+1}^{-1}| + 6\gamma_n^{-1} \bar{\Gamma}_n$  for any  $\omega \in E_1^c$ . Thus we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P[E_3] &\leq P[E_3 \cap E_1^c] + P[E_1] \\ &\leq P[E_2] + P[E_1] \leq 2\delta. \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

Therefore, (29) can be obtained from (59). Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\theta}_{n+1}^{(j)}\|^2 &= \|e_j^T \bar{P}_{n+1}^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot P_{n+1}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\theta}_{n+1}\|^2 \\ &\leq \|e_j^T P_{n+1}^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^2 \cdot \|P_{n+1}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\theta}_{n+1}\|^2 \\ &\leq P_{n+1}^{(j)} \cdot V_{n+1}, \quad a.s. \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

Hence, by (59), we know that with probability at least  $1 - 2\delta$ ,

$$\|\tilde{\theta}_{n+1}^{(j)}\|^2 \leq P_{n+1}^{(j)}[\sigma_b^2(\log |P_{n+1}^{-1}| + 6\gamma_n^{-1}\sigma_a^2 \log |\bar{P}_{n+1}^{-1}|) + T_n + 6\gamma_n^{-1}\bar{\Gamma}_n], \quad \forall n \geq 1. \quad (61)$$

This concludes the proof of Theorem 4.  $\square$

**Proof of Proposition 1.** For any given positive  $\alpha$  and  $t$  with  $\alpha + t < 1$ , denote  $v = \sqrt{\frac{\ln 2 - \ln t}{2K}}$  and let

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 &= \{\tilde{\theta}_n^{(j)} \in [z_K^{(j)}(\frac{\alpha}{2} - v), z_K^{(j)}(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2} + v)]\}, \\ E_2 &= \{\tilde{\theta}_n^{(j)} \in [z^{(j)}(\frac{\alpha}{2}), z^{(j)}(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2})]\}, \\ E_3 &= \{F_k^{(j)}(z_K^{(j)}(\frac{\alpha}{2} - v) - F^{(j)}(z_K^{(j)}(\frac{\alpha}{2} - v))) > -v\} \cap \{F_k^{(j)}(z_K^{(j)}(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2} + v) - F^{(j)}(z_K^{(j)}(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2} + v))) < v\}. \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

For every  $\omega \in E_3$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} F^{(j)}(z_K^{(j)}(\frac{\alpha}{2} - v)) &< F_k^{(j)}(z_K^{(j)}(\frac{\alpha}{2} - v)) + v = \frac{\alpha}{2}, \\ F^{(j)}(z_K^{(j)}(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2} + v)) &> F_k^{(j)}(z_K^{(j)}(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2} + v)) - v = 1 - \frac{\alpha}{2}, \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

which means

$$\begin{aligned} z^{(j)}(\frac{\alpha}{2}) &\geq z_K^{(j)}(\frac{\alpha}{2} - v), \\ z^{(j)}(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2}) &\leq z_K^{(j)}(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2} + v). \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

Hence, we have

$$(E_2 \cap E_3) \subset E_1. \quad (65)$$

From the definition of  $E_2$ , we have

$$P(E_2^c) < \alpha. \quad (66)$$

We now prove that

$$P(E_3^c) < t. \quad (67)$$

Since  $E[F_K^{(j)}(x)] = E[\frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K I_{\{H_j(X_i) \leq x\}}] = F^{(j)}(x)$  for any  $x \in R$ , by Hoffeding's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P\{F_k^{(j)}(z_K^{(j)}(\frac{\alpha}{2} - v) - F^{(j)}(z_K^{(j)}(\frac{\alpha}{2} - v))) \leq -v\} &\leq \frac{t}{2} \\ P\{F_k^{(j)}(z_K^{(j)}(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2} + v) - F^{(j)}(z_K^{(j)}(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2} + v))) \geq v\} &\leq \frac{t}{2} \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

Thus (67) holds true. From (65), (66) and (67), we finally have  $P(E_1) \geq 1 - \alpha - t$ , which proves Proposition 1.  $\square$

## 5 Numerical simulations

In this section, we compare the convergence speeds of the preliminary parameter estimate  $\bar{\theta}_k$  in the first step with the accelerated parameter estimate in the second step  $\hat{\theta}_k$  of TSQN algorithm by a simulation example. Let the saturation function  $S_k(\cdot)$  in the model (1)-(2) be time-invariant with

$$S_k(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & x < 0 \\ x & 0 \leq x \leq 15 \\ 15 & x > 15 \end{cases}. \quad (69)$$

The true parameter  $\theta = [\theta^{(1)}, \theta^{(2)}, \theta^{(3)}, \theta^{(4)}, \theta^{(5)}]^T = [0.5, -1, 1.5, -0.5, 2]^T$  and the noise sequence  $\{e_{k+1}, k \geq 0\}$  is i.i.d with normal distribution  $\mathcal{N}(0, 5)$ . Moreover, the corresponding regressors  $\{\phi_k, k \geq 0\}$  are generated

by  $\phi_k = [\phi_k^{(1)}, \phi_k^{(2)}, \phi_k^{(3)}, \phi_k^{(4)}, \phi_k^{(5)}]^T$ , where  $\phi_k^{(1)} = 1$  and  $\phi_k^{(i)}$  are independent and normally distributed with  $\frac{15}{\sqrt{k}}N(0,1)$  for any  $k \geq 1$  and  $i = 2, \dots, 5$ . It can be verified that  $\lambda_{\min}\{\sum_{k=1}^n \phi_k \phi_k^T\} \sim \sqrt{n}$  and  $\lambda_{\max}\{\sum_{k=1}^n \phi_k \phi_k^T\} \sim n$ , which mean that the PE condition is not satisfied in this case. Let the convex compact parameter set be  $D = \{[\theta^{(1)}, \theta^{(2)}, \theta^{(3)}, \theta^{(4)}, \theta^{(5)}] : |\theta^{(i)}| \leq 5\}$ , on which the estimate is projected in the first step. The preliminary estimate  $\bar{\theta}_k$  and accelerated estimate  $\hat{\theta}_k$  will be generated by our TSQN algorithm, respectively.




Figure 2: Comparison of estimation errors and averaged regrets.

The first figure in Fig 2 shows the trajectory of the estimation error of the preliminary estimate  $\bar{\theta}_k$  and the accelerated estimate  $\hat{\theta}_k$ , where we can see that the accelerated estimate  $\hat{\theta}_k$  in the second step does indeed outperform the performance of the preliminary estimate  $\bar{\theta}_k$  in the first step, in terms of the convergence of the parameter estimation error.

The second figure in Fig 2 shows the convergence result of the averaged regrets of adaptive prediction under TSQN algorithm, where one can see again that the averaged regrets in the second step outperforms that in the first step.

## 6 Conclusions

Motivated by various application backgrounds, we have in this paper studied the problem of identification and prediction problems of stochastic dynamical systems with saturated observations. To get a better estimation algorithm than that of the nonlinear Quasi-Newton estimation algorithm, we have proposed a new two-step TSQN algorithm to estimate the unknown parameters. It is shown that the strong consistency and the

asymptotic normality of the estimate can be established under non-persistent excitation conditions as the data length increases to infinity. When the data length is given and finite, it is also shown that the estimation error can have small estimation error bound with high probability by using either Lyapunov function-based method or Monte Carlo-based method, which appears to be more suitable for application problems where only finite number of data are available. Simulation examples demonstrates that the convergence speed of the proposed TSQN algorithm is better than the Quasi-Newton algorithm even under non-persistent excitation conditions of the data. The proposed new TSQN algorithm has also been used successfully in sentencing computation problems with real finite data set in [9]. For future investigation, there are still a number of interesting problems need to be solved, for examples, how to establish global convergence or estimation error bounds for adaptive estimation algorithms of more complicated stochastic regression models including multi-layer neural networks, and how to solve adapted control problems with saturated observations for stochastic dynamical control systems.

## Appendix A

In this appendix, we give a typical example for the calculation of the functions  $G_k(\cdot)$  and  $\sigma_k(\cdot)$ . Let us consider the case where  $L_k = l_k < u_k = U_k$  for any  $k \geq 1$ , the noise  $e_k$  is  $\mathcal{F}_k$ -measurable with the conditional probability distribution function  $F_k(\cdot)$  and the conditional probability density function  $f_k(\cdot)$ , then the function  $G_k(x) : R^1 \rightarrow R^1$  and  $\sigma_k(x) : R^1 \rightarrow R^1$  can be calculated as follows:

$$G_k(x) = u_k(1 - F_k(u_k - x)) + l_k F_k(l_k - x) + \int_{l_k}^{u_k} t f_k(t - x) dt \quad (70)$$

$$\sigma_k(x) = (u_k - G_k(x))^2(1 - F_k(u_k - x)) + (l_k - G_k(x))^2 F_k(l_k - x) + \int_{l_k}^{u_k} [t - G_k(x)]^2 f_k(t - x) dt \quad (71)$$

In particular, when the noise sequence  $\{e_k\}$  is independent and normally distributed with  $e_k \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ ,  $F_k(\cdot) \equiv F(\cdot)$  and  $f_k(\cdot) \equiv f(\cdot)$  will correspond to the distribution function and density function of  $N(0, \sigma^2)$  respectively, and  $G_k(x)$  and  $\sigma_k(x)$  can be calculated further as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} G_k(x) &= u_k + (l_k - x)F(l_k - x) - (u_k - x)F(u_k - x) + \sigma^2[f(l_k - x) - f(u_k - x)], \\ \sigma_k(x) &= (u_k - G_k(x))^2 + [\sigma^2 + (G_k(x) - x)^2 - (u_k - G_k(x))^2]F(u_k - x) \\ &\quad - [(l_k - G_k(x))^2 - (G_k(x) - x)^2 - \sigma^2]F(l_k - x) \\ &\quad + \sigma^2[(l_k + x - 2G_k(x))f(l_k - x) - (u_k + x - 2G_k(x))f(u_k - x)]. \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

## Appendix B

In this section, we give some key lemmas which are used in the proof of Lemma 1.

**Lemma 3.** ([36]). *The projection operator given by Definition 1 satisfies*

$$\|\Pi_Q^k(x) - \Pi_Q^k(y)\|_Q \leq \|x - y\|_Q \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^m \quad (73)$$

**Lemma 4.** ([3]). *Let  $\{w_n, \mathcal{F}_n\}$  be a martingale difference sequence and  $\{f_n, \mathcal{F}_n\}$  an adapted sequence. If*

$$\sup_n \mathbb{E}[|w_{n+1}|^\alpha | \mathcal{F}_n] < \infty \quad a.s. \quad (74)$$

for some  $\alpha \in (0, 2]$ , then as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ :

$$\sum_{i=0}^n f_i w_{i+1} = O(s_n(\alpha) \log^{\frac{1}{\alpha} + \eta}(s_n^\alpha(\alpha) + e)) \quad a.s., \forall \eta > 0, \quad (75)$$



where

$$s_n(\alpha) = \left( \sum_{i=0}^n |f_i|^\alpha \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \quad (76)$$

**Lemma 5.** ([13]). Let  $X_1, X_2, \dots$  be a sequence of vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^m (m \geq 1)$  and let  $A_n = A_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n X_i X_i^T$ . Let  $|A_n|$  denote the determinant of  $A_n$ . Assume that  $A_0$  is nonsingular, then as  $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$\sum_{k=0}^n \frac{X_k^T A_k^{-1} X_k}{1 + X_k^T A_k^{-1} X_k} = O(\log(|A_n|)). \quad (77)$$

**Lemma 6.** ([32]). Let  $X_1, X_2, \dots$  be any bounded sequence of vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^m (m \geq 1)$ . Denote  $A_n = A_0 + \sum_{i=1}^n X_i X_i^T$  with  $A_0 > 0$ , then we have

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (X_k^T A_k^{-1} X_k)^2 < \infty. \quad (78)$$

## References

- [1] McCulloch W S and Pitts W. A logical calculus of the ideas immanent in neurons activity. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biophysics*, 5(10):115-133, 1943.
- [2] Gallant S I. Perceptron-based learning algorithms. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, 1(2):179-191, 1990.
- [3] Chen H F and Guo L. Identification and stochastic adaptive control. *Springer Science & Business Media*, 1991.
- [4] Rago C, Willett P and Bar-Shalom Y. Censoring sensors: A low-communication-rate scheme for distributed detection. *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, 32(2): 554-568, 1996.
- [5] Appadwedula S, Veeravalli V V, and Jones D L. Decentralized detection with censoring sensors. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 56(4): 1362-1373, 2008.
- [6] Tan S, Guo J, Zhao Y and Zhang J. Adaptive control with saturation-constrained observations for drag-free satellites—A set-valued identification approach. *IEEE Science China Information Sciences*, 64(10): 1-12, 2021.
- [7] Tobin J. Estimation of relationships for limited dependent variables. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, 26(1): 24-36, 1958.
- [8] Caudill S B and Jackson J D. Heteroscedasticity and grouped data regression. *Southern Economic Journal*, 60(1): 128-135, 1993.
- [9] Wang F, Zhang L and Guo L. Sentencing computation: nonlinear models and reliability analysis. *Submitted for publication*, 2022.
- [10] Ljung L. Consistency of the least-squares identification method. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 21(5): 779-781, 1976.
- [11] Moore J B. On strong consistency of least squares identification algorithms. *Automatica*, 14(5): 505-509, 1978.

- [12] Ljung L. Analysis of recursive stochastic algorithms. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 22(4): 551-575, 1977.
- [13] Lai T L and Wei C Z. Least squares estimates in stochastic regression models with applications to identification and control of dynamic systems. *The Annals of Statistic*, 10(1): 154-166, 1982.
- [14] Guo L. Feedback and uncertainty: Some basic problems and results. *Annual Reviews in Control*, 49: 27-36, 2020.
- [15] Powell J L. Least absolute deviations estimation for the censored regression model. *Journal of Econometrics*, 25(3): 303-325, 1984.
- [16] Lai T L and Ying Z. Asymptotically efficient estimation in censored and truncated regression models. *Statistica Sinica*, 2(1): 17-46, 1992.
- [17] Heckman J J. The common structure of statistical models of truncation, sample selection and limited dependent variables and a simple estimator for such models. *Annals of Economic and Social Measurement*, 5(4): 475-492, 1976.
- [18] Zhang J F and Yin G G. System identification using binary sensors. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 48(11): 1892-1907, 2003.
- [19] Yin G G and Zhang J F. Joint identification of plant rational models and noise distribution functions using binary-valued observation. *Automatica*, 42(4): 535-547, 2006.
- [20] Yin G G. Asymptotically efficient parameter estimation using quantized output observations. *Automatica*, 43(7): 1178-1191, 2007.
- [21] Guo J and Zhao Y. Recursive projection algorithm on FIR system identification with binary-valued observations. *Automatica*, 49(11): 3396-3401, 2013.
- [22] Zhang L, Zhao Y and Guo L. Identification and adaptation with binary-valued observations under non-persistent excitation. *Automatica*, 138: 110158, 2022.
- [23] Yu B. Rates of convergence for empirical processes of stationary mixing sequences. *The Annals of Probability*, 22(1): 94-116, 1994.
- [24] Simchowitz M, Mania H and Tu S. Learning without mixing: Towards a sharp analysis of linear system identification. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages: 439-473, 2018.
- [25] Oymak S and Ozay N. Non-asymptotic identification of LTI systems from a single trajectory. In *2019 American control conference (ACC)*, pages: 5655-5661, 2019.
- [26] Tsiamis A and Pappas G J. Finite sample analysis of stochastic system identification. In *2019 IEEE 58th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages: 3648-3654, 2019.
- [27] Kontonis V, Tzamos C and Zampetakis M. Efficient truncated statistics with unknown truncation. In *2019 IEEE 60th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages: 1578-1595, 2019.
- [28] Daskalakis C, Stefanou P, Yao R and Zampetakis M. Efficient truncated linear regression with unknown noise variance. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34: 1952-1963, 2021.
- [29] Cook J and McDonald J. Partially adaptive estimation of interval censored regression models. *Computational Economic*, 42(1): 119-131, 2013.

- [30] Plevrakis O. Learning from censored and dependent data: The case of linear dynamics. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages: 3771-3787, 2021.
- [31] Guo L, Ljung L and Priouret P. Performance analysis of the forgetting factor RLS algorithm. *International Journal of Adaptive Control and Signal Processing*, 7(6): 525-537, 1993.
- [32] Guo L. Convergence and logarithm laws of self-tuning regulators. *Automatica*, 31(3): 435-450, 1995.
- [33] Lai T L. Asymptotically efficient adaptive control in stochastic regression models. *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 7(1): 23-45, 1986.
- [34] Shao J. *Mathematical Statistics*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2003.
- [35] Kroese D P and Chan J C C. *Statistical Modeling and Computation*. New York: Springer, 2014.
- [36] Cheney E W. *Analysis for Applied Mathematics*. New York: Springer, 2001.
- [37] Chow Y S and Teicher H. *Probability Theory: Independence, Interchangeability, Martingales*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2003.