

Non-Asymptotic Error Analysis of Subspace Identification for Deterministic Systems

Shuai Sun

Abstract—This paper is concerned with the perturbation error analysis of the widely-used Subspace Identification Methods (SIM) for n -dimensional discrete-time Multiple-Input Multiple-Output (MIMO) Linear Time-Invariant (LTI) systems with m outputs, based on finite input/output sample data. Using a single input/output trajectory, we provide non-asymptotic upper bounds on the perturbation errors for the system matrices in state-space models as well as the system poles for two unified algorithms, offering a unified perspective across various SIM variants. Furthermore, we prove that SIMs become ill-conditioned for MIMO systems when the ratio n/m is large, regardless of system parameters. Numerical experiments are conducted to validate the ill-conditionedness of SIMs.

Index Terms—system identification, subspace identification methods, finite-time error analysis

I. INTRODUCTION

Linear Time-Invariant (LTI) systems are an important class of models with many applications in finance, biology, robotics, and other engineering fields and control applications [1]. The identification of Multiple-Input Multiple-Output (MIMO) LTI state-space models from input/output sample data is one of the core problems in system analysis, design and control [2]. Subspace Identification Methods (SIM) [3] and Ordinary Least-Squares method (OLS) [4] are two classical, widely used indirect approaches for the identification of LTI state-space models. In this paper, we mainly focus on SIM due to the following advantages [2]: Firstly, the task of model selection become significantly simpler. Secondly, Handling Single-Input Single-Output (SISO) systems can be easily extended to MIMO scenarios. Thirdly, The problem formulation within its framework is more appealing to application engineers. Fourth, SIMs are characterized by numerical stability and computational efficiency without requiring iterative optimization, making them particularly suitable for large-scale data and online applications.

SIMs have attracted significant research interest and achieved substantial development over the past three decades, and numerous meaningful progress [5]–[13] has been made. The identification approach of SIMs involves finding the relevant subspaces of the system from the input/output sample data matrices through a series of projections and decompositions, which requires performing QR and/or Singular Value Decompositions (SVD) on the various matrices consisting of input/output sample data. A number of variants of SIMs have been published, such as Canonical Variate Analysis (CVA) [5],

Numerical algorithms for State Space System Identification (N4SID) [14], and Multivariable Output-Error State Space method (MOESP) [15]. Overschie and De Moor [16] proposed a unifying theorem for deterministic systems, which consolidates all these SIMs [17]–[27] into a single general framework. The theorem reveals that these algorithms share a common subspace to determine the system order and to construct the (extended) observability matrix and the state sequence. Their difference lies in the weighting matrices used to compute the basis of the column space of the (extended) observability matrix and the state sequence. Additionally, Overschie and De Moor [16] introduced two unified SIMs based on the unifying theorem, into which almost all SIM variants can be categorized. The first part of these two algorithms is identical, as both calculate the relevant system subspace from the input/output sample data matrix through a series of projections and decompositions. The distinction lies in the methods used to calculate the system matrices of the state-space model, which correspond to the state approach and the shift invariance approach, respectively. Although these two algorithms can provide identification solutions based on finite sample data in the absence of noise, the oblique projection, QR decomposition, and SVD involved in the SIM steps introduce numerical errors and other perturbations, which impact identification performance. Therefore, it is necessary to theoretically analyze the impact of these perturbations on the identification results.

To date, the academic community has published several works analyzing the estimation errors of SIMs [28]–[39]. Among these, studies [28]–[34] focus on the asymptotic properties of SIMs, including consistency, asymptotic normality, and variance analysis, to establish their theoretical reliability under various conditions such as observed and unobserved inputs. However, these analyses are based on the assumption of an infinitely large data sample. In contrast, the series of works [35]–[39] of Ikedia and collaborators analyze the accuracy and bias of state-space parameter estimates in SIMs such as MOESP, PI-MOESP, and N4SID under finite sample conditions. While they provide explicit error formulas, investigate the impact of weighting matrices on accuracy, and explore how the choice of state-space basis affects model simplification and identification performance, these results rely on the assumption that the system is stable. Moreover, the explicit error formulas are not sufficiently precise, as they only include the dominant parts, while the non-dominant parts are represented using Big \mathcal{O} notation. Furthermore, the results are applicable only to certain SIMs, and they did not investigate the underlying mechanisms behind the perturbation errors.

The author is with Department of Automation, BNRist, Tsinghua University. Emails: suns19@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn.

Therefore, in this paper, we analyze the perturbation errors of two unified SIMs proposed by Overschee and De Moor [16] in a non-asymptotic sense, based on the unifying theorem.

The main contribution of this paper is as follows:

- 1) We provide non-asymptotic upper bounds on the perturbation errors for the system matrices in state-space models as well as the system poles for two unified algorithms, offering a unified perspective across various SIM variants.
- 2) We prove that SIMs become ill-conditioned for n -dimensional MIMO systems with m outputs, when the ratio n/m is large, regardless of system parameters.

Our work differs from existing studies in the following aspects. Firstly, the upper bounds of the perturbation error we provide are precise and do not rely on Big \mathcal{O} notation. Secondly, our analytical results are applicable to almost all variants of SIMs rather than just a few, these results have broad applicability. Thirdly, our analytical results do not assume stability and are therefore applicable to any, possibly unstable, systems. Fourth, we theoretically prove that SIMs become ill-conditioned when the system dimension n is larger than the number m of outputs.

This paper is organized as follows. Section II presents the preliminaries. Section III defines the identification problem, states the assumptions for finite input/output sample data, introduces the unifying theorem, and outlines the two unified SIMs. Sections IV and V provide the perturbation error analysis of the system matrices in state-space models and the system poles for two unified SIMs, respectively. Section VI analyzes the ill-conditionedness of the SIMs. Section VII provides numerical simulations and finally Section VIII concludes this paper.

Notations: $\mathbf{0}$ is an all-zero matrix of proper dimensions. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\lfloor x \rfloor$ denotes the largest integer not exceeding x . For matrix $A = (a_{ij})$, the Frobenius norm is denoted by $\|A\|_F \triangleq \sqrt{\text{tr}(A^H A)}$, and $\|A\|$ is the spectral norm of A , i.e., its largest singular value $\sigma_{\max}(A)$. $\sigma_j(A)$ denotes the j -th largest singular value of A , and $\sigma_{\min}(A)$ denotes the smallest non-zero singular value of A . $\lambda(A)$ denotes the spectrum of a square matrix A . The Moore-Penrose inverse of matrix A is denoted by A^\dagger . $\text{cond}(A) \triangleq \|A\| \|A^\dagger\|$ denotes the condition number of A . I_n denotes the $n \times n$ identity matrix and I denotes the identity matrix of appropriate dimension. Define $P_A \triangleq A A^\dagger$, which represents the projection onto the column space of A . Define $P_{A^H} \triangleq A^\dagger A$, which represents the projection onto the column space of A^H . The projection onto the orthogonal complement subspace of the column of A is denoted by $P_A^\perp \triangleq I - P_A$. Similarly, the projection onto the orthogonal complement subspace of the column of A^H is denoted by $P_{A^H}^\perp \triangleq I - P_{A^H}$. For a matrix B with full row rank, Π_B denotes the operator that orthogonally projects the row space of a matrix into the row space of B : $\Pi_B \triangleq B^T (B B^T)^{-1} B$. $A/B \triangleq A \Pi_B$ is defined as the orthogonal projection of the row space of A onto the row space of B . The projection of the row space of A onto the orthogonal complement of the row space of B is denoted as $A/B^\perp \triangleq A \Pi_B^\perp$, where $\Pi_B^\perp \triangleq I - \Pi_B$. The oblique projection

of the row space of $A \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times l}$ along the row space of $B \in \mathbb{R}^{s \times l}$ onto the row space of $C \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times l}$ is denoted as $A/B C \triangleq A \Pi_B^\perp (C \Pi_B^\perp)^\dagger C$.

II. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we present some important preliminary knowledge that will be used later. For the sake of overall readability, the proofs of the theorems in this section are provided in the Appendix.

First, we present the results of the perturbation analysis for the linear least squares problem. Suppose $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ and $\mathcal{B} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times p}$. It is well known that the minimum Frobenius norm solution to the linear least squares problem

$$\min_x \|\mathcal{A}x - \mathcal{B}\|_F \quad (1)$$

is $x^* = \mathcal{A}^\dagger \mathcal{B}$. Suppose $\mathcal{A}_1 = \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{E}_A$ and $\mathcal{B}_1 = \mathcal{B} + \mathcal{E}_B$, where $\mathcal{E}_A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ and $\mathcal{E}_B \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times p}$ are the perturbations of matrices \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} respectively, then the minimum Frobenius norm solution to the following linear least squares problem

$$\min_{\tilde{x}} \|\mathcal{A}_1 \tilde{x} - \mathcal{B}_1\|_F \quad (2)$$

is $\tilde{x}^* = \mathcal{A}_1^\dagger \mathcal{B}_1$.

The next theorem provides the perturbation results for the minimum norm solution under specific conditions.

Theorem 1 ([40]). *Given $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$, $\mathcal{B} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times p}$ and $\mathcal{A}_1 = \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{E}_A$, $\mathcal{B}_1 = \mathcal{B} + \mathcal{E}_B$, suppose that the minimum Frobenius norm solutions to linear least squares problem (1) and (2) are x^* and $\tilde{x}^* = x^* + h$ respectively. If $\text{rank}[\mathcal{A}] = \text{rank}[\mathcal{A}_1]$ and $\|\mathcal{A}^\dagger\| \|\mathcal{E}_A\| < 1$, then*

$$\|h\| \leq \frac{\text{cond}(\mathcal{A})}{\gamma_+} \left(\frac{\|\mathcal{E}_A\|}{\|\mathcal{A}\|} \|x^*\| + \frac{\|\mathcal{E}_B\|}{\|\mathcal{A}\|} + \frac{\kappa_{\mathcal{A}} \|\mathcal{E}_A\| \|r_x\|}{\gamma_+ \|\mathcal{A}\| \|\mathcal{A}\|} + \|\mathcal{E}_A\| \|\eta\| \right), \quad (3)$$

where $\text{cond}(\mathcal{A}) = \|\mathcal{A}^\dagger\| \|\mathcal{A}\|$ is the condition number of matrix \mathcal{A} , and $\gamma_+ = 1 - \|\mathcal{A}^\dagger\| \|\mathcal{E}_A\|$, and $r_x = \mathcal{B} - \mathcal{A}x^*$, $\eta = \mathcal{A}^{\dagger H} x^*$. In particular, if $\text{rank}[\mathcal{A}] = \text{rank}[\mathcal{A}_1] = n$, and $\|\mathcal{A}^\dagger\| \|\mathcal{E}_A\| < 1$, then

$$\|h\| \leq \frac{\text{cond}(\mathcal{A})}{\gamma_+} \left(\frac{\|\mathcal{E}_A\|}{\|\mathcal{A}\|} \|x^*\| + \frac{\|\mathcal{E}_B\|}{\|\mathcal{A}\|} + \frac{\kappa_{\mathcal{A}} \|\mathcal{E}_A\| \|r_x\|}{\gamma_+ \|\mathcal{A}\| \|\mathcal{A}\|} \right). \quad (4)$$

Theorem 2. *Given a $n \times mp$ ($p \leq n$) matrix $X_{n,mp}$ satisfying*

$$X_{n,mp} = [J_p \quad D J_p \quad \cdots \quad D^{m-1} J_p], \quad (5)$$

where $J_p \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ and D is a unitary diagonalizable matrix with real eigenvalues, the smallest singular value of $X_{n,mp}$ satisfies

$$\sigma_{\min}(X_{n,mp}) \leq 4\rho^{-\frac{\lfloor \min\{n, m(p-[p]_*)\} - 1 \rfloor}{\log(2mp)}} \|X_{n,mp}\|,$$

where $\rho \triangleq e^{\frac{\pi^2}{4}}$, and $[p]_* = 0$ if p is even or $p = 1$ and is 1 if p is an odd number greater than 1.

To characterize the gap between the spectra of square matrices, we introduce the Hausdorff distance [41] as follows.

Definition 1 (The Hausdorff Distance). Given $\mathcal{A} = (\alpha_{ij}) \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ and $\mathcal{B} = (\beta_{ij}) \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$, suppose that $\lambda(\mathcal{A}) = \{\lambda_1(\mathcal{A}), \dots, \lambda_n(\mathcal{A})\}$ and $\lambda(\mathcal{B}) = \{\mu_1(\mathcal{B}), \dots, \mu_n(\mathcal{B})\}$ are the spectra of matrix \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} respectively, then

$$d_H(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \triangleq \max\{s_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{B}), s_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{A})\} \quad (6)$$

is defined as the Hausdorff distance between the spectra of matrix \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} , where

$$s_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{B}) \triangleq \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} |\lambda_i(\mathcal{A}) - \mu_j(\mathcal{B})| \quad (7)$$

is the spectrum variation of \mathcal{B} with respect to \mathcal{A} .

Remark 1. The geometric meaning of $s_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{B})$ can be explained as follows. Let $\mathcal{D}_i \triangleq \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z - \lambda_i(\mathcal{A})| \leq \gamma\}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, then $s_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{B}) \leq \gamma$ means that $\sigma(\mathcal{B}) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathcal{D}_i$. On the other hand, it can be shown that the Hausdorff distance is a metric on $\{\lambda(\mathcal{A}) : \mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}\}$.

Theorem 3. Given $\mathcal{A} = (\alpha_{ij}) \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$, $\mathcal{B} = (\beta_{ij}) \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$, suppose that $\lambda(\mathcal{A}) = \{\lambda_1(\mathcal{A}), \dots, \lambda_n(\mathcal{A})\}$ and $\lambda(\mathcal{B}) = \{\mu_1(\mathcal{B}), \dots, \mu_n(\mathcal{B})\}$ are the spectra of matrix \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} respectively, then the Hausdorff distance between the spectra of matrix \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} satisfy

$$d_H(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \leq n^{\frac{1}{2n}} \left[\left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^n - 1 \right]^{\frac{1}{n}} m_{\mathbb{F}}^{1 - \frac{1}{n}} \|\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{B}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^{\frac{1}{n}}, \quad (8)$$

where $m_{\mathbb{F}} = \max\{\|\mathcal{A}\|_{\mathbb{F}}, \|\mathcal{B}\|_{\mathbb{F}}\}$.

This theorem indicates that the Hausdorff distance between the spectra of matrix \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} can be controlled by the distance between matrix \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} in the sense of matrix norm.

III. PROBLEM SETUP

A. Problem Setup

We consider the identification problem of the MIMO LTI system¹ of order n evolving according to

$$\begin{aligned} x_{k+1}^d &= Ax_k^d + Bu_k, \\ y_k &= Cx_k^d + Du_k, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

based on finite input/output sample data, where $x_k^d \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $u_k \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $y_k \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are the system state, the input and the output, respectively. A, B, C, D are **unknown** matrices with appropriate dimensions: $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, $C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, and $D \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$. The system order n is also **unknown**.

Assumption 1. For the system (9), the pair (A, C) is observable, and the pair (A, B) is controllable. Matrix A is diagonal and its diagonal elements, i.e., the poles of the system (9), are distinct and real.

Remark 2. Indeed, the system (9) is minimal in the sense of Assumption 1, i.e., the state-space realization (A, B, C, D) of the system (9) has the smallest dimension among all state-space realizations with the same input-output relationship. On the other hand, it is worth noting that only the observable part of the system can be identified, and the controllability

assumption of the system can ensure that all modes can be excited by the external input u_k . Therefore, Assumption 1 is necessary and well-defined.

The non-asymptotic identification is to determine the system order n and learn A, B, C, D up to within a similarity transformation using finite input/output sample data

$$\{(u_k, y_k) : 0 \leq k \leq s\}, \quad (10)$$

where s is the length of sample trajectory.

Our goal is to **provide a non-asymptotic perturbation analysis from a unified perspective for various SIM variants**.

B. The Unifying Theorem and Two Unified SIMs

In the subsection, we first briefly review the unifying theorem proposed by Overschee and De Moor [16] for deterministic system, which unified all these approaches [17]–[27] into one general framework, and then review two unified SIMs based on the unifying theorem.

Firstly, we define some notations used to denote input and output block Hankel matrices based on input sequence $\{u_k : 0 \leq k \leq s\}$ as follows

$$U_{0,i-1,j} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} u_0 & u_1 & \cdots & u_{j-1} \\ u_1 & u_2 & \cdots & u_j \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ u_{i-1} & u_i & \cdots & u_{i+j-2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (11)$$

$$U_{i,2i-1,j} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} u_i & u_{i+1} & \cdots & u_{i+j-1} \\ u_{i+1} & u_{i+2} & \cdots & u_{i+j} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ u_{2i-1} & u_{2i} & \cdots & u_{2i+j-2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (12)$$

where the three subscripts on U denote the subscript of the first and last elements of the first column and the number of columns, respectively, and i and j are user-defined indices, which are assumed to be larger than the dimension n of the system (9). It is worth noting that the length s of sample data is large enough and the number of column j is typically equal to $s - 2i + 1$. The past input block Hankel matrix $U_p \in \mathbb{R}^{ip \times j}$ is defined as $U_{0,i-1,j}$, while the corresponding future input block Hankel matrix $U_f \triangleq U_{i,2i-1,j} \in \mathbb{R}^{ip \times j}$. The matrices U_p^+ and U_f^- are defined² by: $U_p^+ \triangleq U_{0,i,j} \in \mathbb{R}^{(i+1)p \times j}$, $U_f^- \triangleq U_{i+1,2i-1,j} \in \mathbb{R}^{(i-1)p \times j}$. Similarly, we can define the corresponding past and future output block Hankel matrix $Y_p \in \mathbb{R}^{im \times j}$, $Y_f \in \mathbb{R}^{im \times j}$ and $Y_p^+ \in \mathbb{R}^{(i+1)m \times j}$, $Y_f^- \in \mathbb{R}^{(i-1)m \times j}$. For convenience, $W_p \in \mathbb{R}^{i(p+m) \times j}$ is defined as the past input and output data

$$W_p \triangleq [U_p^{\top} \quad Y_p^{\top}]^{\top}, \quad (13)$$

and $W_p^+ \in \mathbb{R}^{(i+1)(p+m) \times j}$ is defined in the same way. The extended observability matrix $\Gamma_i \in \mathbb{R}^{im \times n}$ ($i \geq n$) and the

¹Note that the superscript “ d ” in all the following variables denotes “deterministic”.

²The superscript “+” stands for “add one block row” while the superscript “-” stands for “delete one block row”.

state sequence $X_i^d \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times j}$ are defined as follows

$$\Gamma_i \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} C \\ CA \\ \vdots \\ CA^{i-1} \end{bmatrix}, \quad X_i^d \triangleq [x_i^d \quad x_{i+1}^d \quad \cdots \quad x_{i+j-1}^d]. \quad (14)$$

Analogous to the past inputs and outputs, the past state sequence X_p^d and the future state sequence X_f^d are defined as $X_p^d \triangleq X_0^d$ and $X_f^d \triangleq X_i^d$.

- Assumption 2.** 1) The input u_k is persistently exciting of order $2i$, i.e., the input covariance matrix $U_{0,2i-1,j}U_{0,2i-1,j}^\top$ has full row rank $2ip$.
 2) The intersection of the row space of U_f and the row space of X_p^d is empty.
 3) The weighting matrices $W_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{im \times im}$ and $W_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{j \times j}$ satisfy that W_1 is of full rank and W_2 is such that $\text{rank}[W_p] = \text{rank}[W_p W_2]$.




Fig. 1: An overview of the subspace identification procedure for deterministic system.

Theorem 4 (The Unifying Theorem [16]). For the system (9), under the condition that Assumption 1 and 2 are satisfied, let O_i be the oblique projection of the row space of Y_f along the row space of U_f on the row space of W_p :

$$O_i \triangleq Y_f /_{U_f} W_p \quad (15)$$

and the singular value decomposition:

$$W_1 O_i W_2 = [\mathcal{U}_1 \quad \mathcal{U}_2] \begin{bmatrix} S_1 & \\ & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{V}_1^\top \\ \mathcal{V}_2^\top \end{bmatrix} = \mathcal{U}_1 S_1 \mathcal{V}_1^\top, \quad (16)$$

where $S_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n' \times n'}$ is a diagonal matrix, with its elements being the nonzero singular values of the matrix $W_1 O_i W_2$, sorted in descending order, then we have:

- 1) The matrix O_i is the product of the extended observability matrix Γ_i and the state sequence X_f^d : $O_i = \Gamma_i X_f^d$.
- 2) The order of the system (9) is equal to the number of singular values in equation (16) different from zero.
- 3) The extended observability matrix Γ_i is equal to:

$$\Gamma_i = W_1^{-1} \mathcal{U}_1 S_1^{1/2} T, \quad (17)$$

where $T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is an arbitrary non-singular matrix representing a similarity transformation.

- 4) The part of the state sequence X_f^d that lies in the column space of W_2 can be recovered from:

$$X_f^d W_2 = T^{-1} S_1^{1/2} \mathcal{V}_1^\top. \quad (18)$$

- 5) The state sequence X_f^d is equal to

$$X_f^d = \Gamma_i^\dagger O_i. \quad (19)$$

Remark 3. In Theorem 4, the weight matrices W_1 and W_2 determine the state-space basis of the identified model. On the other hand, the introduction of the similarity transformation T is to ensure that the recovered extended observability matrix Γ_i and the state sequence X_f^d are equal to the original Γ_i and X_f^d . In fact, T is a function of the weight matrices W_1 and W_2 , and should be represented as $T(W_1, W_2)$. However, as long as the identified set of state-space matrices is equivalent to the original state-space matrices under a similarity transformation, there is no need to recover the original matrices A , B , C , and D that generate the input/output sample data. This implies that we can also set the similarity transformation T to the identity matrix in the following.

In fact, the calculation of the system matrices A, B, C, D in the state-space model based on the results of Theorem 4 can be performed in two different ways: the state approach and the shift invariance approach, which correspond to Algorithm I and Algorithm II, respectively. It is worth noting that the processes for calculating the extended observability matrix Γ_i and state sequence X_f^d in these two algorithms are consistent with the steps outlined in Theorem 4. Fig. 1 provides an overview of the procedure for the deterministic subspace identification.

Later, we will analyze the perturbation errors of these two unified algorithms in the finite-sample scenario.

IV. PERTURBATION OF THE SYSTEM MATRICES

In this section, for the two deterministic identification algorithms, the state approach and the shift invariance approach, we provide upper bounds on the perturbation errors of the system matrices A, B, C, D in the state-space model under finite input/output sample data.

Theorem 5. For the system (9), under the condition that Assumption 1 and 2 are satisfied, let $\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{C}, \bar{D}$ ³ be the state-space realization corresponding to the output of Algorithm I with O_i and O_{i-1} , and $\hat{A}_i, \hat{B}_i, \hat{C}_i, \hat{D}_i$ be the state-space realization corresponding to the output of Algorithm I with \hat{O}_i and \hat{O}_{i-1} , where \hat{O}_i and \hat{O}_{i-1} correspond to the perturbed O_i and O_{i-1} , respectively. Assume that under perturbations, the state sequence \hat{X}_{i+1}^d and \hat{X}_i^d obtained in Algorithm I with \hat{O}_i and \hat{O}_{i-1} satisfy

$$\hat{X}_{i+1}^d = X_{i+1}^d + \mathcal{E}_{X_{i+1}}, \quad \hat{X}_i^d = X_i^d + \mathcal{E}_{X_i}. \quad (29)$$

³The subscript “I” corresponds to Algorithm I.

Algorithm I The First Deterministic Identification Algorithm

Input: The user-defined indices $i, j \geq n$, where n is the system order, input and output Hankel block matrices U_p, U_f, Y_p and Y_f .

1: Calculate the oblique projections:

$$O_i = Y_f / U_f W_p, \quad O_{i-1} = Y_f^- / U_f^- W_p^+. \quad (20)$$

2: Calculate the singular value decomposition of the weighted oblique projection and determine the system order:

$$W_1 O_i W_2 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{U}_1 & \mathcal{U}_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} S_1 & \\ & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{V}_1^\top \\ \mathcal{V}_2^\top \end{bmatrix} = \mathcal{U}_1 S_1 \mathcal{V}_1^\top, \quad (21)$$

where $S_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n' \times n'}$ is a diagonal matrix, with its elements being the nonzero singular values of the matrix $W_1 O_i W_2$, sorted in descending order, and the system order is chosen equal to n' .

3: Determine Γ_i and Γ_{i-1} as:

$$\Gamma_i = W_1^{-1} \mathcal{U}_1 S_1^{1/2}, \quad \Gamma_{i-1} = \underline{\Gamma}_i, \quad (22)$$

where $\underline{\Gamma}_i$ denote the matrix Γ_i without the last m rows.

4: Determine the state sequences:

$$X_i^d = \Gamma_i^\dagger O_i, \quad X_{i+1}^d = \Gamma_{i-1}^\dagger O_{i-1}. \quad (23)$$

5: Solve the following linear equations system for A, B, C and D :

$$\begin{bmatrix} X_{i+1}^d \\ Y_{i,i,j} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X_i^d \\ U_{i,i,j} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (24)$$

Output: A, B, C, D , and the system order n' .

If $\text{rank} [\mathcal{A}_I] = \text{rank} [\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_I]$, and $\|\mathcal{E}_{X_i}\| < \sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{A}_I)$, then $\widehat{A}_I, \widehat{B}_I, \widehat{C}_I, \widehat{D}_I$ satisfy

$$\left\| \begin{bmatrix} \widehat{A}_I & \widehat{B}_I \\ \widehat{C}_I & \widehat{D}_I \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \overline{A} & \overline{B} \\ \overline{C} & \overline{D} \end{bmatrix} \right\| \leq \frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{A}_I) - \|\mathcal{E}_{X_i}\|} \left(\|\mathcal{E}_{X_{i+1}}\| + (1 + \text{cond}(\mathcal{A}_I)) \|\mathcal{E}_{X_i}\| \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \overline{A} & \overline{B} \\ \overline{C} & \overline{D} \end{bmatrix} \right\| \right), \quad (30)$$

where $\mathcal{A}_I = [(X_i^d)^\top \ U_{i,i,j}^\top]^\top$. In particular, if matrices \mathcal{A}_I and $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_I$ are both full row rank, that is, $\text{rank} [\mathcal{A}_I] = \text{rank} [\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_I] = n + p$, and $\|\mathcal{E}_{X_i}\| < \sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{A}_I)$, then

$$\left\| \begin{bmatrix} \widehat{A}_I & \widehat{B}_I \\ \widehat{C}_I & \widehat{D}_I \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \overline{A} & \overline{B} \\ \overline{C} & \overline{D} \end{bmatrix} \right\| \leq \frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{A}_I) - \|\mathcal{E}_{X_i}\|} \left(\|\mathcal{E}_{X_i}\| \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \overline{A} & \overline{B} \\ \overline{C} & \overline{D} \end{bmatrix} \right\| + \|\mathcal{E}_{X_{i+1}}\| \right). \quad (31)$$

Proof. Since there is no noise, the system (24) of linear equations is consistent and can be written as an equivalent

Algorithm II The Second Deterministic Identification Algorithm

Input: The user-defined indices $i, j \geq n$, where n is the system order, input and output Hankel block matrices U_p, U_f, Y_p and Y_f .

1: Calculate the oblique projection:

$$O_i = Y_f / U_f W_p. \quad (25)$$

2: Repeat Step 2 in Algorithm I.

3: Determine Γ_i and Γ_i^\perp as:

$$\Gamma_i = W_1^{-1} \mathcal{U}_1 S_1^{1/2}, \quad \Gamma_i^\perp = \mathcal{U}_2^\top W_1. \quad (26)$$

4: Determine A and C :

$$A = \underline{\Gamma}_i^\dagger \overline{\Gamma}_i, \quad C = \Gamma_i(1:m,:), \quad (27)$$

where $\underline{\Gamma}_i$ and $\overline{\Gamma}_i$ are the matrices obtained from Γ_i by removing the last m row and the first m row, respectively, and $\Gamma_i(1:m,:)$ denotes the first m rows of Γ_i .

5: Using the following least squares problem, solve for B and D ,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{M}_1 \\ \mathcal{M}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{M}_i \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{L}_1 & \mathcal{L}_2 & \cdots & \mathcal{L}_i \\ \mathcal{L}_2 & \mathcal{L}_3 & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{L}_i & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_p & \\ & \underline{\Gamma}_i \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} D \\ B \end{bmatrix}, \quad (28)$$

where $[\mathcal{M}_1 \ \mathcal{M}_2 \ \cdots \ \mathcal{M}_i] \triangleq \Gamma_i^\perp Y_f U_f^\dagger$, and $[\mathcal{L}_1 \ \mathcal{L}_2 \ \cdots \ \mathcal{L}_i] \triangleq \Gamma_i^\perp$, for each $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, i\}$, $\mathcal{M}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{(mi-n) \times p}$ and $\mathcal{L}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{(mi-n) \times m}$.

Output: A, B, C, D , and the system order n' .

form of the least squares problem as follows

$$\min_{A,B,C,D} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} X_{i+1}^d \\ Y_{i,i,j} \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X_i^d \\ U_{i,i,j} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_F. \quad (32)$$

By applying the results of Theorem 1 to least squares problem (32) and its perturbed version, it can be obtained that

$$\left\| \begin{bmatrix} \widehat{A}_I & \widehat{B}_I \\ \widehat{C}_I & \widehat{D}_I \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \overline{A} & \overline{B} \\ \overline{C} & \overline{D} \end{bmatrix} \right\| \leq \frac{\text{cond}(\mathcal{A}_I)}{\gamma_I} \left(\frac{\|\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}_I}\|}{\|\mathcal{A}_I\|} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \overline{A} & \overline{B} \\ \overline{C} & \overline{D} \end{bmatrix} \right\| + \frac{\|\mathcal{E}_{B_I}\|}{\|\mathcal{A}_I\|} + \frac{\text{cond}(\mathcal{A}_I)}{\gamma_I} \frac{\|\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}_I}\|}{\|\mathcal{A}_I\|} \frac{\|r_I\|}{\|\mathcal{A}_I\|} + \|\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}_I}\| \|\eta_I\| \right), \quad (33)$$

where $\mathcal{A}_I = [(X_i^d)^\top \ U_{i,i,j}^\top]^\top$, and $B_I = [(X_{i+1}^d)^\top \ Y_{i,i,j}^\top]^\top$, and $\text{cond}(\mathcal{A}_I) = \|\mathcal{A}_I^\dagger\| \|\mathcal{A}_I\|$ is the condition number of matrix \mathcal{A}_I , and $\gamma_I = 1 - \|\mathcal{A}_I^\dagger\| \|\mathcal{E}_{X_i}\|$, and $r_I = B_I - \begin{bmatrix} \overline{A} & \overline{B} \\ \overline{C} & \overline{D} \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{A}_I$ is the residual of the least squares problem (32), and $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}_I} = [\mathcal{E}_{X_i}^\top \ \mathbf{0}]^\top$, and $\mathcal{E}_{B_I} = [\mathcal{E}_{X_{i+1}}^\top \ \mathbf{0}]^\top$, and $\eta_I = (\mathcal{A}_I^\dagger)^\text{H} \begin{bmatrix} \overline{A} & \overline{B} \\ \overline{C} & \overline{D} \end{bmatrix}$. Since the system (24) of linear equations is consistent, its residual

r_I is zero, which means the third term inside the braces on the right-hand side of inequality (33) is zero. Noting that $\|\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}_I}\| = \|\mathcal{E}_{X_i}\|$, $\|\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{B}_I}\| = \|\mathcal{E}_{X_{i+1}}\|$, and

$$\|\eta_I\| \leq \|\mathcal{A}_I^\dagger\| \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \overline{A} & \overline{B} \\ \overline{C} & \overline{D} \end{bmatrix} \right\| = \frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{A}_I)} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \overline{A} & \overline{B} \\ \overline{C} & \overline{D} \end{bmatrix} \right\|. \quad (34)$$

Combining the above result with (33) completes the proof of (30). A similar approach can be used to prove (31). \square

Remark 4. The results above is stated in terms of the spectral norm, and one can deduce similar results in terms of the following Frobenius norm by using $\sqrt{n+p}\|\mathcal{A}_I^\dagger\|$ to bound $\|\mathcal{A}_I^\dagger\|_F$. This yields, when $\text{rank}[\mathcal{A}_I] = \text{rank}[\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_I] = n+p$, and $\|\mathcal{E}_{X_i}\| < \sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{A}_I)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \widehat{A}_I & \widehat{B}_I \\ \widehat{C}_I & \widehat{D}_I \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \overline{A} & \overline{B} \\ \overline{C} & \overline{D} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_F \\ & \leq \frac{\sqrt{n+p}}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{A}_I) - \|\mathcal{E}_{X_i}\|} \left(\|\mathcal{E}_{X_i}\|_F \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \overline{A} & \overline{B} \\ \overline{C} & \overline{D} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_F + \|\mathcal{E}_{X_{i+1}}\|_F \right). \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Similarly, the results of Theorem 6 under the Frobenius norm can be obtained.

The results of Theorem 5 indicate that Algorithm I, which uses the state approach to calculate A , B , C and D , is robust to perturbations up to trivial ambiguities. The robustness is controlled by the smallest singular value of $[(X_j^d)^\top \ U_{i,i,j}^\top]^\top$. Therefore, $\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{A}_I)$ being small indicates that the state-space form of the system (9) is hard to identify.

Theorem 6. For the system (9), under the condition that Assumption 1 and 2 are satisfied, let \overline{A} , \overline{B} , \overline{C} , \overline{D} ⁴ be the state-space realization corresponding to the output of Algorithm II with O_i , and \widehat{A}_I , \widehat{B}_I , \widehat{C}_I , \widehat{D}_I be the state-space realization corresponding to the output of Algorithm II with \widehat{O}_i , where \widehat{O}_i corresponds to the perturbed O_i . Assume that under perturbations, the extended observability matrix $\widehat{\Gamma}_i$, $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}$ obtained in Algorithm II with \widehat{O}_i satisfy

$$\widehat{\Gamma}_i = \Gamma_i + \mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_i}, \quad \widehat{\mathcal{L}} = \mathcal{L} + \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{L}}, \quad \widehat{\mathcal{M}} = \mathcal{M} + \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{M}}. \quad (36)$$

If $\text{rank}[\Gamma_i] = \text{rank}[\widehat{\Gamma}_i]$, and $\|\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_i}\| < \sigma_{\min}(\Gamma_i)$, then it can be obtained that

$$\|\widehat{A}_I - \overline{A}\| \leq \frac{\|\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_i}\|}{\sigma_{\min}(\Gamma_i) - \|\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_i}\|} (1 + (1 + \text{cond}(\Gamma_i))\|\overline{A}\|), \quad (37)$$

where $\text{cond}(\Gamma_i) = \|\Gamma_i^\dagger\| \|\Gamma_i\|$ is the condition number of matrix Γ_i . In particular, if $\text{rank}[\Gamma_i] = \text{rank}[\widehat{\Gamma}_i] = n$, and $\|\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_i}\| < \sigma_{\min}(\Gamma_i)$, then

$$\|\widehat{A}_I - \overline{A}\| \leq \frac{\|\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_i}\|}{\sigma_{\min}(\Gamma_i) - \|\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_i}\|} (1 + \|\overline{A}\|). \quad (38)$$

On the other hands, \widehat{C}_I satisfies

$$\|\widehat{C}_I - \overline{C}\| = \|[I_m \ \mathbf{0}]\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_i}\| \leq \|\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_i}\|. \quad (39)$$

If $\text{rank}[\mathcal{L}] = \text{rank}[\widehat{\mathcal{L}}]$, and $\|\mathcal{L}^\dagger\| \|\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{L}}\| < 1$, then \widehat{B}_I and \widehat{D}_I satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \widehat{B}_I \\ \widehat{D}_I \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \overline{B} \\ \overline{D} \end{bmatrix} \right\| \\ & \leq \frac{\text{cond}(\mathcal{L})}{\gamma'_I} \left(\frac{\|\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{L}}\|}{\|\mathcal{L}\|} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \overline{D} \\ \overline{B} \end{bmatrix} \right\| + \frac{\|\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{M}}\|}{\|\mathcal{L}\|} + \|\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{L}}\| \eta'_I \right), \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where

$$\mathcal{M} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{M}_1 \\ \mathcal{M}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{M}_i \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{L} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{L}_1 & \mathcal{L}_2 & \cdots & \mathcal{L}_i \\ \mathcal{L}_2 & \mathcal{L}_3 & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{L}_i & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_p & \\ & \Gamma_i \end{bmatrix} \quad (41)$$

and $\text{cond}(\mathcal{L}) = \|\mathcal{L}^\dagger\| \|\mathcal{L}\|$ is the condition number of matrix \mathcal{L} , and $\gamma'_I = 1 - \|\mathcal{L}^\dagger\| \|\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{L}}\|$, and $\eta'_I = (\mathcal{L})^{\text{tH}} [\overline{D}^\top \ \overline{B}^\top]^\top$.

In particular, if matrices \mathcal{L} and $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}$ are both full row rank, that is, $\text{rank}[\mathcal{L}] = \text{rank}[\widehat{\mathcal{L}}] = n+m$, and $\|\mathcal{L}^\dagger\| \|\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{L}}\| < 1$, then

$$\left\| \begin{bmatrix} \widehat{B}_I \\ \widehat{D}_I \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \overline{B} \\ \overline{D} \end{bmatrix} \right\| \leq \frac{\text{cond}(\mathcal{L})}{\gamma'_I \|\mathcal{L}\|} \left(\|\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{L}}\| \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \overline{D} \\ \overline{B} \end{bmatrix} \right\| + \|\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{M}}\| \right). \quad (42)$$

Proof. Since there is no noise, the first system of linear equations in (27) is consistent and can be written as an equivalent form of the least squares problem as follows

$$\min_A \|\Gamma_i A - \overline{\Gamma}_i\|_F. \quad (43)$$

By applying the results of Theorem 1 to least squares problem (43) and its perturbed version, it can be obtained that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{A}_I - \overline{A}\| & \leq \frac{\text{cond}(\Gamma_i)}{\gamma_I} \left(\frac{\|\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_i}\|}{\|\Gamma_i\|} \|\overline{A}\| + \frac{\|\mathcal{E}_{\overline{\Gamma}_i}\|}{\|\Gamma_i\|} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{\text{cond}(\Gamma_i)}{\gamma_I} \frac{\|\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_i}\| \|\mathbf{r}_I\|}{\|\Gamma_i\|} + \|\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_i}\| \eta_I \right), \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

where \mathbf{r}_I is the residual of equation (44), and $\gamma_I = 1 - \|\Gamma_i^\dagger\| \|\mathbf{0} \ I_{(i-1)m}\| \mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_i}\|$, and $\eta_I = (\Gamma_i)^{\text{tH}} \overline{A}_I$. \mathbf{r}_I is zero because equation (44) is consistent. Note that $\|\mathcal{E}_{\overline{\Gamma}_i}\| = \|[I_{(i-1)m} \ \mathbf{0}]\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_i}\| \leq \|\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_i}\|$ and $\|\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_i}\| = \|\mathbf{0} \ I_{(i-1)m}\| \mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_i}\| \leq \|\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_i}\|$. Combing these results completes the proof of (37). The same steps can be used to prove (38).

On the other hand, the linear equations system (28) can be written as an equivalent form of the least squares problem as follows

$$\min_{B,D} \left\| \mathcal{M} - \mathcal{L} \begin{bmatrix} D \\ B \end{bmatrix} \right\|_F. \quad (45)$$

Based on the results of Theorem 1, a similar process to the proof of Theorem 5 can be used to prove 40 and (42). \square

Similar to Theorem 5, the results of Theorem 6 indicate that Algorithm II, which uses the shift invariance approach to calculate A , B , C and D , is also robust to perturbations up to trivial ambiguities. The robustness is controlled by the smallest singular value $\sigma_{\min}(\Gamma_i)$ of the extended observability matrix Γ_i , which corresponds to the weakest mode of the system (9). Here “weakest” is in terms of observability, therefore, a

⁴The subscript “I” corresponds to Algorithm II.

smaller $\sigma_{\min}(\Gamma_i)$ implies that the matrix A in the state-space model of system (9) is more difficult to identify.

V. PERTURBATION OF THE SYSTEM POLES

So far our attention has focused on analyzing the perturbation errors for the two unified algorithms. Obviously, We are also interesting in understanding how large the perturbation error of the system poles is. In this section, we will use the previous results to provide an perturbation error analysis under finite input/output sample data for the two algorithms.

Theorem 7. *For the system (9), under the condition that Assumption 1 and 2 are satisfied, let $\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{C}, \bar{D}$ be the state-space realization corresponding to the output of Algorithm I with O_i and O_{i-1} , and $\hat{A}_I, \hat{B}_I, \hat{C}_I, \hat{D}_I$ be the state-space realization corresponding to the output of Algorithm I with \hat{O}_i and \hat{O}_{i-1} , where \hat{O}_i and \hat{O}_{i-1} correspond to the perturbed O_i and O_{i-1} , respectively. Assume that under perturbations, the state sequence \hat{X}_{i+1}^d and \hat{X}_i^d obtained in Algorithm I with \hat{O}_i and \hat{O}_{i-1} satisfy*

$$\hat{X}_{i+1}^d = X_{i+1}^d + \mathcal{E}_{X_{i+1}}, \quad \hat{X}_i^d = X_i^d + \mathcal{E}_{X_i}. \quad (46)$$

If $\text{rank}[\mathcal{A}_I] = \text{rank}[\hat{\mathcal{A}}_I] = n + p$, and $\|\mathcal{E}_{X_i}\| < \sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{A}_I)$, then it can be obtained that

$$\begin{aligned} & d_{\text{H}}(\hat{A}_I, \bar{A}) \\ & \leq n^{\frac{1}{n}} \left[\left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^n - 1 \right]^{\frac{1}{n}} (\sqrt{n}\Delta + \|\bar{A}\|_{\text{F}})^{1-\frac{1}{n}} \Delta^{\frac{1}{n}}, \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

where $\Delta = \frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{A}_I) - \|\mathcal{E}_{X_i}\|} \left(\|\mathcal{E}_{X_i}\| \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \bar{A} & \bar{B} \\ \bar{C} & \bar{D} \end{bmatrix} \right\| + \|\mathcal{E}_{X_{i+1}}\| \right)$.

Proof. Based on Theorem 3, it can be obtained that

$$d_{\text{H}}(\hat{A}_I, \bar{A}) \leq n^{\frac{1}{2n}} \left[\left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^n - 1 \right]^{\frac{1}{n}} m_I^{1-\frac{1}{n}} \|\hat{A}_I - \bar{A}\|_{\text{F}}^{\frac{1}{n}}, \quad (48)$$

where $m_I = \max\{\|\bar{A}\|_{\text{F}}, \|\hat{A}_I\|_{\text{F}}\}$. According to Theorem 6, we have

$$\|\hat{A}_I - \bar{A}\| \leq \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \hat{A}_I & \hat{B}_I \\ \hat{C}_I & \hat{D}_I \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \bar{A} & \bar{B} \\ \bar{C} & \bar{D} \end{bmatrix} \right\| \leq \Delta. \quad (49)$$

Furthermore, it can be obtained that

$$\|\hat{A}_I - \bar{A}\|_{\text{F}} \leq \sqrt{n} \|\hat{A}_I - \bar{A}\| \leq \sqrt{n}\Delta. \quad (50)$$

On the other hand, according to the triangle inequality, we obtain

$$m_I \leq \|\bar{A}\|_{\text{F}} + \|\bar{A} - \hat{A}_I\|_{\text{F}} \leq \|\bar{A}\|_{\text{F}} + \sqrt{n}\Delta. \quad (51)$$

By combining (48), (49), (50), and (51), the proof is completed. \square

Theorem 8. *For the system (9), under the condition that Assumption 1 and 2 are satisfied, let $\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{C}, \bar{D}$ be the state-space realization corresponding to the output of Algorithm II with O_i , and $\hat{A}_{\text{II}}, \hat{B}_{\text{II}}, \hat{C}_{\text{II}}, \hat{D}_{\text{II}}$ be the state-space realization corresponding to the output of Algorithm II with \hat{O}_i , where \hat{O}_i corresponds to the perturbed O_i . Assume that under*

perturbations, the extended observability matrix $\hat{\Gamma}_i$ obtained in Algorithm II with \hat{O}_i satisfies

$$\hat{\Gamma}_i = \Gamma_i + \mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_i}. \quad (52)$$

If $\text{rank}[\Gamma_i] = \text{rank}[\hat{\Gamma}_i] = n$, and $\|\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_i}\| < \sigma_{\min}(\Gamma_i)$, then it can be obtained that

$$\begin{aligned} & d_{\text{H}}(\hat{A}_{\text{II}}, \bar{A}) \leq \\ & n^{\frac{1}{n}} \left[\left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^n - 1 \right]^{\frac{1}{n}} (\sqrt{n}\Delta' + \|\bar{A}\|_{\text{F}})^{1-\frac{1}{n}} (\Delta')^{\frac{1}{n}} \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

where $\Delta' = \frac{\|\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_i}\|}{\sigma_{\min}(\Gamma_i) - \|\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_i}\|} (1 + \|\bar{A}\|)$.

Proof. Based on Theorem 3, it can be obtained that

$$d_{\text{H}}(\hat{A}_{\text{II}}, \bar{A}) \leq n^{\frac{1}{2n}} \left[\left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^n - 1 \right]^{\frac{1}{n}} m_{\text{II}}^{1-\frac{1}{n}} \|\hat{A}_{\text{II}} - \bar{A}\|_{\text{F}}^{\frac{1}{n}}, \quad (54)$$

where $m_{\text{II}} = \max\{\|\bar{A}\|_{\text{F}}, \|\hat{A}_{\text{II}}\|_{\text{F}}\}$. According to Theorem 6, we have $\|\hat{A}_{\text{II}} - \bar{A}\| \leq \Delta'$. Furthermore, it can be obtained that

$$\|\hat{A}_{\text{II}} - \bar{A}\|_{\text{F}} \leq \sqrt{n} \|\hat{A}_{\text{II}} - \bar{A}\| \leq \sqrt{n}\Delta'. \quad (55)$$

On the other hand, according to the triangle inequality, we obtain

$$m_{\text{II}} \leq \|\bar{A}\|_{\text{F}} + \|\bar{A} - \hat{A}_{\text{II}}\|_{\text{F}} \leq \|\bar{A}\|_{\text{F}} + \sqrt{n}\Delta'. \quad (56)$$

By combining (54), (55), and (56), the proof is completed. \square

Remark 5. *The term $[(1 + 1/\sqrt{n})^n - 1]^{1/n}$ in inequality (47) of Theorem 7 and inequality (53) of Theorem 8 can be slightly relaxed to $1 + 1/\sqrt{n}$.*

The results of Theorem 7 and 8 reveal that the perturbation error of the system poles is controlled by the perturbation error of the system matrices in the state-space models. This is not surprising, as the eigenvalues of matrices exhibit good continuity. Combing the analysis results from the previous section, it can be concluded that the perturbation error of the system poles in Algorithm I is controlled by the smallest singular value of $[(X_f^d)^{\top} \ U_{i,i,j}^{\top}]^{\top}$, while the perturbation error of the system poles in Algorithm II is controlled by the the smallest singular value of the extended observability matrix Γ_i . This implies that when $\sigma_{\min}([(X_f^d)^{\top} \ U_{i,i,j}^{\top}]^{\top})$ or $\sigma_{\min}(\Gamma_i)$ being small indicates that the perturbation error of the system poles of the corresponding algorithm is large. This, in fact, provides an alternative perspective to explain why the system (9) is difficult to identify in such cases.

VI. ILL-CONDITIONEDNESS OF SUBSPACE IDENTIFICATION METHODS

In the previous two sections, we demonstrate that when $\sigma_{\min}([(X_f^d)^{\top} \ U_{i,i,j}^{\top}]^{\top})$ or $\sigma_{\min}(\Gamma_i)$ is small, the perturbation errors in Algorithm I or Algorithm II become large, including both the perturbation errors of the system matrices in the state-space models and the system poles. This naturally leads one to wonder what the specific underlying principle behind this is. Since the calculation processes of the extended observability matrix Γ_i and the state sequence X_f^d in these two algorithms

are consistent with the steps in Theorem 4, we will focus on analyzing the unifying theorem that unified almost all variants of SIMs in the section.

It is noted that in the unifying theorem (Theorem 4), calculating the Moore-Penrose inverse of the extended observability matrix Γ_i is a key step. Therefore, we will analyze the extended observability matrix Γ_i in the following.

The condition number of the extended observability matrix Γ_i of the system (9) can be characterized by the following theorem.

Theorem 9. *For the system (9) under the condition that Assumption 1 is satisfied, the condition numbers of Γ_i satisfies*

$$\text{cond}(\Gamma_i) \geq \frac{1}{4} \rho^{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2m} \rfloor}, \quad (57)$$

where $\rho \triangleq e^{\frac{\pi^2}{4}} \approx 11.79$.

Proof. Since the pair (A, C) is observable in the system (9), and i is not less than n , Γ_i is full column rank, with a rank of n . Then applying Theorem 2 gives that

$$\sigma_n(\Gamma_i) \leq 4\rho^{-\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2m} \rfloor} \|\Gamma_i\|, \quad (58)$$

then it can be obtained that

$$\text{cond}(\Gamma_i) = \|\Gamma_i\| \|\Gamma_i^\dagger\| = \frac{\|\Gamma_i\|}{\sigma_n(\Gamma_i)} \geq \frac{1}{4} \rho^{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2m} \rfloor}. \quad (59)$$

□

According to the result of Theorem 9, the condition number of the observability matrix Γ_i grows at a super-polynomial rate with respect to the ratio n/m . This implies that when n/m is large, SIMs for identifying state-space models of the system (9) will be ill-conditioned, regardless of system parameters.

VII. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section, we present numerical results for the condition number of the extended observability matrix Γ_i in SIMs, as well as the bound derived in Theorem 9, as illustrated in Fig. 2. For the numerical experiments involving the extended observability matrix Γ_i , we set the number of outputs m to 1, i to n , and A as a diagonal matrix with its diagonal elements and all elements of matrix C uniformly sampled from the interval $[-1, 1]$. For each n , we conduct 10^4 trials.

From Fig. 2, it can be observed that the bound provided in (57) is effective. As the system dimension n increases, the condition number of the matrix Γ_n grows significantly, highlighting the increasingly ill-conditioned nature of the SIMs in such scenarios. However, our bound remains insufficiently tight, and future research could aim to provide more precise and tighter bound.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

This paper considers the perturbation error analysis of SIMs for n -dimensional discrete-time MIMO LTI systems with m output, in a non-asymptotic sense. Based on finite sample data from a single input/output trajectory, we derive non-asymptotic




Fig. 2: Numerical results of the key matrix Γ_n in SIMs. The blue violinplot illustrates the sampling distribution of the condition number of the observability matrix Γ_n across different dimensions n . The blue solid line represents the theoretical bound derived in (57).

upper bounds on the perturbation errors of the system matrices in state-space models and the system poles for two unified algorithms. These results are also applicable to other SIM variants. Furthermore, we prove that when the ratio n/m is large, SIMs become ill-conditioned for MIMO systems, regardless of the system parameters. Future work includes considering systems with process noise and measurement noise, as well as extending the results to the continuous-time case.

IX. APPENDIX

A. Some Lemmas and Theorems

Lemma 1. *Given $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$, $\mathcal{A}_1 = \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}$, if $\text{rank}[\mathcal{A}] = \text{rank}[\mathcal{A}_1]$ and $\|\mathcal{A}^\dagger\| \|\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}\| < 1$, then*

$$\|\mathcal{A}_1^\dagger\| \leq \frac{\|\mathcal{A}^\dagger\|}{\gamma_+}, \quad (60)$$

where $\gamma_+ = 1 - \|\mathcal{A}^\dagger\| \|\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}}\|$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume that $\text{rank}[\mathcal{A}] = \text{rank}[\mathcal{A}_1] = r \leq \min\{m, n\}$, and $\sigma_1(\mathcal{A}) \geq \dots \geq \sigma_r(\mathcal{A}) > 0$, $\sigma_1(\mathcal{A}_1) \geq \dots \geq \sigma_r(\mathcal{A}_1) > 0$ are the nonzero singular values of matrix \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{A}_1 respectively. Obviously we can get that

$$\|\mathcal{A}^\dagger\| = \frac{1}{\sigma_r(\mathcal{A})}, \quad \|\mathcal{A}_1^\dagger\| = \frac{1}{\sigma_r(\mathcal{A}_1)}. \quad (61)$$

According to Weyl inequalities for singular values, we can get

$$|\sigma_r(\mathcal{A}) - \sigma_r(\mathcal{A}_1)| \leq \|\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{A}_1\|, \quad (62)$$

then

$$\|\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{A}_1\| \geq \sigma_r(\mathcal{A}) - \sigma_r(\mathcal{A}_1) = \frac{1}{\|\mathcal{A}^\dagger\|} - \frac{1}{\|\mathcal{A}_1^\dagger\|}, \quad (63)$$

this means that (60) holds. □

Lemma 2. Suppose that $P \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ and $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ are two orthogonal projection matrices with the same rank, then it follows that

$$\|P - Q\| = \|P(I - Q)\|. \quad (64)$$

Proof. For any vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^m$, let $v_1 = Qv$ and $v_2 = (I - Q)v$. Then we can get that $Qv_1 = Q^2v = Qv = v_1$, $Qv_2 = Q(I - Q)v_1 = \mathbf{0}$, and

$$((P - Q)v_2)^\top (P - Q)v_1 = (Pv_2)^\top (P - I)v_1 = v_2^\top P(P - I)v_1 = \mathbf{0}, \quad (65)$$

therefore, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|(P - Q)v\|^2 &= \|(P - Q)(v_1 + v_2)\|^2 \\ &= \|(P - Q)v_1\|^2 + \|(P - Q)v_2\|^2 \\ &= \|(I - P)v_1\|^2 + \|Pv_2\|^2 \\ &= \|(I - P)Qv\|^2 + \|P(I - Q)v\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

According to the arbitrariness of vector v , we can get that

$$\|P - Q\| = \max\{\|(I - P)Q\|, \|P(I - Q)\|\}. \quad (67)$$

Note that P and Q have the same rank, so we can assume the rank is $r \leq m$. Without loss of generality, assume $P = \text{diag}\{I_r, \mathbf{0}_{(m-r) \times (m-r)}\}$ and $Q = \mathcal{U}^\top P \mathcal{U}$ for some orthogonal matrix \mathcal{U} . Then, we have $P \mathcal{U} P = \text{diag}\{X, \mathbf{0}_{(m-r) \times (m-r)}\}$ for some $r \times r$ matrix X . We can further obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|P(I - Q)\|^2 &= \|P(I - Q)P\| = \|P - P \mathcal{U}^\top P \mathcal{U} P\| \\ &= \|P - (P \mathcal{U}^\top P)(P \mathcal{U} P)\| \\ &= \left\| \begin{bmatrix} I_r - X^\top X & \\ & \mathbf{0}_{(m-r) \times (m-r)} \end{bmatrix} \right\| \\ &= \|I_r - X^\top X\|, \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q(I - P)\|^2 &= \|Q(I - P)Q\| = \|\mathcal{U}Q(I - P)Q\mathcal{U}\| \\ &= \|P - P \mathcal{U} P \mathcal{U}^\top P\| = \|P - (P \mathcal{U} P)(P \mathcal{U}^\top P)\| \\ &= \|I_r - X X^\top\|. \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

Therefore, we can get that $\|P(I - Q)\| = \|Q(I - P)\|$. Combined with the already obtained (67), we can complete the proof. \square

Lemma 3. Given $\mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$, $\mathcal{A}_1 = \mathcal{A} + \mathcal{E}_\mathcal{A}$, if $\text{rank}[\mathcal{A}] = \text{rank}[\mathcal{A}_1]$, then

$$\|P_\mathcal{A} - P_{\mathcal{A}_1}\| \leq \min\{\|\mathcal{A}^\dagger\|, \|\mathcal{A}_1^\dagger\|\} \|\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{A}\|. \quad (70)$$

Proof. It is easy to verify that $P_\mathcal{A}$ and $P_{\mathcal{A}_1}$ are both orthogonal projection matrices, so according to Lemma 2 we can get that

$$\|P_\mathcal{A} - P_{\mathcal{A}_1}\| = \|P_\mathcal{A} P_{\mathcal{A}_1}^\perp\| = \|P_{\mathcal{A}_1}^\perp P_\mathcal{A}\|. \quad (71)$$

First, let's analyze $P_\mathcal{A} P_{\mathcal{A}_1}^\perp$.

$$\begin{aligned} P_\mathcal{A} P_{\mathcal{A}_1}^\perp &= P_\mathcal{A}^\text{H} P_{\mathcal{A}_1}^\perp = \mathcal{A}^\dagger \mathcal{A}^\text{H} P_{\mathcal{A}_1}^\perp = \mathcal{A}^\dagger \mathcal{A}^\text{H} (\mathcal{A}_1 - \mathcal{E}_\mathcal{A})^\text{H} P_{\mathcal{A}_1}^\perp \\ &= -\mathcal{A}^\dagger \mathcal{A}^\text{H} \mathcal{E}_\mathcal{A}^\text{H} P_{\mathcal{A}_1}^\perp, \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

where the last equality holds because $\mathcal{A}_1^\text{H} P_{\mathcal{A}_1}^\perp = \mathcal{A}_1^\text{H} (I - P_{\mathcal{A}_1}) = \mathcal{A}_1^\text{H} (I - P_{\mathcal{A}_1}^\text{H}) = \mathcal{A}_1^\text{H} (I - \mathcal{A}_1^\dagger \mathcal{A}_1^\text{H}) = \mathbf{0}$. We can

further obtain

$$\|P_\mathcal{A} P_{\mathcal{A}_1}^\perp\| = \|\mathcal{A}^\dagger \mathcal{A}^\text{H} \mathcal{E}_\mathcal{A}^\text{H} P_{\mathcal{A}_1}^\perp\| \leq \|\mathcal{A}^\dagger\| \|\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{A}\|. \quad (73)$$

Similarly, we can directly get

$$\|P_{\mathcal{A}_1}^\perp P_\mathcal{A}\| \leq \|\mathcal{A}_1^\dagger\| \|\mathcal{E}_\mathcal{A}\|. \quad (74)$$

Combing (71), (73) and (74) together, the proof is completed. \square

B. The Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. If p is equal to 1, the proof can be directly completed based on Corollary 5.3 in [42], thus in the following we consider the case where p is greater than 1. It is not difficult to verify that matrix $X_{n,mp}$ satisfies the following Sylvester matrix equation:

$$DX_{n,mp} - X_{n,mp}P = [\mathbf{0}_{n \times (m-1)p} \quad D^m J_p - J_p D_1], \quad (75)$$

where $P = \begin{bmatrix} & D_1 \\ I_{(m-1)p} & \end{bmatrix}$, and $D_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \\ & -I_{p-1} \end{bmatrix}$.

The following analysis is somewhat similar to the content of Section 5.1 in [42]. For completeness, here we give a complete proof. For the following analysis, it can be assumed that p is even. This is without loss of generality, since we can use Cauchy interlace theorem [43]. To see this, if p is an odd number greater than 1, let matrix J_{p-1} be the $n \times (p-1)$ matrix obtained from J_p by removing its last column and $X_{n,m(p-1)}$ be

$$\begin{bmatrix} J_{p-1} & D J_{p-1} & \cdots & D^{m-1} J_{p-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

According to Cauchy interlace theorem [43], it can be obtained that

$$\sigma_{\min}(X_{n,mp}) \leq \sigma_{\min}(X_{n,m(p-1)}) \leq \|X_{n,m(p-1)}\| \leq \|X_{n,mp}\|,$$

this implies that

$$\frac{\sigma_{\min}(X_{n,mp})}{\|X_{n,mp}\|} \leq \frac{\sigma_{\min}(X_{n,m(p-1)})}{\|X_{n,m(p-1)}\|}. \quad (76)$$

In the following, we assume that p is even. Note that matrices D and P in Sylvester matrix equation (75) are both normal matrices. The eigenvalues of D are real numbers, and the eigenvalues of P are the mp (shifted) roots of unity, i.e., $\sigma(P) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} | z^{mp} = -1\}$. Since p is even, the spectrum $\sigma(P)$ of P does not intersect the real axis. On the other hand, the rank of $D^m J_p - J_p D_1$ does not exceed p . Applying Theorem 2.1, Corollary 3.2 and Lemma 5.1 in [42] yields that

$$\sigma_{\min}(X_{n,mp}) \leq 4\rho^{-\frac{|\min\{n,mp\}-1|}{\log(2^{mp})}} \|X_{n,mp}\|. \quad (77)$$

If p is odd, then the proof can be completed according to (76) and (77). \square

Theorem 10 ([44]). Given $\mathcal{A} = (\alpha_{ij}) \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$, $\mathcal{B} = (\beta_{ij}) \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$, suppose that $\lambda(\mathcal{A}) = \{\lambda_1(\mathcal{A}), \dots, \lambda_n(\mathcal{A})\}$ and $\lambda(\mathcal{B}) = \{\mu_1(\mathcal{B}), \dots, \mu_n(\mathcal{B})\}$ are the spectra of matrices \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} respectively, then

$$\text{sv}_\mathcal{A}(\mathcal{B}) \leq n^{\frac{1}{2n}} \left[\left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^n - 1 \right]^{\frac{1}{n}} m_{\text{F}}^{1-\frac{1}{n}} \|\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{B}\|_{\text{F}}^{\frac{1}{n}}, \quad (78)$$

where $m_F = \max\{\|\mathcal{A}\|_F, \|\mathcal{B}\|_F\}$.

C. The proof of Theorem 1

Proof. Note that $x^* = \mathcal{A}^\dagger \mathcal{B}$ and $x^* + h = \mathcal{A}_1^\dagger (\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{E}_B)$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} h &= \mathcal{A}_1^\dagger (\mathcal{B} + \mathcal{E}_B) - \mathcal{A}^\dagger \mathcal{B} = (\mathcal{A}_1^\dagger - \mathcal{A}^\dagger) \mathcal{B} + \mathcal{A}_1^\dagger \mathcal{E}_B \\ &= (-\mathcal{A}_1^\dagger \mathcal{E}_A \mathcal{A}^\dagger + \mathcal{A}_1^\dagger P_{\mathcal{A}}^\perp - P_{\mathcal{A}_1^\dagger}^\perp \mathcal{A}^\dagger) \mathcal{B} + \mathcal{A}_1^\dagger \mathcal{E}_B \\ &= -\mathcal{A}_1^\dagger \mathcal{E}_A x^* + \mathcal{A}_1^\dagger r_x + \mathcal{A}_1^\dagger \mathcal{E}_B - P_{\mathcal{A}_1^\dagger}^\perp x^*, \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

where the reason why the third equality holds is as follows

$$\begin{aligned} &-\mathcal{A}_1^\dagger \mathcal{E}_A \mathcal{A}^\dagger + \mathcal{A}_1^\dagger P_{\mathcal{A}}^\perp - P_{\mathcal{A}_1^\dagger}^\perp \mathcal{A}^\dagger \\ &= -\mathcal{A}_1^\dagger (\mathcal{A}_1 - \mathcal{A}) \mathcal{A}^\dagger + \mathcal{A}_1^\dagger (I - \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^\dagger) - (I - \mathcal{A}_1^\dagger \mathcal{A}_1) \mathcal{A}^\dagger \\ &= \mathcal{A}_1^\dagger - \mathcal{A}. \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

Based on Lemma 1, it is easy to get that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{A}_1^\dagger \mathcal{E}_A x^*\| &\leq \|\mathcal{A}_1^\dagger\| \|\mathcal{E}_A\| \|x^*\| \leq \frac{\|\mathcal{A}^\dagger\|}{\gamma_+} \|\mathcal{E}_A\| \|x^*\| \\ &= \frac{\text{cond}(\mathcal{A})}{\gamma_+} \frac{\|\mathcal{E}_A\|}{\|\mathcal{A}\|} \|x^*\|, \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{A}_1^\dagger r_x\| &= \|\mathcal{A}_1^\dagger P_{\mathcal{A}_1} P_{\mathcal{A}}^\perp r_x\| \leq \|\mathcal{A}_1^\dagger\| \|P_{\mathcal{A}_1} P_{\mathcal{A}}^\perp\| \|r_x\| \\ &= \|\mathcal{A}_1^\dagger\| \|P_{\mathcal{A}_1}^\dagger (I - P_{\mathcal{A}}^\dagger)\| \|r_x\| \\ &= \|\mathcal{A}_1^\dagger\| \|\mathcal{A}_1^{\dagger H} (\mathcal{A}_1 - \mathcal{A})^H (I - \mathcal{A}^{\dagger H} \mathcal{A}^H)\| \|r_x\| \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{A}_1^\dagger\|^2 \|\mathcal{E}_A\| \|r_x\| \leq \frac{\text{cond}(\mathcal{A})^2}{\gamma_+^2} \frac{\|\mathcal{E}_A\|}{\|\mathcal{A}\|} \|r_x\|, \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

where the second equality above holds because $P_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $P_{\mathcal{A}_1}$ are both Hermitian matrices, and the third equality holds because that $\mathcal{A}^H P_{\mathcal{A}}^\perp = \mathcal{A}^H (I - \mathcal{A}^{\dagger H} \mathcal{A}^H) = \mathbf{0}$, and

$$\|\mathcal{A}_1^\dagger \mathcal{E}_B\| \leq \|\mathcal{A}_1^\dagger\| \|\mathcal{E}_B\| \leq \frac{\text{cond}(\mathcal{A})}{\gamma_+} \frac{\|\mathcal{E}_B\|}{\|\mathcal{A}\|}. \quad (83)$$

Now let's focus on $P_{\mathcal{A}_1^\dagger}^\perp x^*$.

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_{\mathcal{A}_1^\dagger}^\perp x^*\| &= \|(I - \mathcal{A}_1^H \mathcal{A}_1^{\dagger H}) \mathcal{A}^\dagger \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A}^\dagger \mathcal{B}\| \\ &= \|(I - \mathcal{A}_1^H \mathcal{A}_1^{\dagger H}) \mathcal{A}^H \mathcal{A}^{\dagger H} x^*\| \\ &= \|(I - \mathcal{A}_1^H \mathcal{A}_1^{\dagger H}) (\mathcal{A}_1 - \mathcal{A})^H \mathcal{A}^{\dagger H} x^*\| \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{E}_A\| \|\mathcal{A}^{\dagger H} x^*\| = \|\mathcal{E}_A\| \|\eta\|. \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

Combing (79), (81), (82), (83) and (84) together, we can obtain (3). Note that when $\text{rank}[\mathcal{A}] = \text{rank}[\mathcal{A}_1] = n$, it is obtained that $P_{\mathcal{A}_1^\dagger}^\perp = \mathbf{0}$. Therefore, the last term in (79) is $\mathbf{0}$, and we can get (4). \square

D. The proof of Theorem 3

Proof. Note that $d_H(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \triangleq \max\{\text{sv}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{B}), \text{sv}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{A})\}$, then Theorem 3 is a direct corollary of Theorem 10. \square

REFERENCES

[1] L. Ljung, "System identification: theory for the user prentice-hall, inc," *Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA*, 1986.

- [2] M. Verhaegen and P. Dewilde, "Subspace model identification part 1. the output-error state-space model identification class of algorithms," *International Journal of Control*, vol. 56, DOI 10.1080/00207179208934363, no. 5, pp. 1187–1210, 1992. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207179208934363>
- [3] M. Deistler, K. Peternell, and W. Scherrer, "Consistency and relative efficiency of subspace methods," *Automatica*, vol. 31, no. 12, pp. 1865–1875, 1995.
- [4] L. Ljung, "Consistency of the least-squares identification method," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 779–781, 1976.
- [5] W. E. Larimore, "Canonical variate analysis in identification, filtering, and adaptive control," in *29th IEEE Conference on Decision and control*, pp. 596–604. IEEE, 1990.
- [6] P. Van Overschee and B. De Moor, "A unifying theorem for three subspace system identification algorithms," *Automatica*, vol. 31, no. 12, pp. 1853–1864, 1995.
- [7] L. Ljung and T. McKelvey, "Subspace identification from closed loop data," *Signal processing*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 209–215, 1996.
- [8] A. Chiuso and G. Picci, "Consistency analysis of some closed-loop subspace identification methods," *Automatica*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 377–391, 2005.
- [9] P. Massioni and M. Verhaegen, "Subspace identification of circulant systems," *Automatica*, vol. 44, no. 11, pp. 2825–2833, 2008.
- [10] A. Haber and M. Verhaegen, "Subspace identification of large-scale interconnected systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 59, no. 10, pp. 2754–2759, 2014.
- [11] B. Sinquin and M. Verhaegen, "K4sid: Large-scale subspace identification with kronecker modeling," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 960–975, 2018.
- [12] P. B. Cox and R. Tóth, "Linear parameter-varying subspace identification: A unified framework," *Automatica*, vol. 123, p. 109296, 2021.
- [13] V. Kedia and D. Chakraborty, "Fast subspace identification for large input-output data," in *2022 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pp. 3973–3978. IEEE, 2022.
- [14] P. Van Overschee and B. De Moor, "N4sid: Subspace algorithms for the identification of combined deterministic-stochastic systems," *Automatica*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 75–93, 1994.
- [15] M. Verhaegen, "Identification of the deterministic part of mimo state space models given in innovations form from input-output data," *Automatica*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 61–74, 1994.
- [16] P. Van Overschee and B. De Moor, *Subspace identification for linear systems: Theory-Implementation-Applications*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [17] B. De Moor, J. Vandewalle, M. Moonen, L. Vandenberghe, and P. Van Mieghem, "A geometrical strategy for the identification of state space models of linear multivariable systems with singular value decomposition," *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 21, no. 9, pp. 493–497, 1988.
- [18] B. De Moor, "Mathematical concepts and techniques for modelling of static and dynamic systems," *Ph. D. dissertation, Dep. of Elect. Eng., Katholieke Univ.*, 1988.
- [19] B. De Moor, M. Moonen, L. Vandenberghe, and J. Vandewalle, "A geometrical approach for the identification of state space models with singular value decomposition," in *ICASSP-88., International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, pp. 2244–2247. IEEE, 1988.
- [20] B. De Moor, M. Moonen, L. Vandenberghe, and J. Vandewalle, "Identification of linear state space models with singular value decomposition using canonical correlation concepts," in *SVD and signal processing: algorithms, applications and architectures*, pp. 161–169, 1989.
- [21] B. De Moor, M. Moonen, L. Vandenberghe, and J. Vandewalle, "The application of the canonical correlation concept to the identification of linear state space models," in *Analysis and Optimization of Systems*, pp. 1103–1114. Springer, 1988.
- [22] B. De Moor, M. Moonen, L. Vandenberghe, and J. Vandewalle, "A geometrical approach for the identification of state space models with singular value decomposition," in *ICASSP-88., International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, pp. 2244–2247. IEEE, 1988.
- [23] M. Moonen, B. De Moor, L. Vandenberghe, and J. Vandewalle, "On- and off-line identification of linear state-space models," *International Journal of Control*, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 219–232, 1989.
- [24] M. Moonen, B. De Moor, and J. Vandewalle, "Svd-based subspace methods for multivariable continuous-time systems identification," *Identification of Continuous-Time Systems: Methodology and Computer Implementation*, pp. 473–488, 1991.

- [25] M. MOONEN and B. D. MOOR, "Comments on 'state-space model identification with data correlation'," *International Journal of Control*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 257–259, 1992.
- [26] B. De Moor, P. Van Overschee, and J. Suykens, "Subspace algorithms for system identification and stochastic realization," *Proceedings MTNS, Kobe, Japan*, 1991.
- [27] M. Verhaegen and P. Dewilde, "Subspace model identification. part i: The output-error state-space model identification class of algorithm," *Int. J. Control*, vol. 56, pp. 1187–1210, 1992.
- [28] D. Bauer, M. Deistler, and W. Scherrer, "The analysis of the asymptotic variance of subspace algorithms," *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 30, no. 11, pp. 1037–1041, 1997.
- [29] D. Bauer, M. Deistler, and W. Scherrer, "Consistency and asymptotic normality of some subspace algorithms for systems without observed inputs," *Automatica*, vol. 35, no. 7, pp. 1243–1254, 1999.
- [30] D. Bauer and M. Jansson, "Analysis of the asymptotic properties of the moesp type of subspace algorithms," *Automatica*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 497–509, 2000.
- [31] D. Bauer and L. Ljung, "Some facts about the choice of the weighting matrices in larimore type of subspace algorithms," *Automatica*, vol. 38, no. 5, pp. 763–773, 2002.
- [32] D. Bauer, "Asymptotic properties of subspace estimators," *Automatica*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 359–376, 2005.
- [33] M. Jansson, "Asymptotic variance analysis of subspace identification methods," *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 33, no. 15, pp. 91–96, 2000.
- [34] A. Chiuso and G. Picci, "The asymptotic variance of subspace estimates," *Journal of Econometrics*, vol. 118, no. 1-2, pp. 257–291, 2004.
- [35] K. Ikeda, "Asymptotic properties of moesp-type methods," *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 46, no. 11, pp. 92–97, 2013.
- [36] K. Ikeda, "On the precision of the plant estimates in some subspace identification methods," *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 9516–9521, 2014.
- [37] K. Ikeda, "Error analysis of moesp type algorithm," in *21st International Symposium on Mathematical Theory of Networks and Systems (MTNS)*, pp. 545–550, 2014.
- [38] K. Ikeda, "Error analysis of state approaches in subspace identification methods," in *2014 Proceedings of the SICE Annual Conference (SICE)*, pp. 1685–1690. IEEE, 2014.
- [39] K. Ikeda and H. Oku, "Estimation error analysis of system matrices in some subspace identification methods," in *2015 10th Asian Control Conference (ASCC)*, pp. 1–6. IEEE, 2015.
- [40] P.-Å. Wedin, "Perturbation theory for pseudo-inverses," *BIT Numerical Mathematics*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 217–232, 1973.
- [41] F. Hausdorff, *Grundzüge der mengenlehre*, vol. 7. von Veit, 1914.
- [42] B. Beckermann and A. Townsend, "On the singular values of matrices with displacement structure," *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 1227–1248, 2017.
- [43] S.-G. Hwang, "Cauchy's interlace theorem for eigenvalues of hermitian matrices," *The American mathematical monthly*, vol. 111, no. 2, pp. 157–159, 2004.
- [44] L. Elsner, "On the variation of the spectra of matrices," *Linear Algebra and Its Applications*, vol. 47, pp. 127–138, 1982.