

Non-Asymptotic Analysis of Subspace Identification for Stochastic Systems Using Multiple Trajectories

Shuai Sun *

Abstract

This paper is concerned with the analysis of identification errors for n -dimensional discrete-time Linear Time-Invariant (LTI) systems with m outputs and no external inputs, using Subspace Identification Methods (SIM) with finite sample data. We provide non-asymptotic high-probability upper bounds for matrices A , C , the Kalman filter gain K , and the closed loop matrix $A - KC$, based on multiple sample trajectories, and further give the first non-asymptotic high-probability upper bounds for the system poles, which cover both (marginally) stable systems and unstable systems. We show that, with high probability, the non-asymptotic estimation errors of these matrices decay at a rate of at least $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{1/N})$, while the estimation error of the system poles decays at a rate of at least $\mathcal{O}(N^{-\frac{1}{2n}})$, where N represents the number of sample trajectories. Furthermore, we prove that SIMs become ill-conditioned when the ratio n/m is large, regardless of the system parameters. Numerical experiments are conducted to validate the non-asymptotic results and the ill-conditionedness of SIM.

1 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

$$\begin{aligned} x_{k+1} &= Ax_k + Bu_k + w_k, \\ y_k &= Cx_k + Du_k + v_k, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

from input/output sample data is one of the core problems in system analysis, design and control [2]. Most identification algorithms for the identification of LTI state-space models either come from the prediction error approach [1] or Subspace Identification Methods (SIM) [3]. In this paper, we mainly focus on SIM due to the following advantages [2]: Firstly, Handling Single-Input Single-Output (SISO) systems can be easily extended to MIMO scenarios. Secondly, the problem formulation within its framework is more appealing to application engineers. Thirdly, SIMs are characterized by numerical stability and computational efficiency without requiring iterative optimization, making them particularly suitable for large-scale data and online applications. In addition, SIMs typically involve a convex problem, whereas the prediction error approach is generally not convex [4].

The identification approach of SIMs mainly involve finding the relevant subspaces of the system from the input/output sample data matrix through a series of projections or regressions, and then

*The author is with the Department of Automation, BNRist, Tsinghua University, Beijing, 100084, China. Emails: suns19@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn.

using the obtained relevant subspaces to recover the realization of the corresponding state-space model. A number of variants of SIMs have been published, such as Canonical Variate Analysis (CVA) [5], Numerical algorithms for State Space System Identification (N4SID) [6], and Multi-variable Output-Error State Space method (MOESP) [7]. SIMs have attracted significant research interest and achieved substantial development over the past three decades, and numerous meaningful progress [8–15] has been made. Therefore, it is of critical importance to analyze the identification error of SIMs.

To date, numerous papers [3, 16–26] have been published, analyzing the estimation error of SIMs from an asymptotic perspective. These studies primarily focus on examining the asymptotic properties of SIMs, including consistency, asymptotic normality, and variance analysis, with the aim of determining its theoretical reliability under various conditions, such as observed and unobserved inputs. The results in [3, 16] show that as the number of output data T grows to infinity, the identification error can decrease at a rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{T})$ up to a logarithmic factor. However, the non-asymptotic analysis of SIMs remains an open problem [27].

For fully observed LTI systems ($C = I$), where the state can be accurately measured, some papers [28–31] investigate the non-asymptotic identification using a single trajectory, but their focus is on the prediction error approach rather than SIMs. The identification problem of partially observed LTI systems ($C \neq I$) is considerably more challenging due to the fact that the state cannot be accurately obtained [32]. Some recent works [4, 33–35] have studied the non-asymptotic identification and provided a convergence rate for the realization A, B, C, D of the state space models up to a similarity transformation as $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{T})$ or $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{N})$ (up to logarithmic factors), where T and N represent the length or the number of sample trajectories, respectively. These results rely on the assumption that the system is persistently excited by process noise or external inputs. Among them, only the work [4] studies the non-asymptotic identification analysis of SIMs, and it uses only a single sample trajectory. However, the results are only applicable to stable or marginally stable systems.

Similar to the work [4], this paper provides a non-asymptotic identification analysis of the system (1) in the case $B, D = \mathbf{0}$, i.e., there is no input. The difference is that we use multiple trajectories of equal length for identification instead of a single trajectory. We give the non-asymptotic guarantees for the estimates of matrices A, C , the Kalman filter gain K of the system (1) as well as the closed loop matrix $A_C \triangleq A - KC$. We also provide the first end-to-end estimation guarantees for the system poles and analyze the ill-conditionedness of SIMs. Similar to [4, 28–30, 33, 35–39], this paper focuses on data-independent bounds, i.e., revealing how the identification error depends on the number of sample trajectories N and the parameters of the system (1) and the algorithm. The main contribution of this paper is as follows:

1. We provide finite sample upper bounds for matrices A, C , the Kalman filter gain K as well as the closed loop matrix A_C , based on multiple sample trajectories for stochastic system identification, where there is no input, and the system is driven solely by process noise.
2. To the best of our knowledge, we also provide the first finite-sample guarantee for the estimation error of system poles.
3. We prove that, with high probability, the non-asymptotic estimation errors of the matrices A, C , the Kalman filter gain K , and the closed-loop matrix A_C decay to zero at a rate of at least $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{1/N})$, which is consistent with the result in [34]. Furthermore, we first show that with high probability, the non-asymptotic estimation error of the system poles decays to zero at a

rate of at least $\mathcal{O}(N^{\frac{1}{2n}})$. These results apply not only to stable and marginally stable systems but also to unstable systems.

4. Based on our previous work [43], we prove that SIMs become ill-conditioned for n -dimensional systems with m outputs, when the ratio n/m is large, regardless of system parameters.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 defines the identification problem and states the assumptions. Section 3 reviews SIMs. Section 4 provides a non-asymptotic analysis for the regression step in SIMs. Section 5 gives upper bounds for the estimation errors of the matrices A , C , K , and A_C , as well as the system poles based on the results of Section 4. Section 6 analyzes the ill-conditionedness of SIMs. Section 7 provides numerical simulations, and finally, Section 8 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. \otimes is the Kronecker product. The matrix inequality $A \succeq B$ implies that matrix $A - B$ is positive semi-definite. The matrix inequality $A \succ B$ implies that matrix $A - B$ is strictly positive semi-definite. Multivariate Gaussian distribution with mean μ and covariance Σ is denoted by $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$.

2 Problem Setup

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

$$\begin{aligned} x_{k+1} &= Ax_k + w_k, \\ y_k &= Cx_k + v_k, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

based on finite output sample data, where $x_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $y_k \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are the system state and the output, respectively, and the process noise w_k and measurement noise v_k are i.i.d. zero mean Gaussian with covariance matrix \mathcal{Q} and \mathcal{R} ($\mathcal{R} \succ \mathbf{0}$) respectively. The initial state x_0 is zero mean Gaussian with covariance matrix Σ . The initial state, process noise, and measurement noise are independent of each other. $A, C, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}$ and Σ are **unknown** matrices with appropriate dimensions: $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $\mathcal{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $\mathcal{R} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ and $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$.

Assumption 1. For the system (2), the pair (A, C) is observable, and the pair $(A, \mathcal{Q}^{1/2})$ is controllable.

Remark 1. Indeed, the system (2) is minimal in the sense of Assumption 1, i.e., the state-space realization (A, C) of the system (2) 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 process noise w_k . Therefore, Assumption 1 is necessary and well-defined.

Assumption 2. The system order n is known.

According to [40], one can design a Kalman filter for the system (2) to estimate the state under the condition that the pair (A, C) is observable,

$$\hat{x}_{k+1} = A\hat{x}_k + K(y_k - C\hat{x}_k), \quad (3)$$

where $K = APC^\top(CPC^\top + \mathcal{R})^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ is the steady state kalman gain, and P is the positive definite solution of the following algebra Riccati equation

$$P = APA^\top + \mathcal{Q} - APC^\top(CPC^\top + \mathcal{R})^{-1}CPA^\top. \quad (4)$$

Define

$$e_k = y_k - C\hat{x}_k \quad (5)$$

as the innovation of the Kalman filter, we can obtain the equivalent innovation form of the system (2) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{x}_{k+1} &= A\hat{x}_k + Ke_k, \\ y_k &= C\hat{x}_k + e_k, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where the innovation $e_k \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the zero mean Gaussian with covariance matrix $\mathcal{S} = CPC^\top + \mathcal{R}$ and independent of past output. At this point, we denote the covariance matrix of the state \hat{x}_k as $\Sigma_k = \mathbb{E}[\hat{x}_k\hat{x}_k^\top]$.

Since the Kalman filter converges to the steady-state gain at an exponential rate, we make the following assumption here, as given in [4], which is reasonable in many cases.

Assumption 3. *Assume that $\Sigma = P$, so that the Kalman filter (6) has converged to its steady state.*

The non-asymptotic identification is to learn A, C and K up to within a similarity transformation using finite output sample data

$$\left\{ y_k^{(i)} : 0 \leq k \leq 2T - 1, 1 \leq i \leq N \right\}, \quad (7)$$

where $2T$ and N represent the length and number of sample trajectories, respectively. T is assumed to not less than the system order n .

In this paper, we will **provide a non-asymptotic error analysis for SIMs using multiple sample trajectories and analyze the ill-conditionedness of the SIMs when the ratio n/m is large.**

3 Subspace Identification Methods

Most SIMs typically involve the following steps [40]:

1. Regression or Projection. A least squares regression or orthogonal (oblique) projection is performed to estimate one or several high-order models.
2. Model Reduction. The high-order models identified in the previous step is reduced to an appropriate low dimensional subspace that is observable. This step gives the estimate of the (extended) observability matrix or the state sequence.
3. Parameter Estimation. The (extended) observability matrix or the state sequence from the previous step is used to estimate the state space realization A, C and K .

Before introducing SIM, we firstly define some notations.

The past outputs $y_p^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{Tm}$ and future outputs $y_f^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{Tm}$ are defined as follows

$$y_p^{(i)} = \begin{bmatrix} y_0^{(i)} \\ \vdots \\ y_{T-1}^{(i)} \end{bmatrix}, \quad y_f^{(i)} = \begin{bmatrix} y_T^{(i)} \\ \vdots \\ y_{2T-1}^{(i)} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

where $i = 1, \dots, N$ denotes each sample trajectory. By stacking the outputs of all the sample trajectories together, the batch past outputs $Y_p \in \mathbb{R}^{Tm \times N}$ and batch future outputs $Y_f \in \mathbb{R}^{Tm \times N}$ can be obtained as follows

$$Y_p \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} y_p^{(1)} & \dots & y_p^{(N)} \end{bmatrix}, \quad Y_f \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} y_f^{(1)} & \dots & y_f^{(N)} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (9)$$

Similarly, we can define the past noises $e_p^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{Tm}$, the future noises $e_f^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{Tm}$, the batch past noises $E_p \in \mathbb{R}^{Tm \times N}$ and the batch future noises $E_f \in \mathbb{R}^{Tm \times N}$. The batch states is defined as

$$\hat{X} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}_0^{(1)} & \dots & \hat{x}_0^{(N)} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times N}. \quad (10)$$

The (extended) observability matrix $\Gamma_T \in \mathbb{R}^{Tm \times n}$ and the reversed (extended) controllability matrix $\mathcal{K}_T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times Tm}$ associated to the system (6) are defined as

$$\Gamma_T \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} C \\ \vdots \\ CA^{T-1} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{K}_T \triangleq [(A - KC)^{T-1}K \quad \dots \quad K], \quad (11)$$

respectively. The block Hankel matrix $\mathcal{H}_T \in \mathbb{R}^{Tm \times Tm}$ is defined as the product of Γ_T and \mathcal{K}_T : $\mathcal{H}_T \triangleq \Gamma_T \mathcal{K}_T$. Finally, the block Toeplitz matrix $\mathcal{J}_T \in \mathbb{R}^{Tm \times Tm}$ is defined as follows

$$\mathcal{J}_T \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} I_m & & & \\ CK & I_m & & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \\ CA^{T-2}K & CA^{T-3}K & \dots & I_m \end{bmatrix}. \quad (12)$$

3.1 Regression

The future outputs in each sample trajectory i can be compactly written as

$$y_f^{(i)} = \Gamma_T \hat{x}_T^{(i)} + \mathcal{J}_T e_f^{(i)}. \quad (13)$$

On the other hand, by iterating (3), it is straightforward to derive that

$$\hat{x}_T^{(i)} = (A - KC)^T \hat{x}_0^{(i)} + \mathcal{K}_T y_p^{(i)}. \quad (14)$$

By substituting (14) into (13) and simultaneously combining the dynamic responses of different sample trajectories, it can be obtained that

$$Y_f = \mathcal{H}_T Y_p + \mathcal{J}_T E_f + \Gamma_T (A - KC)^T \hat{X}. \quad (15)$$

Then the block Hankel matrix \mathcal{H}_T can be found by regressing the batch future outputs Y_f on the batch past outputs Y_p as follows

$$\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T = \min_{\mathcal{H} \in \mathbb{R}^{T_m \times T_m}} \|Y_f - \mathcal{H}Y_p\|^2 = Y_f Y_p^\dagger, \quad (16)$$

where $Y_p^\dagger = Y_p^\top (Y_p Y_p^\top)^{-1}$ is the right pseudo-inverse of Y_p , and the block Hankel matrix \mathcal{H}_T can be interpreted as a (truncated) Kalman filter, which can directly predict future outputs based on past outputs [27]. Obviously, the prerequisite for obtaining $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T$ is to ensure that Y_p is row full rank, meaning that $Y_p Y_p^\top$ is invertible.

3.2 Parameter Estimation

Perform SVD decomposition on $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T$ as follows

$$\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T = [\mathcal{U}_1 \quad \mathcal{U}_2] \begin{bmatrix} S_1 & \\ & S_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{V}_1^\top \\ \mathcal{V}_2^\top \end{bmatrix}, \quad (17)$$

where $S_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a diagonal matrix, with its elements being the first n largest singular values of the matrix $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T$, sorted in descending order.

Since the sample data is finite and the noise is persistently exciting, the singular values of $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T$ in (17) are all different from zero almost surely, this means that the rank of $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T$ is greater than n almost surely. Note that the system dimension n is known. Denote the best rank- n approximation in the Frobenius norm of $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T$ by $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{T,n}$. According to the definition, it can be obtained that

$$\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{T,n} = \min_{M \in \mathbb{R}^{T_m \times T_m}, \text{rank}[M]=n} \|\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T - M\|_F. \quad (18)$$

Indeed, Eckart–Young–Mirsky theorem reveals that

$$\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{T,n} = \mathcal{U}_1 S_1 \mathcal{V}_1^\top. \quad (19)$$

Then choose

$$\widehat{\Gamma}_T = \mathcal{U}_1 S_1^{1/2} \mathcal{T}, \quad \widehat{\mathcal{K}}_T = \mathcal{T}^{-1} S_1^{1/2} \mathcal{V}_1^\top \quad (20)$$

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

Remark 2. *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, C and K that generate the output sample data. This implies that we can also set the similarity transformation \mathcal{T} to the identity matrix in the following.*

In fact, the calculation of the original matrices A, C and K based on $\widehat{\Gamma}_T$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{K}}_T$ can be performed in two different ways: the state approach and the shift approach. Here, we consider the shift approach and leave the case of the state approach for future work.

In the shift approach, we can approximate the system matrices A, C and K as follows

$$A = \widehat{\Gamma}_{T,p}^\dagger \widehat{\Gamma}_{T,f}, \quad C = \widehat{\Gamma}_T(1 : m, :), \quad K = \widehat{\mathcal{K}}_T(:, -m : -1), \quad (21)$$

where $\widehat{\Gamma}_{T,p}$ and $\widehat{\Gamma}_{T,f}$ are the matrices obtained from $\widehat{\Gamma}_T$ by removing the last m rows and the first m rows, respectively, and $\widehat{\Gamma}_T(1:m,:)$ denotes the first m rows of $\widehat{\Gamma}_T$, and $\widehat{\mathcal{K}}_T(:, -m:-1)$ denotes the last m columns of $\widehat{\mathcal{K}}_T$. Moreover, we can also approximate the closed-loop matrices $A_C \triangleq A - KC$ as follows

$$A_C = \widehat{\mathcal{K}}_{T,f} \widehat{\mathcal{K}}_{T,p}^\dagger, \quad (22)$$

where $\widehat{\mathcal{K}}_{T,p}$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{K}}_{T,f}$ are the matrices obtained from $\widehat{\mathcal{K}}_T$ by removing the first n columns and the last n columns, respectively.

4 Non-Asymptotic Analysis of Regression

In this section, we provide a non-asymptotic analysis of the linear regression step of the subspace identification method (16) based on multiple equally long sample trajectories. Specifically, we provide an high-probability upper bound on the estimation error $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T - \mathcal{H}_T$ of the block Hankel matrix \mathcal{H}_T .

According to (15) and (16), the estimation error $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T - \mathcal{H}_T$ consists of the following two terms:

$$\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T - \mathcal{H}_T = \mathcal{J}_T E_f Y_p^\top (Y_p Y_p^\top)^{-1} + \Gamma_T A_C^\top \widehat{X} Y_p^\top (Y_p Y_p^\top)^{-1}, \quad (23)$$

where these two error terms above correspond to the cross-term error and the truncation bias term of the Kalman filter, and they originate from the noise e_k and the bias in the estimated state caused by using only T past outputs instead of all the outputs.

To upper bound the estimation error $\|\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T - \mathcal{H}_T\|$, the following three steps are essential:

1. Providing condition for the invertibility of $Y_p Y_p^\top$, i.e., the persistent of excitation for the batch past outputs Y_p .
2. Giving an upper bound for the cross-term error $\mathcal{J}_T E_f Y_p^\top (Y_p Y_p^\top)^{-1}$.
3. Giving an upper bound for the Kalman filter truncation bias term $\Gamma_T A_C^\top \widehat{X} Y_p^\top (Y_p Y_p^\top)^{-1}$.

Next, we will sequentially present the results corresponding to these three steps above, and finally summarize the results to provide the non-asymptotic analysis of the linear regression step of the subspace identification method.

4.1 The Invertibility of $Y_p Y_p^\top$

The past outputs in each sample trajectory i can be compactly written as

$$y_p^{(i)} = \Gamma_T \widehat{x}_0^{(i)} + \mathcal{J}_T e_p^{(i)}. \quad (24)$$

Combining the dynamic responses of different sample trajectories, it can be obtained that

$$Y_p = \Gamma_T \widehat{X} + \mathcal{J}_T E_p. \quad (25)$$

Lemma 1. *Let Y_p be as in (25). For a failure probability $\delta \in (0, 1)$, let $N \geq N_1$, then with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$, we have*

$$\mathcal{E}_1 = \left\{ Y_p Y_p^\top \succeq \frac{N}{2} \Sigma_y \succ \mathbf{0} \right\} \quad (26)$$

occurs, where $N_1 = 24Tm \log(9/\delta)$ and $\Sigma_y = \Gamma_T P \Gamma_T^\top + \mathcal{J}_T (I_T \otimes \mathcal{S}) \mathcal{J}_T^\top$.

Proof. Since $\hat{x}_0^{(i)}$ and the past noises $e_p^{(i)}$ are independent of each other, one can easily that all the $y_p^{(i)}$ are independently and identically distributed Gaussian with mean zero and variance matrix $\Sigma_y \triangleq \Gamma_T P \Gamma_T^\top + \mathcal{J}_T (I_T \otimes \mathcal{S}) \mathcal{J}_T^\top$. According to the definition of Y_p , it can be obtained that $Y_p Y_p^\top = \sum_{i=1}^N y_p^{(i)} (y_p^{(i)})^\top$. Now applying Proposition 1, setting $N_1 = 24Tm \log(9/\delta)$, where $\delta \in (0, 1)$ is a failure probability, if $N \geq N_1$, with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$, we have

$$\mathcal{E}_1 = \left\{ Y_p Y_p^\top \succeq \frac{N}{2} \Sigma_y \succ \mathbf{0} \right\} \quad (27)$$

occurs. □

4.2 The Cross-Term Error

To bound the cross-term error $\mathcal{J}_T E_f Y_p^\top (Y_p Y_p^\top)^{-1}$, we need to provide an upper bound of $\|E_f Y_p^\top\|$. The product $E_f Y_p^\top$ is equal to

$$E_f Y_p^\top = \sum_{i=1}^N e_f^{(i)} (y_p^{(i)})^\top = \sum_{i=1}^N e_f^{(i)} (\hat{x}_0^{(i)})^\top \Gamma_T^\top + \sum_{i=1}^N e_f^{(i)} (e_p^{(i)})^\top \mathcal{J}_T^\top, \quad (28)$$

where the second equality holds because of (24). Further, it can be obtained that

$$\|E_f Y_p^\top\| \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^N e_f^{(i)} (\hat{x}_0^{(i)})^\top \right\| \|\Gamma_T^\top\| + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^N e_f^{(i)} (e_p^{(i)})^\top \right\| \|\mathcal{J}_T^\top\|. \quad (29)$$

Then, by using Lemma 5, we can obtain the following Lemma.

Lemma 2. *Let Y_p be as in (25) and E_f be as in Section 3. For a failure probability $\delta \in (0, 1)$, let $N \geq N_2$, then with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$, we have*

$$\mathcal{E}_2 = \left\{ \|E_f Y_p^\top\| \leq 4\sqrt{N \log(9/\delta)} \|\mathcal{S}\|^{1/2} \left(\sqrt{n + Tm} \|P\|^{1/2} \|\Gamma_T\| + \sqrt{2Tm} \|\mathcal{S}\|^{1/2} \|\mathcal{J}_T\| \right) \right\} \quad (30)$$

occurs, where $N_2 = Tm \log(9/\delta)$.

4.3 The Truncation Bias

To bound the truncation bias $\Gamma_T A_C^T \hat{X} Y_p^\top (Y_p Y_p^\top)^{-1}$, we need to provide an upper bound of $\|\hat{X} Y_p^\top\|$. The product $\hat{X} Y_p^\top$ is equal to

$$\hat{X} Y_p^\top = \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{x}_0^{(i)} (y_p^{(i)})^\top = \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{x}_0^{(i)} (\hat{x}_0^{(i)})^\top \Gamma_T^\top + \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{x}_0^{(i)} (e_p^{(i)})^\top \mathcal{J}_T^\top, \quad (31)$$

where the second equality holds because of (24). Further, it can be obtained that

$$\|\hat{X} Y_p^\top\| \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{x}_0^{(i)} (\hat{x}_0^{(i)})^\top \right\| \|\Gamma_T^\top\| + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{x}_0^{(i)} (e_p^{(i)})^\top \right\| \|\mathcal{J}_T^\top\|. \quad (32)$$

Then, by using Proposition 2 and Lemma 5, we can obtain the following Lemma.

Lemma 3. Let Y_p be as in (25) and E_f be as in (10). For a failure probability $\delta \in (0, 1)$, let $N \geq N_3$, then with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$, we have

$$\mathcal{E}_3 = \left\{ \|\widehat{X}Y_p^\top\| \leq 4\sqrt{N \log(9/\delta)} \|P\|^{1/2} \left(\sqrt{n} \|P\|^{1/2} \|\Gamma_T\| + \sqrt{n + Tm} \|\mathcal{S}\|^{1/2} \|\mathcal{J}_T\| \right) \right\} \quad (33)$$

occurs, where $N_3 = \frac{1}{2}(n + Tm) \log(9/\delta)$.

4.4 Final Results

According to (23), the estimation error $\|\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T - \mathcal{H}_T\|$ can be bounded by

$$\|\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T - \mathcal{H}_T\| \leq \|(Y_p Y_p^\top)^{-1}\| \left[\|\mathcal{J}_T\| \|E_f Y_p^\top\| + \|\Gamma_T A_C^T\| \|\widehat{X} Y_p^\top\| \right]. \quad (34)$$

Let $N \geq \max\{N_1, N_2, N_3\} = 24Tm \log(9/\delta)$. Combing the estimates in Lemmas via union bound, we have with probability at least $1 - 6\delta$, the event $\mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_2 \cap \mathcal{E}_3$ occurs. Further, it can be obtained that

$$\|\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T - \mathcal{H}_T\| \leq \frac{8\sqrt{2Tm \log(9/\delta)}}{\sqrt{N}} (\mathcal{C}_1 + \mathcal{C}_2 \|A_C^T\|), \quad (35)$$

where $\mathcal{C}_1 = \frac{\|\mathcal{J}_T\| \|\mathcal{S}\|^{1/2}}{\sigma_{\min}(\Sigma_y)} \mathcal{C}_3$, and $\mathcal{C}_2 = \frac{\|\Gamma_T\| \|P\|^{1/2}}{\sigma_{\min}(\Sigma_y)} \mathcal{C}_3$, and $\mathcal{C}_3 = \|\Gamma_T\| \|P\|^{1/2} + \|\mathcal{J}_T\| \|\mathcal{S}\|^{1/2}$, and $\Sigma_y = \Gamma_T P \Gamma_T^\top + \mathcal{J}_T (I_T \otimes \mathcal{S}) \mathcal{J}_T^\top$.

Theorem 1. For the system (6), under the conditions of Assumptions 1, 2 and 3, let $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T$ be the estimate (16) of the subspace identification algorithm given N sample trajectories, each of length $2T$: $\{y_k^{(i)} : 0 \leq k \leq 2T - 1, 1 \leq i \leq N\}$, and let \mathcal{H}_T be as in Section 3. For a failure probability $\delta \in (0, 1)$, if the number of sample trajectories N satisfies that $N \geq 24Tm \log(9/\delta)$, then with probability at least $1 - 6\delta$,

$$\|\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T - \mathcal{H}_T\| \leq \frac{8\sqrt{2Tm \log(9/\delta)}}{\sqrt{N}} (\mathcal{C}_1 + \mathcal{C}_2 \|A_C^T\|), \quad (36)$$

where $\mathcal{C}_1 = \frac{\|\mathcal{J}_T\| \|\mathcal{S}\|^{1/2}}{\sigma_{\min}(\Sigma_y)} \mathcal{C}_3$, and $\mathcal{C}_2 = \frac{\|\Gamma_T\| \|P\|^{1/2}}{\sigma_{\min}(\Sigma_y)} \mathcal{C}_3$, and $\mathcal{C}_3 = \|\Gamma_T\| \|P\|^{1/2} + \|\mathcal{J}_T\| \|\mathcal{S}\|^{1/2}$, and $\Sigma_y = \Gamma_T P \Gamma_T^\top + \mathcal{J}_T (I_T \otimes \mathcal{S}) \mathcal{J}_T^\top$.

Remark 3. In (23), the estimation error consists of the following two terms:

$$\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T - \mathcal{H}_T = \underbrace{\mathcal{J}_T E_f Y_p^\top (Y_p Y_p^\top)^{-1}}_{\text{Cross term}} + \underbrace{\Gamma_T A_C^T \widehat{X} Y_p^\top (Y_p Y_p^\top)^{-1}}_{\text{Kalman filter truncation bias term}}. \quad (37)$$

It is noticed that the spectral radius of the matrix $A_C = A - KC$ is less than one, so the Kalman filter truncation bias term decays exponentially with T . In this sense, the dominant term is the first term, i.e., the cross term. The upper bound (36) in Theorem 1 reveals that the estimation error $\|\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T - \mathcal{H}_T\|$ behaviors as $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{N})$, which is consistent with previous non-asymptotic results[TODO].

On the other hand, the result given by Theorem 1 applies to both (marginally) stable and unstable systems. Specifically, when the system is unstable, i.e., the spectral radius of matrix A is greater than 1, both \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{C}_2 will grow exponentially, which means that more sample trajectories are needed

for unstable systems to achieve the same accuracy. This is because, for unstable systems, the process noise w_k will be amplified during the system's evolution.

Finally, it is worth noting that in the absence of input, the noise both helps and hinders identification. The larger the noise, the better the excitation effect of the output, but it also reduces the convergence of the least squares estimator. To understand how the non-asymptotic bound (36) captures this, observe that as the noise increases, $\|\mathcal{S}\|$ becomes larger, but $\sigma_{\min}(\Sigma_y)$ also increases. both \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{C}_2 capture this trade-off.

5 Robustness of Balanced Realization

In this section, we analyze the robustness of balanced realizations of the shift approach. Specifically, we first provide upper bounds for the estimation errors of the matrices A , C , K , and A_C based on the estimation error $\|\hat{\mathcal{H}}_T - \mathcal{H}_T\|$. Then, by combining Theorem 1, we establish an end-to-end non-asymptotic estimation guarantee from multiple sample trajectories, and finally, provide upper bounds for the system poles. Similar to the previous results, the results of this section apply to both (marginally) stable and unstable systems.

The next result shows the robustness of the shift approach of the subspace identification method to adversarial disturbances that may occur in the block Hankel matrix \mathcal{H}_T . This result follows the steps in [4, 35].

Theorem 2. *For the system (6), under the conditions of Assumptions 1, 2 and 3, consider the true block Hankel matrix \mathcal{H}_T defined in Section 3 and the noisy estimate $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_T$ defined in (16). Let \bar{A}, \bar{C} and \bar{K} be the output of the balanced realization corresponding to the output of the shift approach given in Subsection 3.2 based on \mathcal{H}_T and \hat{A}, \hat{C} and \hat{K} be the output of the balanced realization corresponding to the output of the shift approach given in Subsection 3.2 based on $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_T$. If \mathcal{H}_T has rank n and satisfies the following perturbation condition:*

$$\|\hat{\mathcal{H}}_T - \mathcal{H}_T\| \leq \frac{\sigma_n(\mathcal{H}_T)}{4}, \quad (38)$$

then there exists a unitary matrix $\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ such that

$$\|\hat{C} - \bar{C}\mathcal{U}\| \leq \|\hat{\Gamma}_T - \bar{\Gamma}_T\mathcal{U}\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{39n}{\sigma_n(\mathcal{H}_T)}} \|\mathcal{H}_T - \hat{\mathcal{H}}_T\|, \quad (39)$$

and

$$\|\hat{K} - \mathcal{U}^\top \bar{K}\| \leq \|\hat{\mathcal{K}}_T - \mathcal{U}^\top \bar{\mathcal{K}}_T\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{39n}{\sigma_n(\mathcal{H}_T)}} \|\mathcal{H}_T - \hat{\mathcal{H}}_T\|. \quad (40)$$

Furthermore, the state matrices \bar{A}, \hat{A} satisfy

$$\|\hat{A} - \mathcal{U}^\top \bar{A}\mathcal{U}\| \leq \left(\sqrt{2} + 2\sqrt{\text{cond}(\mathcal{H}_T)}\right) \frac{\sqrt{39n}}{\sigma_n(\mathcal{H}_T)} \|\mathcal{H}_T - \hat{\mathcal{H}}_T\| \quad (41)$$

and the closed-loop matrices $\bar{A}_C \triangleq \bar{A} - \bar{K}\bar{C}$, $\hat{A}_C \triangleq \hat{A} - \hat{K}\hat{C}$ satisfy

$$\|\hat{A}_C - \mathcal{U}^\top \bar{A}_C\mathcal{U}\| \leq \left(\sqrt{2} + 2\sqrt{\text{cond}(\mathcal{H}_T)}\right) \frac{\sqrt{39n}}{\sigma_n(\mathcal{H}_T)} \|\mathcal{H}_T - \hat{\mathcal{H}}_T\|. \quad (42)$$

The results of Theorem 2 reveal that the balanced realizations of the shift approach in subspace identification method is robust to noise up to trivial ambiguities. The robustness is controlled by the smallest singular value $\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{H}_T)$ of the block Hankel matrix \mathcal{H}_T , where under the condition of Assumption 1, the rank of \mathcal{H}_T is n , so the smallest singular value $\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{H}_T)$ is the n -th largest singular value $\sigma_n(\mathcal{H}_T)$. Here “weakest” is in terms of observability and controllability, therefore, a smaller $\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{H}_T)$ implies that there is a mode of the system (6) is more difficult to identify.

Our next result combines the robustness of the balanced realizations of the shift approach in subspace identification method with the non-asymptotic estimation bounds of Theorem 1, to establish end-to-end estimation guarantees for matrices A, C, K and A_C .

Theorem 3. *For the system (6), under the conditions of Assumptions 1, 2 and 3, consider the true block Hankel matrix \mathcal{H}_T defined in Section 3 and the noisy estimate $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_T$ defined in (16) with N sample trajectories, each of length $2T$: $\{y_k^{(i)} : 0 \leq k \leq 2T - 1, 1 \leq i \leq N\}$. Let \bar{A}, \bar{C} and \bar{K} be the output of the balanced realization corresponding to the output of the shift approach given in Subsection 3.2 based on \mathcal{H}_T and \hat{A}, \hat{C} and \hat{K} be the output of the balanced realization corresponding to the output of the shift approach given in Subsection 3.2 based on $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_T$. For a failure probability $\delta \in (0, 1)$, if the number of sample trajectories N satisfies that $N \geq 24Tm \log(9/\delta)$ and \mathcal{H}_T has rank n and satisfies the following perturbation condition:*

$$\|\hat{\mathcal{H}}_T - \mathcal{H}_T\| \leq \frac{\sigma_n(\mathcal{H}_T)}{4}, \quad (43)$$

then there exists a unitary matrix $\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ such that with probability at least $1 - 6\delta$,

$$\max \left\{ \|\hat{C} - \bar{C}\mathcal{U}\|, \|\hat{K} - \mathcal{U}^\top \bar{K}\| \right\} \leq \frac{8}{\sqrt{N}} \sqrt{\frac{78nTm \log(9/\delta)}{\sigma_n(\mathcal{H}_T)}} (\mathcal{C}_1 + \mathcal{C}_2 \|A_C^T\|), \quad (44)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \max \left\{ \|\hat{A} - \mathcal{U}^\top \bar{A}\mathcal{U}\|, \|\hat{A}_C - \mathcal{U}^\top \bar{A}_C\mathcal{U}\| \right\} \\ \leq \frac{8 \left(\sqrt{2} + 2\sqrt{\text{cond}(\mathcal{H}_T)} \right) \sqrt{78nTm \log(9/\delta)}}{\sqrt{N} \sigma_n(\mathcal{H}_T)} (\mathcal{C}_1 + \mathcal{C}_2 \|A_C^T\|), \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

where $\mathcal{C}_1 = \frac{\|\mathcal{J}_T\| \|\mathcal{S}\|^{1/2}}{\sigma_{\min}(\Sigma_y)} \mathcal{C}_3$, and $\mathcal{C}_2 = \frac{\|\Gamma_T\| \|P\|^{1/2}}{\sigma_{\min}(\Sigma_y)} \mathcal{C}_3$, and $\mathcal{C}_3 = \|\Gamma_T\| \|P\|^{1/2} + \|\mathcal{J}_T\| \|\mathcal{S}\|^{1/2}$, and $\Sigma_y = \Gamma_T P \Gamma_T^\top + \mathcal{J}_T (I_T \otimes \mathcal{S}) \mathcal{J}_T^\top$.

The results of Theorem 3 indicate that all matrix errors have the same statistical rate as the error of the block Hankel matrix \mathcal{H}_T , meaning their estimation errors decrease at a rate of at least $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{N})$, which is consistent with that of [34].

To characterize the gap between the spectra of matrices \bar{A} and \hat{A} , 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*

$$d_H(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \triangleq \max\{\text{sv}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{B}), \text{sv}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{A})\} \quad (46)$$

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

$$sv_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{B}) \triangleq \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} |\lambda_i(\mathcal{A}) - \mu_j(\mathcal{B})| \quad (47)$$

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

Remark 4. 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 $\{\lambda(\mathcal{A}) : \mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}\}$.

The next result shows the robustness of the system poles for the shift approach of the subspace identification method to adversarial disturbances that may occur in the block Hankel matrix \mathcal{H}_T . This result follows the steps in [42].

Theorem 4. For the system (6), under the conditions of Assumptions 1, 2 and 3, consider the true block Hankel matrix \mathcal{H}_T defined in Section 3 and the noisy estimate $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T$ defined in (16) with N sample trajectories, each of length $2T$: $\{y_k^{(i)} : 0 \leq k \leq 2T - 1, 1 \leq i \leq N\}$. Let \bar{A}, \bar{C} and \bar{K} be the output of the balanced realization corresponding to the output of the shift approach given in Subsection 3.2 based on \mathcal{H}_T and \hat{A}, \hat{C} and \hat{K} be the output of the balanced realization corresponding to the output of the shift approach given in Subsection 3.2 based on $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T$. For a failure probability $\delta \in (0, 1)$, if the number of sample trajectories N satisfies that $N \geq 24Tm \log(9/\delta)$ and \mathcal{H}_T has rank n and satisfies the following perturbation condition:

$$\|\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T - \mathcal{H}_T\| \leq \frac{\sigma_n(\mathcal{H}_T)}{4}, \quad (48)$$

then with probability at least $1 - 6\delta$,

$$d_H(\hat{A}, \bar{A}) \leq \sqrt{n}^{1+\frac{1}{n}} \left[\left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^n - 1 \right]^{\frac{1}{n}} (\Delta + \|\bar{A}\|)^{1-\frac{1}{n}} \Delta^{\frac{1}{n}} \quad (49)$$

where $\Delta = \frac{8(\sqrt{2+2\sqrt{\text{cond}(\mathcal{H}_T)})}{\sqrt{N}} \frac{\sqrt{78nTm \log(9/\delta)}}{\sigma_n(\mathcal{H}_T)} (\mathcal{C}_1 + \mathcal{C}_2 \|A_C^T\|)$, and $\mathcal{C}_1 = \frac{\|\mathcal{J}_T\| \|\mathcal{S}\|^{1/2}}{\sigma_{\min}(\Sigma_y)} \mathcal{C}_3$, and $\mathcal{C}_2 = \frac{\|\Gamma_T\| \|\|P\|^{1/2}}{\sigma_{\min}(\Sigma_y)} \mathcal{C}_3$, and $\mathcal{C}_3 = \|\Gamma_T\| \|\|P\|^{1/2}\| + \|\mathcal{J}_T\| \|\|S\|^{1/2}$, and $\Sigma_y = \Gamma_T P \Gamma_T^\top + \mathcal{J}_T (I_T \otimes \mathcal{S}) \mathcal{J}_T^\top$.

Proof. Based on Lemma 8, it can be obtained that

$$d_H(\hat{A}, \bar{A}) = d_H(\hat{A}, \mathcal{U}^\top \bar{A} \mathcal{U}) \leq n^{\frac{1}{2n}} \left[\left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^n - 1 \right]^{\frac{1}{n}} m_A^{1-\frac{1}{n}} \|\hat{A} - \mathcal{U}^\top \bar{A} \mathcal{U}\|_{\text{F}}^{\frac{1}{n}}, \quad (50)$$

where $m_A = \max\{\|\mathcal{U}^\top \bar{A} \mathcal{U}\|_{\text{F}}, \|\hat{A}\|_{\text{F}}\}$, and the first equality holds because the unitary matrix transformation does not change the eigenvalues of the matrix. According to Theorem 3, there exists a unitary matrix $\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ such that with probability at least $1 - 6\delta$, $\|\hat{A} - \mathcal{U}^\top \bar{A} \mathcal{U}\| \leq \delta$. Furthermore, it can be obtained that

$$\|\hat{A} - \mathcal{U}^\top \bar{A} \mathcal{U}\|_{\text{F}} \leq \sqrt{n} \|\hat{A} - \mathcal{U}^\top \bar{A} \mathcal{U}\| \leq \sqrt{n} \Delta. \quad (51)$$

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

$$m_A \leq \|\mathcal{U}^\top \bar{A} \mathcal{U}\|_{\text{F}} + \|\mathcal{U}^\top \bar{A} \mathcal{U} - \hat{A}\|_{\text{F}} \leq \|\mathcal{U}^\top \bar{A} \mathcal{U}\|_{\text{F}} + \sqrt{n} \Delta \leq \sqrt{n} (\|\bar{A}\| + \Delta), \quad (52)$$

where the last inequality holds because the unitary matrix transformation does not change the Frobenius norm of the matrix and $\|\bar{A}\|_{\text{F}} \leq \sqrt{n} \|\bar{A}\|$. By combining (50), (51), and (52), the proof is completed. \square

Theorem 4 provides end-to-end estimation guarantees for the system poles and shows that the estimation error of the system poles is controlled by the estimation error of the matrix A in the state-space model. This is not surprising, as the eigenvalues of a matrix exhibit good continuity. The results of Theorem 4 further indicate that the estimation error of the system poles decreases at a rate of at least $\mathcal{O}(N^{\frac{1}{2n}})$.

6 Ill-conditionedness of Subspace Identification Methods

In the previous two sections, Theorems 1 and 2 sequentially have revealed that when the smallest singular value $\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{H}_T)$ of the block Hankel matrix \mathcal{H}_T is smaller, the identification of the Hankel matrix \mathcal{H}_T , system matrices A , C , K , and A_C , as well as the system poles, becomes more challenging. This naturally leads one to wonder what the specific underlying principle behind this is. In this section, we will focus on exploring this issue.

As discussed in Section 3.2, during the balanced realization process of the shift approach of the subspace methods, calculating the Moore-Penrose inverse of Γ_T and \mathcal{K}_T is a crucial step. Noting that the block Hankel matrix \mathcal{H}_T is the product of Γ_T and \mathcal{K}_T , thus we will focus on analyzing Γ_T , \mathcal{K}_T , and \mathcal{H}_T in the following discussion. The condition numbers of Γ_T and \mathcal{K}_T , as well as the smallest singular value of \mathcal{H}_T , can be characterized by the following theorem.

Theorem 5. *For the system (6), under the conditions of Assumptions 1, along with the conditions that matrix A is diagonal and its diagonal elements, i.e., the poles of the system (2), are distinct and real, and T is greater than or equal to the system order n , the (extended) observability matrix Γ_T and the reversed (extended) controllability matrix \mathcal{K}_T defined in (11) satisfy*

$$\min \{ \text{cond}(\Gamma_T), \text{cond}(\mathcal{K}_T) \} \geq \frac{1}{4} \rho^{\frac{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2m} \rfloor}{\log(2Tm)}}, \quad (53)$$

where $\rho \triangleq e^{\frac{\pi^2}{4}} \approx 11.79$. Moreover, if the system (6) is stable (or marginally stable), then the smallest singular value $\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{H}_T)$ of the block Hankel matrix \mathcal{H}_T , i.e., the n -th largest singular value of \mathcal{H}_T satisfies the following inequality

$$\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{H}_T) \leq 4Tmn\bar{c}\bar{k}\rho^{-\frac{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2m} \rfloor}{\log(2Tm)}}, \quad (54)$$

where $\bar{c} = \max_{i,j} |c_{ij}|$ and $\bar{k} = \max_{i,j} |k_{ij}|$ are the maximum absolute values of the elements in matrices C and K , respectively.

Remark 5. *In fact, this theorem above is derived from Lemma 1 in reference [43]. For completeness, we still provide the proof here.*

Proof. It is not difficult to verify that under the conditions of Assumptions 1 and T is greater than or equal to the system order n , both the (extended) observability matrix Γ_T and the reversed (extended) controllability matrix \mathcal{K}_T have rank n . On the other hand, since matrix A is diagonal and its diagonal elements, i.e., the poles of the system (2), are distinct and real, then applying Lemma 7 gives that

$$\sigma_n(\Gamma_T) \leq 4\rho^{-\frac{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2m} \rfloor}{\log(2Tm)}} \|\Gamma_T\|, \quad \sigma_n(\mathcal{K}_T) \leq 4\rho^{-\frac{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2m} \rfloor}{\log(2Tm)}} \|\mathcal{K}_T\|, \quad (55)$$

where $\rho \triangleq e^{\frac{\pi^2}{4}} \approx 11.79$, then it can be obtained that

$$\text{cond}(\Gamma_T) = \frac{\|\Gamma_T\|}{\sigma_n(\Gamma_T)} \geq \frac{1}{4} \rho^{\frac{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2m} \rfloor}{\log(2Tm)}}, \quad \text{cond}(\mathcal{K}_T) = \frac{\|\mathcal{K}_T\|}{\sigma_n(\mathcal{K}_T)} \geq \frac{1}{4} \rho^{\frac{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2m} \rfloor}{\log(2Tm)}}, \quad (56)$$

which completes the proof of (53). Since $\mathcal{H}_T = \Gamma_T \mathcal{K}_T$, it is not difficult to get that

$$\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{H}_T) = \sigma_n(\mathcal{H}_T) \leq \min \{ \|\mathcal{K}_T\| \sigma_n(\Gamma_T), \|\Gamma_T\| \sigma_n(\mathcal{K}_T) \} \quad (57)$$

by using the properties of singular values. It can be easily verified that

$$\|\Gamma_T\|^2 \leq \|\Gamma_T\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 = \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \|CA^k\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \leq \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \|C\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \|A^k\|^2 \leq \bar{c}^2 Tmn, \quad (58)$$

where $\bar{c} = \max_{i,j} |c_{ij}|$ is the maximum absolute value of the elements in matrix C , and

$$\|\mathcal{K}_T\|^2 \leq \|\mathcal{K}_T\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 = \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \|A_C^k B\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \leq \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \|K\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \|A_C^k\|^2 \leq \bar{k}^2 Tmn, \quad (59)$$

where $\bar{k} = \max_{i,j} |k_{ij}|$ is the maximum absolute value of the elements in matrix K , and the second inequalities in (58) and (59) hold because matrices A and A_c are marginally stable or stable. Combining the above results, it can be obtained that

$$\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{H}_T) \leq 4\rho^{-\frac{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2m} \rfloor}{\log(2Tm)}} \|\Gamma_T\| \|\mathcal{K}_T\| \leq 4Tmn\bar{c}\bar{k}\rho^{-\frac{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2m} \rfloor}{\log(2Tm)}}, \quad (60)$$

then the proof of (54) is completed. \square

According to the results of Theorem 5, the condition numbers of the (extended) observability matrix Γ_T and the reversed (extended) controllability matrix \mathcal{K}_T grows at a super-polynomial rate with respect to the ratio n/m , while the smallest singular value $\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{H}_T)$ of the block Hankel matrix \mathcal{H}_T decreases at a super-polynomial rate with respect to the ratio n/m . This implies that when n/m is large, the subspace methods for identifying state-space models of the system (6) will be ill-conditioned, regardless of system parameters.

7 Numerical Results

7.1 Estimation Error of SIMs

In this section, we first consider a $n = 2$ -dimensional discrete-time LTI stable system with $m = 1$ outputs

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \\ & \lambda_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad C = [c_1 \quad c_2], \quad (61)$$

where λ_1 and λ_2 are independent and identically distributed random variables uniformly distributed on $(-1, 1)$, while c_1 and c_2 are independent and identically distributed Gaussian random variables with mean zero and covariance $1/m = 1$. The covariance \mathcal{R} of the measurement noise v_k is fixed as $\sigma_v^2 = 1/100$. In our experiments, process noise w_k with the covariance matrix \mathcal{Q} set to $\sigma_w^2 I_n = I_2$,




Figure 1: Estimation errors for the Hankel matrices \mathcal{H}_T and $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_T$ for varying number of sample trajectories N and process noise levels. Blue: $\sigma_w = 1$; Green: $\sigma_w = 1/\sqrt{10}$; Red: $\sigma_w = 1/10$.




Figure 2: Comparison of estimation errors for the Hankel matrices \mathcal{H}_T and $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_T$, along with the bound derived in (36), for varying numbers of sample trajectories N with $\sigma_w = 1$.




Figure 3: Comparison of estimation errors for the Hankel matrices \mathcal{H}_T and $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_T$, along with the bound derived in (36), for varying numbers of sample trajectories N with $\sigma_w = 1/\sqrt{10}$.




Figure 4: Comparison of estimation errors for the Hankel matrices \mathcal{H}_T and $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_T$, along with the bound derived in (36), for varying numbers of sample trajectories N with $\sigma_w = 1/10$.

$\sigma_w^2 I_n = I_2/10$, and $\sigma_w^2 I_n = I_2/100$ is used, respectively. For multiple sample trajectories, the length of each trajectory is set to $2T = 2n = 4$. For each case, we run 100 trials.

For varying noise levels $\sigma_w \in \{1, 1/\sqrt{10}, 1/10\}$, we plot the shadedErrorBar of the estimation error $\|\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T - \mathcal{H}_T\|$, as shown in Figure 1. In this numerical experiments, we vary the number N of sample trajectories from 10 to 2000. It can be seen that increasing the number of sample trajectories N reduces the estimation error $\|\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T - \mathcal{H}_T\|$, which is consistent with expectations.

Next, the numerical results comparing the estimation errors of the Hankel matrices \mathcal{H}_T and $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T$ with the bound derived in (36) for different noise levels $\sigma_w \in \{1, 1/\sqrt{10}, 1/10\}$ are depicted in Figures 2, 3, and 4, respectively. In this numerical experiment, we set the failure probability δ to $1/600$. According to Theorem 1, when the number of sample trajectories N is greater than or equal to 413, it ensures that with probability at least 0.99, the estimation errors $\|\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T - \mathcal{H}_T\|$ do not exceed the bound derived in (36). Therefore, we vary the number N of sample trajectories from 413 to 2000. It can be seen that our bound is valid. Since the number of numerical experiments is limited, there may be instances where process noise w_k and measurement noise v_k lead to a larger estimation error $\|\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T - \mathcal{H}_T\|$. On the other hand, we believe there may be potential ways to improve our results, which will be explored in future work.

7.2 Ill-conditionedness of SIMs

Now, we present numerical results for the condition numbers of the (extended) observability matrix Γ_T and the reversed (extended) controllability matrix \mathcal{K}_T , as well as the smallest singular value of the block Hankel matrix \mathcal{H}_T , as shown in Figures 5, 6 and 7. For the numerical experiments, we set the number of output m to 1, A as a diagonal matrix with diagonal elements uniformly sampled from the interval $(-1, 1)$, and the elements in C follow a Gaussian distribution with mean zero and covariance $1/m = 1$. The parameter T is set to n . The covariance matrix \mathcal{Q} of the process noise w_k and the covariance of the measurement noise v_k are set to $I_n = I_2$ and $0.01I_m = 0.01$, respectively. For each dimension n , 10,000 experiments are repeated.

From Figures 5, 6 and 7, it can be observed that, on one hand, the bounds derived in(53) and (54) are effective. As the ratio n/m increases, the condition numbers of Γ_T and \mathcal{K}_T grow at a super-polynomial rate with respect to n/m , while the smallest singular value of \mathcal{H}_T decreases at a super-polynomial rate with respect to n/m . In this sense, it implies that the subspace identification algorithm becomes increasingly ill-conditioned. On the other hand, the bounds are not tight enough, and future research could aim to improve more tighter bounds.

8 Conclusions

This paper analyzes the identification errors for n -dimensional discrete-time LTI systems with m outputs and no external inputs in a non-asymptotic sense. using multiple output sample trajectories, we derive non-asymptotic high-probability upper bounds for the estimation errors of the matrices A, C , the Kalman filter gain K , the closed loop matrix $A - KC$, and the system poles. We show that, with high probability, the non-asymptotic estimation errors of these matrices decay at a rate of at least $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{1/N})$, while the estimation error of the system poles decays at a rate of at least $\mathcal{O}(N^{-\frac{1}{2n}})$, where N denotes the number of sample trajectories. These results apply to both (marginally) stable systems and unstable systems. Additionally, we prove that SIMs become ill-conditioned when the ratio n/m is large, regardless of the system parameters. Future work will involve extending these




Figure 5: Numerical results of the (extended) observability matrix Γ_T . The blue violinplot illustrates the sampling distribution of the condition number of Γ_T across different dimensions n . The blue solid line represents the theoretical bound derived in (53).




Figure 6: Numerical results of the reversed (extended) controllability matrix \mathcal{K}_T . The blue violinplot illustrates the sampling distribution of the condition number of \mathcal{K}_T across different dimensions n . The blue solid line represents the theoretical bound derived in (53).




Figure 7: Numerical results of the block Hankel matrix \mathcal{H}_T . The blue violinplot illustrates the sampling distribution of the smallest singular value of \mathcal{H}_T across different dimensions n . The blue solid line represents the theoretical bound derived in (54).

results to systems with external inputs and considering the continuous-time case.

9 Appendix

9.1 Some Lemmas and Propositions

Lemma 4 ([31]). *Let $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be independently and identically distributed Gaussian with mean zero and covariance matrix Σ_x , and set $M = \sum_{i=1}^N x_i x_i^\top$. Fix a failure probability $\delta \in (0, 1]$, and let $N \geq 24n \log(9/\delta)$. Then with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$, we have that $\lambda_{\min}(M) \geq \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_x) N/2$.*

Proposition 1. *Let $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be independently and identically distributed Gaussian with mean zero and covariance matrix Σ_x , and set $M = \sum_{i=1}^N x_i x_i^\top$. Fix a failure probability $\delta \in (0, 1]$, and let $N \geq 24n \log(9/\delta)$. Then with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$, we have that $M \succeq (N/2)\Sigma_x$.*

Proof. We can rewrite $x_i = \Sigma_x^{1/2} y_i$, where $y_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is Gaussian with mean zero and unit covariance. Fix a failure probability $\delta \in (0, 1]$, and let $N \geq 24n \log(9/\delta)$. Applying Lemma 4, with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$, we have that

$$\lambda_{\min} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N y_i y_i^\top \right) \geq \frac{N}{2} \Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^N y_i y_i^\top \succeq \frac{N}{2} I_n. \quad (62)$$

Multiplying by $\Sigma_x^{1/2}$ from the left and $\Sigma_x^{1/2}$ from the right gives the desired result. \square

Lemma 5 ([31]). *Let $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $w_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be such that $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be independently and identically distributed Gaussian with mean zero and covariance matrix Σ_x , and $w_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be independently and identically distributed Gaussian with mean zero and covariance matrix Σ_w , and let $M = \sum_{i=1}^N x_i w_i^\top$.*

Fix a failure probability $\delta \in (0, 1]$, and let $N \geq \frac{1}{2}(n+m) \log(9/\delta)$. Then, it holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$ that

$$\|M\| \leq 4 \|\Sigma_x\|^{1/2} \|\Sigma_w\|^{1/2} \sqrt{N(n+m) \log(9/\delta)}. \quad (63)$$

Proposition 2. Let $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be independently and identically distributed Gaussian with mean zero and covariance matrix Σ_x , and set $M = \sum_{i=1}^N x_i x_i^\top$. Fix a failure probability $\delta \in (0, 1]$, and let $N \geq \frac{n}{2} \log(9/\delta)$. Then with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have that

$$\|M\| \leq 4 \|\Sigma_x\| \sqrt{Nn \log(9/\delta)}. \quad (64)$$

Proof. This Proposition is from the proof of Proposition III.2 in [31]. \square

Lemma 6 ([35]). For the true block Hankel matrix \mathcal{H}_T defined in Section 3 and the noisy estimate $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T$ defined in (16), suppose $\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{H}_T) \geq 2\|\mathcal{H}_T - \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T\|$. Then, $\|\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T\| \leq 2\|\widehat{H}_T\|$ and $\sigma_{\min}(\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T) \geq \sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{H}_T)/2$.

Lemma 7 ([43]). Given a $n \times mp$ ($p \leq n$) matrix $X_{n,mp}$ satisfying

$$X_{n,mp} = [J_p \quad DJ_p \quad \cdots \quad D^{m-1}J_p], \quad (65)$$

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

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

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.

Lemma 8 ([42]). 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

$$d_H(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \leq n^{\frac{1}{2n}} \left[\left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^n - 1 \right]^{\frac{1}{n}} m_F^{1-\frac{1}{n}} \|\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{B}\|_F^{\frac{1}{n}}, \quad (66)$$

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

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.

9.2 The proof of Theorem 2

Proof. For the block Hankel matrix \mathcal{H}_T and the best rank- n approximation $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{T,n}$ of the estimate block Hankel matrix $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T$, we have

$$\|\mathcal{H}_T - \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{T,n}\| \leq \|\mathcal{H}_T - \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T\| + \|\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T - \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{T,n}\| \leq 2\|\mathcal{H}_T - \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T\|, \quad (67)$$

where the second inequality holds because \mathcal{H}_T and $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{T,n}$ are both matrices of rank n , and $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{T,n}$ is the best rank- n approximation of $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T$, which implies that $\|\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T - \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{T,n}\| \leq \|\mathcal{H}_T - \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T\|$. Combining this result with the perturbation condition (38), we obtain

$$\|\mathcal{H}_T - \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{T,n}\| \leq 2\|\mathcal{H}_T - \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_T\| \leq \frac{\sigma_n(\mathcal{H}_T)}{2}. \quad (68)$$

Now applying Theorem 5.14 from [44], it can be obtained that there exists a unitary matrix $\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ such that

$$\|\widehat{\Gamma}_T - \overline{\Gamma}_T \mathcal{U}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 + \|\widehat{\mathcal{K}}_T - \mathcal{U}^\top \overline{\mathcal{K}}_T\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{2}-1} \frac{\|\mathcal{H}_T - \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{T,n}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2}{\sigma_n(\mathcal{H}_T)}. \quad (69)$$

Note that \mathcal{H}_T and $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{T,n}$ are both matrices of rank n , thus the rank of $\mathcal{H}_T - \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{T,n}$ is not greater than $2n$. Then $\|\mathcal{H}_T - \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{T,n}\|_{\mathbb{F}}$ can be bounded in terms of the spectral norm as follows

$$\|\mathcal{H}_T - \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{T,n}\|_{\mathbb{F}} \leq \sqrt{2n} \|\mathcal{H}_T - \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{T,n}\| \leq 2\sqrt{2n} \|\mathcal{H}_T - \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{T,n}\|, \quad (70)$$

where the second inequality holds because of (67). Since the spectral norm is always not greater than the Frobenius one, combining (69) and (70), we obtain that

$$\|\widehat{\Gamma}_T - \overline{\Gamma}_T \mathcal{U}\|^2 + \|\widehat{\mathcal{K}}_T - \mathcal{U}^\top \overline{\mathcal{K}}_T\|^2 \leq \frac{16n}{\sqrt{2}-1} \frac{\|\mathcal{H}_T - \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{T,n}\|^2}{\sigma_n(\mathcal{H}_T)}. \quad (71)$$

Further, since $\frac{16}{\sqrt{2}-1} < 39$, therefore we have

$$\max \left\{ \|\widehat{\Gamma}_T - \overline{\Gamma}_T \mathcal{U}\|, \|\widehat{\mathcal{K}}_T - \mathcal{U}^\top \overline{\mathcal{K}}_T\| \right\} \leq \sqrt{\frac{39n}{\sigma_n(\mathcal{H}_T)}} \|\mathcal{H}_T - \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{T,n}\|. \quad (72)$$

Since matrix $\widehat{C} - \overline{C} \mathcal{U}$ is the first m rows of $\widehat{\Gamma}_T - \overline{\Gamma}_T \mathcal{U}$, it can be directly obtained that

$$\|\widehat{C} - \overline{C} \mathcal{U}\| \leq \|\widehat{\Gamma}_T - \overline{\Gamma}_T \mathcal{U}\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{39n}{\sigma_n(\mathcal{H}_T)}} \|\mathcal{H}_T - \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{T,n}\|. \quad (73)$$

Similarly, since matrix $\widehat{K} - \mathcal{U}^\top \overline{K}$ is the last m columns of $\widehat{\mathcal{K}}_T - \mathcal{U}^\top \overline{\mathcal{K}}_T$, it can be directly obtained that

$$\|\widehat{K} - \mathcal{U}^\top \overline{K}\| \leq \|\widehat{\mathcal{K}}_T - \mathcal{U}^\top \overline{\mathcal{K}}_T\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{39n}{\sigma_n(\mathcal{H}_T)}} \|\mathcal{H}_T - \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{T,n}\|. \quad (74)$$

Now we focus on $\widehat{A} - \mathcal{U}^\top \overline{A} \mathcal{U}$. Note that $\overline{A} = \overline{\Gamma}_{T,p}^\dagger \overline{\Gamma}_{T,f}$ and $\widehat{A} = \widehat{\Gamma}_{T,p}^\dagger \widehat{\Gamma}_{T,f}$, where $\overline{\Gamma}_{T,p}$ and $\overline{\Gamma}_{T,f}$ are the matrices obtained from $\overline{\Gamma}_T$ by removing the last m rows and the first m rows, respectively, and $\widehat{\Gamma}_{T,p}$ and $\widehat{\Gamma}_{T,f}$ are the matrices obtained from $\widehat{\Gamma}_T$ by removing the last m rows and the first m rows, respectively. Then we have

$$\widehat{A} - \mathcal{U}^\top \overline{A} \mathcal{U} = \widehat{\Gamma}_{T,p}^\dagger \widehat{\Gamma}_{T,f} - \mathcal{U}^\top \overline{\Gamma}_{T,p}^\dagger \overline{\Gamma}_{T,f} \mathcal{U} = \left(\widehat{\Gamma}_{T,p}^\dagger - \mathcal{U}^\top \overline{\Gamma}_{T,p}^\dagger \right) \overline{\Gamma}_{T,f} \mathcal{U} + \widehat{\Gamma}_{T,p}^\dagger \left(\widehat{\Gamma}_{T,f} - \overline{\Gamma}_{T,f} \mathcal{U} \right), \quad (75)$$

this means that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{A} - \mathcal{U}^\top \overline{A} \mathcal{U}\| &\leq \|\widehat{\Gamma}_{T,p}^\dagger - \mathcal{U}^\top \overline{\Gamma}_{T,p}^\dagger\| \|\overline{\Gamma}_{T,f} \mathcal{U}\| + \|\widehat{\Gamma}_{T,p}^\dagger\| \|\widehat{\Gamma}_{T,f} - \overline{\Gamma}_{T,f} \mathcal{U}\| \\ &= \|\widehat{\Gamma}_{T,p}^\dagger - \mathcal{U}^\top \overline{\Gamma}_{T,p}^\dagger\| \|\overline{\Gamma}_{T,f}\| + \|\widehat{\Gamma}_{T,p}^\dagger\| \|\widehat{\Gamma}_{T,f} - \overline{\Gamma}_{T,f} \mathcal{U}\|, \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

where the equality holds because \mathcal{U} is a unitary matrix. Firstly, note that $\widehat{\Gamma}_{T,p}^\dagger$ and $\mathcal{U}^\top \overline{\Gamma}_{T,p}^\dagger$ have the same rank n , then applying Theorem 4.1 of [45], we have

$$\|\widehat{\Gamma}_{T,p}^\dagger - \mathcal{U}^\top \overline{\Gamma}_{T,p}^\dagger\| \leq \sqrt{2} \|\widehat{\Gamma}_{T,p} - \mathcal{U}^\top \overline{\Gamma}_{T,p}\| \|\widehat{\Gamma}_{T,p}^\dagger\| \|\mathcal{U}^\top \overline{\Gamma}_{T,p}^\dagger\| = \frac{\sqrt{2} \|\widehat{\Gamma}_{T,p} - \mathcal{U}^\top \overline{\Gamma}_{T,p}\|}{\sigma_{\min}(\widehat{\Gamma}_{T,p}) \sigma_{\min}(\overline{\Gamma}_{T,p})}. \quad (77)$$

On the other hand, using Cauchy interlace theorem [46] gives that

$$\frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}(\bar{\Gamma}_{T,p})} \leq \frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}(\bar{\Gamma}_T)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{H}_T)}}, \quad \frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}(\hat{\Gamma}_{T,p})} \leq \frac{1}{\sigma_{\min}(\hat{\Gamma}_T)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma_{\min}(\hat{\mathcal{H}}_T)}}. \quad (78)$$

By combining (77), (78) and Lemma 6, we can obtain that

$$\|\hat{\Gamma}_{T,p}^\dagger - \mathcal{U}^\top \bar{\Gamma}_{T,p}^\dagger\| \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}\|\hat{\Gamma}_{T,p} - \mathcal{U}^\top \bar{\Gamma}_{T,p}\|}{\sigma_{\min}(\hat{\Gamma}_{T,p})\sigma_{\min}(\bar{\Gamma}_{T,p})} \leq \frac{2\|\hat{\Gamma}_{T,p} - \mathcal{U}^\top \bar{\Gamma}_{T,p}\|}{\sigma_{\min}(\mathcal{H}_T)}. \quad (79)$$

Secondly, since $\bar{\Gamma}_{T,f}$ is the matrix obtained from $\bar{\Gamma}_T$ by removing the first m rows, there must be that

$$\|\bar{\Gamma}_{T,f}\| \leq \|\bar{\Gamma}_T\| = \|\mathcal{H}_T\|^{1/2}, \quad (80)$$

where the equality holds because of that $\bar{\Gamma}_T = \mathcal{U}_1 S_1^{1/2}$ and $S_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a diagonal matrix, with its elements being all singular values of \mathcal{H}_T , sorted in descending order. Thirdly, it is not difficult to verify that

$$\max \left\{ \|\hat{\Gamma}_{T,p} - \mathcal{U}^\top \bar{\Gamma}_{T,p}\|, \|\hat{\Gamma}_{T,f} - \bar{\Gamma}_{T,f} \mathcal{U}\| \right\} \leq \|\hat{\Gamma}_T - \bar{\Gamma}_T \mathcal{U}\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{39n}{\sigma_n(\mathcal{H}_T)}} \|\mathcal{H}_T - \hat{\mathcal{H}}_T\|. \quad (81)$$

Now, by substituting (78)-(81) into (76), we can obtain

$$\|\hat{A} - \mathcal{U}^\top \bar{A} \mathcal{U}\| \leq \left(\sqrt{2} + 2\sqrt{\text{cond}(\mathcal{H}_T)} \right) \frac{\sqrt{39n}}{\sigma_n(\mathcal{H}_T)} \|\mathcal{H}_T - \hat{\mathcal{H}}_T\|. \quad (82)$$

The proof of (42) is similar to the proof of (41) and will not be repeated here. \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, no. 5, pp. 1187–1210, 1992.
- [3] M. Deistler, K. Peterzell, and W. Scherrer, "Consistency and relative efficiency of subspace methods," *Automatica*, vol. 31, no. 12, pp. 1865–1875, 1995.
- [4] A. Tsiamis and G. J. Pappas, "Finite sample analysis of stochastic system identification," in *2019 IEEE 58th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 3648–3654.
- [5] W. E. Larimore, "Canonical variate analysis in identification, filtering, and adaptive control," in *29th IEEE Conference on Decision and control*. IEEE, 1990, pp. 596–604.
- [6] 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.

- [7] 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.
- [8] 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.
- [9] L. Ljung and T. McKelvey, “Subspace identification from closed loop data,” *Signal processing*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 209–215, 1996.
- [10] A. Chiuso and G. Picci, “Consistency analysis of some closed-loop subspace identification methods,” *Automatica*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 377–391, 2005.
- [11] P. Massioni and M. Verhaegen, “Subspace identification of circulant systems,” *Automatica*, vol. 44, no. 11, pp. 2825–2833, 2008.
- [12] 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.
- [13] 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.
- [14] P. B. Cox and R. Tóth, “Linear parameter-varying subspace identification: A unified framework,” *Automatica*, vol. 123, p. 109296, 2021.
- [15] V. Kedia and D. Chakraborty, “Fast subspace identification for large input-output data,” in *2022 American Control Conference (ACC)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 3973–3978.
- [16] K. Peterzell, W. Scherrer, and M. Deistler, “Statistical analysis of novel subspace identification methods,” *Signal Processing*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 161–177, 1996.
- [17] M. Viberg, B. Wahlberg, and B. Ottersten, “Analysis of state space system identification methods based on instrumental variables and subspace fitting,” *Automatica*, vol. 33, no. 9, pp. 1603–1616, 1997.
- [18] 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.
- [19] M. Jansson and B. Wahlberg, “On consistency of subspace methods for system identification,” *Automatica*, vol. 34, no. 12, pp. 1507–1519, 1998.
- [20] 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.
- [21] 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.
- [22] 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.
- [23] D. Bauer, “Asymptotic properties of subspace estimators,” *Automatica*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 359–376, 2005.

- [24] M. Jansson, “Asymptotic variance analysis of subspace identification methods,” *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 33, no. 15, pp. 91–96, 2000.
- [25] T. Knudsen, “Consistency analysis of subspace identification methods based on a linear regression approach,” *Automatica*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 81–89, 2001.
- [26] A. Chiuso and G. Picci, “The asymptotic variance of subspace estimates,” *Journal of Econometrics*, vol. 118, no. 1-2, pp. 257–291, 2004.
- [27] P. Van Overschee and B. De Moor, *Subspace identification for linear systems: Theory—Implementation—Applications*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [28] M. K. S. Faradonbeh, A. Tewari, and G. Michailidis, “Finite time identification in unstable linear systems,” *Automatica*, vol. 96, pp. 342–353, 2018.
- [29] M. Simchowitz, H. Mania, S. Tu, M. I. Jordan, and B. Recht, “Learning without mixing: Towards a sharp analysis of linear system identification,” in *Conference On Learning Theory*. PMLR, 2018, pp. 439–473.
- [30] T. Sarkar and A. Rakhlin, “Near optimal finite time identification of arbitrary linear dynamical systems,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2019, pp. 5610–5618.
- [31] N. Matni and S. Tu, “A tutorial on concentration bounds for system identification,” in *2019 IEEE 58th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 3741–3749.
- [32] Y. Zheng, L. Furieri, M. Kamgarpour, and N. Li, “Sample complexity of linear quadratic gaussian (lqg) control for output feedback systems,” in *Learning for Dynamics and Control*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 559–570.
- [33] M. Simchowitz, R. Boczar, and B. Recht, “Learning linear dynamical systems with semi-parametric least squares,” in *Conference on Learning Theory*. PMLR, 2019, pp. 2714–2802.
- [34] Y. Zheng and N. Li, “Non-asymptotic identification of linear dynamical systems using multiple trajectories,” *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 1693–1698, 2020.
- [35] S. Oymak and N. Ozay, “Revisiting ho–kalman-based system identification: Robustness and finite-sample analysis,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 67, no. 4, pp. 1914–1928, 2021.
- [36] S. Fattahi, N. Matni, and S. Sojoudi, “Learning sparse dynamical systems from a single sample trajectory,” in *2019 IEEE 58th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 2682–2689.
- [37] E. Weyer, R. C. Williamson, and I. M. Mareels, “Finite sample properties of linear model identification,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 44, no. 7, pp. 1370–1383, 1999.
- [38] M. C. Campi and E. Weyer, “Finite sample properties of system identification methods,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 47, no. 8, pp. 1329–1334, 2002.
- [39] M. Vidyasagar and R. L. Karandikar, “A learning theory approach to system identification and stochastic adaptive control,” *Journal of Process Control*, vol. 18, pp. 421–430, 2008.

- [40] S. J. Qin, “An overview of subspace identification,” *Computers & chemical engineering*, vol. 30, no. 10-12, pp. 1502–1513, 2006.
- [41] F. Hausdorff, *Grundzüge der mengenlehre.* von Veit, 1914, vol. 7.
- [42] S. Sun, “Non-asymptotic error analysis of subspace identification for deterministic systems,” 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.16761>
- [43] S. Sun, J. Li, and Y. Mo, “Finite time performance analysis of mimo systems identification,” 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.11790>
- [44] S. Tu, R. Boczar, M. Simchowitz, M. Soltanolkotabi, and B. Recht, “Low-rank solutions of linear matrix equations via procrustes flow,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2016, pp. 964–973.
- [45] P.-Å. Wedin, “Perturbation theory for pseudo-inverses,” *BIT Numerical Mathematics*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 217–232, 1973.
- [46] S.-G. Hwang, “Cauchy’s interlace theorem for eigenvalues of hermitian matrices,” *The American mathematical monthly*, vol. 111, no. 2, pp. 157–159, 2004.