

Data-Enabled Policy Optimization for Direct Adaptive Learning of the LQR

Feiran Zhao, Florian Dörfler, Alessandro Chiuso, Keyou You

Abstract—Direct data-driven design methods for the linear quadratic regulator (LQR) mainly use offline or episodic data batches, and their online adaptation remains unclear. In this paper, we propose a direct adaptive method to learn the LQR from online closed-loop data. First, we propose a new policy parameterization based on the sample covariance to formulate a direct data-driven LQR problem, which is shown to be equivalent to the certainty-equivalence LQR with optimal non-asymptotic guarantees. Second, we design a novel data-enabled policy optimization (DeePO) method to directly update the policy, where the gradient is explicitly computed using only a batch of persistently exciting (PE) data. Third, we establish its global convergence via a projected gradient dominance property. Importantly, we efficiently use DeePO to adaptively learn the LQR by performing only one-step projected gradient descent per sample of the closed-loop system, which also leads to an explicit recursive update of the policy. Under PE inputs and for bounded noise, we show that the average regret of the LQR cost is upper-bounded by two terms signifying a sublinear decrease in time $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{T})$ plus a bias scaling inversely with signal-to-noise ratio (SNR), which are independent of the noise statistics. Finally, we perform simulations to validate the theoretical results and demonstrate the computational and sample efficiency of our method.

Index Terms—Adaptive control, linear quadratic regulator, policy optimization, direct data-driven control.

I. INTRODUCTION

As a cornerstone of modern control theory, the linear quadratic regulator (LQR) design has been widely studied in data-driven control, where no model but only raw data is available [1]. The manifold approaches to data-driven LQR design can be broadly categorized as *indirect*, i.e., based on system identification (SysID) followed by model-based control design, versus *direct* when bypassing the identification step. Another classification is *episodic* when obtaining the control policy from one episode of data or by alternating episodes of data collection and control (see Fig. 1), versus *adaptive* when updating the control policy from online closed-loop data (see Fig. 2).

Research of F. Zhao and K. You was supported by National Science and Technology Major Project of China (2022ZD0116700) and National Natural Science Foundation of China (62033006, 62325305). (Corresponding author: Keyou You)

F. Zhao and K. You are with the Department of Automation and BNRist, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China. (e-mail: zhaofr18@tsinghua.org.cn, youky@tsinghua.edu.cn)

F. Dörfler is with the Department of Information Technology and Electrical Engineering, ETH Zürich, 8092 Zürich, Switzerland. (e-mail: dorfler@control.ee.ethz.ch)

A. Chiuso is with the Department of Information Engineering, University of Padova, Via Gradenigo 6/b, 35131 Padova, Italy. (e-mail: alessandro.chiuso@unipd.it)




Fig. 1. An illustration of episodic approaches, where $h^i = (x_0, u_0, \dots, x_{T^i})$ denotes the i -th episode of data, and the episodes can be consecutive.




Fig. 2. An illustration of indirect and direct adaptive approaches in a closed-loop system, where function f_t has an explicit form.

The indirect data-driven LQR design has a rich history with well-understood tools for identification and control. Representative approaches include optimism-in-face-of-uncertainty [2], robust control [3], certainty-equivalence control [4]–[8], and adaptive dynamic programming [9], [10]. Most of them are episodic in that they either estimate the system dynamics from a single episode of offline data, or update their estimate only after an episode is completed [2]–[5]. This is due to their requirement of statistically independent data and regret analysis methods. Notable adaptive methods are rooted on certainty-equivalence LQR [6]–[8]: a system is first identified by ordinary least-squares from closed-loop data, and then a certainty-equivalence LQR is obtained with Riccati equations by treating the estimated system as the ground-truth [4]. By alternating identification and certainty-equivalence LQR, they guarantee convergence to the optimal LQR gain. In particular, the work [6] takes the first step towards indirect adaptive control with asymptotic convergence guarantees by regularizing the identification objective with the LQR cost. Recent works [7], [8] have shown that certainty-equivalence control with explorative input ensuring persistency of excitation meets optimal non-asymptotic guarantees.

Different from the indirect design, direct methods entirely by-pass models; see [11] for a discussion of the trade-offs. An emerging line of direct methods obtains the LQR directly from a single episode of persistently exciting (PE) data [12]–[17]. It is inspired by subspace methods [18] and the fundamental lemma [19] in behavioral system theory [20]–[23]. Using subspace relations, the works [12]–[14] show that the closed-loop system can be parameterized by state-space data, leading

to direct data-driven formulations of the LQR problem. By a change of variables, they can be reformulated as semi-definite programs (SDPs) parameterized by raw data matrices. In the presence of noise, regularization is introduced for direct LQR design to promote certainty-equivalence or robustness [14]–[16]. There are also works [24], [25] developing matrix S-lemma or combining prior knowledge for robust LQR design, while they are inherently conservative. Though these methods only use a single episode of offline data, the dimension of their formulations usually scales with the data length. Since adaptation of their policy to the latest data may not improve control performance, they cannot use online closed-loop data to achieve adaptive learning of the LQR. In fact, their real-time adaptation is acknowledged as an open problem in the data-driven control field [18], [20], [26].

A potential path towards direct and online adaptive control is policy optimization (PO), a direct design framework where the policy is parameterized and recursively updated to minimize a cost function. Dating back to the adaptive control of aircraft in the 1950s [27], the concept of direct PO has a long history in control theory [28]–[30]. However, due to the non-convexity of PO formulations, it is usually challenging to obtain strong performance guarantees. Recently, there have been resurgent interests in studying theoretical properties of zeroth-order PO, which is also an essential approach of modern reinforcement learning [31]–[36]. It improves the policy by gradient methods, where the gradient is estimated from observations of the cost. For the LQR learning problem, zeroth-order PO meets global linear convergence thanks to a gradient dominance property [31]–[33]. However, zeroth-order PO is intrinsically unsuitable for adaptive control since (a) the cost used for gradient estimate can be obtained only *after* observing an entire trajectory, (b) the trajectory needs to be sufficiently long to reduce the estimation error, and (c) it requires numerous trajectories to find an optimal policy. Different from zeroth-order PO, our recent work [37] has proposed a data-enabled PO (DeePO) method for the LQR, where the gradient is computed directly from a single trajectory of finite length, and shown global convergence. This is achieved by adopting the data-based policy parameterization in [13]–[16]. While this DeePO method is based on offline data, it paves the way to applying PO for direct and online adaptive control.

Following [37], this paper proposes a novel DeePO method for direct adaptive learning of the LQR, where the policy is directly updated by gradient methods from online closed-loop data; see Fig. 2 for an illustration. Hence, we provide a promising solution to the open problem in [18], [20], [26]. Our contributions are summarized below.

- We propose a new policy parameterization for the LQR based on sample covariance, which is a key ingredient in SysID [4], filtering [38], and data-driven control parameterizations [23], [39]–[41]. Compared with the existing parameterization [13]–[16], it has two salient features that enable online adaptation of DeePO. First, the dimension of the parameterized policy remains constant depending only on the system dimension. Second, the resulting direct LQR is shown to be equivalent to the indirect

certainty-equivalence LQR, which usually requires regularized formulations and methods [14]–[16]. In view of [4], [5], this equivalence implies that our covariance parameterization enables sample-efficient online learning. The covariance parameterization can also be used to solve other control problems (e.g., the \mathcal{H}_∞ problem [13]) in a direct data-driven fashion.

- We propose a DeePO method to solve the covariance-parameterized LQR problem with offline data and show global convergence. The key to our analysis is a *projected gradient* dominance property, which is distinguished from the usual *gradient* dominance in PO literature [31]–[33].
- We use DeePO to adaptively learn the optimal LQR gain from online closed-loop data, starting from an initial stabilizing gain learned from offline data. The proposed approach is direct, online, and has an explicit recursive update of the policy. Moreover, it can be extended straightforwardly to time-varying systems by adding a forgetting factor to the covariance parameterization.
- We provide non-asymptotic guarantees of DeePO for adaptive learning of the LQR, which are independent of noise statistics. Our focus is on the convergence of the policy instead of stability, which is in line with the RL perspective [10], [31] and the definition of adaptive control by Zames [42]. Under PE inputs and bounded noise, we show that the average regret of the LQR cost is upper-bounded by two terms signifying a sublinear decrease in time $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{T})$ plus a bias scaling inversely as signal-to-noise ratio (SNR). This convergence result improves over single batch methods [14]–[16], whose performance also depends on SNR but does not decay over time. Our sublinear decrease rate aligns with that of first-order methods in online convex optimization of smooth functions [43], even though our considered LQR problem is non-convex. This sublinear rate shows the sample efficiency of DeePO to learn from online data.

In the simulations, we validate the global convergence of DeePO. Moreover, we compare DeePO with the indirect adaptive approach [6]–[8] and zeroth-order PO [31]–[33] for the benchmark problem in [3]. The simulations demonstrate favorable computational and sample efficiency of DeePO.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section II recapitulates data-driven LQR formulations and describes the adaptive learning problem. Section III proposes the covariance parameterization for the LQR. Section IV uses DeePO to solve LQR parameterization with offline data. Section V extends DeePO to direct adaptive learning of the LQR with non-asymptotic guarantees. Section VI validates our theoretical results via simulations. We provide concluding remarks in Section VII. All the proofs are deferred to Appendices.

Notation. We use I_n to denote the n -by- n identity matrix. We use $\underline{\sigma}(\cdot)$ to denote the minimal singular value of a matrix. We use $\|\cdot\|$ to denote the 2-norm of a vector or matrix, and $\|\cdot\|_F$ the Frobenius norm. We use $\rho(\cdot)$ to denote the spectral radius of a square matrix. We use $A^\dagger := A^\top(AA^\top)^{-1}$ to denote the right inverse of a full row rank matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$. We use $\mathcal{N}(A)$ to denote the nullspace of A and $\Pi_A := I_m - A^\dagger A$ the projection operator onto $\mathcal{N}(A)$.

II. DATA-DRIVEN FORMULATIONS AND ADAPTIVE LEARNING OF THE LQR

In this section, we first recapitulate indirect certainty-equivalence LQR (least-square SysID followed by model-based LQR design) [16], direct LQR design using data-based policy parameterization [13], [14], and policy optimization (PO) of the LQR based on zeroth-order gradient estimate [31]. Then, we formalize our adaptive learning problem.

A. Model-based LQR

Consider a discrete-time LTI system

$$\begin{cases} x_{t+1} = Ax_t + Bu_t + w_t \\ z_t = \begin{bmatrix} Q^{1/2} & 0 \\ 0 & R^{1/2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_t \\ u_t \end{bmatrix}, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where $t \in \mathbb{N}$, $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the state, $u_t \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the control input, $w_t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the noise, and z_t is the performance signal of interest. We assume that (A, B) are controllable and the weighting matrices (Q, R) are positive definite. Throughout the paper, we do not assume any statistics of the noise w_t .

The LQR problem is phrased as finding a state-feedback gain $K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ that minimizes the \mathcal{H}_2 -norm of the transfer function $\mathcal{T}(K) : w \rightarrow z$ of the closed-loop system

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_{t+1} \\ z_t \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A + BK & I_n \\ \hline Q^{1/2} & 0 \\ R^{1/2} K & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_t \\ w_t \end{bmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

When $A + BK$ is stable, it holds that [1]

$$\|\mathcal{T}(K)\|_2^2 = \text{Tr}((Q + K^\top RK)\Sigma_K) =: C(K), \quad (3)$$

where Σ_K is the closed-loop state covariance matrix obtained as the positive definite solution to the Lyapunov equation

$$\Sigma_K = I_n + (A + BK)\Sigma_K(A + BK)^\top. \quad (4)$$

We refer to $C(K)$ as the LQR cost and to (3)-(4) as a *policy parameterization* of the LQR.

There are alternative formulations to find the optimal LQR gain $K^* := \arg \min_K C(K)$ of (3)-(4), e.g., via the celebrated Riccati equation with known (A, B) [1]. For unknown (A, B) , there is a plethora of data-driven control methods to find K^* , some of which we recapitulate below.

B. Indirect certainty-equivalence LQR with ordinary least-square identification

This conventional approach to data-driven LQR design follows the certainty-equivalence principle: it first identifies a system (A, B) from data, and then solves the LQR problem regarding the identified model as the ground-truth. The SysID step is based on subspace relations among the state-space data. Consider a t -long time series¹ of states, inputs, noises, and successor states

$$\begin{aligned} X_0 &:= [x_0 \ x_1 \ \dots \ x_{t-1}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times t}, \\ U_0 &:= [u_0 \ u_1 \ \dots \ u_{t-1}] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times t}, \\ W_0 &:= [w_0 \ w_1 \ \dots \ w_{t-1}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times t}, \\ X_1 &:= [x_1 \ x_2 \ \dots \ x_t] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times t}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

¹The time series do not have to be consecutive. All results in Sections II-IV also hold when each column in (5) is obtained from independent experiments or even averaged data sets.

which satisfy the system dynamics

$$X_1 = AX_0 + BU_0 + W_0. \quad (6)$$

We assume that the data is *persistently exciting (PE)* [19], i.e., the block matrix of input and state data

$$D_0 := \begin{bmatrix} U_0 \\ X_0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(m+n) \times t}$$

has full row rank

$$\text{rank}(D_0) = m + n. \quad (7)$$

This PE condition is necessary for the data-driven LQR design [44], [45].

Based on the subspace relations (6) and the rank condition (7), an estimate (\hat{A}, \hat{B}) of the system can be obtained as the unique solution to the ordinary least-squares problem

$$[\hat{B}, \hat{A}] = \arg \min_{B, A} \|X_1 - [B, A]D_0\|_F = X_1 D_0^\dagger. \quad (8)$$

Following the certainty-equivalence principle [15], the system (A, B) is replaced with its estimate (\hat{A}, \hat{B}) in (3)-(4), and the LQR problem can be reformulated as a bi-level program

$$\begin{aligned} &\underset{K, \Sigma \geq 0}{\text{minimize}} && \text{Tr}((Q + K^\top RK)\Sigma), \\ &\text{subject to} && \Sigma = I_n + (\hat{A} + \hat{B}K)\Sigma(\hat{A} + \hat{B}K)^\top \\ &&& [\hat{B}, \hat{A}] = \arg \min_{B, A} \|X_1 - [B, A]D_0\|_F. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

The problem (9) is termed *certainty-equivalence* and *indirect data-driven* LQR design in [16]. By alternating between solving (9) and using the resulting policy to collect online closed-loop data, it achieves adaptive learning of the LQR with optimal non-asymptotic guarantees [7], [8].

C. Direct LQR with data-based policy parameterization

In contrast to the SysID-followed-by-control approach (9), the *direct data-driven* LQR design aims to find K^* bypassing the identification step (8) [13]–[15], which we recapitulate as follows. It uses a data-based policy parameterization: by the rank condition (7), there exists a matrix $G \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times n}$ that satisfies

$$\begin{bmatrix} K \\ I_n \end{bmatrix} = D_0 G \quad (10)$$

for any given K . Together with the subspace relation (6), the closed-loop matrix can be written as

$$A + BK = [B, A] \begin{bmatrix} K \\ I_n \end{bmatrix} \stackrel{(10)}{=} [B, A]D_0 G \stackrel{(6)}{=} (X_1 - W_0)G,$$

Since W_0 is unknown and unmeasurable, it is disregarded and $X_1 G$ is used as the closed-loop matrix. Following the certainty-equivalence principle [15], we substitute $A + BK$ with $X_1 G$ in (3)-(4), and together with (10) the LQR problem becomes

$$\begin{aligned} &\underset{G, \Sigma \geq 0}{\text{minimize}} && \text{Tr}((Q + G^\top U_0^\top R U_0 G)\Sigma), \\ &\text{subject to} && \Sigma = I_n + X_1 G \Sigma G^\top X_1^\top, \ X_0 G = I_n \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

with the gain matrix $K = U_0G$, which can be reformulated as an SDP [13]. The LQR parameterization (11) is direct data-driven, as it does not involve any explicit SysID.

However, the LQR parameterization (11) is not robust to noise and requires regularization [15]. Moreover, its dimension scales linearly with t , and it is unclear how to turn (11) into a recursive formulation for online closed-loop adaptation. These issues are naturally addressed with the covariance parameterization in the sequel.

D. PO of the LQR using zeroth-order gradient estimate

As an essential approach of modern reinforcement learning, zeroth-order PO [31]–[33] finds K^* by iterating the gradient descent for the policy parameterization of the LQR (3)–(4):

$$K' = K - \eta \widehat{\nabla C}(K). \quad (12)$$

The PO (12) is initialized with a stabilizing gain, $\eta > 0$ is a constant stepsize, and $\widehat{\nabla C}(K)$ is the gradient estimate from zeroth-order information, e.g., the two-point gradient estimate

$$\widehat{\nabla C}(K) = \left(\widehat{C}(K + rF) - \widehat{C}(K - rF) \right) \cdot \frac{mn}{r} F, \quad (13)$$

where $r > 0$ is the smoothing radius, F is uniformly sampled from the unit sphere \mathbb{S}^{mn-1} , and \widehat{C} is the approximated cost observed from a single realization of a T -long trajectory of system (1), i.e., $\widehat{C}(K) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \|z_t\|^2$ with $u_t = Kx_t$.

While zeroth-order PO has a recursive policy update, it requires to sample a large number of long trajectories to find K^* , which is inherently unsuitable for online adaptive control.

E. Direct adaptive learning for the LQR with online closed-loop data

All the aforementioned data-driven LQR design methods either lack a recursive policy update, or are unsuitable for adaptive control with online closed-loop data. In this paper, we focus on the direct adaptive learning problem of the LQR:

Problem: design a recursive direct method based on online closed-loop data such that the control policy converges to the optimal LQR gain.

Our objective concerns the optimality of the policy whereas traditional adaptive control focuses on stability. Our perspective is in line with the RL perspective [10], [31] and the essence of adaptive control by Zames [42], namely, improving over the best control with *a priori* information. Following [13]–[16], we start with a direct data-driven LQR formulation but with a new policy parameterization. Then, we take an iterative PO perspective to the direct LQR as in our previous work [37], and use gradient methods to achieve adaptive learning of the LQR with online closed-loop data.

III. DIRECT DATA-DRIVEN LQR WITH A NEW POLICY PARAMETERIZATION

In this section, we first propose a new policy parameterization based on the sample covariance to formulate the direct data-driven LQR problem. Then, we establish its equivalence to the indirect certainty-equivalence LQR problem.

A. A new policy parameterization using sample covariance

To efficiently use data, we propose a new policy parameterization based on the sample covariance of input-state data

$$\Phi := \frac{1}{t} D_0 D_0^\top = \begin{bmatrix} U_0 D_0^\top / t \\ X_0 D_0^\top / t \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \overline{U}_0 \\ \overline{X}_0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (14)$$

which plays an important role in SysID [4], filtering [38], and data-driven control parameterizations [23], [39]–[41]. Under the PE rank condition (7), the sample covariance Φ is positive definite, and there exists a *unique* solution $V \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+m) \times n}$ to

$$\begin{bmatrix} K \\ I_n \end{bmatrix} = \Phi V \quad (15)$$

for any given K . We refer to (15) as the *covariance parameterization* of the policy. In contrast to the parameterization in (10), the dimension of V is independent of the data length.

Remark 1: The covariance parameterization (15) can also be derived from (10). Since D_0 does not necessarily have full column rank, there is a considerable nullspace in the solution of (10), which can be reparameterized via orthogonal decomposition:

$$G = \frac{1}{t} D_0^\top V + \Delta, \Delta \in \mathcal{N}(D_0) \quad (16)$$

with $V \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+m) \times n}$. If we remove the nullspace $\mathcal{N}(D_0)$ in (16), then the parameterization (10) reduces to (15). Note that the nullspace is undesirable, and regularization methods are usually used to single out a favorable solution [14]–[16]. ■

For brevity, define the sample covariances $\overline{W}_0 = W_0 D_0^\top / t$, $\overline{X}_1 = X_1 D_0^\top / t$, whose dimensions do not depend on t . Then, the closed-loop matrix can be written as

$$A + BK = [B, A] \begin{bmatrix} K \\ I_n \end{bmatrix} \stackrel{(15)}{=} [B, A] \Phi V \stackrel{(6)}{=} (\overline{X}_1 - \overline{W}_0) V. \quad (17)$$

Analogous to (11), we disregard the uncertainty \overline{W}_0 in the parameterized closed-loop matrix and formulate the direct data-driven LQR problem using (X_0, U_0, X_1) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{V, \Sigma_V \succeq 0}{\text{minimize}} && J(V) := \text{Tr} \left((Q + V^\top \overline{U}_0^\top R \overline{U}_0 V) \Sigma_V \right), \\ & \text{subject to} && \Sigma_V = I_n + \overline{X}_1 V \Sigma_V V^\top \overline{X}_1^\top, \overline{X}_0 V = I_n \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

with the gain matrix $K = \overline{U}_0 V$. We refer to (18) as the LQR problem with covariance parameterization.

Remark 2: In comparison with (11), the covariance parameterization can well display and partially mitigate the effects of stochastic noise. Let $\{w_t\}$ be additive white noise. Then, it follows that $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{i=0}^{t-1} w_i u_i^\top] / t = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{i=0}^{t-1} w_i x_i^\top] / t = 0$. Approximating the expectation using data then leads to $\overline{W}_0 \approx 0$ and hence $A + BK \approx \overline{X}_1 V$. A detailed analysis of the stochastic setting is outside the scope of this paper and left to future work. ■

B. The equivalence between the covariance parameterization of the LQR and the indirect certainty-equivalence LQR

We now show that the data-driven covariance parameterization (18) is equivalent to the indirect certainty-equivalence LQR (9) in the sense that their solutions coincide. Let J^* and

C_{CE}^* be the optimum of (18) and (9), respectively. Then, we have the following result.

Lemma 1 (Equivalence to the certainty-equivalence LQR): The feasible sets of (9) and (18) coincide under the change of variables $V = \Phi^{-1}[K^\top, I_n]^\top$, and $J^* = C_{\text{CE}}^*$.

Remark 3 (Implicit regularization): This equivalence has also been shown for the LQR parameterization (11) with a sufficiently large certainty-equivalence regularizer, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{G, \Sigma \succeq 0}{\text{minimize}} \quad \text{Tr} \left((Q + G^\top U_0^\top R U_0 G) \Sigma \right) + \lambda \|\Pi_{D_0} G\|, \\ & \text{subject to} \quad \Sigma = I_n + X_1 G \Sigma G^\top X_1^\top, \quad X_0 G = I_n \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

with the gain $K = U_0 G$ [15, Corollary 3.2]. Thus, the covariance parameterization of the LQR (18) is *implicitly* regularized as it achieves this equivalence without any regularization. An implicit regularization property is also established in the PO of (19) in the absence of noise [37, Theorem 2]. ■

While the LQR problem with covariance parameterization (18) can be reformulated into an SDP as in [13]–[16], our subsequent solution will not make use of that. Instead, the next section solves (18) via an iterative PO method with convergence guarantees.

IV. DEEPO FOR THE LQR WITH COVARIANCE PARAMETERIZATION USING OFFLINE DATA

In this section, we first present our novel PO method to solve the LQR problem with covariance parameterization (18) given offline data (X_0, U_0, X_1) . Then, we show its global convergence by proving a projected gradient dominance property.

A. Data-enabled policy optimization to solve the LQR problem with covariance parameterization (18)

We assume the feasibility of (18).

Assumption 1: The covariance parameterization of the LQR problem in (18) has at least one solution, i.e., the feasible set $\mathcal{S} := \{V \mid \bar{X}_0 V = I_n, \rho(\bar{X}_1 V) < 1\}$ is non-empty.

Remark 4: By Lemma 1, Assumption 1 is equivalent to the feasibility of the certainty-equivalence LQR problem (9), and hence is necessary also for indirect control [7]. ■

We first derive the gradient for $J(V)$. Since $\Sigma_V = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (\bar{X}_1 V)^i (V^\top \bar{X}_1^\top)^i$, the cost $J(V)$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} J(V) &= \text{Tr} \left((Q + V^\top \bar{U}_0^\top R \bar{U}_0 V) \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (\bar{X}_1 V)^i (V^\top \bar{X}_1^\top)^i \right) \\ &= \text{Tr} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (V^\top \bar{X}_1^\top)^i (Q + V^\top \bar{U}_0^\top R \bar{U}_0 V) (\bar{X}_1 V)^i \right) \\ &= \text{Tr}(P_V), \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where $P_V \succ 0$ is the unique solution to the Lyapunov equation

$$P_V = Q + V^\top \bar{U}_0^\top R \bar{U}_0 V + V^\top \bar{X}_1^\top P_V \bar{X}_1 V. \quad (21)$$

Then, the closed-form expression for $\nabla J(V)$ is given as follows.

Lemma 2: For $V \in \mathcal{S}$, the gradient of $J(V)$ is

$$\nabla J(V) = 2 \left(\bar{U}_0^\top R \bar{U}_0 + \bar{X}_1^\top P_V \bar{X}_1 \right) V \Sigma_V.$$

By (18), (21), and Lemma 2, the gradient can be computed directly from raw data matrices and the solution to (21). Starting from a feasible $V^0 \in \mathcal{S}$, the projected gradient method iterates as

$$V^{k+1} = V^k - \eta \Pi_{\bar{X}_0} \nabla J(V^k), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (22)$$

where $\eta \geq 0$ is a constant stepsize, and the projection $\Pi_{\bar{X}_0}$ enforces the subspace constraint $\bar{X}_0 V = I_n$. We refer to (22) as *data-enabled policy optimization (DeePO)* as the projected gradient is data-driven, and the control gain can be recovered from the covariance parameterization (15) as $K = \bar{U}_0 V$.

Due to non-convexity of the considered problem (20)–(21), it is challenging to provide convergence guarantees for DeePO in (22). The existing PO methods achieve global convergence for the LQR by leveraging a gradient dominance property [31]–[33]. Here, we show a similar projected gradient dominance property of $J(V)$, as a key to global convergence of (22).

B. Projected gradient dominance of the LQR cost

We first define the projected gradient dominance property.

Definition 1 (Projected gradient dominance): A continuously differentiable function $g(x) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is projected gradient dominated of degree $p \in \{1, 2\}$ over a subset $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{dom}(g)$ if

$$g(x) - g(x^*) \leq \alpha \|\Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(\nabla g(x))\|^p, \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X},$$

where $\alpha > 0$ is a constant, x^* is a minimizer of $g(x)$ over \mathcal{X} , and $\Pi_{\mathcal{X}}$ is a projection onto a closed convex subset of \mathcal{X} .

In comparison to the definition of gradient dominance [36, Definition 1], Definition 1 focuses on the property of the *projected* gradient, meaning that optimality is achieved when the projected gradient attains zero. It leads to global convergence of projected gradient descent in conjuncture with a smoothness property, and the convergence rate depends on the degree p . In particular, for smooth objective $p = 1$ leads to a sublinear rate and $p = 2$ leads to a linear rate.

For problem (20)–(21), we show that $J(V)$ is projected gradient dominated of degree 1 over any sublevel set $\mathcal{S}(a) := \{V \in \mathcal{S} \mid J(V) \leq a\}$ with $a > 0$, the proof of which leverages [46, Theorem 1] and a convex reparameterization.

Lemma 3 (Projected gradient dominance of degree 1): For $V \in \mathcal{S}(a)$, it holds that

$$J(V) - J^* \leq \mu(a) \|\Pi_{\bar{X}_0} \nabla J(V)\|$$

with $\mu(a) := 4a^2 / ((\underline{\sigma}(Q))^{3/2} (\underline{\sigma}(R))^{1/2} \underline{\sigma}(\bar{U}_0))$.

Armed with Lemma 3, we show the global convergence of the projected gradient descent (22) in the next subsection.

C. Global convergence of DeePO

As in the LQR parameterization (3)–(4), the cost $J(V)$ here tends to infinity as V approaches the boundary $\partial \mathcal{S}$ [31]. Thus, it is only *locally* smooth over a sublevel set.

Lemma 4 (Local smoothness): For any $V, V' \in \mathcal{S}(a)$ satisfying $V + \phi(V' - V) \in \mathcal{S}(a)$, $\forall \phi \in [0, 1]$, it holds that

$$J(V') \leq J(V) + \langle \nabla J(V), V' - V \rangle + l(a) \|V' - V\|^2 / 2,$$

where the smoothness constant is given by

$$l(a) := 4a^2 (\xi(a) + a - \underline{\sigma}(Q)) \frac{\|\bar{X}_1\|_F^2}{\underline{\sigma}^2(Q)} + \frac{2\xi(a)a}{\underline{\sigma}(Q)}$$

with $\xi(a) := \|\bar{U}_0\|^2 \|R\| + \|\bar{X}_1\|^2 a$.

While Lemmas 3 and 4 are local properties over a sublevel set, we can still use them by selecting an appropriate stepsize such that the policy sequence stays in this sublevel set. For brevity, let $\mu^0 := \mu(J(V^0))$ and $l^0 := l(J(V^0))$, where $V^0 \in \mathcal{S}$ is an initial policy. The convergence of DeePO in (22) is shown as follows.

Theorem 1 (Global convergence): For $V^0 \in \mathcal{S}$ and a stepsize $\eta \in (0, 1/l^0]$, the projected gradient descent (22) leads to $V^k \in \mathcal{S}(J(V^0))$, $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, for any $\epsilon > 0$ and

$$k \geq \frac{2(\mu^0)^2}{\epsilon(2\eta - l^0\eta^2)}, \quad (23)$$

the update (22) has performance bound $J(V^k) - J^* \leq \epsilon$.

We compare our DeePO method developed thus far with zeroth-order PO in (12)-(13) [31]–[33]. Since $J(V)$ is projected gradient dominated of degree 1, we have shown sub-linear convergence of projected gradient descent to J^* (in fact, we observe a faster linear rate in the simulation). In comparison, $C(K)$ in (3) is gradient dominated of degree 2 [31], and hence zeroth-order PO meets linear convergence to $C^* := \min_K C(K)$. However, they rely on zeroth-order gradient estimates, which inevitably require a large number of long trajectories. In contrast, DeePO efficiently computes the gradient from a batch of PE data based on the covariance parameterization of the LQR (18). This remarkable feature enables DeePO to utilize online closed-loop data for adaptive control with recursive updates, as shown in the next section.

V. DEEPO FOR DIRECT, ADAPTIVE, AND RECURSIVE LEARNING OF THE LQR WITH ONLINE CLOSED-LOOP DATA

In this section, we first use DeePO to adaptively and recursively learn the optimal LQR gain from online closed-loop data. Then, we provide non-asymptotic convergence guarantees for DeePO.

A. Direct adaptive learning of the LQR

In the adaptive control setting, we collect online closed-loop data x_t, u_t, x_{t+1} at time t that constitutes the data matrices $(X_{0,t+1}, U_{0,t+1}, X_{1,t+1})^2$. The goal is to use DeePO to learn the optimal LQR gain K^* directly from online closed-loop data. Our key idea is to first use $(X_{0,t+1}, U_{0,t+1}, X_{1,t+1})$ to perform only one-step projected gradient descent for the parameterized policy at time t , then use the updated policy to control the system, and repeat. The details are presented in Algorithm 1, which is both direct and adaptive.

An initial stabilizing gain is obtained from offline data $(X_{0,t_0}, U_{0,t_0}, X_{1,t_0})$, i.e., $K_{t_0} = \bar{U}_{0,t_0} V'_{t_0}$ with V'_{t_0} the solution to (18). Alternatively, K_{t_0} can be found via (9) or (19).

²Since the closed-loop data grows with time in the adaptive control setting, we use $X_{0,t}, U_{0,t}, W_{0,t}, X_{1,t}$ to denote the data series of length t in (5). We also add a subscript t to other notations to highlight the time dependence. Under the new notations, all the results in Sections II, III, IV still hold.

Algorithm 1 DeePO for direct adaptive learning of the LQR

Initialize: Offline data $(X_{0,t_0}, U_{0,t_0}, X_{1,t_0})$, an initial stabilizing policy K_{t_0} , and a stepsize η .

- 1: **for** $t = t_0, t_0 + 1, \dots$ **do**
- 2: Apply u_t and observe x_{t+1} .
- 3: Given K_t , solve V_{t+1} via

$$V_{t+1} = \Phi_{t+1}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} K_t \\ I_n \end{bmatrix}. \quad (24)$$

- 4: Perform one-step projected gradient descent

$$V'_{t+1} = V_{t+1} - \eta \Pi_{\bar{X}_{0,t+1}} \nabla J_{t+1}(V_{t+1}), \quad (25)$$

where the gradient $\nabla J_{t+1}(V_{t+1})$ is given by Lemma 2.

- 5: Update the control gain by

$$K_{t+1} = \bar{U}_{0,t+1} V'_{t+1}. \quad (26)$$

- 6: **end for**

At the online stage $t \geq t_0$, we make the following assumptions on u_t to update the policy.

Assumption 2: For $t \geq t_0$, the input matrix $U_{0,t}$ is $\gamma\sqrt{t(n+1)}$ -persistently exciting of order $1+n$, i.e., $\underline{\sigma}(\mathcal{H}_{n+1}(U_{0,t})) \geq \gamma\sqrt{t(n+1)}$, where γ is a positive constant, and $\mathcal{H}_{n+1}(U_{0,t})$ is a Hankel matrix, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{H}_{n+1}(U_{0,t}) := \begin{bmatrix} u_0 & u_1 & \cdots & u_{t-n-1} \\ u_1 & u_2 & \cdots & u_{t-n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ u_n & u_{n+1} & \cdots & u_{t-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Assumption 2 adopts a quantitative notion of PE [47, Definition 2] and implies the rank condition (7). Here, the constant γ is used to quantify the PE level. Since $\mathcal{H}_{n+1}(U_{0,t})\mathcal{H}_{n+1}^\top(U_{0,t})/t$ is the sample covariance of the input, the $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{t})$ scaling in $\underline{\sigma}(\mathcal{H}_{n+1}(U_{0,t}))$ implies constant covariance excitation. Note that the PE assumption is universal in adaptive control [9], [10].

Assumption 3: There exist constants $\bar{u} > 0, \bar{x} > 0$ such that $\|u_t\| \leq \bar{u}$ and $\|x_t\| \leq \bar{x}, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}$.

Assumption 3 imposes the uniform boundedness and sequential stability [48] of the closed-loop system, i.e., the state does not blow up under the switching policy sequence.

Remark 5: We use Assumptions 2 and 3 to decouple the convergence analysis and the input design problem. The latter concerns designing control inputs ensuring the excitation and boundedness assumptions, which is not the focus of this paper. Briefly, the input can be selected as

$$u_t = K_t x_t + v_t, \quad t \geq t_0, \quad (27)$$

where $\{v_t\}$ is a probing noise sequence. In this case, Assumption 2 holds with high probability when $\{v_t\}$ is i.i.d. Gaussian. Alternatively, a simple linear algebraic manipulation can also determine v_t , as the feedback term $K_t x_t$ is known. Of course, either approach will degrade the closed-loop performance. Assumption 3 can possibly be circumnavigated by a more sophisticated sequential stability analysis [48]. Intuitively, proving sequential stability for (27) requires that (a) the LQR

cost of the closed-loop system $A+BK_t$ is uniformly bounded, which can be achieved by our gradient methods; and (b) K_t changes sufficiently slowly, which can be easily achieved by selecting a small stepsize η . We leave a detailed investigation of the consequences of these assumptions and the input design problem to future work, and instead focus on the convergence analysis in this paper. ■

Finally, we assume that the process noise w_t is bounded as in [13]–[16], [24], which does not necessarily follow any particular statistics and can even be adversarial and correlated.

Assumption 4: The process noise w_t is upper-bounded, i.e., $\|w_t\| \leq \delta$ for some constant $\delta \geq 0$.

To better interpret our analysis and main results, we refer to γ/δ as the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) describing the ratio between the useful and useless information $D_{0,t}$ and $W_{0,t}$. Such a notion of SNR is slightly different from the commonly used power-based definition.

While Algorithm 1 requires to compute the sample covariance matrices $\bar{X}_{0,t}, \bar{U}_{0,t}, \bar{X}_{1,t}$ and $\bar{\Phi}_t^{-1}$, it does not need to store all the historical data $(X_{0,t}, U_{0,t}, X_{1,t})$ and can be implemented recursively, as shown in the next subsection.

B. Recursive implementation of Algorithm 1

We show how to efficiently implement Algorithm 1 via recursive rank-one update. First, the sample covariance matrices $\bar{X}_{0,t}, \bar{U}_{0,t}, \bar{X}_{1,t}$ are updated recursively. To elaborate it, let $\psi_t := [u_t^\top, x_t^\top]^\top$. Then, $\bar{X}_{0,t+1}$ can be written as

$$\bar{X}_{0,t+1} = \frac{1}{t+1} \sum_{k=0}^t x_k \psi_k^\top = \frac{t}{t+1} \bar{X}_{0,t} + \frac{1}{t+1} x_t \psi_t^\top,$$

where the first term is the weighted covariance matrix from the last iteration, and the second is a rank-one matrix. The other two matrices $\bar{U}_{0,t}, \bar{X}_{1,t}$ can be updated accordingly.

Second, the covariance parameterization in (24) can also be implemented via rank-one update. We write the sample covariance recursively as $\Phi_{t+1} = (t\Phi_t + \psi_t \psi_t^\top)/(t+1)$. By Sherman-Morrison formula [49], its inverse Φ_{t+1}^{-1} satisfies

$$\Phi_{t+1}^{-1} = \frac{t+1}{t} \left(\Phi_t^{-1} - \frac{\Phi_t^{-1} \psi_t \psi_t^\top \Phi_t^{-1}}{t + \psi_t^\top \Phi_t^{-1} \psi_t} \right).$$

Then, (24) can be written as a rank-one update

$$\begin{aligned} V_{t+1} &= \frac{t+1}{t} \left(\Phi_t^{-1} - \frac{\Phi_t^{-1} \psi_t \psi_t^\top \Phi_t^{-1}}{t + \psi_t^\top \Phi_t^{-1} \psi_t} \right) \Phi_t V_t' \\ &= \frac{t+1}{t} \left(V_t' - \frac{\Phi_t^{-1} \psi_t \psi_t^\top V_t'}{t + \psi_t^\top \Phi_t^{-1} \psi_t} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where Φ_t^{-1} and V_t' are given from the last iteration.

C. Non-asymptotic convergence guarantees for Algorithm 1

Let Assumptions 2-4 hold throughout this section. Let $T := t - t_0 + 1$ denote the running time of Algorithm 1 and $C^* := \min_K C(K)$. We use the optimality gap $C(K_t) - C^*$ to quantify the convergence of K_t , which is aligned with the RL perspective [31]–[33] and broader online optimization

literature [43]. Define the average regret as the time-average optimality gap of the policy sequence

$$\text{Regret}_T := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=t_0}^{t_0+T-1} (C(K_t) - C^*), \quad T \geq 1.$$

The regret depends on $\{w_t\}$ but is not a well-defined random variable, since we do not assume any particular statistics on the noise. Now, we provide an upper bound on the regret for any bounded $\{w_t\}$ consistent with Assumption 4.

Theorem 2 (Non-asymptotic guarantees): Given offline data $(X_{0,t_0}, U_{0,t_0}, X_{1,t_0})$, there exist constants $\nu_i > 0, i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ polynomial in $(\bar{x}, \bar{u}, \zeta, \omega, \|R\|, \underline{\sigma}(Q), \underline{\sigma}(R), C^*)$, such that, if $\eta \in (0, \nu_1]$ and $\text{SNR} \geq \nu_2$, then

$$\text{Regret}_T \leq \nu_3/\sqrt{T} + \nu_4 \text{SNR}^{-1/2}.$$

Theorem 2 implies that, in the worst case, the time-average optimality gap converges sublinearly to a neighborhood of zero, the size of which scales inversely with the SNR. If the SNR tends to infinity with time, then DeePO is able to learn the optimal LQR gain.

The proof of Theorem 2 is distinguished from the literature and much more challenging: (a) While we adopt the gradient descent framework as in zeroth-order PO [31]–[33], our cost function $J_t(V)$ is non-convex and time-varying due to the adaptive setting. Thus, we need to establish *time-uniform projected* gradient dominance and smoothness properties. To prove convergence, we also need to show time-uniform boundedness of $J_t(V)$, which is not required in zeroth-order PO. (b) The convergence analysis for the gain sequence of indirect methods is mainly based on perturbation theory of Riccati equations [4], [8]. In comparison, we need to additionally characterize the gap between $J_t(V)$ and the actual cost $C(K_t)$ using perturbation analysis for Lyapunov equations. Moreover, the characterization of the optimality of J_t^* requires Lemma 1, which is one of our key novel results. The main proof steps for Theorem 2 are sketched below.

1) Quantifying the progress of the projected gradient descent in (25) with a recursive form. In the considered time-varying setting, the gradient dominance constant in Lemma 3 involves a time-varying term $\underline{\sigma}(\bar{U}_{0,t})$. We provide its lower bound by using the robust fundamental lemma in [47, Theorem 5], which quantifies $\underline{\sigma}(D_{0,t})$ under a sufficiently large SNR.

Lemma 5: There exist positive constants ζ, ω such that, if $\delta/\gamma \leq \zeta/(2\omega)$, then $\underline{\sigma}(D_{0,t}) \geq \sqrt{t}\gamma\zeta/2$ and $\underline{\sigma}(\bar{U}_{0,t}) \geq \gamma\zeta/2$.

Here, the constant ζ is the system-theoretic parameter ρ in [47] that quantifies controllability, and ω is the parameter γ in [47] that quantifies effects of noise propagation. By Lemmas 3 and 5, it is straightforward to show that $J_t(V)$ has a uniform gradient dominance constant independent of t .

Lemma 6 (Uniform projected gradient dominance): If $V \in \mathcal{S}_t(a)$ and $\delta/\gamma \leq \sqrt{n+1}\zeta/(2n\omega)$, then it holds that

$$J_t(V) - J_t^* \leq \mu(a) \|\Pi_{\bar{X}_{0,t}} \nabla J_t(V)\|,$$

where $\mu(a) = 8a^2/(\gamma\zeta(\underline{\sigma}(Q))^{3/2}(\underline{\sigma}(R))^{1/2})$.

Next, we show that $J_t(V)$ also has a uniform smoothness constant, which follows directly from Lemma 4 and the

boundedness of the data matrices $\|\bar{U}_{0,t}\| \leq \bar{u}(\bar{u} + \bar{x})$ and $\|\bar{X}_{1,t}\| \leq \bar{x}(\bar{u} + \bar{x})$ in Assumption 3.

Lemma 7 (Uniform local smoothness): For any $V, V' \in \mathcal{S}_t(a)$ satisfying $V + \phi(V' - V) \in \mathcal{S}_t(a)$ for all scalar $\phi \in [0, 1]$, it holds that $J_t(V') \leq J_t(V) + \langle \nabla J_t(V), V' - V \rangle + l(a)\|V' - V\|^2/2$, where the uniform smoothness constant is

$$l(a) = 2(\bar{u}^2 + \bar{x}\bar{u})^2 \frac{a\|R\|}{\underline{\sigma}(Q)} + (\bar{x}^2 + \bar{x}\bar{u})^2 \frac{2a^2}{\underline{\sigma}^2(Q)} \\ \times (2(\bar{u}^2 + \bar{x}\bar{u})^2\|R\| + 2(\bar{x}^2 + \bar{x}\bar{u})^2a + 2a - \underline{\sigma}(Q)).$$

Following the proof of Theorem 1, for $\eta \in [0, 1/l(J_t(V_t))]$, the progress of (25) can be characterized as

$$J_t(V'_t) - J_t(V_t) \\ \leq -\frac{\eta}{\mu^2(J_t(V_t))} \left(1 - \frac{l(J_t(V_t))\eta}{2}\right) (J_t(V_t) - J_t^*)^2. \quad (28)$$

2) Bounding the difference among $C(K_t), J_{t+1}(V_{t+1})$ and $J_t(V'_t)$. Since the noise matrix is disregarded in the parameterized closed-loop matrix (17), the parameterized LQR cost $J_{t+1}(V_{t+1})$ and $J_t(V'_t)$ are not equal to $C(K_t)$. To bound their difference, we quantify the distance between their closed-loop matrices. In particular, it holds that

$$\|A + BK_t - \bar{X}_{1,t}V'_t\| \\ \stackrel{(6)}{=} \|A + BK_t - ([B \quad A] \Phi_t + \bar{W}_{0,t})V'_t\| \\ \stackrel{(26)}{=} \left\| W_{0,t}D_{0,t}^\dagger \begin{bmatrix} K_t \\ I_n \end{bmatrix} \right\|. \quad (29)$$

By Lemma 5 and Assumption 4, it follows that

$$\|W_{0,t}D_{0,t}^\dagger\| \leq \|W_{0,t}\|(\underline{\sigma}(D_{0,t}))^{-1} \leq \frac{2\delta}{\gamma\zeta}, \quad (30)$$

and (29) further leads to

$$\|A + BK_t - \bar{X}_{1,t}V'_t\| \leq 2(1 + \|K_t\|)\delta/(\gamma\zeta). \quad (31)$$

Then, we can use perturbation theory of Lyapunov equations to bound $|C(K_t) - J_t(V'_t)|$. Let $p(a)$ be the polynomial of a scalar $a \geq 0$:

$$p(a) = \frac{16a^3}{\underline{\sigma}^2(Q)\zeta} \left(1 + \frac{a}{\underline{\sigma}(Q)}\right) \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{a}{\underline{\sigma}(R)}}\right).$$

Then, we have the following results.

Lemma 8: For $t \geq t_0$, if $V'_t \in \mathcal{S}_t$ and

$$\frac{\delta}{\gamma} \leq \min \left\{ \frac{J_t^2(V'_t)\zeta}{\underline{\sigma}(Q)p(J_t(V'_t))}, \frac{\zeta}{2\omega} \right\},$$

then it holds that

$$|C(K_t) - J_t(V'_t)| \leq \frac{p(J_t(V'_t))\delta}{2\gamma}, \quad (32)$$

$$|J_{t+1}(V_{t+1}) - J_t(V'_t)| \leq \frac{p(J_t(V'_t))\delta}{\gamma}, \quad (33)$$

$$|J_{t+1}(V_{t+1}) - C(K_t)| \leq \frac{3p(J_t(V'_t))\delta}{2\gamma}. \quad (34)$$

3) Bounding $|J_t^* - C^*|$. By Lemma 1, it is equivalent to provide an upper bound for $|C_{\text{CE},t}^* - C^*|$, which is exactly the sub-optimality gap of the certainty-equivalence LQR (9). Since by (30) $\|\widehat{B}_t, A_t\| - \|B, A\| = \|W_{0,t}D_{0,t}^\dagger\| \leq 2\delta/(\gamma\zeta)$, we can

use perturbation theory of Riccati equations [4, Proposition 1] to provide an upper bound for $|C_{\text{CE},t}^* - C^*|$.

Lemma 9: There exist two constants c_1, c_2 depending only on n, A, B, Q, R such that, if $\delta/\gamma \leq \min\{c_1\zeta, \zeta/(2\omega)\}$, then $|J_t^* - C^*| \leq c_2\delta/(\gamma\zeta)$.

4) Uniform bounds for $J_t(V)$. Both $\mu(J_t(V_t)), l(J_t(V_t))$ in (28) and the bounds in Lemma 8 depend on $J_t(V_t)$ and $J_t(V'_t)$. Next, we provide uniform bounds for $J_t(V_t)$ and $J_t(V'_t)$. For brevity, let $c_3 := l(\underline{\sigma}(Q))$, $c_4 := \mu(\underline{\sigma}(Q))$, $\bar{J} := J_{t_0}^* + C^* + c_1c_2 + 1/(2c_3c_4^2) + 1$, $\bar{\mu} := \mu(\bar{J})$, $\bar{l} := l(\bar{J})$, and $\bar{p} := p(\bar{J})$. Then, we have the following result.

Lemma 10: If $\eta \in (0, 1/\bar{l})$ and

$$\frac{\delta}{\gamma} \leq \min \left\{ \frac{\bar{J}^2}{\underline{\sigma}(Q)\bar{p}}, \frac{\zeta}{2\omega}, \frac{\eta}{2\bar{\mu}^2\bar{p}}, c_1\zeta \right\}, \quad (35)$$

then $J_t(V_t) \leq \bar{J}$ for $t > t_0$ and $J_t(V'_t) \leq \bar{J}$ for $t \geq t_0$.

Equipped with Lemmas 5-10, Theorem 2 can be proved combining standard gradient descent arguments [43].

D. Discussion

The DeePO method in Algorithm 1 is adaptive and direct in that it learns from online closed-loop data without any explicit SysID. This is in contrast to the indirect adaptive control that involves an identification step [6]–[8], and the episodic methods using single or multiple alternating episodes of data collection and control [2], [13], [31].

The DeePO method has a recursive policy update and is computationally efficient. In particular, Algorithm 1 performs only one-step projected gradient descent per time efficiently using online closed-loop data, and can be implemented recursively (see Section V-B). In comparison, the indirect adaptive control [6]–[8] requires to solve one certainty-equivalence LQR problem (9) per time. While one can do one or a few Riccati iterations per time step to gain in terms of computation time, it remains unclear if such an iterative approach has provable theoretical guarantees.

Our analysis of Theorem 2 is non-asymptotic and independent of the noise statistics. It improves over single batch methods [14]–[16], where their performance also depends on SNR but does not decay over time [16, Theorem 4.1]. Our sublinear decrease matches the attainable rate $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{T})$ of first-order methods in online convex optimization of smooth functions [43, Chapter 3], even though our considered LQR problem (3)–(4) is non-convex [31]. This indicates a favorable sample efficiency of DeePO to learn from online closed-loop data. The regret bound also has a polynomial dependence on the optimal LQR cost C^* , which is a key system-theoretic parameter [50]. This is in line with the scaling in terms of C^* of the regret bounds in indirect adaptive control [5].

While Theorem 2 assumes the boundedness of noise, DeePO can handle stochastic noise as well. Suppose that $\{w_t\}$ is white Gaussian, then the SNR has an explicit high-confidence bound, i.e., it decays inversely proportional to the square root of time [4]. Together with Theorem 2, it can be shown that the regret converges sublinearly with high probability. A detailed investigation of the stochastic case is left to future work.

Since the policy update of DeePO is end-to-end, we can enhance the adaptivity by using sliding window data or




Fig. 3. Convergence of DeePO for the LQR with offline data, where J^* is obtained by solving the convex program of (18).

forgetting factor, which is useful in time-varying systems. For example, adding a forgetting factor $\beta \in (0, 1)$ to the sample covariance (14) leads to $\Phi := D_0 S D_0^\top / t$ with $S = \text{diag}(\beta^{t-1}, \beta^{t-2}, \dots, 1)$, and all results in Section V-C continue to hold. We defer a rigorous analysis of time-varying systems to future work.

VI. SIMULATIONS

In this section, we first simulate over a randomly generated linear system to validate the convergence of DeePO for learning the LQR using offline and online closed-loop data, respectively. Then, we compare DeePO with indirect adaptive control [7], [8] and zeroth-order PO [31]–[33].

A. Convergence of DeePO for the LQR with offline data

We randomly generate a controllable and open-loop stable system (A, B) with $n = 4, m = 2$ as

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} -0.13 & 0.14 & -0.29 & 0.28 \\ 0.48 & 0.09 & 0.41 & 0.30 \\ -0.01 & 0.04 & 0.17 & 0.43 \\ 0.14 & 0.31 & -0.29 & -0.10 \end{bmatrix}, B = \begin{bmatrix} 1.63 & 0.93 \\ 0.26 & 1.79 \\ 1.46 & 1.18 \\ 0.77 & 0.11 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let $Q = I_4$ and $R = I_2$. We generate PE data X_0, U_0, W_0 of length 8 from a standard normal distribution and compute X_1 using the linear dynamics (6). The SNR (computed as $\underline{\sigma}(D_0) / \|W_0\|$) is -0.12 dB. We use only (X_0, U_0, X_1) to perform DeePO (22) to solve the LQR problem with covariance parameterization (18), which is feasible under the given set of PE data. We set the stepsize to $\eta = 0.1$ and the initial policy to $V^0 = \Phi^{-1}[0, I_4]^\top \in \mathcal{S}$. Fig. 3 shows that the LQR cost converges to J^* at a linear rate, which implies that the sublinear rate certified in Theorem 1 may be conservative.

B. Convergence of DeePO for the adaptive learning of the LQR with online closed-loop data

In this subsection, we perform Algorithm 1 for the adaptive learning of the LQR with online closed-loop data to validate Theorem 2. We set $x_0 = 0$ and $u_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_2)$ for $t < t_0$ with $t_0 = 8$. For $t \geq t_0$, we set $u_t = K_t x_t + v_t$ with $v_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_2)$ to ensure persistency of excitation. The white noise sequence $\{w_t\}$ is drawn from a uniform distribution, where each element of w_t is uniformly sampled from $[0, \sigma]$. We consider three noise levels $\sigma \in \{0.1, 0.01, 0.001\}$, which correspond approximately to the SNR $\in [0, 5], [10, 15], [20, 25]$ dB (computed as $\underline{\sigma}(D_{0,t}) / \|W_{0,t}\|$), respectively. Note that the




Fig. 4. Convergence of DeePO for adaptive learning of the LQR under different level of noise σ .




Fig. 5. Comparison of DeePO and indirect methods for adaptive learning of the LQR. We also plot the optimality gap of the initial gain (dashed green line) computed by single batch methods from offline data [14]–[16].

SNR varies within a interval due to the random online sample of noise. We set the stepsize to $\eta = 0.01$.

Fig. 4 shows that average regret matches the expected sublinear decrease $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{T})$ in Theorem 2. Moreover, since the bounded noise w_t has non-zero mean, the regret does not converge to zero. Roughly, the bias scales as SNR^{-2} rather than the expected $\text{SNR}^{-1/2}$, which implies that our bound on the bias term certified in Theorem 2 may be conservative. Bridging this gap requires tighter perturbation bounds.

C. Comparison with indirect certainty-equivalence adaptive control for adaptive learning of the LQR

Consider the system proposed in [3, Section 6]

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1.01 & 0.01 & 0 \\ 0.01 & 1.01 & 0.01 \\ 0 & 0.01 & 1.01 \end{bmatrix}, B = I_3, \quad (36)$$

which corresponds to a discrete-time marginally unstable Laplacian system. Let $Q = R = I_3$. To verify that DeePO can handle unbounded noise, let $w_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_3/100)$ which corresponds to $\text{SNR} \in [0, 5]$ as in [15, Section VI]. We compare Algorithm 1 with the indirect adaptive approach in [7], [8]. Specifically, the indirect adaptive method alternates between finding the certainty-equivalence LQR gain K_t (9) every time step and using $u_t = K_t x_t + v_t$ with $v_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_2)$ to obtain the new state x_{t+1} . For both methods, we use the solution to the LQR problem with covariance parameterization (18) based on $(X_{0,t_0}, U_{0,t_0}, X_{1,t_0})$ as the initial gain K_{t_0} .

Fig. 5 shows that the optimality gap of both methods converges sublinearly to 10^{-4} in 200 time steps. By using online closed-loop data, both methods improve the performance over the initial gain. For $t \leq 20$, the indirect approach exhibits faster convergence than DeePO. This is because DeePO only




Fig. 6. Comparison of the finite-horizon cost of DeePO and the indirect method.




Fig. 7. Comparison of the computation time for performing 100 time steps.

performs one-step projected gradient descent per time, and hence requires more iterations to asymptotically approach the certainty-equivalence LQR. Indeed, they achieve similar performance for $t \geq 60$. Moreover, thanks to the recursive policy update, the curve of DeePO is significantly smoother.

Next, we compare the finite-horizon cost $\sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \|z_k\|^2$ induced by DeePO and the indirect method, denoted by $C_d(t)$ and $C_{in}(t)$, respectively. Fig. 6 reports the average finite-horizon cost from 50 independent trials, showing that their performance is extremely close during the entire run time. Further, at the initial several steps, the DeePO method has slightly lower cost due to smoother switching of the policy. After that, the indirect method performs better but their relative cost approaches to zero asymptotically.

Finally, we compare their efficiency in terms of real-time computation. For a fair comparison, we apply rank-one update for Algorithm 1 (see Section V-B) and recursive least squares for SysID (8). Let Q and R be identity matrices with proper dimension. With identified model, the certainty-equivalence LQR problem (9) is solved using the *dlqr* function in MATLAB. First, we evaluate the computation time for systems with different dimensions during 100 time steps. Let the dimension of the state and input be equal, and $n = m \in \{10, 20, 30, 40, 50\}$. For each instance, we perform 50 independent trials, where each trial uses randomly generated stable state matrix A and identity input matrix B . The box plot in Fig. 7 shows that DeePO is significantly more efficient than indirect methods, and their gap scales significantly with the dimension. Second, we also compare the computation time to achieve different optimality gap $\epsilon := (C(K) - C^*)/C^*$ for a fixed system dimension $n = 4$. Fig. 8 shows the results from 50 independent trials. For a large optimality gap (e.g., $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$), the computation time is similar for both methods. This reveals that while the indirect method converges faster at the beginning (see Fig. 5), its real-time computation is more




Fig. 8. Comparison of the computation time to achieve a specified optimality gap.

	$\epsilon = 1$	$\epsilon = 0.1$	$\epsilon = 0.01$
Zeroth-order PO (# of trajectories)	1393	45260	151607
DeePO (# of input-state pairs)	10	25	49

TABLE I
COMPARISON OF THE SAMPLE COMPLEXITY TO ACHIEVE A SPECIFIED OPTIMALITY GAP ϵ .

time-consuming. For a small optimality gap (e.g., $\epsilon = 10^{-5}$), DeePO requires significantly less computation time. Since a rank-one update has been applied in both methods, the difference of computational efficiency is due to DeePO only performing one-step gradient descent per time, but the indirect method needs to solve a Riccati equation.

D. Comparison with zeroth-order PO

While the zeroth-order PO methods [31]–[33] are episodic (see Fig. 1), we compare them with DeePO in Algorithm 1 to demonstrate our sample efficiency. We use the simulation model (36) with $Q = 10 \times I_3$, $R = I_3$ and $w_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 0.01I_n)$. We adopt the zeroth-order PO method in (12)–(13) for comparison. In particular, we use a minibatch of 30 zeroth-order samples for (13) to reduce the variance of gradient estimate. We set the smooth radius to $r = 0.02$, the stepsize to $\eta = 10^{-3}$, and the length of the trajectory to $T = 50$. The setting for Algorithm 1 is the same as in Section VI-B. For both methods, we use $-0.15 \times I_3$ as the initial stabilizing gain.

Table I demonstrates the sample complexity of zeroth-order PO (in terms of number of trajectories) and DeePO (in terms of number of input-state pairs) to achieve different optimality gap. It indicates that the zeroth-order PO is vastly less efficient for solving the LQR problem, which is in line with the sample complexity discussion in [51].

VII. CONCLUDING REMARKS

This paper proposed DeePO for the direct adaptive learning of the LQR based on the covariance parameterization. The proposed method is direct, adaptive, with closed-loop data, and has a recursive implementation. Hence, we provided a viable angle of attack to the open problem in [18], [20], [26].

We believe that our paper leads to fruitful future works. As discussed in Remark 5, input design, quantifying the effects of probing noise, and weakening Assumptions 2 and 3 are formidable problems worthy of further investigations.

We believe that the sequential stability analysis [48] would be the key to achieving this. As observed in the simulation, the sublinear rate in Theorem 1 and the dependence on the SNR in Theorem 2 may be conservative, and their sharper analysis is an important future work. While this paper considers only the LQR problem, we believe that the covariance parameterization and DeePO can be extended for other objectives (e.g., output feedback control), performance indices (e.g., \mathcal{H}_∞ norm), and system classes (e.g., time-varying systems). It is valuable to move beyond the bounded noise assumption and analyze the expected regret under stochastic noise. The adaptivity of DeePO can be further enhanced by using sliding data window and/or forgetting factor, and a rigorous analysis is also open.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We would like to thank Prof. Mihailo R. Jovanović from University of Southern California and Dr. Hesameddin Mohammadi from NVIDIA for fruitful discussions.

APPENDIX A PROOF OF LEMMA 1

By the covariance parameterization (15) and the positive definiteness of Φ (due to the PE condition (7)), V is uniquely determined as $V = \Phi^{-1}[K^\top, I_n]^\top$. Then, the LQR problem with covariance parameterization (18) can be reformulated as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize } \text{Tr}((Q + K^\top RK)\Sigma), \\ & \quad K, \Sigma \succeq 0 \\ & \text{subject to } \Sigma = I_n + X_1 D_0^\dagger \begin{bmatrix} K \\ I_n \end{bmatrix} \Sigma \begin{bmatrix} K \\ I_n \end{bmatrix}^\top (X_1 D_0^\dagger)^\top. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition $[\hat{B}, \hat{A}] = X_1 D_0^\dagger$ in (8), this problem is exactly the certainty-equivalence LQR problem (9).

APPENDIX B PROOF IN SECTION IV

We provide some useful bounds which will be invoked frequently in the rest of the paper.

Lemma 11: For $V \in \mathcal{S}$, it holds (i) $\|\Sigma_V\| \leq J(V)/\underline{\sigma}(Q)$, (ii) $\|P_V\| \leq J(V)$, and (iii) $\|\bar{U}_0 V\|_F \leq (J(V)/\underline{\sigma}(R))^{1/2}$.

Proof: The proof of (i) and (ii) follows directly from the definition of $J(V)$. To show (iii), we have $J(V) = \text{Tr}((Q + V^\top \bar{U}_0^\top R \bar{U}_0 V)\Sigma_V) \geq \text{Tr}(V^\top \bar{U}_0^\top R \bar{U}_0 V \Sigma_V) \geq \text{Tr}(V^\top \bar{U}_0^\top \bar{U}_0 V) \underline{\sigma}(R) = \|\bar{U}_0 V\|_F^2 \underline{\sigma}(R)$. ■

A. Proof of Lemma 2

The proof follows the same vein as that of [30, Proposition 1]. We first compute the differential of P_V . Define $E_V := (\bar{U}_0^\top R \bar{U}_0 + \bar{X}_1^\top P_V \bar{X}_1) V$. By definition, it holds that $dP_V = dV^\top E_V + E_V^\top dV + V^\top \bar{X}_1^\top dP_V \bar{X}_1 V$.

Since $\rho(\bar{X}_1 V) < 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} dP_V &= \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left(V^\top \bar{X}_1^\top \right)^i (dV^\top E_V + E_V^\top dV) (\bar{X}_1 V)^i \\ \text{Tr}(dP_V) &= \text{Tr} \left(2 \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (\bar{X}_1 V)^i (V^\top \bar{X}_1^\top)^i \cdot E_V^\top dV \right) \\ &= \text{Tr}(2\Sigma_V E_V^\top dV). \end{aligned}$$

B. Proof of Lemma 3

We apply [46, Theorem 1] to prove Lemma 3. We first relate the LQR problem with covariance parameterization (18) to the following convex reparameterization via a change of variables $V = L\Sigma^{-1}$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize}_{L, \Sigma} f(L, \Sigma) := \text{Tr}(Q\Sigma) + \text{Tr}(L\Sigma^{-1}L^\top \bar{U}_0^\top R \bar{U}_0), \\ & \text{subject to } \Sigma = \bar{X}_0 L, \quad \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma - I_n & \bar{X}_1 L \\ L^\top \bar{X}_1^\top & \Sigma \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Let \mathcal{L} denote the feasible set of (37). The equivalence between (18) and (37) are established below.

Lemma 12: For any $(L, \Sigma) \in \mathcal{L}$, it holds that Σ is invertible and $L\Sigma^{-1} \in \mathcal{S}$. Moreover, for $V \in \mathcal{S}$, we have

$$J(V) = \min_{L, \Sigma} \{f(L, \Sigma), \text{s.t. } (L, \Sigma) \in \mathcal{L}, L\Sigma^{-1} = V\}. \quad (38)$$

Proof: Applying the Schur complement to the linear matrix inequality constraint in (37) yields $\Sigma \succ 0$ and $\Sigma - I_n - \bar{X}_1 L \Sigma^{-1} L^\top \bar{X}_1^\top \succeq 0$. By the non-singularity of Σ , let $V = L\Sigma^{-1}$. Then, a substitution of $L = V\Sigma$ into the above inequality yields $\Sigma - I_n - \bar{X}_1 V \Sigma V^\top \bar{X}_1^\top \succeq 0$. Thus, $\bar{X}_1 V$ is stable, i.e., $\rho(\bar{X}_1 V) < 1$. Since the first constraint of (37) implies $\bar{X}_0 V = \bar{X}_0 L \Sigma^{-1} = \Sigma \Sigma^{-1} = I_n$, it holds that $V = L\Sigma^{-1} \in \mathcal{S}$.

Next, we prove the second statement. Using the constraint $V = L\Sigma^{-1}$ and the Schur complement, the right-hand side of (38) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\Sigma \succ 0} \text{Tr} \left((Q + V^\top \bar{U}_0^\top R \bar{U}_0 V) \Sigma \right) \\ & \text{s.t. } \bar{X}_0 V = I_n, \Sigma \succeq I_n + \bar{X}_1 V \Sigma V^\top \bar{X}_1^\top. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Let $\Sigma(\Theta)$ be the unique positive definite solution of the Lyapunov equation $\Sigma(\Theta) = \Theta + \bar{X}_1 V \Sigma(\Theta) V^\top \bar{X}_1^\top$ with $\Theta \succeq I_n$. By monotonicity of $\Sigma(\Theta)$, we have $\Sigma(\Theta) \succeq \Sigma(I_n)$. Since $Q + V^\top \bar{U}_0^\top R \bar{U}_0 V \succ 0$, the minimum of (39) is attained at $\Sigma(I_n)$, which is $\text{Tr}((Q + V^\top \bar{U}_0^\top R \bar{U}_0 V)\Sigma(I_n))$ with $\bar{X}_0 V = I_n$. This is exactly the definition of $J(V)$. ■

Next, we show the convexity of the reparameterization (37).

Lemma 13: The feasible set \mathcal{L} is convex, and $f(L, \Sigma)$ is convex over \mathcal{L} . Moreover, $f(L, \Sigma)$ is differentiable over an open domain that contains \mathcal{L} .

Proof: Since the constraints in (37) are linear in (L, Σ) , the feasible set \mathcal{L} is convex. Clearly, $f(L, \Sigma)$ is differentiable over \mathcal{L} . Hence, f is convex over \mathcal{L} . Define the derivative and Hessian of f along the direction $(\tilde{L}, \tilde{\Sigma})$ as

$$\begin{aligned} f'(L, \Sigma)[(\tilde{L}, \tilde{\Sigma})] &:= \frac{d}{d\tau} f(L + \tau\tilde{L}, \Sigma + \tau\tilde{\Sigma})|_{\tau=0}, \\ \nabla^2 f(L, \Sigma)[(\tilde{L}, \tilde{\Sigma}), (\tilde{L}, \tilde{\Sigma})] &:= \frac{d^2}{d\tau^2} f(L + \tau\tilde{L}, \Sigma + \tau\tilde{\Sigma})|_{\tau=0}, \end{aligned}$$

respectively. By the definition of $f(L, \Sigma)$, it holds that $f'(L, \Sigma)[(\tilde{L}, \tilde{\Sigma})] = \text{Tr}(Q\tilde{\Sigma}) - \text{Tr}(\Sigma^{-1}L^\top \bar{U}_0^\top R \bar{U}_0 L \Sigma^{-1} \tilde{\Sigma}) + 2\text{Tr}(\tilde{L} \Sigma^{-1} L^\top \bar{U}_0^\top R \bar{U}_0)$. For brevity, let $\bar{R} = \bar{U}_0^\top R \bar{U}_0$. Then, the Hessian satisfies

$$\nabla^2 f(L, \Sigma)[(\tilde{L}, \tilde{\Sigma}), (\tilde{L}, \tilde{\Sigma})]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \text{Tr}(\Sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Sigma}\Sigma^{-1}L^\top\bar{R}L\Sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Sigma}) + \text{Tr}(\Sigma^{-1}L^\top\bar{R}L\Sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Sigma}\Sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Sigma}) \\
&\quad + 2\text{Tr}(\tilde{L}\Sigma^{-1}\tilde{L}^\top\bar{R}) - 4\text{Tr}(\bar{R}L\Sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Sigma}\Sigma^{-1}\tilde{L}^\top) \\
&= 2\left\|R^{\frac{1}{2}}(\bar{U}_0\tilde{L} - \bar{U}_0L\Sigma^{-1}\tilde{\Sigma})\Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right\|_F^2 \geq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \blacksquare

By Lemmas 12 and 13, the LQR problem with covariance parameterization (18) and its convex reparameterization (37) satisfy the assumptions of [46, Theorem 1]. Then, there exists $c > 0$ and a direction $Z \in \mathcal{N}(\bar{X}_0)$ with $\|Z\|_F = 1$ in the descent cone of $\mathcal{S}(a)$ such that $J'(V)[Z] \leq -c(J(V) - J^*)$, where $J'(V)[Z]$ denotes the derivative of $J(V)$ along the direction Z . Let $Z' = \Pi_{\bar{X}_0} \nabla J(V) / \|\Pi_{\bar{X}_0} \nabla J(V)\|_F$ be the normalized projected gradient. Since both Z and Z' are feasible directions but Z' is the direction of the projected gradient, we have $J'(V)[Z'] \leq J'(V)[Z], \forall Z \in \mathcal{N}(\bar{X}_0)$. Thus, it holds that $J(V) - J^* \leq \|\Pi_{\bar{X}_0} \nabla J(V)\|_F / c$.

Next, we derive an explicit upper bound of $1/c$ over $V \in \mathcal{S}(a)$. By [46, Theorem 1], c is given by

$$c = (2 \max\{\|L - L^*\|_F / \underline{\sigma}(\Sigma), \|\Sigma - \Sigma^*\|_F \|L\| / \underline{\sigma}^2(\Sigma)\})^{-1},$$

where (L^*, Σ^*) is an optimal solution of (37), and $(L, \Sigma) = \arg \min_{(L', \Sigma') \in \mathcal{L}} \{f(L', \Sigma'), \text{s.t. } L'(\Sigma')^{-1} = V\}$. We now provide upper bounds for $\underline{\sigma}^{-1}(\Sigma)$, $\|\Sigma\|_F$, $\|L\|_F$. Since $\underline{\sigma}(\Sigma) \geq 1$, it holds $\underline{\sigma}^{-1}(\Sigma) \leq 1$. The sublevel set gives $\text{Tr}(Q\Sigma) \leq a$, and hence $\|\Sigma\|_F \leq a / \underline{\sigma}(Q)$. Since

$$\begin{aligned}
\underline{\sigma}(R)\underline{\sigma}^2(\bar{U}_0)\|\Sigma\|^{-1}\|L\|_F^2 &\leq \text{Tr}(L\Sigma^{-1}L^\top\bar{U}_0^\top R\bar{U}_0) \\
&\leq \text{Tr}(Q\Sigma) + \text{Tr}(L\Sigma^{-1}L^\top\bar{U}_0^\top R\bar{U}_0) \leq a,
\end{aligned}$$

an upper bound of $\|L\|_F$ is given by

$$\|L\|_F \leq \left(\frac{a\|\Sigma\|}{\underline{\sigma}(R)\underline{\sigma}^2(\bar{U}_0)}\right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{a}{(\underline{\sigma}(Q)\underline{\sigma}(R))^{1/2}\underline{\sigma}(\bar{U}_0)}.$$

Those bounds are also true for (L^*, Σ^*) . Furthermore, we can provide the following upper bound

$$\frac{1}{c} \leq \frac{4a}{(\underline{\sigma}(Q)\underline{\sigma}(R))^{1/2}\underline{\sigma}(\bar{U}_0)} \max\left\{1, \frac{a}{\underline{\sigma}(Q)}\right\}.$$

Since $\mathcal{S}(a)$ is non-empty, we have $a \geq J^* \geq \underline{\sigma}(Q)$. Hence,

$$\frac{1}{c} \leq \frac{4a^2}{(\underline{\sigma}(Q))^{3/2}(\underline{\sigma}(R))^{1/2}\underline{\sigma}(\bar{U}_0)} := \mu(a).$$

C. Proof of Lemma 4

We show the local smoothness of $J(V)$ by providing an upper bound for $\|\nabla^2 J(V)\| := \sup_{\|Z\|_F=1} |\nabla^2 J(V)[Z, Z]|$ over the sublevel set $V \in \mathcal{S}(a)$. We first present a formula for the Hessian of $J(V)$.

Lemma 14: For $V \in \mathcal{S}$ and a feasible direction $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+m) \times n}$, the Hessian of $J(V)$ is characterized as

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla^2 J(V)[Z, Z] &= 4\text{Tr}\left(Z^\top \bar{X}_1^\top P'[Z] \bar{X}_1 V \Sigma_V\right) \\
&\quad + 2\text{Tr}\left(Z^\top \left(\bar{U}_0^\top R \bar{U}_0 + \bar{X}_1^\top P_V \bar{X}_1\right) Z \Sigma_V\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where $P'[Z] = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (V^\top \bar{X}_1^\top)^i (Z^\top E_V + E_V^\top Z) (\bar{X}_1 V)^i$.

Proof: By the definition of P_V in (21), it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
P'[Z] &= Z^\top \bar{X}_1^\top P_V \bar{X}_1 V + V^\top \bar{X}_1^\top P_V \bar{X}_1 Z \\
&\quad + Z^\top \bar{U}_0^\top R \bar{U}_0 V + V^\top \bar{U}_0^\top R \bar{U}_0 Z + V^\top \bar{X}_1^\top P'[Z] \bar{X}_1 V \\
&= Z^\top E_V + E_V^\top Z + V^\top \bar{X}_1^\top P'[Z] \bar{X}_1 V.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we have $E'[Z] = (\bar{U}_0^\top R \bar{U}_0 + \bar{X}_1^\top P_V \bar{X}_1) Z + \bar{X}_1^\top P'[Z] \bar{X}_1 V$, and the Hessian $P''[Z]$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
P''[Z] &= V^\top \bar{X}_1^\top P'[Z] \bar{X}_1 Z + Z^\top \bar{X}_1^\top P'[Z] \bar{X}_1 V \\
&\quad + Z^\top E'[Z] + (E'[Z])^\top Z + V^\top \bar{X}_1^\top P''[Z] \bar{X}_1 V \\
&= S + V^\top \bar{X}_1^\top P''[Z] \bar{X}_1 V,
\end{aligned}$$

where $S = 2V^\top \bar{X}_1^\top P'[Z] \bar{X}_1 Z + 2Z^\top \bar{X}_1^\top P'[Z] \bar{X}_1 V + 2Z^\top (\bar{U}_0^\top R \bar{U}_0 + \bar{X}_1^\top P_V \bar{X}_1) Z$.

By the definition of $J(V)$ in (20), it holds that $\nabla^2 J(V)[Z, Z] = \text{Tr}(P''[Z]) = \text{Tr}(S \Sigma_V)$. \blacksquare

Next, we provide an upper bound for $\|\nabla^2 J(V)\|$. Let $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+m) \times n}$ be a feasible direction with $\|Z\|_F = 1$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla^2 J(V)\| &\leq 4 \left| \text{Tr}\left(Z^\top \bar{X}_1^\top P'[Z] \bar{X}_1 V \Sigma_V\right) \right| \\
&\quad + 2 \left\| Z^\top \left(\bar{U}_0^\top R \bar{U}_0 + \bar{X}_1^\top P_V \bar{X}_1\right) Z \right\| \text{Tr}(\Sigma_V).
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

For the first term, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \text{Tr}(Z^\top \bar{X}_1^\top P'[Z] \bar{X}_1 V \Sigma_V) \right| \\
&\leq \left\| Z^\top \bar{X}_1^\top P'[Z] \bar{X}_1 V \Sigma_V^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_F \left\| \Sigma_V^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_F \\
&\leq \|\bar{X}_1\|_F^2 \left\| \bar{X}_1 V \Sigma_V^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_F \left\| \Sigma_V^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_F \|P'[Z]\|_F \\
&\leq \|\bar{X}_1\|_F^2 \|P'[Z]\|_F \cdot a / \underline{\sigma}(Q),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma 11 and

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \bar{X}_1 V \Sigma_V^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_F^2 &= \text{Tr}\left(\bar{X}_1 V \Sigma_V V^\top \bar{X}_1^\top\right) \\
&\leq \text{Tr}\left(\bar{X}_1 V \Sigma_V V^\top \bar{X}_1^\top + I_n\right) = \left\| \Sigma_V^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_F^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we only need to provide an upper bound for $\|P'[Z]\|_F$. Since $\|Z\|_F = 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
Z^\top E_V + E_V^\top Z &\leq Z^\top \left(\bar{U}_0^\top R \bar{U}_0 + \bar{X}_1^\top P_V \bar{X}_1\right) Z \\
&\quad + V^\top \left(\bar{U}_0^\top R \bar{U}_0 + \bar{X}_1^\top P_V \bar{X}_1\right) V \\
&= Z^\top \left(\bar{U}_0^\top R \bar{U}_0 + \bar{X}_1^\top P_V \bar{X}_1\right) Z + P_V - Q \\
&\leq ((\xi(a) + a) / \underline{\sigma}(Q) - 1) Q,
\end{aligned}$$

the definition implies that $P'[Z] = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (V^\top \bar{X}_1^\top)^i (Z^\top E_V + E_V^\top Z) (\bar{X}_1 V)^i \preceq ((\xi(a) + a) / \underline{\sigma}(Q) - 1) P_V$.

Then, it holds that $\|P'[Z]\|_F \leq a((\xi(a) + a) / \underline{\sigma}(Q) - 1)$, and the first term of the right-hand side of (40) is bounded by $4((\xi(a) + a) / \underline{\sigma}(Q) - 1) \|\bar{X}_1\|_F^2 a^2 / \underline{\sigma}(Q)$. By Lemma 11, the second term is bounded by $2\xi(a)a / \underline{\sigma}(Q)$. That is,

$$\|\nabla^2 J(V)\| \leq 4a^2 (\xi(a) + a - \underline{\sigma}(Q)) \frac{\|\bar{X}_1\|_F^2}{\underline{\sigma}^2(Q)} + \frac{2\xi(a)a}{\underline{\sigma}(Q)}.$$

By the Taylor expansion of $J(V)$, the proof is completed.

D. Proof of Theorem 1

Let $V_\eta := V - \eta \Pi_{\bar{X}_0} \nabla J(V)$. We first show that for a non-optimal $V \in \mathcal{S}(a)$ and any $\eta \in [0, 1/l(a)]$, it holds $V_\eta \in \mathcal{S}(a)$.

Define $\mathcal{S}^o(a) := \{V \in \mathcal{S} \mid J(V) < a\}$, and $(\mathcal{S}^o(a))^c$ as its complement, which is closed. By Lemma 4, given $\phi \in (0, 1)$, there exists $b > 0$ such that $\|\nabla^2 J(V)\| \leq (1 + \phi)l(a)$ for $V \in \mathcal{S}(a + b)$. Clearly, $\mathcal{S}(a) \cap (\mathcal{S}^o(a + b))^c = \emptyset$. Then, the distance between them $d := \inf\{\|V' - V\|, \forall V \in \mathcal{S}(a), V' \in (\mathcal{S}^o(a + b))^c\}$ is positive. Let $\bar{N} \in \mathbb{N}_+$ be large enough such that $2/(\bar{N}(1 + \phi)l(a)) < d/\|\Pi_{\bar{X}_0} \nabla J(V)\|$, which is well-defined since V is not optimal. Define a stepsize $\tau \in [0, 2/(\bar{N}(1 + \phi)l(a))]$. Since $\tau < d/\|\Pi_{\bar{X}_0} \nabla J(V)\|$, we have $\|V_\tau - V\| < d$, i.e., $V_\tau \in \mathcal{S}(a + b)$. Thus, we can apply Lemma 4 over $\mathcal{S}(a + b)$ to show $J(V_\tau) - J(V) \leq -\tau(1 - (1 + \phi)l(a)\tau/2)\|\Pi_{\bar{X}_0} \nabla J(V)\|^2 \leq 0$, where the last inequality follows from $\tau \leq 2/(1 + \phi)l(a)$. This implies that the segment between V and V_τ is contained in $\mathcal{S}(a)$. It is also clear that $V_{2\tau} \in \mathcal{S}(a + b)$ since $\|V_{2\tau} - V_\tau\| < d$. Then, we can use induction to show that the segment between V and $V_{N\tau}$ for $N \in \mathbb{N}_+$ is in $\mathcal{S}(a)$ as long as $N\tau \leq 2/(1 + \phi)l(a)$. Since $\phi \in (0, 1)$, we let $\eta \leq 1/l(a)$ to ensure the segment between V and V_η contained in $\mathcal{S}(a)$.

Then, a simple induction leads to that for $\eta \in [0, 1/l^0]$, the update (22) satisfies $V^k \in \mathcal{S}(J(V^0)), \forall k \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover,

$$J(V^{k+1}) \leq J(V^k) - \eta \left(1 - \frac{l^0 \eta}{2}\right) \|\Pi_{\bar{X}_0} \nabla J(V^k)\|^2.$$

Using Lemma 3 and subtracting J^* in both sides yield

$$J(V^{k+1}) - J^* \leq J(V^k) - J^* - \frac{2\eta - l^0 \eta^2}{2(\mu^0)^2} (J(V^k) - J^*)^2.$$

Dividing by $(J(V^k) - J^*)(J(V^{k+1}) - J^*)$ in both sides and noting $J(V^{k+1}) \leq J(V^k)$ lead to

$$\frac{2\eta - l^0 \eta^2}{2(\mu^0)^2} \leq \frac{1}{J(V^{k+1}) - J^*} - \frac{1}{J(V^k) - J^*}.$$

Summing up both sides over $0, 1, \dots, k - 1$ and using telescopic cancellation yield that

$$\frac{k(2\eta - l^0 \eta^2)}{2(\mu^0)^2} \leq \frac{1}{J(V^k) - J^*}.$$

Letting the right-hand side of the above inequality equal ϵ and solving k yields the required number of iterations (23).

APPENDIX C PROOF IN SECTION V

A. Proof of Lemma 5

Since $\underline{\sigma}(\bar{U}_{0,t}) \geq \underline{\sigma}(U_{0,t})\underline{\sigma}(D_{0,t})/t$, we provide lower bounds for $\underline{\sigma}(U_{0,t})$ and $\underline{\sigma}(D_{0,t})$, respectively.

Let $\theta_l \in \mathbb{R}^m, \theta_r \in \mathbb{R}^t$ be the left and right singular vectors of $U_{0,t}$ corresponding to the minimal singular value $\underline{\sigma}(U_{0,t})$, respectively, i.e., $\theta_l^\top U_{0,t} = \underline{\sigma}(U_{0,t})\theta_r^\top$ with $\|\theta_l\| = \|\theta_r\| = 1$. Define the diagonal block matrix $\Omega := \text{diag}(\theta_l^\top, \dots, \theta_l^\top) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times nm}$, which has full row rank. Then, it holds that $\Omega \cdot \mathcal{H}_{n+1}(U_{0,t}) = \underline{\sigma}(U_{0,t})\mathcal{H}_{n+1}(\theta_r)$, and hence

$$\underline{\sigma}(\Omega)\underline{\sigma}(\mathcal{H}_{n+1}(U_{0,t})) \leq \underline{\sigma}(U_{0,t})\|\mathcal{H}_{n+1}(\theta_r)\|. \quad (41)$$

Since $\|\theta_l\| = \|\theta_r\| = 1$, we have $\|\mathcal{H}_{n+1}(\theta_r)\| \leq \sqrt{n+1}$ and $\underline{\sigma}(\Omega) = 1$. Substituting them into (41) and using Assumption 2, we yield $\underline{\sigma}(U_{0,t}) \geq \sqrt{t}\gamma$.

By Assumption 2 and the robust fundamental lemma [47, Theorem 5], there exist positive constants ζ, ω such that

$$\underline{\sigma}(D_{0,t}) \geq \sqrt{t}\gamma\zeta - \frac{\omega\|\mathcal{H}_n(W_{0,t-1})\|}{\sqrt{n+1}}.$$

By Assumption 4, it holds that $\|\mathcal{H}_n(W_{0,t-1})\| \leq \|\mathcal{H}_n(W_{0,t-1})\|_F \leq \sqrt{n(t-n)}\delta \leq \sqrt{(n+1)t}\delta$. Then, the hypothesis $\delta/\gamma \leq \zeta/(2\omega)$ leads to $\underline{\sigma}(D_{0,t}) \geq \sqrt{t}\gamma\zeta/2$.

Hence, we have $\underline{\sigma}(\bar{U}_{0,t}) \geq \underline{\sigma}(U_{0,t})\underline{\sigma}(D_{0,t})/t \geq \gamma\zeta/2$.

B. Proof of Lemma 8

We first provide the following result on the perturbation theory for Lyapunov equations.

Lemma 15: Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be stable and $\Sigma(A) = I_n + A\Sigma(A)A^\top$. If $\|A' - A\| \leq 1/(4(\|\Sigma(A)\|(1 + \|A\|)))$, then A' is stable and $\|\Sigma(A') - \Sigma(A)\| \leq 4\|\Sigma(A)\|^2(1 + \|A\|)\|A' - A\|$.

Proof: The proof follows the same vein as that of [31, Lemma 16] and is omitted for saving space. ■

1) Proof of (32). By definition, the cost can be written as

$$J_t(V'_t) = \text{Tr}((Q + K_t^\top R K_t)\Sigma_t(V'_t)) \\ C(K_t) = \text{Tr}((Q + K_t^\top R K_t)\Sigma_{K_t})$$

with $\Sigma_t(V'_t) = I_n + \bar{X}_{1,t}V'_t\Sigma_t(V'_t)(V'_t)^\top \bar{X}_{1,t}^\top$ and $\Sigma_{K_t} = I_n + (A + BK_t)\Sigma_{K_t}(A + BK_t)^\top$. Then, it holds that $|C(K_t) - J_t(V'_t)| = |\text{Tr}(Q + K_t^\top R K_t)(\Sigma_{K_t} - \Sigma_t(V'_t))| \leq J_t(V'_t)\|\Sigma_{K_t} - \Sigma_t(V'_t)\|$.

Next, we provide an upper bound for $\|\Sigma_{K_t} - \Sigma_t(V'_t)\|$ based on Lemma 15. Starting from (31), we have

$$\|A + BK_t - \bar{X}_{1,t}V'_t\| \leq \frac{2\delta}{\gamma\zeta} \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{J_t(V'_t)}{\underline{\sigma}(R)}}\right) \\ \leq \frac{\underline{\sigma}^2(Q)}{4J_t(V'_t)(\underline{\sigma}(Q) + J_t(V'_t))} \leq \frac{\underline{\sigma}(Q)}{4J_t(V'_t)(1 + \|\bar{X}_{1,t}V'_t\|)},$$

where the first inequality follows from Lemmas 5 and 11, the second from the condition on δ/γ , and the last from $\|\bar{X}_{1,t}V'_t\| \leq \|\bar{X}_{1,t}V'_t\Sigma_t^{1/2}(V'_t)\|\|\Sigma_t^{1/2}(V'_t)\| \leq \|\Sigma_t(V'_t)\| \leq J_t(V'_t)/\underline{\sigma}(Q)$.

Then, it follows from Lemma 15 that

$$\|\Sigma_{K_t} - \Sigma_t(V'_t)\| \leq 4 \left(\frac{J_t(V'_t)}{\underline{\sigma}(Q)}\right)^2 (1 + \|\bar{X}_{1,t}V'_t\|) \\ \times \|A + BK_t - \bar{X}_{1,t}V'_t\|. \quad (42)$$

Hence, the cost difference can be bounded as

$$|C(K_t) - J_t(V'_t)| \leq J_t(V'_t)\|\Sigma_{K_t} - \Sigma_t(V'_t)\| \\ \leq \left(\frac{4J_t^3(V'_t)}{\underline{\sigma}^2(Q)}\right) (1 + \|\bar{X}_{1,t}V'_t\|) \|A + BK_t - \bar{X}_{1,t}V'_t\| \\ \leq p(J_t(V'_t))\delta/(2\gamma).$$

2) Proof of (33). By definition, we have $J_{t+1}(V_{t+1}) = \text{Tr}((Q + K_t^\top R K_t)\Sigma_{t+1}(V_{t+1}))$ with $\Sigma_{t+1}(V_{t+1}) = I_n + \bar{X}_{1,t+1}V_{t+1}\Sigma_{t+1}(V_{t+1})V_{t+1}^\top \bar{X}_{1,t+1}^\top$. Then, it follows that

$|J_{t+1}(V_{t+1}) - J_t(V'_t)| = |\text{Tr}((Q + K_t^\top R K_t)(\Sigma_{t+1}(V_{t+1}) - \Sigma_t(V'_t)))| \leq J_t(V'_t) \cdot \|\Sigma_{t+1}(V_{t+1}) - \Sigma_t(V'_t)\|$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{X}_{1,t+1}V_{t+1} - \bar{X}_{1,t}V'_t\| &= \|\bar{W}_{0,t+1}V_{t+1} - \bar{W}_{0,t}V'_t\| \\ &= \left\| W_{0,t+1}D_{0,t+1}^\dagger \begin{bmatrix} K_t \\ I_n \end{bmatrix} - W_{0,t}D_{0,t}^\dagger \begin{bmatrix} K_t \\ I_n \end{bmatrix} \right\| \\ &\leq \left\| W_{0,t+1}D_{0,t+1}^\dagger - W_{0,t}D_{0,t}^\dagger \right\| (1 + \|K_t\|) \\ &\leq \frac{4\delta}{\gamma\zeta} \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{J_t(V'_t)}{\underline{\sigma}(R)}} \right) \leq \frac{\underline{\sigma}(Q)}{4J_t(V'_t)(1 + \|\bar{X}_{1,t}V'_t\|)}, \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

it follows from Lemma 15 that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Sigma_{t+1}(V_{t+1}) - \Sigma_t(V'_t)\| &\leq 4 \left(\frac{J_t(V'_t)}{\underline{\sigma}(Q)} \right)^2 (1 + \|\bar{X}_{1,t}V'_t\|) \|\bar{X}_{1,t+1}V_{t+1} - \bar{X}_{1,t}V'_t\| \\ &\leq \frac{16\delta}{\gamma\zeta} \left(\frac{J_t(V'_t)}{\underline{\sigma}(Q)} \right)^2 \left(1 + \frac{J_t(V'_t)}{\underline{\sigma}(Q)} \right) \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{J_t(V'_t)}{\underline{\sigma}(R)}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then, the cost difference can be upper-bounded as $|J_{t+1}(V_{t+1}) - J_t(V'_t)| \leq J_t(V'_t)\|\Sigma_{t+1}(V_{t+1}) - \Sigma_t(V'_t)\| \leq p(J_t(V'_t))\delta/\gamma$.

3) Proof of (34). It follows by combining (32) and (33).

C. Proof of Lemma 9

Let P^* and P_t^* be the solution to the algebraic Riccati equation of the ground-truth (A, B) and the estimated system (\hat{A}_t, \hat{B}_t) , respectively, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} P^* &= A^\top P^* A + Q - A^\top P^* B (R + B^\top P^* B)^{-1} B^\top P^* A, \\ P_t^* &= \hat{A}_t^\top P_t^* \hat{A}_t + Q - \hat{A}_t^\top P_t^* \hat{B}_t (R + \hat{B}_t^\top P_t^* \hat{B}_t)^{-1} \hat{B}_t^\top P_t^* \hat{A}_t. \end{aligned}$$

By the perturbation theory for the discrete-time Riccati equation [4, Proposition 1], there exist two constants \bar{c}_1, \bar{c}_2 depending only on A, B, Q, R , such that if $\|\hat{B}_t, \hat{A}_t\| - [B, A] \leq \bar{c}_1$, then $\|P_t^* - P^*\| \leq \bar{c}_2 \|\hat{B}_t, \hat{A}_t\| - [B, A]$. Since $\|\hat{B}_t, \hat{A}_t\| - [B, A] = \|W_{0,t}D_{0,t}^\dagger\| \leq 2\delta/(\gamma\zeta)$, it suffices to let $\delta/\gamma \leq \zeta\bar{c}_1/2 =: \zeta c_1$. Then, it follows that $\|P_t^* - P^*\| \leq \bar{c}_2 \|\hat{B}_t, \hat{A}_t\| - [B, A] \leq 2\bar{c}_2\delta/(\gamma\zeta)$. Hence, it holds that $|C_{\text{CE},t}^* - C^*| = |\text{Tr}(P_t^*) - \text{Tr}(P^*)| \leq 2\sqrt{n}\bar{c}_2\delta/(\gamma\zeta)$. By Lemma 1, it holds that $|C^* - J_t^*| = |C^* - C_{\text{CE},t}^*|$. Letting $c_2 = 2\sqrt{n}\bar{c}_2$ completes the proof.

D. Proof of Lemma 10

The proof relies on the lower bounds of the gradient dominance and smoothness constants in Lemmas 6 and 7. For brevity, let $\mu_t := \mu(J_t(V_t))$ and $l_t := l(J_t(V_t))$.

Lemma 16: For $V_t \in \mathcal{S}_t$, it holds that $l_t \geq c_3$ and $\mu_t \geq c_4$.

Proof: By definition, it holds that $J_t(V_t) \geq J_t^* \geq \underline{\sigma}(Q)$. Then, l_t and μ_t can be lower-bounded accordingly. ■

We use mathematical induction to show $J_t(V_t) \leq \bar{J}$ for $t > t_0$. We first show that it holds at $t = t_0 + 1$. Since $J_{t_0}(V'_{t_0}) = J_{t_0}^* \leq \bar{J}$, the assumption of Lemma 8 is satisfied, and $J_{t_0+1}(V_{t_0+1}) \leq J_{t_0}(V'_{t_0}) + p(J_{t_0}(V'_{t_0}))\delta/\gamma \leq J_{t_0}^* + \bar{p}\delta/\gamma$. Using the condition $\delta/\gamma \leq \eta/(2\bar{\mu}^2\bar{p})$ and Lemma 16 lead to

$$J_{t_0+1}(V_{t_0+1}) \leq J_{t_0}^* + \frac{\eta}{2\bar{\mu}^2} \leq J_{t_0}^* + \frac{1}{2\bar{l}\bar{\mu}^2} \leq J_{t_0}^* + \frac{1}{2c_3c_4^2} \leq \bar{J}.$$

Next, we assume that $J_t(V_t) \leq \bar{J}$ and show $J_{t+1}(V_{t+1}) \leq \bar{J}$. Since $J_t(V_t) \leq \bar{J}$, we have $l_t \leq \bar{l}$ and $\eta \leq 1/\bar{l} \leq 1/l_t$. Following the same vein as the proof of Theorem 1, we can show that $V'_t \in \mathcal{S}_t$ and

$$\begin{aligned} J_t(V'_t) - J_t(V_t) &\leq -\eta \left(1 - \frac{l_t\eta}{2} \right) \left\| \Pi_{\bar{X}_{0,t}} \nabla J_t(V_t) \right\|^2 \\ &\leq -\frac{\eta}{2} \left\| \Pi_{\bar{X}_{0,t}} \nabla J_t(V_t) \right\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

where the second inequality follows from $\eta \leq 1/l_t$. Hence, it holds that $J_t(V'_t) \leq J_t(V_t) \leq \bar{J}$. By Lemma 8 and our condition $\delta/\gamma \leq \eta/(2\bar{\mu}^2\bar{p})$, we have

$$J_{t+1}(V_{t+1}) - J_t(V'_t) \leq \frac{p(J_t(V'_t))\delta}{\gamma} \leq \frac{\bar{p}\delta}{\gamma} \leq \frac{\eta}{2\bar{\mu}^2}. \quad (45)$$

Combing (44) and (45) and using Lemma 6 yield

$$\begin{aligned} J_{t+1}(V_{t+1}) - J_t(V_t) &\leq \frac{\eta}{2\bar{\mu}^2} - \frac{\eta}{2} \left\| \Pi_{\bar{X}_{0,t}} \nabla J_t(V_t) \right\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\eta}{2\bar{\mu}_t^2} - \frac{\eta}{2\bar{\mu}_t^2} (J_t(V_t) - J_t^*)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

To show $J_{t+1}(V_{t+1}) \leq \bar{J}$, we consider two cases. Suppose that $J_t(V_t) \geq C^* + c_1c_2 + 1$. By Lemma 9, it holds that $|C^* - J_t^*| \leq c_2\delta/(\gamma\zeta) \leq c_1c_2$. Hence, $(J_t(V_t) - J_t^*)^2 \geq (C^* + c_1c_2 + 1 - J_t^*)^2 \geq 1$. Furthermore, (46) yields

$$J_{t+1}(V_{t+1}) \leq J_t(V_t) + \frac{\eta}{2\bar{\mu}_t^2} - \frac{\eta}{2\bar{\mu}_t^2} (J_t(V_t) - J_t^*)^2 \leq \bar{J}.$$

Otherwise, if $J_t(V_t) < C^* + c_1c_2 + 1$, then (46) yields

$$J_{t+1}(V_{t+1}) \leq J_t(V_t) + \frac{\eta}{2\bar{\mu}_t^2} \leq J_t(V_t) + \frac{1}{2c_3c_4^2} \leq \bar{J},$$

where the second inequality follows from $\eta \leq 1/\bar{l}$ and Lemma 16. Thus, the induction shows that $J_t(V_t) \leq \bar{J}$ for $t > t_0$.

It follows from (44) that $J_t(V'_t) \leq \bar{J}$ for $t > t_0$. Recalling that $J_{t_0}(V'_{t_0}) = J_{t_0}^* \leq \bar{J}$ completes the proof.

E. Proof of Theorem 2

By Lemma 10, it holds that $V'_t \in \mathcal{S}_t, \forall t \geq t_0$. Hence, the assumption of Lemma 8 is satisfied and $\{K_t\}$ is stabilizing.

It follows from $\eta \in (0, 1/\bar{l})$ and Lemma 10 that $\eta < 1/l_{t+1}$. Then, the progress of the one-step projected gradient descent in (28) leads to $J_{t+1}(V'_{t+1}) - J_{t+1}(V_{t+1}) \leq -(\eta/2\bar{\mu}_{t+1}^2)(J_{t+1}(V_{t+1}) - J_{t+1}^*)^2$. By Lemmas 8 and 10, it holds that $J_{t+1}(V_{t+1}) - J_t(V'_t) \leq p(J_t(V'_t))\delta/\gamma \leq \bar{p}\delta/\gamma$. Adding the above two inequalities on both sides and noting $\mu_t \leq \bar{\mu}$ yield

$$J_{t+1}(V'_{t+1}) - J_t(V'_t) \leq \frac{\bar{p}\delta}{\gamma} - \frac{\eta}{2\bar{\mu}^2} (J_{t+1}(V_{t+1}) - J_{t+1}^*)^2. \quad (47)$$

By Lemma 8, the left-hand side of (47) is lower-bounded:

$$J_{t+1}(V'_{t+1}) - J_t(V'_t) \geq C(K_{t+1}) - C(K_t) - \frac{\bar{p}\delta}{\gamma}. \quad (48)$$

Next, we provide a lower bound for the right-hand side of (47). For $t > t_0$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} (J_t(V_t) - J_t^*)^2 &= (J_t(V_t) - C^*)^2 + (C^* - J_t^*)^2 \\ &\quad + 2(J_t(V_t) - C^*)(C^* - J_t^*) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq (J_t(V_t) - C^*)^2 - 2|J_t(V_t) - C^*||C^* - J_t^*| \\ &\geq (J_t(V_t) - C^*)^2 - 4c_2\bar{J}\delta/\gamma\zeta, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemmas 9 and 10.

Define $e_t = C(K_t) - C^*$. Then, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} (J_t(V_t) - C^*)^2 &= (J_t(V_t) - C(K_{t-1}) + e_{t-1})^2 \\ &\geq e_{t-1}^2 - 2|J_t(V_t) - C(K_{t-1})||e_{t-1}| \\ &\geq e_{t-1}^2 - \frac{3\bar{p}\delta}{\gamma} (C(K_{t-1}) + C^*) \\ &\geq e_{t-1}^2 - \frac{3\bar{p}\delta}{\gamma} \left(J_t(V_t) + \frac{3\bar{p}\delta}{2\gamma} + C^* \right) \\ &\geq e_{t-1}^2 - \frac{3\bar{p}\delta}{\gamma} \left(\bar{J} + \frac{3}{2} \left(C^* + \frac{1}{2c_3c_4^2} \right) \right) \\ &\geq e_{t-1}^2 - \frac{15\bar{p}\bar{J}\delta}{2\gamma}, \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

where the second and the third inequalities follow from Lemma 8, and the fourth follows from

$$\bar{p}\frac{\delta}{\gamma} \leq \frac{\eta}{2\bar{\mu}^2} \leq \frac{1}{2\bar{l}\bar{\mu}^2} \leq \frac{1}{2c_3c_4^2}.$$

Then, the right-hand side of (47) can be upper-bounded by

$$-\frac{\eta}{2\bar{\mu}^2}e_t^2 + \left(\bar{p} + \frac{2\eta c_2\bar{J}}{\bar{\mu}^2\zeta} + \frac{15\eta\bar{p}\bar{J}}{4\bar{\mu}^2} \right) \frac{\delta}{\gamma}.$$

Combining (48), we yield

$$e_{t+1} - e_t \leq -\frac{\eta}{2\bar{\mu}^2}e_t^2 + \left(2\bar{p} + \frac{2\eta c_2\bar{J}}{\bar{\mu}^2\zeta} + \frac{15\eta\bar{p}\bar{J}}{4\bar{\mu}^2} \right) \frac{\delta}{\gamma}. \quad (50)$$

Let $\nu_3 = \sqrt{2\bar{\mu}^2(C(K_{t_0}) - C^*)/\eta}$ and $\nu_4 = (4\bar{p}\bar{\mu}^2/\eta + 4c_2\bar{J}/\zeta + 15\bar{p}\bar{J}/2)^{1/2}$. Rearranging (50) yields $e_t^2 \leq 2\bar{\mu}^2(e_t - e_{t+1})/\eta + \nu_4\delta/\gamma$. Summing up both sides from t_0 to t yields

$$\sum_{k=t_0}^t e_k^2 \leq \frac{2\bar{\mu}^2}{\eta} (e_{t_0} - e_{t+1}) + \frac{T\nu_4^2\delta}{\gamma} \leq \nu_3^2 + \frac{T\nu_4^2\delta}{\gamma}$$

with $T = t - t_0 + 1$. Dividing both sides by T and using the AM-GM inequality yield that

$$\text{regret}_T \leq \sqrt{\frac{\nu_3^2}{T} + \frac{\nu_4^2\delta}{\gamma}} \leq \frac{\nu_3}{\sqrt{T}} + \nu_4\sqrt{\frac{\delta}{\gamma}}.$$

Letting $\nu_1 = 1/\bar{l}$ and ν_2 be the right-hand side of (35), the proof is completed.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. D. Anderson and J. B. Moore, *Optimal control: linear quadratic methods*. Courier Corporation, 2007.
- [2] 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*. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2011, pp. 1–26.
- [3] S. Dean, H. Mania, N. Matni, B. Recht, and S. Tu, “On the sample complexity of the linear quadratic regulator,” *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 633–679, 2020.
- [4] H. Mania, S. Tu, and B. Recht, “Certainty equivalence is efficient for linear quadratic control,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 32. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019.
- [5] M. Simchowitz and D. Foster, “Naive exploration is optimal for online LQR,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 8937–8948.
- [6] M. C. Campi and P. Kumar, “Adaptive linear quadratic gaussian control: the cost-biased approach revisited,” *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 1890–1907, 1998.
- [7] F. Wang and L. Janson, “Exact asymptotics for linear quadratic adaptive control,” *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 12 136–12 247, 2021.
- [8] Y. Lu and Y. Mo, “Almost surely \sqrt{T} regret bound for adaptive LQR,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.05537*, 2023.
- [9] T. Bian and Z.-P. Jiang, “Value iteration and adaptive dynamic programming for data-driven adaptive optimal control design,” *Automatica*, vol. 71, pp. 348–360, 2016.
- [10] F. L. Lewis and D. Vrabie, “Reinforcement learning and adaptive dynamic programming for feedback control,” *IEEE Circuits and Systems Magazine*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 32–50, 2009.
- [11] F. Dörfler, “Data-driven control: Part two of two: Hot take: Why not go with models?” *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, vol. 43, no. 6, pp. 27–31, 2023.
- [12] F. Celi, G. Baggio, and F. Pasqualetti, “Closed-form and robust expressions for data-driven LQ control,” *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 56, p. 100916, 2023.
- [13] C. De Persis and P. Tesi, “Formulas for data-driven control: Stabilization, optimality, and robustness,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 65, no. 3, pp. 909–924, 2019.
- [14] —, “Low-complexity learning of linear quadratic regulators from noisy data,” *Automatica*, vol. 128, p. 109548, 2021.
- [15] F. Dörfler, P. Tesi, and C. De Persis, “On the certainty-equivalence approach to direct data-driven lqr design,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 12, pp. 7989–7996, 2023.
- [16] —, “On the role of regularization in direct data-driven LQR control,” in *61st IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2022, pp. 1091–1098.
- [17] W. Liu, G. Wang, J. Sun, F. Bullo, and J. Chen, “Learning robust data-based LQG controllers from noisy data,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, pp. 1–13, 2024, Early Access.
- [18] I. Markovskiy, L. Huang, and F. Dörfler, “Data-driven control based on the behavioral approach: From theory to applications in power systems,” *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, vol. 43, no. 5, pp. 28–68, 2023.
- [19] J. C. Willems, P. Rapisarda, I. Markovskiy, and B. L. De Moor, “A note on persistency of excitation,” *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 54, no. 4, pp. 325–329, 2005.
- [20] I. Markovskiy and F. Dörfler, “Behavioral systems theory in data-driven analysis, signal processing, and control,” *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 52, pp. 42–64, 2021.
- [21] J. Coulson, J. Lygeros, and F. Dörfler, “Data-enabled predictive control: In the shallows of the DeepPC,” in *18th European Control Conference (ECC)*, 2019, pp. 307–312.
- [22] V. Breschi, A. Chiuso, and S. Formentin, “Data-driven predictive control in a stochastic setting: a unified framework,” *Automatica*, vol. 152, p. 110961, 2023.
- [23] A. Chiuso, M. Fabris, V. Breschi, and S. Formentin, “Harnessing the final control error for optimal data-driven predictive control,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.14788*, 2023.
- [24] H. J. van Waarde, M. K. Camlibel, and M. Mesbahi, “From noisy data to feedback controllers: Nonconservative design via a matrix S-lemma,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 67, no. 1, pp. 162–175, 2020.
- [25] J. Berberich, C. W. Scherer, and F. Allgöwer, “Combining prior knowledge and data for robust controller design,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 8, pp. 4618–4633, 2023.
- [26] A. M. Annaswamy, “Adaptive control and intersections with reinforcement learning,” *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, vol. 6, pp. 65–93, 2023.
- [27] H. P. Whitaker, J. Yamron, and A. Kezer, *Design of model-reference adaptive control systems for aircraft*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Instrumentation Laboratory, 1958.
- [28] P. Makila and H. Toivonen, “Computational methods for parametric LQ problems – A survey,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 32, no. 8, pp. 658–671, 1987.
- [29] R. E. Kalman *et al.*, “Contributions to the theory of optimal control,” *Bol. soc. mat. mexicana*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 102–119, 1960.
- [30] K. Mårtensson and A. Rantzer, “Gradient methods for iterative distributed control synthesis,” in *Proceedings of the 48th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC) held jointly with 2009 28th Chinese Control Conference*, 2009, pp. 549–554.
- [31] 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*, 2018, pp. 1467–1476.

- [32] H. Mohammadi, A. Zare, M. Soltanolkotabi, and M. R. Jovanović, “Convergence and sample complexity of gradient methods for the model-free linear quadratic regulator problem,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 67, no. 5, pp. 2435–2450, 2022.
- [33] D. Malik, A. Pananjady, K. Bhatia, K. Khamaru, P. Bartlett, and M. Wainwright, “Derivative-free methods for policy optimization: Guarantees for linear quadratic systems,” in *22nd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2019, pp. 2916–2925.
- [34] F. Zhao, K. You, and T. Başar, “Global convergence of policy gradient primal-dual methods for risk-constrained LQRs,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 5, pp. 2934–2949, 2023.
- [35] F. Zhao, X. Fu, and K. You, “Convergence and sample complexity of policy gradient methods for stabilizing linear systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, pp. 1–12, 2024, early access.
- [36] B. Hu, K. Zhang, N. Li, M. Mesbahi, M. Fazel, and T. Başar, “Toward a theoretical foundation of policy optimization for learning control policies,” *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, vol. 6, pp. 123–158, 2023.
- [37] F. Zhao, F. Dörfler, and K. You, “Data-enabled policy optimization for the linear quadratic regulator,” in *62nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2023, pp. 6160–6165.
- [38] T. Kailath, A. H. Sayed, and B. Hassibi, *Linear estimation*. Prentice Hall, 2000.
- [39] A. Rantzer, “A data-driven Riccati equation,” in *6th Annual Learning for Dynamics & Control Conference*. PMLR, 2024, pp. 504–513.
- [40] —, “Minimax adaptive control for a finite set of linear systems,” in *Learning for Dynamics and Control*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 893–904.
- [41] B. Song and A. Iannelli, “The role of identification in data-driven policy iteration: A system theoretic study,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.06721*, 2024.
- [42] G. Zames, “Adaptive control: Towards a complexity-based general theory,” *Automatica*, vol. 34, no. 10, pp. 1161–1167, 1998.
- [43] E. Hazan *et al.*, “Introduction to online convex optimization,” *Foundations and Trends® in Optimization*, vol. 2, no. 3–4, pp. 157–325, 2016.
- [44] H. J. Van Waarde, J. Eising, H. L. Trentelman, and M. K. Camlibel, “Data informativity: a new perspective on data-driven analysis and control,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 65, no. 11, pp. 4753–4768, 2020.
- [45] S. Kang and K. You, “Minimum input design for direct data-driven property identification of unknown linear systems,” *Automatica*, vol. 156, p. 111130, 2023.
- [46] Y. Sun and M. Fazel, “Analysis of policy gradient descent for control: Global optimality via convex parameterization,” [Online], Available at <https://github.com/sunyue93/Nonconvex-optimization-meets-control/blob/master/convexify.pdf>.
- [47] J. Coulson, H. J. Van Waarde, J. Lygeros, and F. Dörfler, “A quantitative notion of persistency of excitation and the robust fundamental lemma,” *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 7, pp. 1243–1248, 2022.
- [48] A. Cohen, A. Hasidim, T. Koren, N. Lazić, Y. Mansour, and K. Talwar, “Online linear quadratic control,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2018, pp. 1029–1038.
- [49] J. Sherman and W. J. Morrison, “Adjustment of an inverse matrix corresponding to a change in one element of a given matrix,” *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 124–127, 1950.
- [50] A. Tsiamis, I. Ziemann, N. Matni, and G. J. Pappas, “Statistical learning theory for control: A finite-sample perspective,” *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, vol. 43, no. 6, pp. 67–97, 2023.
- [51] S. Tu and B. Recht, “The gap between model-based and model-free methods on the linear quadratic regulator: An asymptotic viewpoint,” in *Conference on Learning Theory*, 2019, pp. 3036–3083.



Feiran Zhao received the B.S. degree in Control Science and Engineering from the Harbin Institute of Technology, China, in 2018, and the Ph.D. degree in Control Science and Engineering from the Tsinghua University, China, in 2024. He held a visiting position at ETH Zürich. His research interests include policy optimization, data-driven control, adaptive control and their applications.



Florian Dörfler is a Full Professor at the Automatic Control Laboratory at ETH Zürich. He received his Ph.D. degree in Mechanical Engineering from the University of California at Santa Barbara in 2013, and a Diplom degree in Engineering Cybernetics from the University of Stuttgart in 2008. From 2013 to 2014 he was an Assistant Professor at the University of California Los Angeles. He has been serving as the Associate Head of the ETH Zürich Department of Information Technology and Electrical Engineering from 2021 until 2022. His research interests are centered around automatic control, system theory, and optimization. His particular foci are on network systems, data-driven settings, and applications to power systems. He is a recipient of the distinguished young research awards by IFAC (Manfred Thoma Medal 2020) and EUCA (European Control Award 2020). His students were winners or finalists for Best Student Paper awards at the European Control Conference (2013, 2019), the American Control Conference (2016, 2024), the Conference on Decision and Control (2020), the PES General Meeting (2020), the PES PowerTech Conference (2017), the International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (2021), and the IEEE CSS Swiss Chapter Young Author Best Journal Paper Award (2022, 2024). He is furthermore a recipient of the 2010 ACC Student Best Paper Award, the 2011 O. Hugo Schuck Best Paper Award, the 2012–2014 Automatica Best Paper Award, the 2016 IEEE Circuits and Systems Guillemín-Cauer Best Paper Award, the 2022 IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics Prize Paper Award, and the 2015 UCSB ME Best PhD award. He is currently serving on the council of the European Control Association and as a senior editor of *Automatica*.



Alessandro Chiuso (Fellow, IEEE) is Professor with the Department of Information Engineering, Università di Padova. He received the “Laurea” degree summa cum laude in Telecommunication Engineering from the University of Padova in July 1996 and the Ph.D. degree (Dottorato di ricerca) in System Engineering from the University of Bologna in 2000. He has been a visiting scholar with the Dept. of Electrical Engineering, Washington University St. Louis and Post-Doctoral fellow with the Dept. Mathematics, Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden. He joined the University of Padova as an Assistant Professor in 2001, Associate Professor in 2006 and then Full Professor since 2017. He currently serves as Editor (System Identification and Filtering) for *Automatica*. He has served as an Associate Editor for *Automatica*, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, *European Journal of Control* and *MCSS*. He is chair of the IFAC Coordinating Committee on Signals and Systems. He has been General Chair of the IFAC Symposium on System Identification, 2021 and he is a Fellow of IEEE (Class 2022). His research interests are mainly at the intersection of Machine Learning, Estimation, Identification and their Applications, Computer Vision and Networked Estimation and Control.



Keyou You received the B.S. degree in Statistical Science from Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, China, in 2007 and the Ph.D. degree in Electrical and Electronic Engineering from Nanyang Technological University (NTU), Singapore, in 2012. After briefly working as a Research Fellow at NTU, he joined Tsinghua University in Beijing, China where he is now a Full Professor in the Department of Automation. He held visiting positions at Politecnico di Torino, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, University of Melbourne and etc.

Prof. You’s research interests focus on the intersections between control, optimization and learning as well as their applications in autonomous systems. He received the Guan Zhaozhi award at the 29th Chinese Control Conference in 2010 and the ACA (Asian Control Association) Temasek Young Educator Award in 2019. He received the National Science Funds for Excellent Young Scholars in 2017, and for Distinguished Young Scholars in 2023. Currently, he is an Associate Editor for *Automatica*, *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, and *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*.