

Learning Unstable Continuous-Time Stochastic Linear Control Systems

Reza Sadeghi Hafshejani, Mohamad Kazem Shirani Faradonbeh

Abstract

We study the problem of system identification for stochastic continuous-time dynamics, based on a single finite-length state trajectory. We present a method for estimating the possibly unstable open-loop matrix by employing properly randomized control inputs. Then, we establish theoretical performance guarantees showing that the estimation error decays with trajectory length, a measure of excitability, and the signal-to-noise ratio, while it grows with dimension. Numerical illustrations that showcase the rates of learning the dynamics, will be provided as well. To perform the theoretical analysis, we develop new technical tools that are of independent interest. That includes non-asymptotic stochastic bounds for highly non-stationary martingales and generalized laws of iterated logarithms, among others.

Index Terms

Unstable Dynamics, Random Input, Single Trajectory, Estimation Rates, Finite-time Learning

I. INTRODUCTION

Stochastic linear dynamical systems are powerful models for capturing the evolutions of random environments. They appear frequently in various areas such as portfolio optimization [1], algorithmic trading [2], and quantitative biology [3]. In many applications, there are non-negligible uncertainties about the system dynamics, necessitating it to be learned by interacting with the environment [4], [5]. Practically speaking, the above learning of the system dynamics can use the data of a single state trajectory, which is

presumably unstable in the sense that the state variables suffer from big fluctuations and have increasing magnitudes over time. In the sequel, we elaborate both the causes and consequences of such instabilities, as well as their effects on system identification.

Unstable linear dynamical systems inevitably arise in engineering and biology [6]–[9], among others. For example, (nuclear) reactors that are preferred to operate stably for long periods of time, can become unstable due to structural breaks or adversarial attacks [6], [7]. So, the issue needs to be identified and addressed according to a *shortest-possible* state trajectory [6], [7]. In microbiology, a tumor can be viewed as a dynamical system, where the metastatic cancer cells are associated with loss of stability [8]. Therefore, accurate estimation of system dynamics becomes crucial for understanding the main causes of the disease. Furthermore, in such systems, the identification needs to be performed based on a *single* state trajectory, since the underlying patient dynamics or the reactor breaks, both are highly likely to be idiosyncratic [6], [10].

The problem of system identification is conventionally studied for stable discrete-time dynamics. Both asymptotic [11]–[14] and non-asymptotic results on the estimation errors are established for a single system [15], [16], or a family of multiple related systems [17]. On the other hand, the latest findings on unstable system identification indicate that learning under instability can be essentially different in terms of technical challenges for establishing performance guarantees, the rates at which the estimation error decays, and the minimal assumptions for consistency [18]–[21].

For continuous-time stochastic systems, the literature is significantly sparser. Early works establish bounds on the estimation error after infinite-time interactions with the system [22]–[26]. More recent studies, extend these asymptotic results on estimation errors in both online [27] and offline settings [28]. To the authors' knowledge, there are only two papers on non-asymptotic learning of unstable continuous-time systems [29], [30]. The former builds its estimation upon multiple independent system trajectories, while the latter adopts a Bayesian approach without providing a comprehensive analysis of sample complexities. That is, there are currently no theoretical results for *finite-time* identification of an unstable system, especially when it comes to fully specifying effects of all the model parameters on the quality of estimation. Filling this gap is adopted as the focus of this work. We present a comprehensive study that includes the effects of all the model parameters on the estimation error, without any assumptions on the eigen-structure of the continuous-time dynamics matrix.

From the control theory viewpoint, an accurate estimation of the underlying unstable system is necessary

before that any attempts at employing a control policy can be made [4], [5]. Therefore, having finite-time error bounds with theoretical guarantees is vital for any reliable interaction with dynamical systems. More precisely, a stable linear system can operate for extended periods of time without any issue (e.g., state explosion), clearly because the stability precludes excessively large state vectors. However, when a continuous-time linear system is unstable (in the sense of open-loop matrix having eigenvalues of positive real-parts), the state variables grow exponentially fast as time proceeds [31]. This makes guaranteed estimation significantly more difficult, and raises the need for development of new methods for input design, as well as new technical tools for performance analysis.

We establish finite-time error bounds for estimating the dynamics matrix based on a single realization of the system trajectory. We show how the estimation error scales with time, state dimension, magnitude of the control action, a measure of excitability, and finally the eigen-structure of the underlying open-loop dynamics matrix. Our analysis shows that when the system is (*marginally*) *stable*, the squared estimation error decays linearly with time (apart from to a logarithmic factor). In *unstable* systems, estimation of unexcited dynamics can be inconsistent no matter how long the trajectory grows. To address that, we apply moderately large random control inputs to ensure signal-strength in all directions of the state space, and theoretically prove that it leads to accurate estimates. In all cases, we show that the estimation error increases with signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) and with the square-root of dimension.

To establish non-asymptotic error bounds in unstable continuous-time systems, several technical challenges must be addressed. First, instabilities (as well as marginal stabilities) induce very strong statistical dependence between every two samples from the state trajectory. Note that when the system is stable, such dependencies are weak and temporary, as the stable dynamics makes them diminish fast as time proceeds. However, unstable dynamics exacerbate the influence of every state vector on the future samples. In other words, unstable systems possess an amplifying long-term memory. Accordingly, the conventional probabilistic techniques (e.g., concentration inequalities) [29], [32] fail to effectively work, necessitating development of new techniques. Furthermore, another widely-used approach for uniformly bounding the stochastic signals via union bounds is inapplicable due to having an uncountable index set. Finally, whenever the system has both (marginally) stable and unstable modes, the strongest and weakest signals grow at very different rates with time. Specifically, since the former (latter) grows exponentially (linearly) with time, this rapid disparity between signal modes quickly renders the identification ill-conditioned [18], [33].

In order to overcome these challenges, we establish useful representations of estimation error in terms of the sample covariance matrix of the state trajectory. Then, we prove tight deterministic upper- and lower-bounds for that matrix. Further, we generalize the existing results to matrix-valued self-normalized continuous-time martingales. The technical novelties also include uniformly bounding state magnitudes, and are obtained by leveraging several tools such as uniform bounds for Wiener processes, rescaled time indices [34], specifying the effect of eigenvalues and eigenspaces of the true open-loop dynamics, and a finite-time law of iterated logarithm [35]. The authors expect these technicalities to be of broader interests, and provide further details in the proofs of the main and auxiliary results.

This paper is organized as follows. In section II we formulate the problem, while Section III contains design of the input and estimator. Section IV presents the main results, and is followed by the proof and some intermediate results in Section V. Finally, Section VI presents numerical illustrations. Due to space constraints, technical proofs and further auxiliary lemmas are presented in the appendices VIII.

Notation and Terminology: For a matrix A , A^\top denotes its transpose. For $A \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$, let $\bar{\lambda}_1(A), \dots, \bar{\lambda}_p(A)$ denote its (possibly repetitive) eigenvalues and let $\lambda_1(A), \dots, \lambda_p(A)$ be their respective ordered real-parts. That is, $\lambda_i(A) = \Re(\bar{\lambda}_i(A))$, $i = 1, \dots, p$, where $\Re(\cdot)$ denotes the real-part of a complex number, and it holds that $\lambda_1(A) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_p(A)$. Matrix A is said to be stable if $\lambda_1(A) < 0$, marginally stable if $\lambda_1(A) = 0$, and unstable otherwise. When clear from the context, we drop the argument and represent the eigenvalue real parts as $\lambda_i, \dots, \lambda_p$. For an integer n , \mathbb{I}_n denotes the identity matrix of dimension n . For a positive semidefinite matrix P , its Moore-Penrose generalized inverse is denoted as P^\dagger , and we use $\lambda_{\max}(P)$ and $\lambda_{\min}(P)$ to refer to the largest and smallest eigenvalues. For two symmetric matrices P and Q , we write $P \preceq Q$ whenever $Q - P$ is positive semidefinite. For a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $\|v\|_q$ is the ℓ_q norm of v . Finally, we define the matrix operator norm $\|A\|_q = \sup_{v \neq 0} \|Av\|_q / \|v\|_q$.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

We consider a linear control system, whose evolution is given by the Ito stochastic differential equation

$$dX_t = (A_* X_t + B_* U_t)dt + C d\mathbb{W}_t, \quad (1)$$

starting from an arbitrary initial state $X_0 \in \mathbb{R}^p$. The matrices $A_* \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$, and $C \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times r}$ are the unknown open-loop dynamics matrix and the unknown noise coefficients matrix, respectively, while the input matrix $B_* \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$ is assumed to be known. Moreover, \mathbb{W}_t is a r -dimensional Wiener process on the probability

space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. That is, Ω is the sample space, $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \in [0, \infty]}$ is a family of non-decreasing sigma-algebras with respect to which all the random processes are measurable, and \mathbb{P} is the probability measure. Further, for any positive integer n , a Weiner process \mathbb{W}_t of dimension n satisfies (i) $\mathbb{W}_0 = 0_n$, almost surely, and (ii) \mathbb{W} has independent multivariate Gaussian increments. That is, for $t_2 > t_1 \geq 0$, the displacement $\mathbb{W}_{t_2} - \mathbb{W}_{t_1}$ is independent of \mathcal{F}_{t_1} , and $\mathbb{W}_{t_2} - \mathbb{W}_{t_1} \sim \mathbb{N}(0_n, (t_2 - t_1) \mathbb{I}_n)$.

The goal is to show that through *proper design* of the input U_t , we can prove *finite-time error bounds* for recovering the unknown dynamics matrix A_* from a single state trajectory. To proceed, we express the following assumption.

Assumption 1: We assume that $B_* B_*^\top$ is positive definite, and denote its smallest eigenvalue by $c = \lambda_{\min}(B_* B_*^\top)$.

Remark 1: The above assumption is adopted in the existing literature [36], [37], [38]. It is a stronger notion of controllability (i.e., positiveness of controllability Gramian [39]), that we adopt for the ease of presentation in quantifying the effects of all involved parameters on the estimation error. However, relaxing this assumption to controllability is a matter of technicality, for which the details are left to a future work.

III. DESIGN OF EXOGENOUS INPUT AND ESTIMATOR

A. Exogenous Input

In this subsection, we discuss the design of the exogenous input. First, we apply a stochastic control input U_t to the system that will be fully specified shortly, and solve the differential equation (1) for that. Upon this construction, in the next subsection we build a least-squares estimator \widehat{A}_T for the dynamics matrix A_* . Analysis of this two-fold procedure will be presented in the next section, where we establish high probability error bounds. Let us proceed by defining

$$Y_t = e^{-A_* t} X_t. \quad (2)$$

Since according to Ito calculus, the product of two differentials vanishes [40], we obtain the following for Y_t

$$dY_t = -e^{A_* t} A_* X_t dt + e^{-A_* t} dX_t. \quad (3)$$

Now, replace (1) in (3), to get

$$dY_t = e^{-A_*t} B_* U_t dt + e^{-A_*t} C d\mathbb{W}_t. \quad (4)$$

Therefore, the fundamental theorem of calculus yields to

$$Y_t = Y_0 + \int_0^t e^{-A_*s} B_* U_s ds + \int_0^t e^{-A_*s} C d\mathbb{W}_s. \quad (5)$$

Using $Y_0 = X_0$, together with (2) and (5), and finally by multiplying both sides by e^{A_*t} , we obtain the solution

$$X_t = e^{A_*t} X_0 + \int_0^t e^{A_*(t-s)} B_* U_s ds + \int_0^t e^{A_*(t-s)} C d\mathbb{W}_s. \quad (6)$$

Then, to precisely design the control input U_t , let

$$U_s = \kappa \frac{d\mathbb{U}_s}{ds}, \quad (7)$$

where $\mathbb{U}_s \in \mathbb{R}^q$ is a q -dimensional Wiener process independent of the r -dimensional stochastic disturbance \mathbb{W}_s . In other words, U_s is the product of a scalar $\kappa \geq 1$ and a q -dimensional white noise $d\mathbb{U}_s/ds$ [41], [42]. Plugging into (6), we get

$$X_t = e^{A_*t} X_0 + \kappa \int_0^t e^{A_*(t-s)} B_* d\mathbb{U}_s + \int_0^t e^{A_*(t-s)} C d\mathbb{W}_s. \quad (8)$$

So, the second term above becomes an Ito integral (similar to the third term) [41]. Additional formal technicalities in the above derivation as well as the definition of U_s in (7), fall beyond the scope of this work and can be found in the relevant literature on generalized derivatives of Wiener processes [41], [42].

The two stochastic integrals on the right hand side of (8) possess conceptually different roles in our setting because by the definition, the disturbance noise \mathbb{W}_s is unobservable, while we have a full knowledge of the Wiener *signal* \mathbb{U}_s that we design and apply to the system as the control action. We leverage this knowledge in the design of the estimator in the next subsection.

B. Least Squares Estimator

The objective is to find an estimator which minimizes the total sum of squares, i.e., the aggregated deviations of the predicted Ito differential form from the actually observed one, as elaborated below. To

proceed, note that by plugging U_t in (7) into the dynamics equation (1), we have

$$dX_t = A_* X_t dt + \kappa B_* dU_t + C dW_t. \quad (9)$$

Therefore, for $A \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$, we define the loss function as

$$\mathcal{L}_T(A) = \int_0^T \left\| \frac{dX_t}{dt} - \kappa B_* \frac{dU_t}{dt} - AX_t \right\|_2^2 dt. \quad (10)$$

So, after solving for a matrix A that minimizes $\mathcal{L}_T(A)$, the least-squares estimate of A_* will be

$$\widehat{A}_T = \left[\int_0^T X_t (dX_t - \kappa B_* dU_t)^\top \right]^\top \left[\int_0^T X_t X_t^\top dt \right]^\dagger.$$

A slightly more precise derivation of the above estimate according to the Riemann definition of the integral in (10) is available in the literature [27], [43].

Later on, we show that the first matrix on the right hand side of (11) is invertible for T being sufficiently large. Therefore, for all such T , \widehat{A}_T can be equivalently written as

$$\widehat{A}_T = \left[\int_0^T X_t (dX_t - \kappa B_* dU_t)^\top \right]^\top \left[\int_0^T X_t X_t^\top dt \right]^{-1}. \quad (11)$$

IV. MAIN RESULTS

After doing some algebra, since A_* satisfies (9), the error of the estimate in (11) can be written as follows:

$$\widehat{A}_T - A_* = C \left[\int_0^T X_t dW_t^\top \right]^\top \left[\int_0^T X_t X_t^\top dt \right]^{-1}. \quad (12)$$

Thus, the analysis of the estimator heavily relies on the following two random matrices. First, the sample covariance matrix

$$V_T = \int_0^T X_t X_t^\top dt, \quad (13)$$

and second, the matrix-valued martingale

$$S_T = \int_0^T X_t dW_t^\top. \quad (14)$$

In the sequel, we establish tight bounds on V_T , and S_T (after being self-normalized by V_T), leading to the following bound for $\widehat{A}_T - A_*$.

Theorem 1: For any $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have

$$\left\| \widehat{A}_T - A_* \right\|_2^2 = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{p \|C\|_2^2 (\log T - \log \delta)}{cT\kappa^2} \right), \quad (15)$$

when A_* is stable,

$$\left\| \widehat{A}_T - A_* \right\|_2^2 = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{p^2 \|C\|_2^2 (\log T - \log \delta)}{cT\kappa^2} \right), \quad (16)$$

when A_* is marginally stable, and whenever A_* is unstable,

$$\left\| \widehat{A}_T - A_* \right\|_2^2 = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{p \|C\|_2^2 (T - \log \delta)}{cT\kappa^2} \right). \quad (17)$$

Theorem 1 states that the estimation error scales with p when A_* is marginally stable and with \sqrt{p} when it is not. Moreover, the error scales with $\|C\|_2/\kappa$, which is the inverse of the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR). Further, it shows that when the system is (marginally) stable, the estimator (11) has square-root consistency up to a logarithmic factor. However, when the system is unstable, a larger value for κ is needed to ensure an estimation error of the conventional square-root decay rate; $\kappa = \sqrt{T}$ guarantees that, according to (17). In general, a larger value for κ leads to a faster decay rate of the estimation error. However, larger values for κ leads to larger X_t which defeats the purpose [32], [44]. Therefore, κ cannot be excessively large.

Next, we define the size of the largest block in the Jordan decomposition of the open-loop matrix; $A_* = P^{-1}\Lambda P$. That is, Λ is block-diagonal with blocks $\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_k$, each Jordan block Λ_i being a matrix of size l_i for the eigenvalue $\bar{\lambda}_i$:

$$\Lambda = \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & \Lambda_k \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Lambda_i = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\lambda}_i & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{\lambda}_i & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \bar{\lambda}_i \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then, let the size of the largest Jordan block be

$$l^* = \max \{l_i, i = 1, \dots, k\}. \quad (18)$$

Remark 2: When the system is marginally stable, we can replace the factor p^2 in (16) with l^*p , where l^* is defined in (18), and in the worst case (that Λ has only one block) is p .

V. PROOF OF THE THEOREM AND AUXILIARY LEMMAS

In this section, we first present three lemmas which constitute the building blocks for the proof of Theorem 1. Then, we employ these intermediate results for completing the proof. Proofs of the following auxiliary lemmas are lengthy, involves extensive technical details, relies on further intermediate results, and so are delegated to the supplementary materials.

Lemma 1 establishes high-probability upper-bounds for continuous-time matrix-valued self-normalized martingales.

Lemma 1: Let V_T and S_T be as in (13) and (14), respectively. Further, define $\bar{V}_T = V_T + V$, where V is an arbitrary positive definite matrix. Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\left\| \bar{V}_T^{-\frac{1}{2}} S_T \right\|_2^2 < 8 \log \left(\frac{12^r \det(\bar{V}_T)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\delta \det(V)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \text{ for all } T \geq 0.$$

The next lemma provides a high probability upper-bound for the sample covariance matrix.

Lemma 2: Let l^* and κ be as in (18) and (7) respectively. For $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have

$$\lambda_{\max}(V_T) = \mathcal{O} \left((p\kappa^2 T^{2l^*} e^{2\lambda_1(A_*)T} + \kappa^2 T) \log \frac{T}{\delta} \right). \quad (19)$$

Note that based on this lemma, when A_* is unstable, the largest eigenvalue of V_T grows exponentially fast with time, specifically as $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^2 T^{2l^*} e^{2\lambda_1(A_*)T})$. However, in stable and marginally stable systems, the growth is polynomial and linear, i.e., with the rates $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^2 T^{2l^*})$ and $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^2 T)$, respectively.

Next Lemma gives a lower bound for the sample covariance matrix V_T in (13).


Lemma 3: In stable, marginally stable, and unstable systems, and for any $\delta > 0$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds that

$$\lambda_{\max}(V_T^{-1}) = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{cT\kappa^2} \right).$$

A. Proof of Theorem 1

Let V_T , S_T be as in (13), (14), and define

$$\bar{V}_T = V_T + \mathbb{I}_p. \quad (20)$$



(a) Estimation error amplified by a \sqrt{T} factor vs T , for a stable system with $\kappa = 1$. (b) Estimation error amplified by \sqrt{T} vs T , for a marginally stable system with $\kappa = 2$. (c) Estimation error amplified by a \sqrt{T} factor vs T , for an unstable system with $\kappa = 5$.

Fig. 1: Multiple realizations of properly scaled estimation errors are illustrated versus the length of the state trajectory, for stable, marginally stable, and unstable systems. Further, by comparing the graphs, we see that the compromised estimation caused by system instability can be compensated by increasing κ ; i.e., by employing larger random input signals.

Clearly, for the estimation error in (12), it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
 A_*^\top - \widehat{A}_T^\top &= V_T^{-1} S_T C^\top \\
 &= V_T^{-1} (V_T + \mathbb{I}_p)^{\frac{1}{2}} \overline{V}_T^{-\frac{1}{2}} S_T C^\top \\
 &= (V_T^{-1} + V_T^{-2})^{\frac{1}{2}} \overline{V}_T^{-\frac{1}{2}} S_T C^\top.
 \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Next, we have the following inequality

$$(V_T^{-1} + V_T^{-2})^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq V_T^{-\frac{1}{2}} + V_T^{-1}. \tag{22}$$

Note that the above is implied by

$$(V_T^{-\frac{1}{2}} + V_T^{-1})^2 = V_T^{-1} + V_T^{-2} + 2V_T^{-\frac{3}{2}},$$

because the last term in the latter inequality is a positive semidefinite matrix. Therefore, (21) together with (22), lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
 \left\| \widehat{A}_T - A_* \right\|_2 &\leq \left\| (V_T^{-1} + V_T^{-2})^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_2 \left\| \overline{V}_T^{-\frac{1}{2}} S_T \right\|_2 \left\| C \right\|_2 \\
 &\leq \left\| V_T^{-\frac{1}{2}} + V_T^{-1} \right\|_2 \left\| \overline{V}_T^{-\frac{1}{2}} S_T \right\|_2 \left\| C \right\|_2.
 \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

So, by applying the triangle inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \widehat{A}_T - A_* \right\|_2 &\leq \left\| V_T^{-1} \right\|_2 \left\| \overline{V}_T^{-1} S_T \right\|_2 \left\| C \right\|_2 \\ &\quad + \left\| V_T^{-1} \right\|_2 \left\| \overline{V}_T^{-1} S_T \right\|_2 \left\| C \right\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

When T is large enough, according to Lemma 3, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds that

$$\left\| \widehat{A}_T - A_* \right\|_2 \leq 2 \left\| V_T^{-1} \right\|_2 \left\| \overline{V}_T^{-1} S_T \right\|_2 \left\| C \right\|_2. \quad (24)$$

We bound the first term on the right hand side of (24) using Lemma 3, and leverage Lemma 1 to upper-bound the second term. Thus, with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$, we have

$$\left\| \widehat{A}_T - A_* \right\|_2 = \mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\left\| C \right\|_2^2}{cT\kappa^2}} \sqrt{\log \frac{12^r (\lambda_{\max}(V_T))^{\frac{p}{2}}}{\delta}} \right).$$

Note that p and r have the same order of magnitude. Thus, by expanding the logarithm, the above estimation error bound becomes

$$\mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\frac{p \left\| C \right\|_2^2 (\log(\lambda_{\max}(V_T)) - \log \delta)}{cT\kappa^2}} \right). \quad (25)$$

When A_* is stable, we have the following bound from Lemma 2, and its subsequent discussion, with probability at least $1 - \delta$:

$$\log \lambda_{\max}(V_T) = \mathcal{O}(\log T - \log \delta). \quad (26)$$

Therefore, in this case, by combining (25) and (26), we get the desired error bound in (15).

On the other hand, when A_* is marginally stable, Lemma (2) indicates that with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have

$$\log \lambda_{\max}(V_T) = \mathcal{O}(l^* \log T - \log \delta), \quad (27)$$

where l^* is defined in (18), and as explained in the Remark 2, can be as large as the dimension p . Thus, in this case, we get the rate in (16) by putting (25) and (27) together.

Finally, Lemma 2 show that when A_* is unstable, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds that

$$\log \lambda_{\max}(V_T) = \mathcal{O}(T - \log \delta), \quad (28)$$

which together with (25) gives the high-probability bound in (17), and so completes the proof.

VI. NUMERICAL ILLUSTRATIONS

Next, we perform numerical simulations to illustrate the result of Theorem 1. To that end, we use an exemplary linear dynamical system representing a nuclear reactor [45], whose open-loop dynamics matrix is

$$A_* = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 & -z \\ 2 & -2 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 & -3 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The parameter z can take different values determining (in)stability of the system. When $z = 5$, all the eigenvalues of the dynamics matrix are on the left hand side of the complex plane with largest eigenvalue real-part being $\lambda_1(A_*) = -0.3928$. However, $z = 10$ and $z = 15$, yield marginally stable and unstable systems, with the largest eigenvalue real-parts $\lambda_1(A_*) = 0$ and $\lambda_1(A_*) = 0.2779$, respectively.

We let the input and noise coefficients matrices B_* and C both be $1/5 \times \mathbb{I}_3$, where \mathbb{I}_3 is the 3×3 identity matrix. For each system, we run 20 independent trajectories for 50 seconds, starting from a random initial state X_0 . When the dynamics matrix A_* is stable, we choose $\kappa = 1$, while for marginally stable and unstable A_* , we select $\kappa = 2$ and $\kappa = 5$, respectively.

The estimation is performed at integer times $T = 1, \dots, 50$, according to (11). Figures 1a, 1b, and 1c, show the (properly normalized) estimation error in the three different regimes of (in)stability, versus time. That is, the horizontal axes represent T , while the vertical axes depict the value of $\sqrt{T} \left\| \widehat{A}_T - A_* \right\|_2$. All the 20 trajectories are plotted in the graphs to illustrate the high probability nature of the results in Theorem 1. When the system matrix is stable, $\kappa = 1$ is sufficiently large to have square-root consistency for estimator (11). However, under unstable dynamics a larger κ ensures accuracy of learning the dynamics matrix as established in the third result of Theorem 1, and is shown in Figures 1b, 1c.

VII. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

We study system identification in linear dynamical systems that evolve in continuous-time according to stochastic differential equations. The setting involves only one trajectory of the state vectors and does not assume any form of stability for system dynamics, rendering guaranteed learning under instability a key technical challenge. We propose an applicable estimation method based on least-squares estimates together with randomized control inputs.

Then, we establish performance guarantees by quantifying the decay rates of estimation error as the length of the trajectory grows. All different regimes of stability are considered so that the open-loop

dynamics can be (marginally) stable or unstable. We also provide effects of the following parameters on the quality of system identification: dimensions, signal-to-noise ratios, magnitudes of stochastic control inputs, and eigenvalues and eigenspaces of the matrix governing the system dynamics.

Importantly, this work specifies the extent to which one can address consistency issues caused by system instability, through effective and easy-to-implement designs of the control inputs. Furthermore, the technical framework we develop for theoretical analysis of the identification performance are applicable to a wide range of problems. Accordingly, the presented approach can be extended to a family of relevant problems that constitute interesting subjects for future work. That includes problems involving identification of both the input and state-transition matrices, as well as extensions to systems of slower excitations, higher order differential equations, and positive-definite controllability Grammians.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Wang and X. Y. Zhou, "Continuous-time mean–variance portfolio selection: A reinforcement learning framework," *Mathematical Finance*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 1273–1308, 2020.
- [2] A. Cartea, S. Jaimungal, and J. Ricci, "Algorithmic trading, stochastic control, and mutually exciting processes," *SIAM review*, vol. 60, no. 3, pp. 673–703, 2018.
- [3] R. Bailo, M. Bongini, J. A. Carrillo, and D. Kalise, "Optimal consensus control of the cuckoo-smale model," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 51, no. 13, pp. 1–6, 2018.
- [4] P. Caines and S. Lafortune, "Adaptive control with recursive identification for stochastic linear systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 312–321, 1984.
- [5] I. Rusnak and A. Guez, "Optimal adaptive control of uncertain stochastic linear systems," in *Proceedings of 1995 American Control Conference-ACC'95*, vol. 4. IEEE, 1995, pp. 2520–2524.
- [6] A. Simorgh, A. Razminia, and V. I. Shiryayev, "System identification and control design of a nonlinear continuously stirred tank reactor," *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation*, vol. 173, pp. 16–31, 2020.
- [7] H. Anglart, *Nuclear reactor dynamics and stability*. KTH Royal Institute of Technology, 2011.
- [8] F. Grizzi and M. Chiriva-Internati, "Cancer: looking for simplicity and finding complexity," *Cancer Cell International*, vol. 6, pp. 1–7, 2006.
- [9] V. Rajinikanth and K. Latha, "Identification and control of unstable biochemical reactor," *International Journal of Chemical Engineering and Applications*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 106–111, 2010.
- [10] J. D. Davis, C. M. Kumbale, Q. Zhang, and E. O. Voit, "Dynamical systems approaches to personalized medicine," *Current opinion in biotechnology*, vol. 58, pp. 168–174, 2019.
- [11] T. Lai and C. Wei, "Asymptotic properties of general autoregressive models and strong consistency of least-squares estimates of their parameters," *Journal of multivariate analysis*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 1–23, 1983.
- [12] L. Ljung, "System identification," in *Signal analysis and prediction*. Springer, 1998, pp. 163–173.
- [13] P. Van Overschee and B. De Moor, *Subspace identification for linear systems: Theory—Implementation—Applications*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

- [14] M. K. S. Faradonbeh, A. Tewari, and G. Michailidis, "On applications of bootstrap in continuous space reinforcement learning," in *2019 IEEE 58th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1977–1984.
- [15] Y. Zheng and N. Li, "Non-asymptotic identification of linear dynamical systems using multiple trajectories," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 1693–1698, 2020.
- [16] S. Oymak and N. Ozay, "Non-asymptotic identification of lti systems from a single trajectory," in *2019 American control conference (ACC)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 5655–5661.
- [17] A. Modi, M. K. S. Faradonbeh, A. Tewari, and G. Michailidis, "Joint learning of linear time-invariant dynamical systems," *Automatica*, vol. 164, p. 111635, 2024.
- [18] M. K. S. Faradonbeh, A. Tewari, and G. Michailidis, "Finite time identification in unstable linear systems," *Automatica*, vol. 96, pp. 342–353, 2018.
- [19] M. Simchowitz, H. Mania, S. Tu, M. I. Jordan, and B. Recht, "Learning without mixing: Towards a sharp analysis of linear system identification," in *Conference On Learning Theory*. PMLR, 2018, pp. 439–473.
- [20] T. Sarkar and A. Rakhlin, "Near optimal finite time identification of arbitrary linear dynamical systems," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2019, pp. 5610–5618.
- [21] A. Modi, M. K. S. Faradonbeh, Z. Xu, and A. Tewari, "Big control actions help multitask learning of unstable linear systems," *ICML Workshop on Complex Feedback in Online Learning*, 2022.
- [22] P. Mandl, T. E. Duncan, and B. Pasik-Duncan, "On the consistency of a least squares identification procedure," *Kybernetika*, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 340–346, 1988.
- [23] T. E. Duncan and B. Pasik-Duncan, "Adaptive control of continuous-time linear stochastic systems," *Mathematics of Control, signals and systems*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 45–60, 1990.
- [24] T. E. Duncan, P. Mandl, and B. Pasik-Duncan, "On least squares estimation in continuous time linear stochastic systems," *Kybernetika*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 169–180, 1992.
- [25] T. E. Duncan, L. Guo, and B. Pasik-Duncan, "Adaptive continuous-time linear quadratic gaussian control," *IEEE Transactions on automatic control*, vol. 44, no. 9, pp. 1653–1662, 1999.
- [26] K. Doya, "Reinforcement learning in continuous time and space," *Neural computation*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 219–245, 2000.
- [27] M. K. S. Faradonbeh and M. S. S. Faradonbeh, "Online reinforcement learning in stochastic continuous-time systems," in *The Thirty Sixth Annual Conference on Learning Theory*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 612–656.
- [28] H. Wang, T. Zariphopoulou, and X. Zhou, "Exploration versus exploitation in reinforcement learning: A stochastic control approach," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.01552*, 2018.
- [29] M. Basei, X. Guo, A. Hu, and Y. Zhang, "Logarithmic regret for episodic continuous-time linear-quadratic reinforcement learning over a finite-time horizon," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 23, no. 178, pp. 1–34, 2022.
- [30] M. K. S. Faradonbeh and M. S. S. Faradonbeh, "Bayesian algorithms learn to stabilize unknown continuous-time systems," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 55, no. 12, pp. 377–382, 2022.
- [31] T. Lauvdal and T. I. Fossen, "Stabilization of linear unstable systems with control constraints," in *Proceedings of the 36th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, vol. 5. IEEE, 1997, pp. 4504–4509.
- [32] 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.
- [33] T. L. Lai and C. Z. Wei, "Least squares estimates in stochastic regression models with applications to identification and control of dynamic systems," *The Annals of Statistics*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 154–166, 1982.
- [34] D. Revuz and M. Yor, *Continuous martingales and Brownian motion*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013, vol. 293.

- [35] S. R. Howard, A. Ramdas, J. McAuliffe, and J. Sekhon, “Time-uniform, nonparametric, nonasymptotic confidence sequences,” 2021.
- [36] M. Liu, L. Zhang, P. Shi, and H. R. Karimi, “Robust control of stochastic systems against bounded disturbances with application to flight control,” *IEEE transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 61, no. 3, pp. 1504–1515, 2013.
- [37] P. E. Caines and D. Levanony, “Stochastic ε -optimal linear quadratic adaptation: An alternating controls policy,” *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 1094–1126, 2019.
- [38] E. S. Palamarchuk, “On the optimal control problem for a linear stochastic system with an unstable state matrix unbounded at infinity,” *Automation and Remote Control*, vol. 80, pp. 250–261, 2019.
- [39] D. Bertsekas, *Dynamic programming and optimal control: Volume I*. Athena scientific, 2012, vol. 4.
- [40] I. Karatzas and S. Shreve, *Brownian motion and stochastic calculus*. springer, 2014, vol. 113.
- [41] A. Løkka, B. Øksendal, and F. Proske, “Stochastic partial differential equations driven by lévy space-time white noise,” 2004.
- [42] K. Sobczyk, *Stochastic differential equations: with applications to physics and engineering*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013, vol. 40.
- [43] M. Ibrahim, “Three problems in high-dimensional statistical parameter estimation,” Ph.D. dissertation, STANFORD UNIVERSITY, 2013.
- [44] 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*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, S. M. Kakade and U. von Luxburg, Eds., vol. 19. Budapest, Hungary: PMLR, 09–11 Jun 2011, pp. 1–26. [Online]. Available: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v19/abbasi-yadkori11a.html>
- [45] T. W. Kerlin and B. R. Upadhyaya, *Dynamics and control of nuclear reactors*. Academic press, 2019.
- [46] S. S. Du, W. Hu, S. M. Kakade, J. D. Lee, and Q. Lei, “Few-shot learning via learning the representation, provably,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.09434*, 2020.
- [47] R. Vershynin, *High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science*. Cambridge university press, 2018, vol. 47.

VIII. APPENDICES

A. Organization of the Appendices

The appendices are organized as follow. Appendix VIII-B includes the complementary notation and additional definitions that set up the stage for the proofs of Lemmas 1, 2, and 3, which are given in the appendices VIII-C, VIII-D, and VIII-E, respectively.

B. Complementary Notation and Definitions

- 1) For a matrix A , we define $\|A\|_{\alpha \rightarrow \beta}$ indexed by α and β as $\|A\|_{\alpha \rightarrow \beta} = \sup_v \|Av\|_{\beta} / \|v\|_{\alpha}$. When $\alpha = \beta$, we simply write $\|A\|_{\alpha}$. The Frobenius norm of the matrix A is indicated by $\|A\|_F$. We adopt the convention that $\inf\{\emptyset\} = \infty$. Moreover, \vee and \wedge stand for the maximum and minimum respectively.

2) For a positive semi-definite matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, and vectors $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we define the P -norm of v as $\|v\|_P = (v^\top P v)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

3) Let x_t be a 1-dimensional random process given by

$$x_t = x_0 + \int_0^t \mu_s ds + \int_0^t \sigma_s d\mathbb{V}_s,$$

where x_0 is a deterministic initial point, $\mu(s)$ and $\sigma(s)$ are deterministic coefficients which only depend on the time component s , and \mathbb{V}_s is a 1-dimensional standard Brownian motion. We denote the quadratic variation of x_t by $[[x]]_t$ which is defined as

$$[[x]]_t = \int_0^t \sigma_s^2 ds.$$

4) Define $H = [\kappa B_*, C]$, that is, the matrix H is obtained by stacking the columns of the two matrices κB_* and C .

5) Similarly, define $L = [B_*, C]$.

6) Lemma 1 considers deviations of the stochastic integral

$$\int_0^T X_t d\mathbb{W}_t^\top,$$

when appropriately transformed by \bar{V}_T . However, a similar result can be shown for the stochastic integral

$$\int_0^T X_t d\mathbb{U}_t^\top,$$

where \mathbb{U}_t denotes the Weiner process coming from the control action U_t . Indeed we can combine these two random processes and get another similar result for this combined process. To make this rigorous, let $\widetilde{\mathbb{W}}_t$ be the random process obtained from concatenation of \mathbb{U}_t and \mathbb{W}_t . That is

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{W}}_t = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{U}_t \\ \mathbb{W}_t \end{bmatrix},$$

and let us define \widetilde{S}_T and $\widetilde{y}(T, \delta)$ accordingly

$$\widetilde{S}_T = \int_0^T X_t d\widetilde{\mathbb{W}}_t^\top,$$

$$\tilde{y}(T, \delta) = \sqrt{8 \log \left(\frac{12^{(q+r)} \det(\bar{V}_T)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\delta \det(V)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right)}.$$

Note that the only difference between $y(T, \delta)$ and $\tilde{y}(T, \delta)$, is the change in exponent of the constant 12, which reflects the dimension effect of the concatenated process. With V_T and V defined as before, we have the following re-statement of Lemma 1: For any $\delta > 0$ we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \bar{V}_T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{S}_T \right\|_2 < \tilde{y}(T, \delta) \text{ for all } T \geq 0 \right) \geq 1 - \delta.$$

7) From now on, we drop the tilde symbol from $\tilde{\mathbb{W}}_t$, \tilde{S}_T , and $\tilde{y}(T, \delta)$, and simply write them as \mathbb{W}_t , S_T , and $y(T, \delta)$. Thus, throughout all the proofs, by \mathbb{W}_t we mean this new stacked random process, and S_T and $y(T, \delta)$ have altered accordingly.

C. Proof of Lemma 1

This proof is based on the following propositions which are presented first, and are followed by the proof of the Lemma 1.

Proposition 1: Let $w \in \mathcal{S}^{q+r-1}$ be an arbitrary element of the unit sphere. Moreover, let $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^p$ be an arbitrary vector. Now, define

$$M_t^\theta = \exp \left\{ \int_0^t \theta^\top X_s d\mathbb{W}_s^\top w - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \theta^\top X_s X_s^\top \theta ds \right\},$$

and let τ be a stopping time with respect to the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$. Then M_τ^θ is almost surely well-defined and is a super martingale with $\mathbb{E}(M_\tau^\theta) \leq 1$.

1) *Proof of Proposition 1:* Let $t_2 > t_1 > 0$. We show that

$$\mathbb{E} [M_{t_2}^\theta | \mathcal{F}_{t_1}] = M_{t_1}^\theta.$$

Choose ϵ such that we have the following discretization of $[0, t_2] = 0, \epsilon, \dots, N_1\epsilon = t_1, \dots, N_2\epsilon = t_2$, and let $\mathbb{W}_i \sim \mathbb{N}(0, \epsilon \mathbb{I}_{q+r})$, $i = 1, \dots, N_2$ be the corresponding discretization of the Weiner process. Note

that $w^\top \mathbb{W}_i \sim \mathbb{N}(0, \epsilon)$ since w is a unit vector. For $i = 0, \dots, N_2 - 1$ define

$$D_i^\theta = \exp \left(\theta^\top X_i \mathbb{W}_{i+1}^\top w - \frac{\epsilon}{2} \theta^\top X_i X_i^\top \theta \right).$$

By known properties of the moment generating function of a normal variable, for any i we have

$$\mathbb{E} [D_i^\theta | \mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\epsilon}] = 1.$$

Moreover, from the tower property of conditional expectation, we can write

$$\mathbb{E} [D_{i+1}^\theta | \mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\epsilon}] = \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} [D_{i+1}^\theta | \mathcal{F}_{i\epsilon}] | \mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\epsilon}] = 1,$$

and so on and so forth. Therefore, we obtain the following martingale equality

$$\mathbb{E} [M_{t_2} | \mathcal{F}_{t_1}] = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} [M_{t_1}^\theta D_{N_1+1}^\theta \dots D_{N_2}^\theta | \mathcal{F}_{t_1}] = M_{t_1}^\theta \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} [D_{N_1+1}^\theta \dots D_{N_2}^\theta | \mathcal{F}_{N_1\epsilon}] = M_{t_1}^\theta.$$

Now, suppose τ is a stopping time with respect to the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$, and let $Y_t^\theta = M_{\min(\tau, t)}^\theta$ be the stopped version of M_t^θ . It is well-known that the stopped version of a martingale is also martingale. Therefore, we can write

$$\mathbb{E} [Y_t^\theta] = \mathbb{E} [Y_0^\theta] = 1.$$

By the convergence theorem for non-negative martingales, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} Y_t^\theta$ almost surely exists. This means that M_τ^θ is almost surely well defined. Now, by application of Fatou's Lemma, we get

$$\mathbb{E} [M_\tau^\theta] = \mathbb{E} \left[\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} Y_t^\theta \right] \leq \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} [Y_t^\theta] \leq 1.$$

Proposition 2: Let $w \in \mathcal{S}^{q+r-1}$ and τ be a stopping time with respect to the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$. Moreover, let V be any positive definite $p \times p$ matrix and $\bar{V}_T = V_T + V$, then with probability at least $1 - \delta$ we have

$$\|S_\tau w\|_{\bar{V}_\tau^{-1}} \leq 2 \log \left(\frac{\det(\bar{V}_\tau)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\delta \det(V)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right).$$

2) *Proof of Proposition 2:* Let $\Theta \sim \mathbb{N}(0_p, V^{-1})$ be a normal vector with covariance matrix V^{-1} . Define

$$M_t = \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} M_t^\theta f(\theta) d(\theta),$$

where f is the density function of Θ . Note that we have $\mathbb{E}[M_\tau] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[M_\tau^\Theta | \Theta]] \leq 1$. Therefore, we can write

$$M_t = (2\pi)^{-\frac{p}{2}} \det(V)^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \exp \left\{ \theta^\top S_t w - \frac{1}{2} \theta^\top (V + V_t) \theta \right\} d\theta.$$

Let $\bar{V}_t = V_t + V$. By completing the square inside the exponential, we get M_t as the following expression

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{\det(V)}{\det(\bar{V}_t)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} w^\top S_t^\top (\bar{V}_t)^{-1} S_t w \right\} \int_{\mathbb{R}^p} \frac{\det(\bar{V}_t)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{(2\pi)^{\frac{p}{2}}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} [(\theta - (\bar{V}_t)^{-1} S_t w)^\top (\bar{V}_t) (\theta - (\bar{V}_t)^{-1} S_t w)] \right\} d\theta \\ &= \left(\frac{\det(V)}{\det(\bar{V}_t)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} w^\top S_t^\top (\bar{V}_t)^{-1} S_t w \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

With some simple algebra, the following equality holds

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(w^\top S_\tau^\top \bar{V}_\tau^{-1} S_\tau w > 2 \log \left(\frac{\det(\bar{V}_\tau)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\delta \det(V)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \right) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left(\exp \left(\frac{1}{2} w^\top S_\tau^\top (\bar{V}_\tau)^{-1} S_\tau w \right) \left(\frac{\det(V)}{\det(\bar{V}_\tau)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} > \frac{1}{\delta} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which by application of the Markov inequality and the Proposition 1, can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \delta \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\frac{1}{2} w^\top S_\tau^\top (\bar{V}_\tau)^{-1} S_\tau w \right) \left(\frac{\det(V)}{\det(\bar{V}_\tau)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \\ &= \delta \mathbb{E} [M_\tau] \\ &\leq \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 3: Let $O^{m \times m'}$, $m > m'$ be the set of matrices with orthonormal columns. Then for every $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ there exist an ϵ -net, $\mathcal{N}_\epsilon \subset O^{m \times m'}$, such that $|\mathcal{N}_\epsilon| \leq \left(\frac{6\sqrt{m'}}{\epsilon} \right)^{mm'}$ and for every $V \in O^{m \times m'}$ there is a $V' \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon$ such that $\|V - V'\|_F \leq \epsilon$.

The proof is available in the literature [46].

Remark 3: Note that when $m' = 1$ the Frobenius norm in the above proposition would be the same as the usual l_2 norm. In such case, the ϵ -net is to cover the unit sphere in the m -dimensional space.

The following proposition is also adopted from the existing literature [47].

Proposition 4: Let M be a random matrix and $\epsilon \leq 1$ arbitrary. Then we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\|M\|_2 > z) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{w \in \mathcal{N}_\epsilon} \|Mw\| > (1 - \epsilon)z\right).$$

Now, we can present the proof of Lemma 1.

3) *Proof of Lemma 1:* Let $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}$, $\mathcal{N}_{\frac{1}{2}}$ be the corresponding ϵ -net, and $w \in \mathcal{N}_{\frac{1}{2}}$ an arbitrary element of the ϵ -net in the $(p+r)$ -dimensional space. Based on proposition 3, $|\mathcal{N}_{\frac{1}{2}}| \leq 12^{q+r}$. Now define

$$B_t(\delta) = \left\{ \omega_0 \in \Omega : w^\top S_t^\top \bar{V}_t^{-1} S_t w > 2 \log \left(\frac{12^{q+r} \det(\bar{V}_t)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\delta \det(V)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \right\},$$

and

$$\tau(\omega_0) = \min \{t \geq 0 : \omega_0 \in B_t(\delta)\}.$$

Note that $\bigcup_{t \geq 0} B_t(\delta) = \{\omega_0 : \tau(\omega_0) < \infty\} = \left\{ w^\top S_\tau^\top \bar{V}_\tau S_\tau w > 2 \log \left(\frac{12^{q+r} \det(\bar{V}_\tau)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\delta \det(V)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \right\}$. So we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{t \geq 0} B_t(\delta)\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\tau < \infty) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(w^\top S_\tau^\top \bar{V}_\tau S_\tau w > 2 \log \left(\frac{12^{q+r} \det(\bar{V}_\tau)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\delta \det(V)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right)\right) \\ &\leq \frac{\delta}{12^{q+r}}. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality comes from proposition 2. Now using proposition 4 we have the desired result

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(\left\| \bar{V}_t^{-\frac{1}{2}} S_t \right\|_2 > y(t, \delta) \text{ for some } t \geq 0\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{w \in \mathcal{N}_{\frac{1}{2}}} w^\top S_t^\top \bar{V}_t^{-1} S_t w > \frac{y(t, \delta)^2}{4} \text{ for some } t \geq 0\right), \end{aligned}$$

which by union bounds over all points of the epsilon-net, can be bounded as

$$\sum_{w \in \mathcal{N}_{\frac{1}{2}}} \mathbb{P}\left(w^\top S_t^\top \bar{V}_t^{-1} S_t w > \frac{y(t, \delta)^2}{4} \text{ for some } t \geq 0\right) \leq \delta.$$

D. Proof of Lemma 2

This proof constructs upon the following theorem which is available in the literature [34], and states that every 1-dimensional continuous local martingale vanishing at zero can be represented as a standard Brownian motion with a changed clock. We use this theorem together with a finite-time version of the law of iterated logarithm [35] to construct the upper bound. For the sake of completeness, we state these two theorems in terms of Propositions 5 and 6 and further discuss their implications.

Proposition 5: Let x_t be a 1-dimensional \mathcal{F}_t -measurable continuous local martingale vanishing at zero, with $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \llbracket x \rrbracket_t = \infty$, almost surely. For each $0 \leq s < \infty$, define the stopping time

$$T(s) = \{\inf t \geq 0; \llbracket x \rrbracket_t > s\}.$$

Then the time changed process $\mathbb{V}_s = x_{T_s}$ is a standard Brownian motion with respect to the filtration \mathcal{F}_{T_s} , and we have

$$x_t = \mathbb{V}_{\llbracket x \rrbracket_t}; \quad 0 \leq t < \infty.$$

The interpretation is that, x can be considered as a standard Brownian motion \mathbb{V} , that runs with a different clock. This means, we replace the original clock t with the changed clock $\llbracket x \rrbracket_t$. Therefore we can translate known properties of the Brownian motion, for other local martingales. One such property is the following finite-time law of iterated logarithm from the literature [35]. It provides, high probability finite-time uniform bounds for the displacement of a standard Brownian motion.

Proposition 6: Let \mathbb{V}_t be the standard 1-dimensional Brownian motion. Then for any $\eta > 1$ and $s > 1$

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\exists t \in (0, \infty) : \mathbb{V}_t \geq \frac{\eta^{\frac{1}{4}} + \eta^{-\frac{1}{4}}}{\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{(1 \vee t) \left(s \log \log(\eta(1 \vee t)) + \log \frac{\zeta(s)}{\delta \log^s \eta} \right)} \right) \leq \delta, \quad (29)$$

where $\zeta(s)$ is the Riemann zeta function.

As an example, Suppose x_t is a 1-dimensional linear SDE satisfying $dx_t = \bar{\lambda}x_t dt + h d\mathbb{V}_t^1$, $x_0 = 0$ where $\bar{\lambda}$ is a complex valued number with corresponding real part λ , $h \in \mathbb{R}$ is a positive number, and \mathbb{V}^1 is a standard 1-dimensional Brownian motion. Note that x_t can be equivalently shown as $x_t = \int_0^t e^{\bar{\lambda}(t-s)} h d\mathbb{V}_s^1$.

The quadratic variation of x_t is

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket x \rrbracket_t &= \int_0^t \|e^{\bar{\lambda}(t-s)} h\|^2 ds \\ &= h^2 \int_0^t e^{2\lambda(t-s)} ds. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to check that when $\lambda > 0$, x_t meets the condition of the Proposition 5, and therefore can be represented as a Brownian motion with a changed clock. That is, $x_t = \mathbb{V}_{\alpha_{\lambda,h}(t)}$, $0 \leq t < \infty$, where $\alpha_{\lambda,h}(t) = \frac{h^2}{2\lambda}(e^{2\lambda t} - 1)$ is the new clock. Note that when $\lambda < 0$ the condition $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \llbracket x \rrbracket_t = \infty$, is not met. However, Proposition 5 is still applicable under an enlargement of the filtered probability space. A rigorous argument is available in the literature [34]. Now, we consider the three cases of unstable, marginally stable, and stable dynamics matrix separately.

1) *Unstable dynamics*, $\lambda_1(A_*) > 0$: First, suppose we have an integral of the form

$$x_t = \int_0^t e^{\bar{\lambda}(t-s)} h d\mathbb{V}_s, \quad (30)$$

for a complex valued $\bar{\lambda}$, with positive real part λ , and a positive real number h . Define

$$\alpha_{\lambda,h}(t) = \frac{h^2}{2\lambda}(e^{2\lambda t} - 1),$$

and

$$f_{\lambda,h}(t, \delta) = h \sqrt{\frac{2}{\lambda}} e^{\lambda t} \sqrt{2 \log(2\lambda t + 1 + \log \frac{h^2}{2\lambda}) + \log \frac{4}{\delta}}. \quad (31)$$

By letting $s = 2$ and $\eta = e$ in (29) and application of Proposition 5, one can easily check the following high probability bound

$$\mathbb{P}(|x_t| \leq f_{\lambda,h}(t, \delta), \text{ for all } t \geq 0) \geq 1 - \delta. \quad (32)$$

Now, we can upper bound $\|X_t\|$ in the general setting. Suppose A_* has the Jordan decomposition $A_* = P^{-1}\Lambda P$, where Λ is a block diagonal matrix

$$\Lambda = \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & \Lambda_k \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Lambda_i = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\lambda}_i & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{\lambda}_i & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \bar{\lambda}_i \end{bmatrix},$$

and each Jordan block Λ_i has $\bar{\lambda}_i$ on the main diagonal, 1 right of diagonal and zero elsewhere. Note that X_t can be written as

$$X_t = P^{-1}e^{\Lambda t}PX_0 + P^{-1}\int_0^t e^{\Lambda(t-s)}PHd\mathbb{W}_s. \quad (33)$$

Now, we bound each term on the right hand side of the above expression. First, note that for each Jordan block, we have

$$e^{\Lambda_i(t-s)} = e^{\bar{\lambda}_i(t-s)} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & (t-s) & \frac{(t-s)^2}{2!} & \dots & \frac{(t-s)^{l_i-1}}{(l_i-1)!} \\ 0 & 1 & (t-s) & \dots & \frac{(t-s)^{l_i-2}}{(l_i-2)!} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (34)$$

Therefore, we can expand the stochastic term on the right hand side of (33) as follow. Let $c_1^\top, \dots, c_p^\top$ be the p -dimensional row vectors that constitute the rows of P . Moreover, suppose $\mathbb{V}^i, i = 1, \dots, q+r$ are the 1-dimensional Brownian components of the noise vector \mathbb{W} . Therefore, $PHd\mathbb{W}_s$ is a vector in \mathbb{R}^p the j^{th} element of which is given by

$$\langle c_j^\top H, d\mathbb{W}_s \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{q+r} (c_j^\top H)_i d\mathbb{V}_s^i,$$

where $(c_j^\top H)_i$ is the i^{th} element of the row vector $c_j^\top H$ and \mathbb{V}^i the i^{th} component of the Brownian motion.

Thus, with reference to the exponential blocks (34) we define the vector v as

$$v = \int_0^t e^{\Lambda(t-s)}PHd\mathbb{W}_s = \begin{bmatrix} v_1 \\ \vdots \\ v_p \end{bmatrix}, \quad (35)$$

where

$$v_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{q+r} \int_0^t e^{\bar{\lambda}_1(t-s)} (c_1^\top H)_i d\mathbb{V}_s^i + \dots + \sum_{i=1}^{q+r} \int_0^t \frac{(t-s)^{l_1-1}}{(l_1-1)!} e^{\bar{\lambda}_1(t-s)} (c_{l_1}^\top H)_i d\mathbb{V}_s^i,$$

and

$$v_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{q+r} \int_0^t e^{\bar{\lambda}_1(t-s)} (c_2^\top H)_i d\mathbb{V}_s^i + \dots + \sum_{i=1}^{q+r} \int_0^t \frac{(t-s)^{l_1-2}}{(l_1-2)!} e^{\bar{\lambda}_1(t-s)} (c_{l_1}^\top H)_i d\mathbb{V}_s^i,$$

and so on and so forth. Therefore, we can write the following upper bound for the magnitude of the second vector on the right hand side of (33)

$$\|P^{-1}v\|_2 \leq \left\| \|P^{-1}\| \right\|_{\infty \rightarrow 2} \|v\|_\infty. \quad (36)$$

Note that all the entries of the matrix PH , have magnitude at most as large as p^* , defined as $p^* = \|||H\|||_\infty \|||P\|||_\infty$. Therefore, for all $t \geq 1$, we have with probability at least $1 - \delta$

$$\begin{aligned} \|P^{-1}v\|_2 &\leq \|||P^{-1}\|||_{\infty \rightarrow 2} (q+r) f_{\lambda_1, p^*} \left(t, \frac{\delta}{(q+r)pl^*} \right) \left(1 + t + \dots + \frac{t^{(l^*-1)}}{(l^*-1)!} \right) \\ &\leq \|||P^{-1}\|||_{\infty \rightarrow 2} (q+r) e t^{l^*-1} f_{\lambda_1, p^*} \left(t, \frac{\delta}{(q+r)pl^*} \right) \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{\lambda_1}} \beta p^{\frac{1}{2}} e \kappa (q+r) e^{\lambda_1 t} t^{l^*-1} \sqrt{2 \log(2\lambda_1 t + 1 + \log \frac{p^{*2}}{2\lambda_1}) + \log \frac{4pl^*(q+r)}{\delta}}. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

where

$$\beta = \|||P^{-1}\|||_\infty \|||P\|||_\infty \|||L\|||_\infty, \quad L = [B, C]. \quad (38)$$

The first inequality in (37) is based on the following reasoning. The quadratic variation of integrals of the form (30) which constitute the components of v is increasing in both h and λ . Moreover, the uniform upper bound given in (29) is increasing in t . Therefore, we can for all i, j, l , uniformly bound the integrals of the form $\int_0^t e^{\bar{\lambda}_i(t-s)} (c_j^\top H)_i d\mathbb{V}_s^i$ with the largest upper bound given by f_{λ_1, p^*} . The second inequality in (37) is because of the fact that

$$1 + \frac{1}{2} + \dots + \frac{1}{(l^*-1)!} \leq e, \quad (39)$$

and the last inequality in (37) is from the fact that $\|||P^{-1}\|||_{\infty \rightarrow 2} \leq \sqrt{p} \|||P^{-1}\|||_\infty$. Now, we bound the first term on the right hand side of (33). Note that

$$\|e^{A^*t} X_0\| \leq \|||P^{-1}\|||_{\infty \rightarrow 2} \|||e^{\Lambda t}\|||_\infty \|||P\|||_\infty \|X_0\|_\infty. \quad (40)$$

Moreover, $e^{\Lambda t}$ is composed of the blocks of the form

$$e^{\Lambda_i t} = e^{\bar{\lambda}_i t} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & t & \frac{t^2}{2!} & \dots & \frac{t^{l_i-1}}{(l_i-1)!} \\ 0 & 1 & t & \dots & \frac{t^{l_i-2}}{(l_i-2)!} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Therefore,

$$\|||e^{\Lambda t}\|||_\infty \leq e^{\lambda_1 t} \left(1 + \dots + \frac{t^{l^*-1}}{(l^*-1)!} \right) \leq e t^{l^*-1} e^{\lambda_1 t},$$

where the last inequality comes from (39). Thus, from (40) we have

$$\|e^{A_*t}X_0\| \leq \| \|P^{-1}\| \| \|_{\infty \rightarrow 2} \| \|P\| \| \|_{\infty} \|X_0\|_{\infty} e^{l^*-1} e^{\lambda_1 t}.$$

Hence, we can write

$$\|e^{A_*t}X_0\| \leq \| \|P^{-1}\| \| \|_{\infty} \| \|P\| \| \|_{\infty} \|X_0\|_{\infty} p^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{l^*-1} e^{\lambda_1 t}, \quad (41)$$

Note that when $\sqrt{\frac{4 \log 2\lambda_1 t}{\lambda_1}} > \frac{\|X_0\|_{\infty}}{\|L\|_{\infty}}$ the upper bound in (37) is larger than the upper bound in (41).

Therefore, putting the bound in (37) back in (33), we get the following result

$$\|X_t\|_2 \leq 2\sqrt{\frac{2}{\lambda_1}} \beta p^{\frac{1}{2}} e \kappa (q+r) e^{\lambda_1 t} t^{l^*-1} \sqrt{2 \log(2\lambda_1 t + 1 + \log \frac{p^{*2}}{2\lambda_1}) + \log \frac{4pl^*(q+r)}{\delta}}. \quad (42)$$

Thus, we have established the following upper bound for the largest eigen-value of the covariance matrix

$$\lambda_1(V_t) \leq \frac{8}{\lambda_1} \beta^2 p e^2 \kappa^2 (q+r) e^{2\lambda_1 t} t^{2l^*-1} \left[2 \log(2\lambda_1 t + 1 + \log \frac{p^{*2}}{2\lambda_1}) + \log \frac{4pl^*(q+r)}{\delta} \right]. \quad (43)$$

Moreover, define

$$C_u(t, \delta) = \frac{8}{\lambda_1} \beta^2 p e^2 \kappa^2 (q+r) \left[2 \log(2\lambda_1 t + 1 + \log \frac{p^{*2}}{2\lambda_1}) + \log \frac{4pl^*(q+r)}{\delta} \right]. \quad (44)$$

We need $C_u(t, \delta)$ in proof of Lemma 3.

2) *Marginally stable dynamics*, $\lambda_1(A_*) = 0$: The proof in the marginally case, is exactly the same. First, we bound the second term on the right hand side of (33). Note that in this case, all the independent 1-dimensional random components $\int_0^t e^{\bar{\lambda}_i(t-s)} (c_j^{\top} H)_i d\mathbb{V}_s^i$ which are components of v (35), can be uniformly bounded with probability at least with $\frac{\delta}{pl^*(q+r)} f_p^*(t, \frac{\delta}{pl^*(q+r)})$, where we define

$$f_h(t, \delta) = 2ht^{\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{2 \log(\log t + 2 \log h + 1) + \log \frac{4}{\delta}}, \lambda > 0. \quad (45)$$

Therefore, the second term on the right hand side of (33) can be uniformly bounded with probability at least $1 - \delta$ as follow

$$\begin{aligned} \|P^{-1}v\|_2 &\leq \left\| \left\| P^{-1} \right\|_{\infty \rightarrow 2} (q+r) f_{p^*} \left(t, \frac{\delta}{(q+r)pl^*} \right) \left(1+t+\dots+\frac{t^{(l^*-1)}}{(l^*-1)!} \right) \right\| \\ &\leq \left\| \left\| P^{-1} \right\|_{\infty \rightarrow 2} (q+r) e t^{l^*-\frac{1}{2}} f_{p^*} \left(t, \frac{\delta}{(q+r)pl^*} \right) \right\| \\ &\leq 2\beta p^{\frac{1}{2}} e \kappa (q+r) t^{l^*-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{2 \log(\log t + 2 \log p^* + 1) + \log \frac{4pl^*(q+r)}{\delta}}. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

Similarly, the first term on the right hand side of (33) can be bounded as follow

$$\|e^{A_*t} X_0\| \leq \left\| \left\| P^{-1} \right\|_{\infty \rightarrow 2} \left\| P \right\|_{\infty} \|X_0\|_{\infty} e t^{l^*-1} \right\|.$$

Hence, we can write

$$\|e^{A_*t} X_0\| \leq \left\| \left\| P^{-1} \right\|_{\infty} \left\| P \right\|_{\infty} \|X_0\|_{\infty} p^{\frac{1}{2}} e t^{l^*-1} \right\|,$$

which can be equivalently written as

$$\|e^{A_*t} X_0\| \leq \frac{\beta}{\left\| \left\| L \right\|_{\infty} \right\|} \|X_0\|_{\infty} p^{\frac{1}{2}} e t^{l^*-1}. \quad (47)$$

Note that when

$$t^{\frac{1}{2}} > \frac{\|X_0\|_{\infty}}{\left\| \left\| L \right\|_{\infty} \right\|},$$

the upper bound in (46) is at least twice larger than the upper bound in (47). Therefore, putting the bound in (46) back in (33), we get the following result

$$\|X_t\|_2 \leq 3\beta p^{\frac{1}{2}} e \kappa (q+r) t^{l^*-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{2 \log(\log t + 2 \log p^* + 1) + \log \frac{4pl^*(q+r)}{\delta}}. \quad (48)$$

Hence, with probability at least $1 - \delta$ we have the following upper bound for the largest eigen-value of the covariance matrix

$$\lambda_1(V_t) \leq 9\beta^2 p e^2 \kappa^2 (q+r)^2 t^{2l^*} \left[2 \log(\log t + 2 \log p^* + 1) + \log \frac{4pl^*(q+r)}{\delta} \right]. \quad (49)$$

Next, we make the following definition which is used in the proof of Lemma 3.

$$C_s(t, \delta) = 9\beta^2 p e^2 \kappa^2 (q+r)^2 \left[2 \log(\log t + 2 \log p^* + 1) + \log \frac{4pl^*(q+r)}{\delta} \right]. \quad (50)$$

3) *Stable dynamics matrix*, $\lambda_1(A_*) < 0$: First, suppose we have an integral of the form

$$x_t = \int_0^t e^{\bar{\lambda}(t-s)} (t-s)^l h d\mathbb{V}_s, \quad (51)$$

for a complex valued $\bar{\lambda}$ with negative real part λ , a one dimensional Weiner process \mathbb{V} , and a positive real number h and a non-negative integer l . Then, x_t has a quadratic variation $\alpha_{\lambda,h}(t)$ given by the following integral

$$\alpha_{\lambda,h}(t) = h^2 \int_0^t e^{2\lambda s} s^{2l} ds$$

Note that $\alpha_{\lambda,h}(t)$ is increasing in both λ , and h . With multiple applications of integration by parts, we get the following closed form solution for $\alpha_{\lambda,h}(t)$

$$\alpha_{\lambda,h}(t) = h^2 e^{2\lambda t} \left[\sum_{i=0}^{2l} \frac{(t^{2l-i}) 2l!}{(-2\lambda)^{i+1} (2l-i)!} \right].$$

Now, we bound both terms on the right hand side of (33). To bound the second term, first let t_0 be large enough such that $\alpha_{\lambda_1, p^*}(t) < 1$. Moreover, let

$$l_0 = \max_{0 \leq s \leq t_0} \{\alpha_{\lambda_1, p^*}(s)\} \vee 1$$

Note that since α_{λ_1, p^*} is continuous, and we take the maximum on a compact set, then l_0 is bounded. Let

$$f_h(t, \delta) = \sqrt{2l^0 \left(2 \log \log l^0 + \log \frac{4}{\delta} \right)}, \quad (52)$$

which is a constant with respect to t . Hence, the second term on the right hand side of (33) can be uniformly bounded with probability at least $1 - \delta$ as follow

$$\begin{aligned} \|P^{-1}v\|_2 &\leq \| \|P^{-1}\| \|_{\infty \rightarrow 2} (q+r) f_{p^*} \left(t, \frac{\delta}{(q+r)pl^*} \right) \left(1 + \dots + \frac{1}{(l^* - 1)!} \right) \\ &\leq \| \|P^{-1}\| \|_{\infty \rightarrow 2} (q+r) e \sqrt{2l^0 \left(2 \log \log l^0 + \log \frac{4pl^*(q+r)}{\delta} \right)} \\ &\leq \beta p^{\frac{1}{2}} e \kappa (q+r) \sqrt{2l^0 \left(2 \log \log l^0 + \log \frac{4pl^*(q+r)}{\delta} \right)}. \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

Similar to the unstable case, we can bound the deterministic term on the right hand side of (33) as follow

$$\|e^{A_*t} X_0\| \leq \| \|P^{-1}\| \|P\| \|X_0\| e^{l^*-1} e^{\lambda_1 t}.$$

Hence, we can write

$$\|e^{A_*t} X_0\| \leq \| \|P^{-1}\| \|P\| \|X_0\| p^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{l^*-1} e^{\lambda_1 t}, \quad (54)$$

Let t be large enough such that the bound on the right hand side of (54) is smaller than the bound on the right hand side of (53). Therefore, putting the bound in (53) back in (33), we get the following result

$$\|X_t\|_2 \leq 2\beta p^{\frac{1}{2}} e\kappa(q+r) \sqrt{2l^0 \left(2\log\log l^0 + \log \frac{4pl^*(q+r)}{\delta} \right)}. \quad (55)$$

Thus, we have the following upper bound for the largest eigen-value of the covariance matrix

$$\lambda_1(V_t) \leq 4\beta^2 p e^2 \kappa^2 (q+r)^2 t \left[2l^0 \left(2\log\log l^0 + \log \frac{4pl^*(q+r)}{\delta} \right) \right]. \quad (56)$$

Moreover, define

$$D_s(\delta) = 4\beta^2 p e^2 \kappa^2 (q+r)^2 \left[2l^0 \left(2\log\log l^0 + \log \frac{4pl^*(q+r)}{\delta} \right) \right]. \quad (57)$$

We need $D_s(\delta)$ in proof of Lemma 3. This completes the proof of Lemma (2).

E. Proof of the Lemma 3

Let $Y_t = X_t X_t^\top$ and use Ito's formula to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} dY_t &= dX_t X_t^\top + X_t dX_t^\top + dX_t dX_t^\top \\ &= A_* X_t X_t^\top dt + H d\mathbb{W}_t X_t^\top + X_t X_t^\top A_*^\top dt + X_t d\mathbb{W}_t^\top H^\top + H H^\top dt. \end{aligned}$$

This differential equation, can be equivalently written as the following integral equation

$$\begin{aligned} Y_T - Y_0 &= A_* \left(\int_0^T X_t X_t^\top dt \right) + \left(\int_0^T X_t X_t^\top dt \right) A_*^\top \\ &\quad + H \left(\int_0^T d\mathbb{W}_t X_t^\top \right) + \left(\int_0^T X_t d\mathbb{W}_t^\top \right) H^\top + \int_0^T H H^\top dt. \end{aligned}$$

We can write this as

$$A_* V_T + V_T A_*^\top + H S_T^\top + S_T H^\top + T H H^\top + Y_0 - Y_T = 0. \quad (58)$$

Let $\bar{V}_T = V_T + \mathbb{I}_p$ and $u \in \mathcal{S}^{p-1}$ be arbitrary. In equation (58), multiply u^\top and u from left and right to get

$$u^\top A_* V_T u + u^\top V_T A_*^\top u + u^\top H S_T^\top \bar{V}_T^{-\frac{1}{2}} \bar{V}_T^{\frac{1}{2}} u + u^\top \bar{V}_T^{\frac{1}{2}} \bar{V}_T^{-\frac{1}{2}} S_T H^\top u + T u^\top H H^\top u + u^\top Y_0 u - u^\top Y_T u = 0.$$

By simply writing the first four terms on the left hand side of the previous equation in the inner product notation, we obtain

$$2\langle V_T u, A_*^\top u \rangle + 2\langle \bar{V}_T^{\frac{1}{2}} u, \bar{V}_T^{-\frac{1}{2}} S_T H^\top u \rangle + T u^\top H H^\top u + u^\top Y_0 u - u^\top Y_T u = 0.$$

Now, by application of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for inner products, we can write

$$-2\|V_T u\| \|A_*^\top u\| - 2\|\bar{V}_T^{\frac{1}{2}} u\| \|\bar{V}_T^{-\frac{1}{2}} S_T H^\top u\| + T u^\top H H^\top u - u^\top Y_T u \leq 0.$$

Using the upper bound for the norm of $\bar{V}_T^{-\frac{1}{2}} S_T$ that was obtained in Lemma 1, with probability at least $1 - \delta$ the following holds

$$T u^\top H H^\top u \leq 2\|V_T u\| \|A_*^\top u\| + 2\|\bar{V}_T^{\frac{1}{2}} u\| \sqrt{8 \log\left(\frac{12^{q+r} \det(\bar{V}_T)^{\frac{1}{2}} \det(\mathbb{I}_p)^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{\delta}\right)} \|H\|_2 + u^\top Y_T u.$$

Therefore, we have the following inequality with probability at least $1 - \delta$

$$T c \kappa^2 \leq 2\|V_T u\| \|A_*^\top u\| + 2\kappa \|\bar{V}_T^{\frac{1}{2}} u\| \sqrt{8 \log\left(\frac{12^{q+r} \det(\bar{V}_T)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\delta}\right)} \|L\|_2 + u^\top Y_T u. \quad (59)$$

Therefore, with probability $1 - \delta$, at least one of the three following events must hold true

$$\mathcal{B}_1 = \left\{ \|V_T u\| \geq \frac{1}{6 \|A_*\|_2} (T c \kappa^2) \right\}$$

or,

$$\mathcal{B}_2 = \left\{ \kappa \|\bar{V}_T^{\frac{1}{2}} u\| \|L\|_2 \sqrt{8 \log\left(\frac{12^{q+r} \det(\bar{V}_T)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\delta}\right)} \geq \frac{1}{6} (T c \kappa^2) \right\}$$

or,

$$\mathcal{B}_3 = \left\{ u^\top Y_T u \geq \frac{1}{3} (T c \kappa^2) \right\}.$$

Moreover, define \mathcal{E}_1 , and \mathcal{E}_2 as follow

$$\mathcal{E}_1 = \mathcal{B}_1 \cup \mathcal{B}_3 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}_2 = \mathcal{B}_2 \cup \mathcal{B}_3.$$

It is clear that with probability $1 - \delta$ at least one of \mathcal{E}_1 or \mathcal{E}_2 must hold. We show that under both \mathcal{E}_1 , and \mathcal{E}_2 the minimum eigenvalue of the covariance matrix has the desired growth rate. First, we discuss the intuition behind defining \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 . Note that

$$u^\top V_T u = \int_0^T u^\top Y_t u dt.$$

Since Y_t is path-wise continuous for all t , this can be written in the differential form

$$d(u^\top V_t u)|_{t=T} = u^\top Y_T u dt.$$

Therefore, what \mathcal{E}_1 means is that, at each fixed time T , either $u^\top V_T u$ or its derivative are greater than a multiple of $Tc\kappa^2$. As we show in the sequel, this implies that there is T_0 such that for all $T \geq T_0$, $u^\top V_T u$ is greater than a multiple of $Tc\kappa^2$. \mathcal{E}_2 has a similar interpretation although with a different constant factor. First, suppose that \mathcal{E}_1 holds. This means that with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the following event holds true

$$\frac{1}{T\kappa^2} u^\top V_T u \geq \frac{1}{6 \| \| A_* \| \|_2} c \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{(u^\top X_T)^2}{T\kappa^2} \geq \frac{1}{3} c.$$

Define

$$\tau_1 = \inf \left\{ T \geq 1, \text{ s.t. } \frac{1}{T\kappa^2} u^\top V_T u \geq \left\{ \frac{1}{6} \wedge \frac{1}{6 \| \| A_* \| \|_2} \right\} c \right\}.$$

Note that $\tau_1 \leq 2$ almost surely under \mathcal{E}_1 , because otherwise, for all $1 \leq t \leq 2$ we have $\frac{1}{t\kappa^2} u^\top V_t u < \frac{1}{6 \| \| A_* \| \|_2} c$ and therefore, for all such t , $\frac{(u^\top X_t)^2}{t\kappa^2} \geq \frac{1}{3} c$, thus,

$$\frac{1}{2\kappa^2} u^\top V_2 u \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_1^2 \frac{(u^\top X_t)^2}{\kappa^2} dt \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_1^2 \frac{(u^\top X_t)^2}{t\kappa^2} dt \geq \frac{1}{6} c$$

which is a contradiction. This means that almost surely under \mathcal{E}_1 , there is $T_0 \leq 2$ such that

$$\frac{1}{T_0 c \kappa^2} u^\top V_{T_0} u \geq \left\{ \frac{1}{6} \wedge \frac{1}{6 \| \| A_* \| \|_2} \right\}.$$

Next, we show that for all $T \geq T_0$ the same relation holds. Define

$$\tau_2 = \inf \left\{ T \geq \tau_1, \text{ s.t. } \frac{1}{T\kappa^2} u^\top V_T u < \left\{ \frac{1}{6} \wedge \frac{1}{6 \| \| A_* \| \|_2} \right\} c \right\}.$$

Since under \mathcal{E}_1 , $\tau_1 \leq 2$ almost surely, τ_2 is well defined. Next, we prove $\tau_2 = \infty$ almost surely. To see that, suppose $\tau_2 = T_l$ for some finite T_l . This means that $u^\top V_{T_l} u < \frac{1}{6\|A_*\|_2} cT_l \kappa^2$ and therefore, $(u^\top X_{T_l})^2 > \frac{1}{3} cT_l \kappa^2$. Note that the process X_t is continuous at all points t and therefore V_t is differentiable. Therefore, we can write

$$d(u^\top V_t u)|_{t=T_l} = (u^\top X_{T_l})^2 dt.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} u^\top V_{T_l} u &= u^\top V_{T_l^-} u + d(u^\top V_{T_l} u)|_{t=T_l} \\ &= u^\top V_{T_l^-} u + (u^\top X_{T_l})^2 dt \\ &\geq \left\{ \frac{1}{6} \wedge \frac{1}{6\|A_*\|_2} \right\} cT_l^- \kappa^2 + \frac{1}{3} cT_l \kappa^2 dt \\ &\geq \left\{ \frac{1}{6} \wedge \frac{1}{6\|A_*\|_2} \right\} cT_l \kappa^2 \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Thus far, we have shown that under \mathcal{E}_1 , $\lambda_{\min}(V_T)$ has the desired growth rate.

Next, we show that the same order holds under \mathcal{E}_2 .

We note that when the dynamics matrix A_* is stable or marginally stable, that is when $\lambda_{\max}(A_*) < 0$ or $\lambda_{\max}(A_*) = 0$ then for large enough T , we have $\mathcal{B}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{B}_1$ and therefore, $\mathcal{E}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{E}_1$. To see this, suppose \mathcal{B}_2 holds true, therefore

$$\kappa \|\bar{V}_{T}^{\frac{1}{2}} u\| \|L\|_2 \sqrt{8 \log \left(\frac{12^{q+r} \det(\bar{V}_T)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\delta} \right)} \geq \frac{1}{6} (T c \kappa^2),$$

or equivalently,

$$\|\bar{V}_{T}^{\frac{1}{2}} u\| \geq \sqrt{\frac{T c \kappa^2}{6\|A_*\|_2}} \sqrt{\frac{T c \kappa^2 \|A_*\|_2}{48 \kappa^2 \|L\|_2^2 \log \left(\frac{12^{q+r} \det(\bar{V}_T)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\delta} \right)}}. \quad (60)$$

Note that, in stable and unstable dynamics $\lambda_{\max}(V_T)$ grows poly-logarithmic. That is, with probability $1 - \delta$

$$\lambda_{\max}(V_T) \leq C_s(T, \delta) T^{2l^*} e^{2\lambda_1 T} + D_s(T, \delta) T \quad (61)$$

where $C_s(T, \delta)$ is defined in the unstable and marginally stable cases as in (44), and (50) respectively, and $D_s(T, \delta)$ is defined as in (57). Thus, when T is large enough such that

$$\frac{Tc\kappa^2 \||A_*\||_2}{48\kappa^2 \||L\||_2^2 \log \left(\frac{12^{q+r} (C_s(T, \delta) T^{2l^*} e^{2\lambda_1 T} + D_s(T, \delta) T)^{\frac{p}{2}}}{\delta} \right)} > 2,$$

then by squaring (60), we have

$$\|\bar{V}_T u\| \geq 2 \frac{Tc\kappa^2}{6 \||A_*\||_2}. \quad (62)$$

Note that $\|\bar{V}_T u\| \leq \|V_T u\| + 1$, hence when $Tc\kappa^2 > 6 \||A_*\||_2$, from (62), we get

$$\|V_T u\| \geq \frac{Tc\kappa^2}{6 \||A_*\||_2}. \quad (63)$$

Thus far, we have shown that when the dynamics is stable or marginally stable, \mathcal{E}_2 implies \mathcal{E}_1 with probability at least $1 - \delta$. Finally, we show that when the dynamics is unstable, that is $\lambda_1(A_*) > 0$, then under \mathcal{E}_2 , the smallest eigen-value of the covariance matrix has the desired growth rate with probability at least $1 - \delta$. Under the event \mathcal{E}_2 we have

$$\kappa \|\bar{V}_T^{\frac{1}{2}} u\| \||L\||_2 \sqrt{8 \log \left(\frac{12^{q+r} \det(\bar{V}_T)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\delta} \right)} \geq \frac{1}{6} (Tc\kappa^2) \text{ or } u^\top Y_T u \geq \frac{1}{3} Tc\kappa^2 \quad (64)$$

and therefore, under \mathcal{E}_2 we have with probability $1 - \delta$

$$\kappa \|\bar{V}_T^{\frac{1}{2}} u\| \||L\||_2 \sqrt{8 \log \left(\frac{12^{q+r} (C_u(T, \delta) T^{2l^* - 1} e^{2\lambda_1 T} + 1)^{\frac{p}{2}}}{\delta} \right)} \geq \frac{1}{6} (Tc\kappa^2) \text{ or } u^\top Y_T u \geq \frac{1}{3} Tc\kappa^2 \quad (65)$$

where $C_u(T, \delta)$ is defined in (44). By expanding the logarithm in (65) we obtain

$$\|\bar{V}_T^{\frac{1}{2}} u\| \kappa \||L\||_2 \sqrt{8 \left[(q+r) \log 12 + \lambda_1 p T + \log \frac{(C_u(T, \delta) T^{2l^* - 1} + 1)^{\frac{p}{2}}}{\delta} \right]} \geq \frac{1}{6} (Tc\kappa^2) \text{ or } \frac{(u^\top X_T)^2}{T\kappa^2} \geq \frac{1}{3} c,$$

or equivalently

$$\|\bar{V}_T^{\frac{1}{2}} u\| \||L\||_2 \sqrt{\frac{8}{T} \left[(q+r) \log 12 + \lambda_1 p T + \log \frac{(C_u(T, \delta) T^{2l^* - 1} + 1)^{\frac{p}{2}}}{\delta} \right]} \geq \frac{1}{6} (\sqrt{T} c \kappa) \text{ or } \frac{(u^\top X_T)^2}{T\kappa^2} > \frac{1}{3} c.$$

Now, let T_0 be large enough such that

$$\frac{1}{T_0} \left[(q+r) \log 12 + \log \frac{(C_u(T_0, \delta) T_0^{2l^*} + 1)^{\frac{q}{2}}}{\delta} \right] < \lambda_1 p.$$

Therefore, for all $T \geq T_0$, with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$, the following event must hold true

$$\|\bar{V}_T^{\frac{1}{2}} u\| \|L\|_2 \sqrt{16\lambda_1 p} \geq \frac{1}{6} (\sqrt{T} c \kappa) \text{ or } \frac{(u^\top X_T)^2}{T \kappa^2} \geq \frac{1}{3} c.$$

Equivalently, for all such T , the following event must hold true

$$\frac{1}{T \kappa^2} u^\top \bar{V}_T u \geq \left(\frac{c}{24 \|L\|_2 \sqrt{\lambda_1 p}} \right)^2 \text{ or } \frac{(u^\top X_T)^2}{T \kappa^2} \geq \frac{1}{3} c.$$

The remaining of the proof, is very much similar to the proof for \mathcal{E}_1 . Define

$$\tau_3 = \inf \left\{ T \geq T_0 \text{ s.t. } \frac{1}{T \kappa^2} u^\top \bar{V}_T u \geq \left\{ \frac{1}{6} \wedge \frac{c}{(24 \|L\|_2 \sqrt{\lambda_1 p})^2} \right\} c \right\}.$$

Note that $\tau_3 \leq 2T_0$ almost surely, because otherwise, for all $T_0 \leq t \leq 2T_0$ we have $\frac{1}{t \kappa^2} u^\top \bar{V}_t u < (c / (24 \|L\|_2 \sqrt{\lambda_1 p}))^2$ and therefore, for all such t , $\frac{(u^\top X_t)^2}{t \kappa^2} \geq \frac{1}{3} c$, hence,

$$\frac{1}{2T_0 \kappa^2} u^\top \bar{V}_{2T_0} u \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{T_0}^{T_0+1} \frac{(u^\top X_t)^2}{T_0 \kappa^2} dt \geq \frac{1}{2} \int_{T_0}^{T_0+1} \frac{(u^\top X_t)^2}{t \kappa^2} dt \geq \frac{1}{6} c$$

which is a contradiction. Now define

$$\tau_4 = \inf \left\{ T \geq \tau_3, \text{ s.t. } \frac{1}{T \kappa^2} u^\top \bar{V}_T u < \left\{ \frac{1}{6} \wedge \frac{c}{(24 \|L\|_2 \sqrt{\lambda_1 p})^2} \right\} c \right\}.$$

Since $\tau_3 \leq 2T_0$ almost surely, τ_4 is well defined. Next, we prove $\tau_4 = \infty$ almost surely. To see that, suppose $\tau_4 = T_l$ for some finite T_l . This means that $u^\top \bar{V}_{T_l} u < \frac{c}{(24 \|L\|_2 \sqrt{\lambda_1 p})^2} c T_l \kappa^2$ and therefore, $(u^\top X_{T_l})^2 \geq \frac{1}{3} c T_l \kappa^2$. Note that the process X_t is continuous at all points t and therefore \bar{V}_t is differentiable.

Therefore, we can write

$$d(u^\top \bar{V}_t u)|_{t=T_l} = (u^\top X_{T_l})^2 dt.$$

Hence we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
u^\top \bar{V}_{T_l} u &= u^\top \bar{V}_{T_l^-} u + d(u^\top \bar{V}_{T_l} u)|_{t=T_l} \\
&= u^\top \bar{V}_{T_l^-} u + (u^\top X_{T_l})^2 dt \\
&\geq \frac{c}{(24 \|L\|_2 \sqrt{\lambda_1 p})^2} c T_l^- \kappa^2 + \frac{1}{3} c T_l \kappa^2 dt \\
&\geq \left\{ \frac{1}{6} \wedge \frac{c}{(24 \|L\|_2 \sqrt{\lambda_1 p})^2} \right\} c T_l \kappa^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by letting $C_4 = \min \left\{ \frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{6 \|A\|_2}, \frac{c}{(24 \|L\|_2 \sqrt{\lambda_1 p})^2} \right\}$, we have shown that for large enough T

$$\lambda_{\min}(V_T) \geq C_4 T c \kappa^2,$$

which completes the proof.