

# LeARN: Learnable and Adaptive Representations for Nonlinear Dynamics in System Identification

Arunabh Singh and Joyjit Mukherjee

*Birla Institute of Technology and Science Pilani, Hyderabad Campus*

## Abstract

System identification, the process of deriving mathematical models of dynamical systems from observed input-output data, has undergone a paradigm shift with the advent of learning-based methods. Addressing the intricate challenges of data-driven discovery in nonlinear dynamical systems, these methods have garnered significant attention. Among them, Sparse Identification of Nonlinear Dynamics (SINDy) has emerged as a transformative approach, distilling complex dynamical behaviors into interpretable linear combinations of basis functions. However, SINDy's reliance on domain-specific expertise to construct its foundational 'library' of basis functions limits its adaptability and universality. In this work, we introduce a nonlinear system identification framework **LeARN** that transcends the need for prior domain knowledge by learning the library of basis functions directly from data. To enhance adaptability to evolving system dynamics under varying noise conditions, we employ a novel meta-learning-based system identification approach that utilizes a light-weight Deep Neural Network (DNN) to dynamically refine these basis functions. This not only captures intricate system behaviors but also adapts seamlessly to new dynamical regimes.

We validate our framework on the Neural Fly dataset, showcasing its robust adaptation and generalization capabilities. Despite its simplicity, our LeARN achieves competitive dynamical error performance to SINDy. This work presents a step towards autonomous discovery of dynamical systems, paving the way for a future where machine learning uncovers the governing principles of complex systems without requiring extensive domain-specific interventions.

**Keywords:** System Identification, Dynamical Systems, Meta-Learning

## 1. Introduction

For robots to operate effectively in real-world scenarios, they must adapt to unseen and unstructured environments. This adaptability is critical for achieving robustness. A significant portion of research in robotics control systems has focused on improving control laws to enhance adaptability (Tedrake, 2023). Efficient and robust control laws are vital in achieving the desired robotic behavior; however, their performance depends heavily on the accuracy of the plant model that describes the system dynamics. Conventionally, system dynamics has been modeled using physics-based equations. These models are grounded in well-understood physical principles, offering interpretability and reliability under ideal conditions. However, such models face critical limitations:

- Complex nonlinear dynamics:** Many robotic systems operate in high-dimensional spaces with nonlinear interactions, making precise modeling difficult.
- Unknown or un-modeled dynamics:** Environmental disturbances and uncertainties often introduce dynamics that are challenging to capture using predefined equations.
- High-dimensional inputs:** Robots with numerous sensors and actuators generate large-scale data that physics-based models may struggle to incorporate.

Formulating accurate physics-based models for such systems is not only time-consuming but also relies on significant domain expertise. As the complexity of robotic systems increases, these limitations hinder the development of robust and adaptive systems. Data-driven methods have emerged as a powerful alternative, leveraging large datasets to construct models of system dynamics. With advances in computational power and the availability of extensive sensor data, machine learning-based approaches have shown great promise. Deep Neural Networks (DNNs), in particular, have demonstrated the ability to approximate highly nonlinear relationships and generalize across various operating conditions, offering a compelling tool for modeling system dynamics without explicit reliance on predefined equations. These capabilities have spurred interest in using DNNs for system identification, enabling robots to better understand their natural dynamics and interactions with the environment.

Among existing frameworks for modeling system dynamics, Sparse Identification of Nonlinear Dynamics (SINDy) (Brunton et al., 2016) represents a significant advancement. By exploiting sparsity principles, SINDy identifies governing equations of a system using a small set of basis functions. While effective, SINDy requires domain-specific knowledge to construct the library of basis functions, limiting its flexibility and scalability to new systems or environments. To address this limitation, and build on the existing frameworks presented in Section (2) our work introduces a novel approach **LeARN** that learns the library of basis functions directly from data, eliminating the dependency on prior domain knowledge. The key contributions of our work are:

- a. Unlike traditional SINDy, our method does not require a predefined function library, thus enhancing flexibility and eliminating the need for domain expertise.
- b. By meta-learning (Finn et al., 2017) (Hospedales et al., 2022) the library of basis functions, **LeARN** enables adaptability to changing dynamics and noisy conditions.
- c. Moreover, by employing light-weight deep neural networks, we retain the ability to model complex nonlinearities while the learned basis functions facilitates the interpretability of nonlinear dynamical interactions in the system dynamics.

**LeARN** addresses key limitations in both conventional and data-driven methods. In this paper, we test our approach on the Neural Fly dataset (O’Connell et al., 2022), which provides a challenging benchmark for nonlinear system identification. Therefore, throughout the paper, our principal robotic system of interest will be a quadrotor. Our results demonstrate that the proposed method achieves competitive performance against SINDy while overcoming its dependency on domain expertise.

## 2. Related Work

Traditional system identification methods rely on physics-based models to describe the dynamics of systems. These methods involve deriving equations based on first principles and are often parameterized to match observed behavior. (Ljung, 1998) explores linear and nonlinear system identification techniques for practical applications. (Ljung, 2010) emphasizes that while linear models are computationally efficient and well understood, they often fail to capture the complexities of real-world systems, especially those with nonlinear and time-varying characteristics. Early nonlinear methods (Billings, 1980), such as the Wiener series and Volterra series, attempted to extend

the utility of linear systems theory. The primary drawback of conventional methods is their dependence on explicit mathematical formulations, which can make them unsuitable for systems with unknown dynamics or when environmental disturbances play a significant role. The limitations of traditional methods have spurred the development of data-driven approaches, leveraging advances in machine learning and computational power. (Narendra and Parthasarathy, 1990) demonstrated the use of neural networks for identifying and controlling nonlinear systems.

Deep learning has further transformed system identification by enabling the modeling of complex, high-dimensional systems. Architectures such as feedforward neural networks (Hornik et al., 1989) have been shown to be universal approximators under ideal conditions. Raissi et al.’s work on physics-informed neural networks (PINNs) (Raissi et al., 2019) combines data-driven approaches with physical laws, solving forward and inverse problems involving partial differential equations (PDEs). Despite their advantages, deep learning methods face challenges such as interpretability of the nonlinear dynamical interactions. Sparse Identification of Nonlinear Dynamical Systems (SINDy) (Brunton et al., 2016) represents formulates the problem as a sparse regression task, selecting only the most critical terms from a library of candidate functions to describe system dynamics. This approach offers interpretability and computational efficiency, making it suitable for systems with a small number of governing equations. However, the reliance on predefined libraries necessitates domain expertise, limiting adaptability to systems with unknown or evolving dynamics. (Champion et al., 2019) learns the coordinate transformation to a space where the dynamics may be sparsely represented. While addressing the need for domain expertise, the interpretability of the learned dynamics equations reduces due to the latent space coordinate representation. Our contributions in the paper aim to bridge the gap between interpretability, adaptability, and generalizability in system identification, paving the way for robust and scalable applications in robotics and beyond.

### 3. Preliminary

#### 3.1. Sparse System Identification

SINDy (Brunton et al., 2016) employs sparse regression (Tibshirani, 1996) to model system dynamics, identifying the terms contributing prominently to the dynamical model. SINDy models the dynamics as follows:

$$\dot{X} \approx \Theta(X)\mathcal{E} \quad (1)$$

, where  $\Theta(\cdot)$  constitutes of candidate basis functions.  $\mathcal{E}$  is a matrix of coefficients for the terms obtained by processing  $\Theta(X)$ , where  $X$  represents our features of interest for modeling the dynamics. In our case for a quadrotor, our features of interest will be the quadrotor’s state and control inputs.

#### 3.2. Meta-Learning

Meta-Learning (Hospedales et al., 2022) is a mechanism for learning to learn. It improves the knowledge to best optimize a meta-objective given different tasks. Model Agnostic Meta-Learning (MAML) (Finn et al., 2017) provides a gradient-based framework to leverage meta-learning approaches to different kinds of tasks while being agnostic to the learning framework and the architecture of the neural network model. For MAML, the bi-level meta-learning problem can be

formulated as:

$$\theta^* \in \arg \min_{\theta} \left( \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \ell_i(\phi_i, \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{eval}}) + \mu_{\text{meta}} \|\theta\|_2^2 \right), \quad \text{s.t. } \phi_i = \theta - \eta \nabla_{\theta} \ell_i(\theta, \mathcal{D}_i^{\text{train}}), \quad (2)$$

, where the optimal meta-parameters  $\theta^*$  minimizes the average evaluation loss across  $M$  tasks. Each task  $i$  is associated with a task-specific loss function  $\ell_i$ , a training dataset  $\mathcal{D}_i^{\text{train}}$ , and an evaluation dataset  $\mathcal{D}_i^{\text{eval}}$ . The task-specific parameters  $\phi_i$  are derived by applying a gradient-based adaptation mechanism which adapts the meta-parameters  $\theta$  to the task using the task's training dataset. Here,  $\mu_{\text{meta}} \geq 0$  is the regularization coefficient. This formulation ensures that the meta-parameters  $\theta$  are well-suited for adaptation across a variety of tasks. Meta-learning based approaches have been used in adaptive control to model the residual aerodynamical interactions (O'Connell et al., 2022), (Shi et al., 2020) for control. (Richards et al., 2021) meta-learns an adaptive controller based on closed-loop tracking simulations. However, none of these attempt to meta-learn the basis functions to model the full system dynamics.

## 4. Method

### 4.1. Problem Setup

Since our system of interest in this paper is a quadrotor, we consider the following dynamics:

$$\dot{\mathbf{p}} = \mathbf{v}, \quad m\dot{\mathbf{v}} = m\mathbf{g} + R\mathbf{f}_u + \mathbf{f}_a, \quad (3)$$

$$\dot{R} = RS(\boldsymbol{\omega}), \quad J\dot{\boldsymbol{\omega}} = J\boldsymbol{\omega} \times \boldsymbol{\omega} + \boldsymbol{\tau}_u + \boldsymbol{\tau}_a. \quad (4)$$

, where the global position vector  $p \in \mathbb{R}^3$ , velocity vector  $v \in \mathbb{R}^3$ , attitude rotation matrix  $R \in \mathbf{SO}(3)$  and the body angular velocity  $\boldsymbol{\omega} \in \mathbb{R}^3$  gives the states of the quadrotor. Further,  $m$  is the mass of the quadrotor,  $J$  is the inertia matrix,  $g$  is gravitational acceleration,  $f_a$  is external disturbance force,  $S(\cdot)$  is the skew-symmetric mapping,  $\tau_u$  and  $\tau_a$  are control and external disturbance torques respectively (Shi et al., 2019). We first aim to learn the partial dynamics of the quadrotor for which we will use the following formulation of translational dynamics:

$$\dot{v} = f(v, u = Rf_u) \quad (5)$$

Based on Eq (3), we model the evolution of the translational dynamics as a function of its state  $v$  and the control input  $Rf_u$ , where  $f_u = [0 \ 0 \ T]^T$ ,  $T$  being the magnitude of the thrust generated by the quadrotor motors at the sampling time instant. We use the above mapping to learn the basis functions for modeling translational dynamics. The quadrotor output wrench  $\eta = [T \ \tau_x \ \tau_y \ \tau_z]^T$  is linearly related to the squared motor speeds  $u = [n_1^2 \ n_2^2 \ n_3^2 \ n_4^2]^T$  by  $\eta = B_0 u$ , where  $B_0$  models the rotor force and torque coefficients. Therefore, based on Eq (4), for our analysis of system identification algorithms we will model the partial attitude dynamics as follows:

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{\omega}} = g(\boldsymbol{\omega}, u = [n_1 \ n_2 \ n_3 \ n_4]^T) \quad (6)$$

Based on Eq (5) and Eq (6), we model the full system dynamics as follows:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{v} \\ \dot{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \end{bmatrix} = h \left( \begin{bmatrix} v \\ \boldsymbol{\omega} \end{bmatrix}, u = \begin{bmatrix} n_1^2 \\ n_2^2 \\ n_3^2 \\ n_4^2 \end{bmatrix} \right) \quad (7)$$



Therefore, our aim is to model the mappings  $f(\cdot)$ ,  $g(\cdot)$  and  $h(\cdot)$  as in Eq (5), (6) and (7) respectively.

#### 4.2. Learning the Basis Functions




Figure 1: For a concatenated feature vector  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times (I+U)}$  of the form,  $X = [x \ u]$ , where  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times I}$  is the state feature vector and  $u \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times U}$  is the control input corresponding to  $x$ ,  $\Theta(X; \psi) \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times P(I+U)}$  is the learned basis function library for a total of  $P$  basis functions, where  $m_p$  represents the  $p^{\text{th}}$  basis function and  $\mathcal{E}(X; \phi) \in \mathbb{R}^{I \times P(I+U)}$  is the learned feature selection matrix, for a total of  $n = I$  sets of coefficients,  $e_k \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times (P+U)}$  is coefficient for the  $k^{\text{th}}$  state feature in  $X$ .

We will discuss our framework LeARN in the context of learning the mapping presented in Eq (5) and this framework can be extended to learn the mappings  $g(\cdot)$  and  $h(\cdot)$ .

Firstly, to stay consistent with the interpretability of the learned system dynamics offered by SINDy, to be able to understand the features contributing prominently and the cross-interaction between the dynamical terms, we model the dynamics as follows:

$$y = \Theta(X; \psi) \mathcal{E}(X; \phi)^T \quad (8)$$

, where in reference to Eq (5),  $\dot{v} \approx y$ , and  $f(\cdot)$  is parametrized by  $\psi$  and  $\phi$ , for augmented input feature  $X = [v \ Rf_u]$  as discussed in Fig (1) for the state input  $v$  and the control input  $Rf_u$ .  $\psi$  parametrizes a set of basis functions which forms the basis function library  $\Theta(X; \psi)$  and  $\phi$

**Algorithm 1:** The Meta-Training Loop of LeARN

**Input:**  $[v(W), Rfu(W)]$ : distribution of state and control input features over training wind data  $\mathcal{D}_i^{train}$

**Output:**  $\phi, \psi$ : meta-trained parameters

**Hyperparameters:**  $\alpha, \beta, n$ : step size hyperparameters, inner loop rounds

**while not done do**

Sample a batch of tasks  $\mathcal{T}_i(v_i, Rfu_i) \sim [v(W), Rfu(W)]$

**for all**  $\mathcal{T}_i(v_i, Rfu_i)$  **do**

Evaluate the basis functions  $\Theta_\psi(v_i, Rfu_i)$

Evaluate the feature-selection matrix  $\mathcal{E}_\phi(v_i, Rfu_i)$

Evaluate the task objective loss i.e. the dynamical estimation loss:

$$L_i = \|\dot{v}_i - \Theta_\psi(v_i, Rfu_i)\mathcal{E}_\phi(v_i, Rfu_i)\|_2^2$$

**for round**  $\leftarrow 1$  **to**  $n$  **do**

Compute the adapted parameter  $\phi'$ :

$$\phi' \leftarrow \phi - \alpha \cdot \nabla_\phi L_i$$

Compute the adapted parameter  $\psi'$ , using  $\nabla_\psi L_i(f_\psi)$ :

$$\psi' \leftarrow \psi - \alpha \cdot \nabla_\psi L_i$$

**end**

Sample datapoints  $D'_i = \{v'_i, Rfu'_i\}$  from  $\mathcal{T}_i(v_i, Rfu_i)$  for the meta-update

**end**

Consider  $L'_i$ :

$$L'_i = \|\dot{v}'_i - \Theta_{\psi'}(v'_i, Rfu'_i)\mathcal{E}_{\phi'}(v'_i, Rfu'_i)\|_2^2$$

Perform meta-update using each  $D'_i$ :

$$\phi \leftarrow \phi - \beta \cdot \nabla_\phi \sum_{v'_i, Rfu'_i} L'_i$$

$$\psi \leftarrow \psi - \beta \cdot \nabla_\psi \sum_{v'_i, Rfu'_i} L'_i$$

**end**

parametrizes the feature selection matrix  $\mathcal{E}(X; \phi)$ , for a given input feature  $X$ . To obtain generalizable basis functions and further dynamical representations, we start by meta-training the parameters  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  following the MAML (Finn et al., 2017) algorithm. Since, we are evaluating our methods on the Neural Fly (O’Connell et al., 2022) dataset, the different task objectives involve modeling the system dynamics accurately for a quadrotor being flown using a nonlinear baseline controller under different wind conditions. As aforementioned, we will discuss our algorithm for partial translational

dynamics presented in Eq (5). The bi-level meta-training loop is presented in Alg (1). Once, we have the meta-trained parameters, we perform online adaptation to new tasks as discussed in Eq (9). While online adaptation, we assume that the state features are  $L$  Lipschitz continuous, and add a regularizer to guide the training process as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_{t+1} &= \psi_t - \nabla_{\psi} L_{adapt}(f(X_t; \phi_t, \psi_t)) \\ \phi_{t+1} &= \phi_t - \nabla_{\phi} L_{adapt}(f(X_t; \phi_t, \psi_t))\end{aligned}\tag{9}$$

, where we initialize  $\psi_t$  and  $\phi_t$ , with the meta-trained parameters  $\psi$  and  $\phi$  respectively at  $t = 0$ , while adapting to a new task i.e. a new wind condition for the quadrotor to fly in.  $X_t$  is sampled from the new task and  $L_{adapt}$  gives us the adaptation loss as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}L_{adapt}(f(X_t; \phi_t, \psi_t)) &= (\dot{v}_t - f(X_t; \phi_t, \psi_t))^2 \\ &+ \lambda \max(0, \|f(X_t; \phi_t, \psi_t) - f(X_{t-1}; \phi_{t-1}, \psi_{t-1})\|_1 - L)\end{aligned}\tag{10}$$

, where  $\lambda$  is a hyperparameter and the regularizer ensures  $L$  Lipschitz continuity of the state inputs.

## 5. Experiments

### 5.1. Baselines

We present a comparative performance analysis of our framework LeARN against SINDy. Based on the Neural Fly dataset (O’Connell et al., 2022), we use data gathered by the quadrotor using the baseline controller in the following wind conditions for meta-training the parameters  $\psi$  and  $\phi$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\text{nowind} &= 0 \text{ m/s}, & 10\text{wind} &= 1.3 \text{ m/s}, & 20\text{wind} &= 2.5 \text{ m/s}, \\ 30\text{wind} &= 3.7 \text{ m/s}, & 40\text{wind} &= 4.9 \text{ m/s}, & 50\text{wind} &= 6.1 \text{ m/s}.\end{aligned}$$

We evaluate LeARN and SINDy for the system identification tasks across three different formulations of the quadrotor dynamics, the full system dynamics in Eq (7), the attitude dynamics in Eq (6) and the partial translational dynamics formulated in Eq (3). We perform this evaluation for the data gathered by the baseline nonlinear controller in the following wind conditions:

$$\begin{aligned}35\text{wind} &= 4.2 \text{ m/s}, & 70\text{psin}20 &= 8.5 + 2.4\sin(t) \text{ m/s}, \\ 70\text{wind} &= 8.5 \text{ m/s}, & 100\text{wind} &= 12.1 \text{ m/s}.\end{aligned}$$

We use a lightweight fully connected DNN parameterized by  $\psi$ , with GELU activations to model the basis function library. We use a lightweight fully connected DNN parameterized by  $\psi$ , with GELU activations to model the basis function library  $\Theta$ . This DNN has the following layer dimensions:

$$(\text{Input Feature Dimension} \times 12), (12 \times 16), (16 \times 24), (24 \times 48), (48 \times \text{Number of Basis Functions})$$

We further use another lightweight fully connected DNN parameterized by  $\phi$ , with GELU activations to model the feature selection matrix  $\mathcal{E}$ . Also, from extensive experimentation, we have seen that for the Neural Fly dataset,  $\sin(x)$  and  $\cos(x)$  suffice as a set of basis functions for the SINDy algorithm. Therefore, for comparison with LeARN, we model the DNN to have only two output features as in Fig (1), which gives us a set of two learned basis functions for fair evaluation against

SINDy. We employ SINDy with the sparsity threshold set to 0.2. Before delving into further results, it is important to note that for the adaptation wind tasks in the Neural Fly dataset, the data was collected by maneuvering the quadrotor in a figure-eight trajectory. The figure-eight trajectory in the Neural Fly dataset is inherently oscillatory, which makes it naturally suited to modeling by trigonometric functions. While DNNs are universal approximators, their capacity is constrained by their architecture and training data. According to VC-theory (Vapnik, 1995), the VC-dimension determines the range of functions a model can represent. A finite-capacity DNN, particularly one trained with limited data, may struggle to generalize to the intricate behavior of such trajectories in unobserved regions of the input space, resulting in suboptimal performance.

## 5.2. Results and Discussion

For analysis of adaptation and generalization performance, we evaluate the mean-squared error between the ground truth and the dynamical predictions. Despite the above discussion, we observe that LeARN delivers a much more competitive generalization performance as the input features begin to increase in dimension. It can be observed that the average difference in the generalization performance across the different adaptation wind tasks reduces from 0.043737 in Tables (6) and (5) to 0.002853 in Tables (4) and (3), and further down to 0.001811 in Tables (2) and (1), as the dimensionality of the concatenated input feature  $X$  increases. We use the PySINDy (de Silva et al., 2020) package for modeling the SINDy dynamics representations and the Higher (Grefenstette et al., 2019) package for implementing the bi-level MAML training loop.

### 5.2.1. FULL QUADROTOR DYNAMICS

We present the qualitative and quantitative comparisons of full system dynamics (7) of the quadrotor modeled by SINDy and LeARN. The quantitative comparisons are given in the tables (1) and (2). A qualitative comparison of the learned dynamics is presented in Fig (2).

SINDy	Adaptation Error	Generalization Error
35wind	0.306774	0.338733
70psin20	0.339417	0.273363
70wind	0.375176	0.481510
100wind	0.632472	0.725927

Table 1: SINDy full dynamics results

LeARN	Adaptation Error	Generalization Error
35wind	0.264041	0.317947
70psin20	0.335513	0.301584
70wind	0.379029	0.485635
100wind	0.644668	0.721661

Table 2: LeARN full dynamics results

### 5.2.2. ATTITUDE DYNAMICS

We present the quantitative comparisons of the rotational dynamics (6) of the quadrotor modeled by SINDy and LeARN. The quantitative comparisons are presented in the tables (3) and (4). The qualitative results are added to **Additional Results** due to the space constraints.

LEARNABLE BASIS FUNCTIONS FOR SYSTEM IDENTIFICATION




Figure 2: Qualitative results of the full dynamics modeled by SINDy and LeARN across different wind conditions. **Background** represents the ground truth dynamics. Then, we have **Adaptation performance**, and the **Generalization performance** on unseen data. The horizontal axis runs across 2511 data points and the vertical axis represents the value.

SINDy	Adaptation Error	Generalization Error
35wind	0.425098	0.466754
70psin20	0.577752	0.458267
70wind	0.562637	0.827086
100wind	0.993231	1.114576

Table 3: SINDy attitude dynamics results

LeARN	Adaptation Error	Generalization Error
35wind	0.415001	0.461112
70psin20	0.628583	0.493315
70wind	0.528537	0.830337
100wind	0.992714	1.093623

Table 4: LeARN attitude dynamics results

### 5.2.3. TRANSLATIONAL DYNAMICS

We present the quantitative comparisons of translational partial dynamics (5) modeled by. The quantitative comparisons are presented in tables (5) and (6). The qualitative results are added to **Additional Results** due to the space constraints.

SINDy	Adaptation Error	Generalization Error
35wind	0.155732	0.194475
70psin20	0.138483	0.104922
70wind	0.193284	0.171666
100wind	0.226771	0.232093

Table 5: SINDy translational dynamics results

LeARN	Adaptation Error	Generalization Error
35wind	0.154989	0.207919
70psin20	0.156630	0.149163
70wind	0.209953	0.218615
100wind	0.268037	0.302406

Table 6: LeARN translational dynamics results

## 6. Conclusion

In this work, we introduced LeARN, a novel algorithm for meta-learning the basis functions for nonlinear system identification. Our proposed approach demonstrates significant adaptability and generalization capabilities in modeling dynamical systems, as evidenced by its performance on unseen wind conditions in the Neural Fly dataset. Unlike the SINDy algorithm, our approach learns the library of basis functions directly from data. The proposed algorithm yields a parameterized basis function library optimized for adaptability to new, unseen environments. This ensures robustness without needing system-specific redesigns when encountering new dynamic regimes. Notably, we demonstrated that LeARN significantly narrows the performance gap with SINDy, particularly as the dimensionality of the input feature space increases, underscoring its suitability for capturing higher dimensional, complex nonlinear dynamical interactions. Furthermore, even in scenarios involving out-of-distribution dynamics, our approach, based on model-agnostic meta-learning, provides a guarantee that given sufficient gradient steps, the model can generalize effectively to challenging dynamical conditions. In the future, we aim to explore methods for learning basis functions for modeling intrinsic residual dynamics. Looking forward, our study sets the groundwork to address the broader goal of enabling robots to autonomously model and adapt to dynamic environments. Furthermore, our approach paves the way for developing robust, versatile, and adaptive robotic systems capable of operating safely and effectively in real-world environments.

## References

S.A. Billings. Identification of nonlinear systems—a survey. *IEE Proceedings D (Control Theory and Applications)*, 127:272–285, 1980. doi: 10.1049/ip-d.1980.0047. URL <https://digital-library>.



[theiet.org/doi/abs/10.1049/ip-d.1980.0047](https://theiet.org/doi/abs/10.1049/ip-d.1980.0047).

- Steven L. Brunton, Joshua L. Proctor, and J. Nathan Kutz. Discovering governing equations from data by sparse identification of nonlinear dynamical systems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(15):3932–3937, 2016. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1517384113. URL <https://www.pnas.org/doi/abs/10.1073/pnas.1517384113>.
- Kathleen Champion, Bethany Lusch, J. Nathan Kutz, and Steven L. Brunton. Data-driven discovery of coordinates and governing equations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(45):22445–22451, 2019. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1906995116. URL <https://www.pnas.org/doi/abs/10.1073/pnas.1906995116>.
- Brian de Silva, Kathleen Champion, Markus Quade, Jean-Christophe Loiseau, J. Kutz, and Steven Brunton. Pysindy: A python package for the sparse identification of nonlinear dynamical systems from data. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 5(49):2104, 2020. doi: 10.21105/joss.02104. URL <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.02104>.
- Chelsea Finn, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. Model-agnostic meta-learning for fast adaptation of deep networks, 2017. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1703.03400>.
- Edward Grefenstette, Brandon Amos, Denis Yarats, Phu Mon Htut, Artem Molchanov, Franziska Meier, Douwe Kiela, Kyunghyun Cho, and Soumith Chintala. Generalized inner loop meta-learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.01727*, 2019.
- Kurt Hornik, Maxwell Stinchcombe, and Halbert White. Multilayer feedforward networks are universal approximators. *Neural Networks*, 2(5):359–366, 1989. ISSN 0893-6080. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0893-6080\(89\)90020-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0893-6080(89)90020-8). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0893608089900208>.
- Timothy Hospedales, Antreas Antoniou, Paul Micaelli, and Amos Storkey. Meta-learning in neural networks: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 44(9):5149–5169, 2022. doi: 10.1109/TPAMI.2021.3079209.
- Lennart Ljung. *System Identification*, pages 163–173. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1998. ISBN 978-1-4612-1768-8. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4612-1768-8\_11. URL [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-1768-8\\_11](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-1768-8_11).
- Lennart Ljung. Perspectives on system identification. *Annual Reviews in Control*, 34(1):1–12, 2010. ISSN 1367-5788. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arcontrol.2009.12.001>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1367578810000027>.
- K.S. Narendra and K. Parthasarathy. Identification and control of dynamical systems using neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, 1(1):4–27, 1990. doi: 10.1109/72.80202.
- Michael O’Connell, Guanya Shi, Xichen Shi, Kamyar Azizzadenesheli, Anima Anandkumar, Yisong Yue, and Soon-Jo Chung. Neural-fly enables rapid learning for agile flight in strong winds. *Science Robotics*, 7(66), May 2022. ISSN 2470-9476. doi: 10.1126/scirobotics.abm6597. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/scirobotics.abm6597>.
- M. Raissi, P. Perdikaris, and G.E. Karniadakis. Physics-informed neural networks: A deep learning framework for solving forward and inverse problems involving nonlinear partial differential equations. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 378:686–707, 2019. ISSN 0021-9991. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2018.10.045>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0021999118307125>.

- Spencer M. Richards, Navid Azizan, Jean-Jacques Slotine, and Marco Pavone. Adaptive-control-oriented meta-learning for nonlinear systems, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.04490>.
- Guanya Shi, Xichen Shi, Michael O’Connell, Rose Yu, Kamyar Azizzadenesheli, Animashree Anandkumar, Yisong Yue, and Soon-Jo Chung. Neural lander: Stable drone landing control using learned dynamics. In *2019 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, page 9784–9790. IEEE Press, 2019. doi: 10.1109/ICRA.2019.8794351. URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICRA.2019.8794351>.
- Guanya Shi, Wolfgang Hönig, Yisong Yue, and Soon-Jo Chung. Neural-swarm: Decentralized close-proximity multirotor control using learned interactions, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2003.02992>.
- Russ Tedrake. *Underactuated Robotics*. 2023. URL <https://underactuated.csail.mit.edu>.
- Robert Tibshirani. Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 58(1):267–288, 1996. ISSN 00359246. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2346178>.
- Vladimir N Vapnik. *The Nature of Statistical Learning Theory*. Springer, 1995.