

A Unified Recursive Identification Algorithm with Quantized Observations Based on Weighted Least-Squares Type Criteria

Xingrui Liu, Ying Wang, *Member, IEEE*, and Yanlong Zhao, *Senior Member, IEEE*

Abstract—This paper investigates system identification problems with Gaussian inputs and quantized observations under fixed thresholds. A new formulation for the predictor of quantized observations is introduced, establishing a linear correlation with the parameter estimations through a probabilistic relationship among quantized observations, Gaussian inputs, and system parameters. Subsequently, a novel weighted least-squares criterion is proposed, and a two-step recursive identification algorithm is constructed, which is capable of addressing both noisy and noise-free linear systems. Convergence analysis of this identification algorithm is conducted, demonstrating convergence in both almost sure and L^p senses under mild conditions, with respective rates of $O(\sqrt{\log \log k/k})$ and $O(1/k^{p/2})$, where k denotes the time step. In particular, this algorithm offers an asymptotically efficient estimation of the variance of Gaussian variables using quantized observations. Additionally, asymptotic normality is established, and an expression for the asymptotic variance is provided when the weight coefficients are properly selected. Furthermore, extensions to output-error systems are discussed, enhancing the applicability and relevance of the proposed methods. Two numerical examples are provided to validate these theoretical advancements.

Index Terms—System identification, quantized observations, weighted least-squares, Gaussian inputs, convergence analysis

I. INTRODUCTION

DUE to the cost-effectiveness and power limitations inherent in sensor technologies, the challenge of quantized identification has become increasingly prominent across various systems, including industrial systems [1]–[3], networked systems [4], and even biological systems [5]. Quantized identification denotes estimating the unknown parameters of systems based on quantized measurements, where only the discrete set to which the system output belongs is discernible, without

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 62025306, 62303452, and T2293773, CAS Project for Young Scientists in Basic Research under Grant YSBR-008, China Postdoctoral Program for Innovation Talents under BX20230403. (Corresponding author: Yanlong Zhao.)

Xingrui Liu, Ying Wang, and Yanlong Zhao are with the Key Laboratory of Systems and Control, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, P. R. China. Xingrui Liu and Yanlong Zhao are also with the School of Mathematics Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100149, P. R. China. Ying Wang is also with the Division of Decision and Control Systems, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm 11428, Sweden (e-mail: liuxingrui@amss.ac.cn; wangying96@amss.ac.cn; ylzhaol@amss.ac.cn).

exact knowledge of the output value. Over the past two decades, numerous studies have emerged addressing quantized identification challenges [6]–[31], proposing various methods including empirical measure method [6]–[8], expectation maximization method [9]–[11], stochastic approximation method [12]–[15], stochastic gradient method [16]–[18] and sign-error method [21]–[24]. Indeed, the prevailing quantized identification algorithms are primarily grounded on the following three fundamental techniques:

The first technique is to utilize the noise distributions. For instance, [6] derived a probability expression for binary-valued observations using noise distribution. They developed an identification algorithm under periodic input conditions employing the empirical measure method based on the inverse function of the noise distribution. Similarly, under general bounded persistently exciting inputs, [12] utilized noise distributions to establish a probabilistic relationship between quantized observations and parameters, leading to the development of a stochastic approximation type recursive estimator for finite impulse response (FIR) systems. Subsequent studies have expanded upon these foundations, addressing issues such as more generalized system models [15], weaker excitations [7], [16], and enhanced convergence properties [8], [17].

The second technique revolves around adaptive thresholds, which are specially designed to compare the size relationship between actual and predicted outputs. For instance, under independent and identically distributed (iid) inputs, [21] and [22] investigated quantized identification problems of ARX systems and nonlinear FIR systems, respectively, utilizing the sign-error type algorithm with expanding truncations proposed by [32]. Reference [23] introduced a stochastic approximation type identification algorithm for linear systems with adaptive binary-valued observations. Furthermore, these adaptive thresholds make it possible to estimate the unknown parameter in both noisy and noise-free cases. Under general bounded persistently exciting inputs, [24] presented a unified sign-error type identification algorithm for FIR systems.

The third technique entails the design of tailored inputs to enhance parameter information within finite quantized data. For example, [19] and [20] addressed system identification problems in a worst-case setting with binary-valued observations. Employing two distinct cost functions: maximum parametric identification error and relative uncertainty reduction concerning the minimum achievable error, they devised sub-optimal input signals for identifying FIR models and provided

an upper bound for time complexity.

However, it is essential to note that the first technique relies on noise distributions, rendering it inadequate for handling identification problems in noise-free cases. The second technique encounters challenges in some practical systems where the time-invariant quantizers with fixed thresholds cannot be designed [15]. Moreover, designing thresholds in the second technique and designing inputs in the third technique may entail significant costs. These techniques are subject to fundamental limitations. In the cases where thresholds are fixed and inputs cannot be designed, almost all existing works have yet to consider developing recursive algorithms that simultaneously adapt to both noisy and noise-free scenarios.

Motivated by these considerations, this study investigates quantized identification problems under fixed thresholds, encompassing scenarios both with and without noise. Specifically, this paper utilizes optimization methods.

In classical system identification theory, optimization methods such as the weighted least-squares (WLS) algorithm have been proven effective in resolving system identification problems in both noisy and noise-free cases [33]. However, when only quantized observations are available, the absence of accurate output information presents a considerable challenge in computing prediction errors. This obstacle makes the direct application of the classical WLS algorithm impractical.

Relevant studies have proposed novel criteria aimed at addressing quantized identification challenges by substituting prediction errors in the classical WLS with those derived from quantized observations [25]–[27]. These criteria introduced a predictor of quantized observations by directly applying the quantizer to the predicted accurate observations. The primary challenge in developing a recursive identification algorithm based on these criteria stems from the quantizer's nonlinearity, which complicates the derivation of differential expressions for the predicted quantized observations concerning the parameter estimations. To address this issue, [25] utilized the approximation of the derivative of the quantizer. Reference [26] incorporated predicted outputs into the weight coefficients and subsequently proposed a novel criterion. Based on this criterion, [27] treated the predicted quantized observations as an independent variable in parameter estimations and developed a recursive identification algorithm accordingly. However, based on these criteria, the identification algorithms mentioned above can only operate offline or theoretically be proved convergent in noise-free cases.

Recently, [13] proposed a stochastic approximation quantized identification algorithm by establishing a correlation function between quantized observations, Gaussian inputs, and system parameters, which exhibits almost sure convergence. Building on this work, [28] introduced a least-squares type quantized identification algorithm proven to converge in the mean square sense. These algorithms apply to both Gaussian noise and noise-free conditions. However, due to the presence of product terms involving unknown parameters and their nonlinear functions in the correlation functions, these algorithms require prior knowledge of the parameters. For instance, the algorithm in [13] is limited to the semiparametric response model, while [28] can only identify the parameter direction.

Therefore, based on these works, this paper further investigates criterion formulation and algorithm development. The primary contributions of this paper are as follows:

i) This paper proposes a novel WLS-type criterion for quantized identification by replacing the prediction errors of accurate observations with those of quantized observations. In contrast to the previous methods [25]–[27], which directly apply the quantizer to the predicted accurate observations to obtain the predicted quantized observations that are nonlinear and non-differentiable concerning parameter estimations, we introduce a new formulation for the predictor of quantized observations. This predictor establishes a linear relationship with parameter estimation through a probabilistic connection between quantized observations, Gaussian inputs, and parameters, enabling a recursive identification algorithm.

ii) This paper develops a two-step unified recursive identification algorithm suitable for both Gaussian noise and noise-free scenarios. Specifically, the first step estimates the system output's variance, which can be regarded as estimating the variance of Gaussian variables since the WLS-type criterion involves the unknown system output's variance. The second step estimates the unknown parameters by minimizing the WLS-type criterion using the previously obtained variance estimates. This identification algorithm applies to both cases since the variance estimates and the WLS-type criterion are designed to handle both Gaussian noise and noise-free cases. Additionally, it leverages richer statistical information from Gaussian inputs rather than deterministic ones, eliminating the need for designable thresholds as in [24]. **Furthermore, since the second step of the algorithm estimates the parameter direction while jointly estimating their norm with the first step, it removes the need for prior knowledge of the semiparametric response model as in [13] or the parameter norms as in [28].**

iii) This paper demonstrates that the algorithm converges in both almost sure and L^p senses with rates of $O(\sqrt{\log \log k/k})$ and $O(1/k^{p/2})$, respectively, through separate analyses of the convergence of both steps under mild conditions. **Asymptotic normality is established, and an expression for the asymptotic variance is derived by appropriately selecting the weight coefficients.** Additionally, the algorithm provides an asymptotically efficient estimation of the variance of Gaussian variables using quantized observations.

iv) **This paper further tackles the quantized identification problem for dynamic output-error (OE) systems. Based on Durbin's method (DM), we transform the identification problem for OE systems to that for finite impulse response (FIR) systems. Then, the proposed DM-type algorithm establishes the estimate for parameters of OE systems using the estimate for FIR systems given by the proposed two-step algorithm. Almost sure convergence rate of the proposed identification algorithm for OE systems matches or surpasses that of empirical measure methods [6]–[8], stochastic approximation methods [12]–[15], and stochastic gradient methods [16]–[18].**

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section II formulates the problem with linear system structures and discusses the system identifiability. Section III focuses on the algorithm construction and establishes the main results. Section IV further extends the methods and results to OE

systems. Section V presents the proofs of the main results. Section VI gives simulation examples to verify the conclusion. Section VII is the summary and prospect of this paper.

Notations : In this paper, \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{R}^n and $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ are the sets of real number, n -dimensional real vectors, and matrices with rows m and columns n , respectively. For a constant x , $|x|$ denotes its absolute value; $\lceil x \rceil$ denotes its rounding up to the nearest integer. For a pair of integers $N \geq k \geq 0$, $\binom{N}{k}$ denotes its binomial coefficients. For a vector $a = [a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n]^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\|a\|$ denotes its Euclidean norm, i.e., $\|a\| = (\sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2)^{1/2}$. $\mathbf{1}_n = [1, 1, \dots, 1]^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$. $\mathbf{0}_n = [0, 0, \dots, 0]^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$. For a matrix A , A^T denotes its transpose; $A_{i,j}$ denotes its element in the i -th row and the j -th column; $\text{rank}(A)$ denotes its rank; A^{-1} denotes its inverse matrix. I_n is an n -dimension identity matrix. \mathbb{P} denotes the probability operator. \mathbb{E} denotes the expectation operator. $I_{\{\cdot\}}$ denotes the indicator function, whose value is 1 if its argument (a formula) is true and 0 otherwise. $F(\cdot)$ and $f(\cdot)$ denote the cumulative distribution and probability density functions of the standard Gaussian random variable. $F^{-1}(\cdot)$ is the inverse function of $F(\cdot)$. $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \delta^2)$ denotes the (multivariate) Gaussian distribution with mean μ and standard deviation δ .

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

Consider a linear system described by

$$y_k = \phi_k^T \theta + d_k, \quad k \geq 1, \quad (1)$$

where k is the time index; $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a vector of unknown parameters; $\phi_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the system input; $d_k \in \mathbb{R}$ is the potential system noise. Especially if $d_k = 0, k \geq 1$, the linear system (1) is precisely a noise-free system. The system output y_k cannot be exactly measured and can only be measured by quantized observation:

$$s_k = Q(y_k) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } y_k \leq C_1, \\ 1, & \text{if } C_1 < y_k \leq C_2, \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ m, & \text{if } y_k > C_m, \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where $Q(\cdot)$ is the quantizer; $-\infty = C_0 < C_1 < C_2 < \dots < C_m < C_{m+1} = \infty$ are the known thresholds; m is the number of the quantizer thresholds. The quantized observation can also be represented as $s_k = \sum_{i=0}^m i I_{\{C_i < y_k \leq C_{i+1}\}}$.

The goal of this paper is to develop a unified algorithm to estimate the unknown parameter vector θ based on the system input $\{\phi_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ and the quantized observation $\{s_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ in both noisy and noise-free cases.

Remark 2.1: This paper starts with a basic static linear model to illustrate the algorithm's construction. The extensions to more complex dynamic systems will be given in Section IV.

A. Assumptions

To proceed with our analysis, we introduce some assumptions concerning the inputs and the noises.

Assumption 2.1: (Stochastic persistent excitation) $\{\phi_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ is a sequence of independent and identically distributed (iid) Gaussian random variables with zero mean and an unknown

positive definite covariance matrix $H \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, i.e., $\phi_k \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_n, H)$, where $H \triangleq \mathbb{E}[\phi_k \phi_k^T] > 0, k \geq 1$.

Assumption 2.2: (Potential Gaussian noise) $\{d_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ is a sequence of iid Gaussian random variables with zero mean and an unknown variance δ_d^2 , i.e., $d_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \delta_d^2)$, where $\delta_d^2 \triangleq \mathbb{E}[d_k^2] \geq 0$ for all $k \geq 1$, and is independent of $\{\phi_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$.

Remark 2.2: The assumption of a Gaussian distribution for the system input $\{\phi_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ is standard in various fields, including system identification [13], [26], [34], signal processing [35], [36], and stochastic control [37]. Additionally, the probabilistic properties of white Gaussian inputs, such as symmetry and independence, allow for the design of a unified recursive identification algorithm, as discussed in Section III.

Remark 2.3: This paper investigates the quantized identification problems both in Gaussian noisy and noise-free cases. Specifically, in the case where $\delta_d^2 > 0$, the linear system (1) is precisely a Gaussian noisy system. It is worth noticing that, the variance of the noise δ_d^2 is unknown in this paper. In fact, in the field of parameter estimation in system identification and signal processing, the popular estimation methods, including the empirical measure method [6], approximate message passing method [35], and the maximum likelihood (ML) method [38], require noise distributions as priors. In the case where $\delta_d^2 = 0$, the noise $d_k = 0, k \geq 1$ and the linear system (1) is precisely a noise-free system.

B. System identifiability

Due to the lack of information about accurate output y_k , one may discuss the system identifiability at first.

Proposition 2.1: If Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 hold, then the linear system (1)-(2) is unidentifiable with $m = 1$ and $C_1 = 0$.

The proof of Proposition 2.1 is supplied in Section V-A.

Remark 2.4: In fact, in the cases where $m = 1$ and $C_1 = 0$, quantized observation s_k reflects the symbol information of system output y_k . In the absence of noise, equal scale amplification or reduction of parameters will not affect the symbol information of the output since it merely scales the system output. Similarly, in the presence of Gaussian noise with zero mean, such operations do not probabilistically affect the output symbol information due to the symmetry of the Gaussian noise in distribution. Indeed, in this case, the linear system (1)-(2) can be determined up to a scaling factor [29].

Therefore, this paper considers all cases except for one mentioned in Proposition 2.1.

III. ALGORITHM DESIGN AND ITS PROPERTIES

This section will construct a two-step unified recursive identification algorithm based on quantized observations in both noisy and noise-free cases and establish its convergence properties.

A. The design concept of the identification algorithm

We would like to introduce the design concept of the identification algorithm in this subsection first.

In scenarios where accurate output measurements are available, the WLS algorithm proves to be an effective identification method, applicable in both noisy and noise-free

environments [33]. The core idea of the WLS algorithm is to minimize the criterion $\sum_{l=1}^k \beta_l (y_l - \phi_l^T \hat{\theta}_k)^2$ to obtain the parameter estimate $\hat{\theta}_k$, where $\{\beta_l\}_{l=1}^k$ represents the weight coefficients.

However, when only quantized observations are accessible, obtaining the prediction error $y_l - \phi_l^T \hat{\theta}_k$ becomes unfeasible. Furthermore, the nonlinearity introduced by the quantizer $Q(\cdot)$ poses challenges in providing the differential expression for the quantized observation $s_l = Q(y_l) = Q(\phi_l^T \theta + d_l)$ with respect to the system parameter θ . Consequently, the majority of existing recursive quantized identification algorithms have not been formulated using optimization methods [6]–[31].

To address this challenge, we establish a probabilistic relationship among the quantized observation s_l , Gaussian input ϕ_l , and system parameter θ as a preliminary step.

Proposition 3.1: If Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 hold, then we have

$$\mathbb{E}[s_k \phi_k] = \rho(\delta_y) H \theta, \quad k \geq 1, \quad (3)$$

where $\rho(\delta_y) \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^m \exp(-C_i^2 / (2\delta_y^2)) / (\sqrt{2\pi}\delta_y)$; δ_y denotes the standard deviation of y_k , i.e., $\delta_y^2 \triangleq \mathbb{E}[y_1^2] = \theta^T H \theta + \delta_d^2$.

The proof of Proposition 3.1 is supplied in Section V-B.

Remark 3.1: The inspiration for this proposition comes from [13], and this represents a high-dimensional extension of the concept introduced in [13].

Note that $\mathbb{E}[\phi_k \phi_k^T] = H$, which implies $\mathbb{E}[(s_k - \rho(\delta_y) \phi_k^T \theta) \phi_k] = 0$. Based on this equation and the WLS criterion, we propose utilizing $\sum_{l=1}^k \beta_l \mathbb{E}[(s_l - \rho(\delta_y) \phi_l^T \hat{\theta}_k)^2]$ as the criterion for quantized identification problems. Given that $\mathbb{E}[s_l^2] = \mathbb{E}[(Q(y_l))^2]$ relies on unknown parameters, unknown input covariance, and unknown noise variance, direct derivation proves to be infeasible. Therefore, we designate $\rho(\delta_y) \phi_l^T \hat{\theta}_k$ as the predictor of the quantized observation s_l , and replace $\sum_{l=1}^k \beta_l \mathbb{E}[(s_l - \rho(\delta_y) \phi_l^T \hat{\theta}_k)^2]$ with a WLS-type criterion of the following form:

$$J_k = \sum_{l=1}^k \beta_l \left(s_l - \rho(\delta_y) \phi_l^T \hat{\theta}_k \right)^2, \quad (4)$$

where the prediction errors $y_l - \phi_l^T \hat{\theta}_k$ in the classical WLS criterion is substituted by the prediction errors of quantized observations $s_l - \rho(\delta_y) \phi_l^T \hat{\theta}_k$.

Remark 3.2: The weight coefficient β_k enables the adjustment of the individual weight of prediction errors to emphasize different observations. For instance, assigning smaller weight coefficients to outliers can help reduce their impact [33].

It's worth noting that $\delta_y^2 = \theta^T H \theta + \delta_d^2$. Consequently, $\rho(\delta_y)$ in the WLS-type criterion (4) depends on the unknown parameter θ , making direct computation unattainable.

To address this challenge, we introduce $\gamma \triangleq \rho(\delta_y) \theta$ and propose a two-step algorithm: first, estimating δ_y , and then estimating γ to subsequently obtain θ . In Subsection III-B, we introduce the ML-type algorithm for estimating δ_y . Then, in Subsection III-C, we reformulate the WLS-type criterion (4) as $J_k = \sum_{l=1}^k \beta_l (s_l - \phi_l^T \hat{\gamma}_k)^2$ and derive the optimal estimate of γ under this criterion. Finally, the estimate of the unknown parameter θ is obtained as $\hat{\theta}_k = \hat{\gamma}_k / \rho(\hat{\delta}_k)$, where $\hat{\delta}_k$ represents the estimate of δ_y and $\hat{\gamma}_k$ represents the estimate of

γ at time k . A simplified depiction of the design concept of the identification algorithm is illustrated in Fig. 1.




Fig. 1. Identification algorithm block diagram

Remark 3.3: An intuitive explanation of the two-step algorithm is as follows: the estimate of $\rho(\delta_y)$ from the first step corresponds to the norm of the unknown parameter, while the direction is determined by $\hat{\gamma}_k$ from the second step. Specifically, the second step uses information from the input ϕ_k to establish the direction of the estimate. In contrast, the first step treats the problem as an estimation of the variance of Gaussian variables based on quantized observations, which is independent of input information.

B. First step: estimating the system output's variance

In this subsection, we will introduce the design concept and establish the convergence properties of the ML-type algorithm for estimating δ_y . We treat this problem as estimating the variance of Gaussian variables based on quantized observations independent of system identification. Given that the output y_k is iid, the log-likelihood function can be expressed as:

$$l_k = \log \mathbb{P}(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k | \delta_y) = \sum_{l=1}^k \log \mathbb{P}(s_l | \delta_y).$$

Define $S_k^i \triangleq \sum_{l=1}^k I_{\{s_l=i\}} / k$, $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, m$. Then by $\mathbb{P}(s_l = i | \delta_y) = \mathbb{P}(C_i < y_l \leq C_{i+1} | \delta_y) = F(C_{i+1} / \delta_y) - F(C_i / \delta_y)$, we have

$$l_k = k \sum_{i=0}^m S_k^i \log \left(F \left(\frac{C_{i+1}}{\delta_y} \right) - F \left(\frac{C_i}{\delta_y} \right) \right). \quad (5)$$

It follows that

$$\frac{\partial l_k}{\partial \delta_y} = k \sum_{i=0}^m S_k^i \frac{f(C_i / \delta_y) C_i / \delta_y^2 - f(C_{i+1} / \delta_y) C_{i+1} / \delta_y^2}{F(C_{i+1} / \delta_y) - F(C_i / \delta_y)}. \quad (6)$$

Specially, in the case where $m = 1$, since $C_1 \neq 0$, the solution of $\partial l_k / \partial \delta_y = 0$ yields the maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) of δ_y in this cases as:¹

$$\hat{\delta}_k = \frac{C_1}{F^{-1}(S_k^0)}. \quad (7)$$

¹Note that $F^{-1}(\cdot)$ is not invertible at $S_k^0 = 0$ or $S_k^0 = 1$ and $C_1 / F^{-1}(\cdot)$ is not invertible at $S_k^0 = 1/2$. Based on the idea of EM method without truncation [8], one may modify these points by $S_k^0 = c^*$ when $S_k^0 = 0$, $S_k^0 = 1/2$ or $S_k^0 = 1$, where $c^* \in (0, 1)$ and $c^* \neq 1/2$, which does not affect the convergence analysis and properties. Therefore, this modification will not be explicitly stated in the subsequent proofs and development. Besides, the non-invertible points with general quantized observations can be modified in the same way.

In the case where $m > 1$, as (6) represents a nonlinear function, obtaining the explicit solution for the MLE of δ_y through differentiation becomes challenging. Inspired by (7), we address parameter estimation under binary-valued observations by considering different thresholds $C_j, j = 1, 2, \dots, m$ separately, and then combine them to estimate δ_y .

Specifically, for nonzero threshold C_j , the j th estimate of δ_y is defined as $\hat{\delta}_k^j = C_j/F^{-1}(\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i)$. For zero threshold C_j , we utilize another threshold to estimate δ_y : if $j > 1$, since $C_1 \neq 0$ and $\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i$ is precisely the value of the k -sample empirical distribution of output y_k at C_j/δ_y , we define $\hat{\delta}_k^j = C_1/F^{-1}(F(0) - \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} S_k^i)$. Similarly, if $C_1 = 0$, then we could also define $\hat{\delta}_k^1 = C_m/F^{-1}(F(0) + \sum_{i=j}^{m-1} S_k^i)$. Based on these estimates, the estimate of δ_y at time k could be given by

$$\hat{\delta}_k = \sum_{j=1}^m \mu_j \hat{\delta}_k^j = \mu^T \hat{\Delta}_k, \quad (8)$$

where $\mu = [\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_m]^T \in \mathbb{R}^m; \mu_j \in \mathbb{R}, j = 1, 2, \dots, m$ satisfies $\sum_{j=1}^m \mu_j = 1; \hat{\Delta}_k = [\hat{\delta}_k^1, \hat{\delta}_k^2, \dots, \hat{\delta}_k^m]^T \in \mathbb{R}^m$.

In cases where $m = 1$, (8) equals to the MLE (7). The variance of the estimation errors of the MLE asymptotically reaches the minimum variance of unbiased estimates, i.e., Cramér–Rao (CR) lower bound [39]. Given that the variance of estimation errors can serve as a criterion to assess the effectiveness of an unbiased estimator, we aim to design μ in (8) to approach the performance of the MLE from the perspective of the CR lower bound.

Define $\Delta_y \triangleq [\delta_y, \delta_y, \dots, \delta_y]^T \in \mathbb{R}^m, \tilde{\Delta}_k \triangleq \hat{\Delta}_k - \Delta_y$ and $V_k \triangleq \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\Delta}_k \tilde{\Delta}_k^T]$. Then, the variance of the estimation errors of (8) is given by

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\hat{\delta}_k - \delta_y \right)^2 \right] = \mu^T \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\Delta}_k \tilde{\Delta}_k^T \right] \mu = \mu^T V_k \mu. \quad (9)$$

Using (9) as the criterion, the problem of designing μ can be transformed into the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \mu^T V_k \mu \\ & \text{subject to} && \mu^T \mathbf{1}_m = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Based on the Gauss–Markov estimation [40], the solution of the problem (10) could be given by

$$\mu^* = \frac{V_k^{-1} \mathbf{1}_m}{\mathbf{1}_m^T V_k^{-1} \mathbf{1}_m}.$$

However, since δ_y is unknown, V_k is not explicitly derived. Inspired by [8], we will provide an important proposition and then estimate V_k .

Proposition 3.2: Under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} k V_k = (U + G^T)^{-1} (W - w w^T) (U + G)^{-1}, \quad (11)$$

where $F_i = F(C_i/\delta_y), f_i = f(C_i/\delta_y)C_i/\delta_y^2, i = 1, 2, \dots, m; U = \text{diag}(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_m) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}; w = [F_1, F_2, \dots, F_m]^T \in \mathbb{R}^m; G \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ satisfies

$$G_{u,v} = \begin{cases} f_1, & \text{if } C_j = 0, j > 1, u = 1, v = j, \\ -f_1, & \text{if } C_j = 0, j > 1, u = j, v = j, \\ f_m, & \text{if } C_1 = 0, u = m, v = 1, \\ -f_m, & \text{if } C_1 = 0, u = 1, v = 1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases}$$

$$W = \begin{bmatrix} F_1 & F_1 & \cdots & F_1 \\ F_1 & F_2 & \cdots & F_2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ F_1 & F_2 & \cdots & F_m \end{bmatrix}.$$

The proof of Proposition 3.2 is supplied in Section V-C. Then, the ML-type algorithm for estimating δ_y in a recursive form is constructed as Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 The ML-type algorithm for estimating δ_y

Beginning with initial values $\hat{\delta}_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $S_0^i = 0$, for $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, m - 1, j = 1, 2, \dots, m$, the algorithm for estimating δ_y is recursively defined at any $k \geq 1$ as follows:

$$\hat{\delta}_k = \Pi \left(\left[\hat{\delta}_k^1, \hat{\delta}_k^2, \dots, \hat{\delta}_k^m \right] \hat{\mu}_k \right), \quad (12)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\delta}_k^j &= \frac{C_j I_{\{C_j \neq 0\}}}{F^{-1}(\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i)} + \frac{C_1 I_{\{C_j = 0, j > 1\}}}{F^{-1}(F(0) - \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} S_k^i)} \\ &+ \frac{C_m I_{\{C_j = 0, j = 1\}}}{F^{-1}(F(0) + \sum_{i=j}^{m-1} S_k^i)}, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

$$S_k^i = \frac{k-1}{k} S_{k-1}^i + \frac{1}{k} I_{\{s_k = i\}}, \quad (14)$$

$$\hat{\mu}_k = \frac{(\hat{U}_k + \hat{G}_k)(\hat{W}_k - \hat{w}_k \hat{w}_k^T)^{-1} (\hat{U}_k + \hat{G}_k^T) \mathbf{1}_m}{\mathbf{1}_m^T (\hat{U}_k + \hat{G}_k)(\hat{W}_k - \hat{w}_k \hat{w}_k^T)^{-1} (\hat{U}_k + \hat{G}_k^T) \mathbf{1}_m}, \quad (15)$$

where $\hat{\delta}_k$ is the estimate of δ_y at time k ; $\Pi(\cdot)$ denotes a projection operator as $\Pi(x) = \text{argmin}\{\|x - \zeta\|, \zeta \in [c, 1/c], \forall x \in \mathbb{R}\}$ with a sufficiently small positive constant c for ensuring that $\hat{\mu}_k$ has a solution; $\hat{U}_k = \text{diag}(\hat{f}_k^1, \hat{f}_k^2, \dots, \hat{f}_k^m); \hat{w}_k = [\hat{F}_k^1, \hat{F}_k^2, \dots, \hat{F}_k^m]^T; \hat{G}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ satisfies

$$(\hat{G}_k)_{u,v} = \begin{cases} \hat{f}_k^1, & \text{if } C_j = 0, j > 1, u = 1, v = j, \\ -\hat{f}_k^1, & \text{if } C_j = 0, j > 1, u = j, v = j, \\ \hat{f}_k^m, & \text{if } C_1 = 0, u = m, v = 1 \\ -\hat{f}_k^m, & \text{if } C_1 = 0, u = v = 1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases}$$

$$\hat{W}_k = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{F}_k^1 & \hat{F}_k^1 & \cdots & \hat{F}_k^1 \\ \hat{F}_k^1 & \hat{F}_k^2 & \cdots & \hat{F}_k^2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \hat{F}_k^1 & \hat{F}_k^2 & \cdots & \hat{F}_k^m \end{bmatrix};$$

$$\hat{F}_k^i = F(C_i/\hat{\delta}_{k-1}); \hat{f}_k^i = f(C_i/\hat{\delta}_{k-1})C_i/(\hat{\delta}_{k-1})^2;$$

The ML-type algorithm has the following convergence properties and asymptotic efficiency.

Theorem 3.1: Under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, $\hat{\delta}_k$ given by the ML-type algorithm has the following properties:

i) Almost sure convergence: $\hat{\delta}_k$ converges to δ_y in the almost sure sense with a convergence rate of $O(\sqrt{\log \log k/k})$, i.e.,

$$|\tilde{\delta}_k| = O \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log \log k}{k}} \right), \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad (16)$$

where $\tilde{\delta}_k \triangleq \hat{\delta}_k - \delta_y$ is the estimation error of δ_y .

ii) L^p convergence: $\hat{\delta}_k$ converges to δ_y in the L^p sense with a convergence rate of $O(1/k^{p/2})$, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|\tilde{\delta}_k|^p \right] = O \left(\frac{1}{k^{p/2}} \right), \quad (17)$$

where p is an arbitrary positive integer.

iii) Asymptotic efficiency: $\hat{\delta}_k$ is an asymptotically efficient estimate of δ_y based on quantized observations, i.e.,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sqrt{k} \tilde{\delta}_k \right|^2 \right] - k \sigma_{\text{CR}}(k) = 0. \quad (18)$$

where $\sigma_{\text{CR}}(k) = (\sum_{i=0}^m \tilde{f}_i^2 / \tilde{F}_i)^{-1} / k$ is the CR lower bound for estimating the variance of Gaussian variables based on quantized observations at time k ; $\tilde{f}_l = f_{l+1} - f_l$, $\tilde{F}_l = F_{l+1} - F_l$, $l = 0, 1, 2, \dots, m$.

The proof of Theorem 3.1 is supplied in Section V-D.

Remark 3.4: The L^p convergence of Theorem 3.1 states that this estimate converges to the real parameter in the mean square sense with a convergence rate of $O(1/k)$, which also indicates that this estimate is asymptotically unbiased.

C. Second step: estimating the system parameter

This subsection will introduce the design concept and establish the convergence properties of the WLS-type algorithm for estimating θ .

Note that $\gamma = \rho(\delta_y)\theta$ and $\hat{\gamma}_k$ denotes the estimate of γ at time k . The WLS-type criterion (4) can be expressed as:

$$J_k = \sum_{l=1}^k \beta_l (s_l - \phi_l^T \hat{\gamma}_k)^2.$$

Following the derivation method of the classical WLS algorithm, we set $\partial J_k / \partial \hat{\gamma}_k^* = 0$, yielding $\hat{\gamma}_k^* = (\sum_{l=1}^k \beta_l \phi_l \phi_l^T)^{-1} (\sum_{l=1}^k \beta_l s_l \phi_l)$. Then, similarly to the recursive form of the WLS algorithm, the WLS-type algorithm for estimating θ is constructed as Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2 The WLS-type algorithm for estimating θ

Beginning with initial values $\hat{\gamma}_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and a positive definitive matrix $P_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, based on $\hat{\delta}_k$ by the ML-type algorithm, the algorithm for estimating θ is recursively defined at any $k \geq 1$ as follows:

$$\hat{\theta}_k = \frac{\hat{\gamma}_k}{\rho(\hat{\delta}_k)}, \quad (19)$$

$$\hat{\gamma}_k = \hat{\gamma}_{k-1} + \alpha_k P_{k-1} \phi_k (s_k - \phi_k^T \hat{\gamma}_{k-1}), \quad (20)$$

$$\alpha_k = \frac{1}{\beta_k^{-1} + \phi_k^T P_{k-1} \phi_k}, \quad (21)$$

$$P_k = P_{k-1} - \alpha_k P_{k-1} \phi_k \phi_k^T P_{k-1}, \quad (22)$$

$$\rho(\hat{\delta}_k) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi} \hat{\delta}_k} \sum_{i=1}^m \exp \left(-\frac{C_i^2}{2(\hat{\delta}_k)^2} \right), \quad (23)$$

where $\hat{\theta}_k$ is the estimate of θ at time k ; β_k is the weight coefficient satisfies $0 < \underline{\beta} \leq \beta_k \leq \bar{\beta} < \infty$.

Remark 3.5: Similar to the classical WLS algorithm, P_k can be expressed as $P_k = (\sum_{l=1}^k \beta_l \phi_l \phi_l^T + P_0^{-1})^{-1}$ (Eq. (6) in [41]) and $\hat{\gamma}_k$ could be represented as $\hat{\gamma}_k = P_k (\sum_{l=1}^k \beta_l s_l \phi_l) + P_k P_0^{-1} \hat{\gamma}_0$ (Eq. (11.19) in [33]), which indicates that $\hat{\gamma}_k$ given by the WLS-type algorithm is actually the minima of $J_k + (\hat{\gamma}_k - \hat{\gamma}_0)^T P_0^{-1} (\hat{\gamma}_k - \hat{\gamma}_0)$, where the term $(\hat{\gamma}_k - \hat{\gamma}_0)^T P_0^{-1} (\hat{\gamma}_k - \hat{\gamma}_0)$ only depends on the initial values and does not affect the asymptotic properties.

The WLS-type algorithm has the following properties.

Theorem 3.2: Under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, $\hat{\theta}_k$ given by the WLS-type algorithm has the following properties:

i) Almost sure convergence: $\hat{\theta}_k$ converges to θ in the almost sure sense with a convergence rate of $O(\sqrt{\log \log k/k})$, i.e.,

$$\|\tilde{\theta}_k\| = O \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log \log k}{k}} \right), \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad (24)$$

where $\tilde{\theta}_k \triangleq \hat{\theta}_k - \theta$ is the estimation error of θ .

ii) L^p convergence: $\hat{\theta}_k$ converges to θ in the L^p sense with a convergence rate of $O(1/k^{p/2})$, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\|\tilde{\theta}_k\|^p \right] = O \left(\frac{1}{k^{p/2}} \right), \quad (25)$$

where p is an arbitrary positive integer.

iii) Furthermore, if we set the weight coefficient β_k satisfying $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=1}^k \beta_l / k = \beta^*$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=1}^k \beta_l^2 / k = \beta^{**}$, where β^* and β^{**} are positive constants, then,

iii.a) Asymptotic normality: $\hat{\theta}_k$ is an asymptotically normal estimate of θ , i.e.,

$$\sqrt{k} \tilde{\theta}_k \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N} \left(\mathbf{0}_n, \frac{\beta^{**}}{(\beta^* \rho(\delta_y))^2} H^{-1} \Lambda H^{-1} \right), \quad (26)$$

where $\Lambda = \mathbb{E}[(s_1 - \phi_1^T \gamma) \phi_1 \phi_1^T]$ and \xrightarrow{d} denotes convergence in distribution;

iii.b) Asymptotic variance: the variance of $\sqrt{k} \tilde{\theta}_k$ converges to $\beta^{**} H^{-1} \Lambda H^{-1} / (\beta^* \rho(\delta_y))^2$, i.e.,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} k \mathbb{E} \left[\tilde{\theta}_k \tilde{\theta}_k^T \right] = \frac{\beta^{**}}{(\beta^* \rho(\delta_y))^2} H^{-1} \Lambda H^{-1}. \quad (27)$$

The proof of Theorem 3.2 is supplied in Section V-E.

Remark 3.6: This algorithm is primarily applicable in both noisy and noise-free cases because the probabilistic relationship (3) holds in both scenarios. As a result, the WLS-type criterion (4) naturally applies to both cases. Furthermore, although $\hat{\theta}_k$ obtained based on the WLS-type criterion is related to the unknown parameter $\rho(\delta_y)$, the ML-type algorithm for estimating δ_y can be conducted independently of system identification in both scenarios.

Remark 3.7: The proposed identification algorithm provides the asymptotic optimal estimate of δ_y under the likelihood function criterion and the asymptotic optimal solution of γ under the WLS-type criterion. However, the θ obtained by combining these two estimates is probably not the asymptotic optimal solution of either the likelihood function criterion or the WLS-type criterion. Instead, it represents a feasible solution.

IV. EXTENSION TO DYNAMIC SYSTEMS

The above theory is established for static systems, where the output y_k at time k is solely dependent on the current input and is independent of the inputs before time k . This section focuses on solving the dynamic system identification problems by extending the proposed method in both noisy and noise-free cases.

A. Problem Formulation

Consider an OE system described by

$$y_k = \phi_k^T B(z)/A(z) + d_k, \quad k \geq 1, \quad (28)$$

where k is the time index; $\phi_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the n -dimensional system input; $d_k \in \mathbb{R}$ is the potential system noise; $A(z)$ is the p -th order polynomial and $B(z)$ is the q -th order polynomial, both expressed in terms of unit backward shift operator z : $zy_k = y_{k-1}$ as $A(z) = 1 + a_1z + \dots + a_pz^p$ and $B(z) = b_0 + b_1z + \dots + b_qz^q$; $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_p \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b_0, b_1, \dots, b_q \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are unknown parameters; the system output y_k cannot be exactly measured and can only be measured by quantized observations $s_k = Q(y_k)$; the quantizer $Q(\cdot)$ is defined by (2). Besides, we stipulate that $A(z)$ has no poles on or outside the unit circle; $A(z)$ and $B(z)$ are coprime; $a_p \neq 0$; $b_q \neq \mathbf{0}_n$.

The goal of this section is to estimate unknown parameter $\theta^* = [a_1, a_2, \dots, a_p, b_0^T, b_1^T, \dots, b_q^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{p+n(q+1)}$ based on the input $\{\phi_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ and the quantized observation $\{s_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ in both noisy and noise-free cases.

Remark 4.1: If both p and q are zero, the OE system in (28) reduces to the linear system (1) described earlier. If p is zero, the OE system (28) simplifies to an FIR system.

B. Algorithm design and its properties

Similarly with Durbin's method (DM) [42], we will first transform the OE system identification problem into a linear FIR system identification problem. Since $A(z)$ has no poles on or outside the unit circle, the OE system (28) can be described by the IIR system:

$$y_k = \phi_k^T H(z) + d_k, \quad k \geq 1, \quad (29)$$

where $H(z) = B(z)/A(z) = \sum_{i=0}^\infty h_i z^i$; $h_0, h_1, h_2, \dots \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are the n -dimensional vectors of impulse responses. Then, under Assumption 2.1 and 2.2, it can be concluded that

$$\mathbb{E}[\phi_{k-i} y_k] = H h_i, \quad i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k-1.$$

Note that $H > 0$, and the OE system (28) equals

$$\begin{aligned} y_k + a_1 y_{k-1} + a_2 y_{k-2} + \dots + a_p y_{k-p} \\ = \phi_k^T b_0 + \phi_{k-1}^T b_1 + \dots + \phi_{k-q}^T b_q + A(q) d_k. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Then, multiplying both sides of (30) by ϕ_{k-i} and taking the expectation, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} h_i + a_1 h_{i-1} + \dots + a_p h_{i-p} &= b_i, \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, q, \\ h_i + a_1 h_{i-1} + \dots + a_p h_{i-p} &= \mathbf{0}_n, \quad i \geq q+1, \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where we stipulate that $h_i = 0$ for $i < 0$. It follows that

$$\Gamma [a_1, a_2, \dots, a_p]^T = [-h_{q+1}^T, -h_{q+2}^T, \dots, -h_{\kappa}^T]^T,$$

where the positive integer $\kappa \geq p+q$ and

$$\Gamma = \begin{bmatrix} h_q & h_{q-1} & \dots & h_{q+1-p} \\ h_{q+1} & h_q & \dots & h_{q+2-p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ h_{\kappa-1} & h_{\kappa-2} & \dots & h_{\kappa-p} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n(\kappa-q) \times p}.$$

Proposition 4.1: The rank of T is equal to p .

The proof of Proposition 4.1 is supplied in Section V-F.

Hence, there exists a matrix $L \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n(\kappa-q)}$ satisfying $L\Gamma = I_p$. This relationship implies

$$[a_1, a_2, \dots, a_p]^T = L [-h_{q+1}^T, -h_{q+2}^T, \dots, -h_{\kappa}^T]^T. \quad (32)$$

Thus, by (31) and (32), the parameter estimation problem for θ^* can be reformulated as the estimation problem for $h \triangleq [h_0^T, h_1^T, \dots, h_{\kappa}^T]^T$.

To estimate h , the OE system (28) can be rewritten as a linear FIR system:

$$y_k = \varphi_k^T h + e_k, \quad k \geq 1, \quad (33)$$

where $\varphi_k \triangleq [\phi_k^T, \phi_{k-1}^T, \dots, \phi_{k-\kappa}^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{(\kappa+1)n}$ is the system regressor which can be regarded as the input of this linear FIR system; h is the unknown parameter to be estimated; $e_k \triangleq \phi_k^T H(z) - \varphi_k^T h + d_k$ is the system error which can be regarded as the system noise. Besides, the assumption of white input ϕ_k and noise d_k ensures that the system regressor φ_k and system error e_k of the linear FIR system (33) are also white, making it possible to directly apply the ML-type algorithm and the WLS-type algorithm to estimate h in the linear FIR system (33) without the need to assess the long tail terms ($h_{\kappa+1}, h_{\kappa+2}, \dots$). Based on this, and utilizing the ideas from (31) and (32), the following DM-type algorithm for estimating θ^* based on the estimate of h is outlined in Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 3 The DM-type algorithm for estimating θ^*

Based on $\hat{h}_k = [(\hat{h}_k^0)^T, (\hat{h}_k^1)^T, \dots, (\hat{h}_k^q)^T]^T$ by the WLS-type algorithm for estimating h of the linear FIR system (33), the algorithm for estimating θ^* is defined at any $k \geq 1$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\theta}_k^* &= [\hat{a}_k^1, \hat{a}_k^2, \dots, \hat{a}_k^p, (\hat{b}_k^0)^T, (\hat{b}_k^1)^T, \dots, (\hat{b}_k^q)^T], \\ [\hat{a}_k^1, \hat{a}_k^2, \dots, \hat{a}_k^p]^T &= -L_k [(\hat{h}_k^{q+1})^T, (\hat{h}_k^{q+2})^T, \dots, (\hat{h}_k^{\kappa})^T]^T, \\ \hat{b}_k^j &= \hat{h}_k^j + \sum_{i=1}^p \hat{a}_k^i \hat{h}_k^{j-i}, \quad j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, q, \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\theta}_k^*$ is the estimate of θ^* at time k ; $L_k \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times \kappa}$ satisfies $L_k \hat{\Gamma}_k = I_p I_{\{\text{rank}(\hat{\Gamma}_k)=p\}}$;

$$\hat{\Gamma}_k = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{h}_k^q & \hat{h}_k^{q-1} & \dots & \hat{h}_k^{q+1-p} \\ \hat{h}_k^{q+1} & \hat{h}_k^q & \dots & \hat{h}_k^{q+2-p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \hat{h}_k^{\kappa-1} & \hat{h}_k^{\kappa-2} & \dots & \hat{h}_k^{\kappa-p} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The DM-type algorithm has the following properties.

Theorem 4.1: Under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, $\hat{\theta}_k^*$ converges to θ^* in the almost sure sense with a convergence rate of $O(\sqrt{\log k \log \log k/k})$, i.e.,

$$\|\tilde{\theta}_k^*\| = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log k \log \log k}{k}}\right), \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (34)$$

where $\tilde{\theta}_k^* \triangleq \hat{\theta}_k^* - \theta^*$ is the estimation error of θ^* .

The proof of Theorem 4.1 is supplied in Section V-G.

Remark 4.2: The parameter κ represents a tradeoff between the accuracy and the computational complexity of the DM-type algorithm. Specifically, κ is the order of the linear FIR system (33), derived by truncating the IIR system (29). A larger κ reduces the loss of θ^* information but increases the computational cost, particularly its multiplication complexity, which grows with the order κ^3 . Theorem 4.1 provides a lower bound for κ , i.e., when $\kappa \geq p+q$, the DM-type algorithm can successfully identify the OE systems.

V. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULTS

Some lemmas are collected and established first, which will be frequently used in convergence analysis.

Lemma 5.1: (Lemma 1 and Remark 2 in [8]) Denote $F^k(\cdot)$ as the k -sample empirical distribution of the standard Gaussian random variable. Then, there exists a stretched Brownian bridge process $e(\cdot)$ such that $\sqrt{k}(F^k(\cdot) - F(\cdot))$ converges to $e(\cdot)$ almost surely and $\mathbb{E}[e(x_1)e(x_2)] = \min\{F(x_1), F(x_2)\} - F(x_1)F(x_2)$ for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}$.

Lemma 5.2: (Eq. (11) in [43]) Denote μ_k^r as the r -th central moment of the Binomial process with k independent trials and success probability q . Then, for each positive integer p :

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mu_k^{2p}}{(2kq(q-1))^p} = \frac{1 \cdot 3 \cdot 5 \cdots (2p-1)}{2^p} = O(1).$$

Lemma 5.3: (Theorem 4.5.2 in [44]) If the random process $\{X_n\}$ converges to X in distribution, and for some $p > 0$, $\sup_n \mathbb{E}[\|X_n\|^p] = O(1)$, then, for each $r < p$:

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\|X_n\|^r] = \mathbb{E}[\|X\|^r] = O(1).$$

Lemma 5.4: (Proposition 6 in [12]) The projection operator $\Pi(\cdot)$ given by Algorithm 1 follows $\|\Pi(x_1) - \Pi(x_2)\| \leq \|x_1 - x_2\|$ for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Lemma 5.5: (Lemma 3.1 in [45]) If the random symmetric positive definite matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ has the Wishart distribution as $A \sim W_n(k, \Sigma)$, where k represents the degrees of freedom and Σ is the scale matrix. Then, for each positive integer p :

$$\mathbb{E}[\|A^{-1}\|^p] = \frac{\|\Sigma^{-1}\|^p \Gamma_n(k/2 - p)}{2^{np} \Gamma_n(k/2)}, \quad \frac{k}{2} > p,$$

where $\Gamma_n(x) = \pi^{n(n-1)/4} \prod_{i=1}^n \Gamma(x - (i-1)/2)$ for all $x > (p-1)/2$ and $\Gamma(\cdot)$ is the gamma function.

Lemma 5.6: (Lemma 3 in Section 2.3 of [46])

$$\int_x^\infty \exp\left(-\frac{u^2}{2}\right) du < \frac{\exp(-x^2/2)}{x}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

A. Proof of Proposition 2.1

Based on the linear system (1)-(2), for all $b > 0$ and $k \geq 1$, we construct an another system:

$$\bar{y}_k = \phi_k^T \eta + \omega_k, \quad \bar{s}_k = I_{\{\bar{y}_k > 0\}}, \quad (35)$$

where $\eta = b\theta$ and $\omega_k = bd_k$.

Then we will show the unidentifiable between the linear system (1)-(2) and the linear system (35).

Case 1: The noise-free case, i.e., $\delta_d^2 = 0$.

Note that $\mathbb{P}(\bar{s}_k = 0 | \phi_k, \eta) = I_{\{\phi_k^T \eta \leq 0\}} = I_{\{\phi_k^T \theta \leq 0\}} = \mathbb{P}(s_k = 0 | \phi_k, \theta)$. Thus, under the same arbitrary inputs, the observations of the linear system (1)-(2) and the linear system

(35) are the same in the probabilistic sense, which means the linear system (1)-(2) is unidentifiable in this case.

Case 2: The noisy case, i.e., $\delta_d^2 > 0$.

Note that $\mathbb{P}(\bar{s}_k = 0 | \phi_k, \eta) = \mathbb{P}(\phi_k^T \eta + \omega_k \leq 0) = F(-\phi_k^T \eta / b\delta_d) = F(-\phi_k^T \theta / \delta_d) = \mathbb{P}(\phi_k^T \theta + d_k \leq 0) = \mathbb{P}(s_k = 0 | \phi_k, \theta)$. The linear system (1)-(2) is unidentifiable in this case.

In summary, the linear system (1)-(2) is unidentifiable with $m = 1$ and $C_1 = 0$.

The proof is completed.

B. Proof of Proposition 3.1

From $\mathbb{E}[\phi_k y_k] = \mathbb{E}[\phi_k \phi_k^T \theta + \phi_k d_k] = H\theta$, we have $\mathbb{E}[(\phi_k - H\theta y_k / \delta_y^2) y_k] = 0$. Noticing both $\phi_k - H\theta y_k / \delta_y^2$ and y_k are Gaussian, we conclude that $\phi_k - H\theta y_k / \delta_y^2$ and y_k are independent. Thus we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\phi_k | y_k] = \frac{H\theta y_k}{\delta_y^2}. \quad (36)$$

Besides, from (2), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[s_k y_k] &= \sum_{i=0}^m i \int_{C_i}^{C_{i+1}} \frac{x}{\sqrt{2\pi}\delta_y} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2\delta_y^2}\right) dx \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^m \frac{i\delta_y^2}{\sqrt{2\pi}\delta_y} \left(\exp\left(-\frac{C_i^2}{2\delta_y^2}\right) - \exp\left(-\frac{C_{i+1}^2}{2\delta_y^2}\right) \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\delta_y^2}{\sqrt{2\pi}\delta_y} \exp\left(-\frac{C_i^2}{2\delta_y^2}\right) = \delta_y^2 \rho(\delta_y). \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Thus, by (36) and (37), we have $\mathbb{E}[s_k \phi_k] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[s_k \phi_k | y_k]] = \mathbb{E}[s_k \mathbb{E}[\phi_k | y_k]] = \mathbb{E}[s_k y_k] H\theta / \delta_y^2 = \rho(\delta_y) H\theta$.

The proof is completed.

C. Proof of Proposition 3.2

By Lemma 5.1, since the cumulative sum $\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i$ corresponds to $F^k(C_j / \delta_y)$, for $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$, one can get

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{k} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i - F_j \right) = e\left(\frac{C_j}{\delta_y}\right), \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (38)$$

Note that $\mathbb{E}[I_{\{s_l=i\}}] = F_{i+1} - F_i$ and $\mathbb{E}[(I_{\{s_l=i\}} - (F_{i+1} - F_i))^2] \leq 1$, where $l = 1, 2, \dots, k$ and $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, m-1$. Then, by the law of the iterated logarithm [44], for $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, m-1$, we have

$$|S_k^i - (F_{i+1} - F_i)| = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log \log k}{k}}\right), \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Note that $C_0 = -\infty$ and $F(C_0 / \delta_y) = 0$. It holds that

$$\left| \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i - F_j \right| = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log \log k}{k}}\right), \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (39)$$

Let $g(\cdot)$ denote the derivative of $F^{-1}(\cdot)$. By the mean value theorem [47], there exists a point ξ_k^j lying between $\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i$ and F_j , such that $F^{-1}(\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i) - C_j / \delta_y =$

$g(\xi_k^j)(\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i - F_j)$. Define $\tilde{\delta}_k^j \triangleq \hat{\delta}_k^j - \delta_y$. Then, for nonzero C_j , using (13), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\delta}_k^j &= \frac{\delta_y}{F^{-1}(\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i)} \left(\frac{C_j}{\delta_y} - F^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i \right) \right) \\ &= -\frac{\delta_y g(\xi_k^j)(\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i - F_j)}{F^{-1}(\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i)}. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Note that $g(\cdot) = 1/f(\cdot)$ and ξ_k^j is between $\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i$ and F_j . Then, by (39), one can get

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} g(\xi_k^j) = g(F_j) = \frac{1}{f(C_j/\delta_y)}, \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad (41)$$

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} F^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i \right) = \frac{C_j}{\delta_y}, \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (42)$$

Thus, by substituting (38), (41) and (42) into (40), we obtain

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{k} \tilde{\delta}_k^j = -\frac{e(C_j/\delta_y)}{f_j}, \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (43)$$

Besides, for each positive integer p , by (40) and Hölder's inequality [48], it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sqrt{k} \tilde{\delta}_k^j \right|^{2p} \right] &\leq k^p |\delta_y|^{2p} \left| g(\xi_k^j) \right|^{2p} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i - F_j \right|^{4p} \right]} \\ &\quad \cdot \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{1}{F^{-1}(\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i)} \right|^{4p} \right]} \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Since ξ_k^j is between $\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i$ and F_j , by the mean value theorem [47], ξ_k^j is constrained such that its upper bound is less than 1 and its lower bound is greater than 0. Then, by $g(\cdot) = 1/f(\cdot)$, we have

$$\left| g(\xi_k^j) \right|^{2p} = O(1). \quad (45)$$

Since $\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i = \sum_{i=1}^k I_{\{s_i < j\}}/k$ and $\mathbb{E}[\left| \sum_{i=1}^k I_{\{s_i < j\}} - kF_j \right|^{2p}]$ is the $2p$ -th central moment of Binomial distribution, by Lemma 5.2, one can get

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i - F_j \right|^{4p} \right] = O \left(\frac{1}{k^{2p}} \right). \quad (46)$$

Now we examine the last term on the right side of (44). For $l = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k$, it holds that $\mathbb{P}(\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i = l/k) = \binom{k}{l} F_j^l (1 - F_j)^{k-l}$. Without loss of any generality, we assume $C_j < 0$. Then, for a positive constant $c_s < 1/2 - F_j$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i = \frac{l}{k} \right) &= \binom{k}{l} \left(\frac{1}{2} - c_s \right)^l \left(\frac{1}{2} + c_s \right)^{k-l} \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\frac{F_j}{1/2 - c_s} \right)^l \left(\frac{1 - F_j}{1/2 + c_s} \right)^{k-l}. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Define the function $h(x) \triangleq l \log x + (k-l) \log(1-x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\dot{h}(\cdot)$ is the derivative of $h(\cdot)$. Then, using the mean value theorem [47], there exists $q_1 \in (F_j, 1/2 - c_s)$

such that $\log((F_j/(1/2 - c_s))^l ((1 - F_j)/(1/2 + c_s))^{k-l}) = h(F_j) - h(1/2 - c_s) = \dot{h}(q_1)(F_j - (1/2 - c_s))$.

For all $l > k/2 - c_s k$, we have $\dot{h}(q_1) = (l - kq_1)/(q_1(1 - q_1)) > (1/2 - c_s - q_1)k/(q_1(1 - q_1))$. Define $\rho \triangleq -(F_j - (1/2 - c_s))(1/2 - c_s - q_1)/(q_1(1 - q_1))$. Then, one can get $\rho > 0$ and $(F_j/(1/2 - c_s))^l ((1 - F_j)/(1/2 + c_s))^{k-l} = O(\exp(-\rho k))$.

Note that $\binom{k}{l} (1/2 - c_s)^l (1/2 + c_s)^{k-l} \leq \sum_{l=0}^k \binom{k}{l} (1/2 - c_s)^l (1/2 + c_s)^{k-l} = 1$. Thus, by (47), for $|l/k - 1/2| < c_s$, it holds that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i = \frac{l}{k} \right) = O(\exp(-\rho k)). \quad (48)$$

In addition, using the mean value theorem [47], there exists a point q_2 lying between l/k and $1/2$ such that $F^{-1}(l/k) - F^{-1}(1/2) = g(q_2)(l/k - 1/2)$. Since $g(\cdot) = 1/f(\cdot)$, we have $|F^{-1}(l/k) - F^{-1}(1/2)| \geq \sqrt{2\pi}|l/k - 1/2|$. Thus, for $l/k \neq 1/2$, it holds that $|F^{-1}(l/k) - F^{-1}(1/2)| \geq \sqrt{2\pi}/(2k)$. Since the point $\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i = 1/2$ has been modified, by (48), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{1}{F^{-1}(\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i)} \right|^{4p} I_{\{|\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i - 1/2| < c_s\}} \right] \\ &= \sum_{|l/k - 1/2| < c_s, \text{ if } l/k \neq 1/2} \frac{\mathbb{P}(\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i = l/k)}{|F^{-1}(l/k)|^{4p}} + \frac{\mathbb{P}(\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i = 1/2)}{|F^{-1}(c^*)|^{4p}} \\ &= O(k^{4p+1} \exp(-\rho k)) = O(1). \end{aligned}$$

Besides, for $|\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i - 1/2| \geq c_s$, $|F^{-1}(\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i)|^{-4p}$ is constrained such that its lower bound is greater than 0, which indicates that $\mathbb{E}[|F^{-1}(\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i)|^{-4p} I_{\{|\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i - 1/2| \geq c_s\}}] = O(1)$. Therefore, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{1}{F^{-1}(\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i)} \right|^{4p} \right] = O(1). \quad (49)$$

Thus, by substituting (45), (46) and (49) into (44), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sqrt{k} \tilde{\delta}_k^j \right|^{2p} \right] = O(1). \quad (50)$$

Consequently, in the case of $\forall C_j \neq 0$, one can get

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sqrt{k} \tilde{\Delta}_k \right|^4 \right] = O(1). \quad (51)$$

In addition, by Lemma 5.1, for $u \leq v$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e \left(\frac{C_u}{\delta_y} \right) e \left(\frac{C_v}{\delta_y} \right) \right] = F_u - F_v F_v. \quad (52)$$

Then, by Lemma 5.3, (43) and (51), in the case of $\forall C_j \neq 0$, one can get

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} kV_k &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[k \tilde{\Delta}_k \tilde{\Delta}_k^T \right] \\ &= (U + G^T)^{-1} (W - w w^T) (U + G)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

In the case of $C_j = 0$ with $j > 1$, by the mean value theorem [47], there exists a point ζ_k^j between $F(0) - \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} S_k^i$ and F_1 such that

$$\tilde{\delta}_k^j = \frac{\delta_y g(\zeta_k^j)(F_1 - (F(0) - \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} S_k^i))}{F^{-1}(F(0) - \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} S_k^i)}. \quad (53)$$

Then, by $F_j = F(0)$ and (38), it holds that $\sqrt{k}(F_1 - (F(0) - \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} S_k^i))$ converges to $e(C_j/\delta_y) - e(C_1/\delta_y)$ almost surely. Similarly with the analysis of the nonzero thresholds, for $C_j = 0$ with $j > 1$, one can get (50) holds and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{k} \tilde{\delta}_k^j = \frac{e(C_j/\delta_y) - e(C_1/\delta_y)}{f_1}, \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (54)$$

Thus, in the case of $C_j = 0$ with $j > 1$, we have (51) holds.

Define $U_j \triangleq \text{diag}(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_{j-1}, -f_1, f_{j+1}, \dots, f_m) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ and a positive definite matrix $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{p,q} &\triangleq (W - ww^T)_{p,q}, \quad p \neq j, q \neq j, 1 \leq p, q \leq m; \\ Y_{p,j} &= Y_{j,p} \triangleq F_p - F_j F_p - (F_1 - F_1 F_p) \\ &= (W - ww^T)_{j,q} - (W - ww^T)_{1,p}, \quad p \neq j, 1 \leq p \leq m; \\ Y_{j,j} &\triangleq F_j - F_j^2 - F_1 + 2F_1 F_j - F_1^2 \\ &= (W - ww^T)_{j,j} - 2(W - ww^T)_{1,j} + (W - ww^T)_{1,1}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, in the case of $C_j = 0, j > 1$, by Lemma 5.3, (43), (51), (52) and (54), we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} kV_k = U_j^{-1} Y U_j^{-1}. \quad (55)$$

Define $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ satifing

$$Z_{u,v} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } 1 \leq u = v \leq m \text{ or } u = 1, v = j, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, for $u, v = 1, 2, \dots, m$, one can get

$$\begin{aligned} (Z^T Y Z)_{u,v} &= (W - ww^T)_{u,v}, \quad u \neq j, v \neq j; \\ (Z^T Y Z)_{u,j} &= Y_{u,j} + Y_{u,1} = (W - ww^T)_{u,j}, \quad u \neq j; \\ (Z^T Y Z)_{j,v} &= Y_{j,v} + Y_{1,v} = (W - ww^T)_{j,v}, \quad v \neq j; \\ (Z^T Y Z)_{j,j} &= Y_{j,j} + Y_{j,1} + Y_{1,j} + Y_{1,1} = (W - ww^T)_{j,j}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $Z^T Y Z = W - ww^T$. Besides, by $U_j Z = U + G$ and (55), in the case of $C_j = 0, j > 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} kV_k &= (Z^T U_j)^{-1} Z^T Y Z (U_j Z)^{-1} \\ &= (U + G^T)^{-1} (W - ww^T) (U + G)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, (11) can also be proven in the case of $C_1 = 0$. The proof is completed.

D. Proof of Theorem 3.1

This proof will be divided into the following two parts.

Part 1 : Represent the CR lower bound.

By $\partial F_i / \partial \delta_y = -f_i$ and (5), in the case of $\forall C_j \neq 0$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 l_k}{k \partial \delta_y^2} &= -\frac{S_k^0 \dot{f}_1}{F_1} - \frac{S_k^0 \dot{f}_1^2}{F_1^2} + \frac{S_k^m \dot{f}_m}{1 - F_m} - \frac{S_k^m \dot{f}_m^2}{(1 - F_m)^2} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \frac{S_k^i (\dot{f}_i - \dot{f}_{i+1})}{F_{i+1} - F_i} - \frac{S_k^i (f_i - f_{i+1})^2}{(F_{i+1} - F_i)^2} \\ &= -\sum_{i=0}^m S_k^i \frac{\dot{f}_i}{\tilde{F}_i} - S_k^i \frac{\tilde{f}_i^2}{\tilde{F}_i^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, in the case of $\exists C_j = 0$, one can get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 l_k}{k \partial \delta_y^2} &= -\sum_{i=0}^{j-2} S_k^i \frac{\dot{f}_i}{\tilde{F}_i} + S_k^{j-1} \frac{\dot{f}_{j-1}}{\tilde{F}_{j-1}} - S_k^j \frac{\dot{f}_{j+1}}{\tilde{F}_j} \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=j+1}^m S_k^i \frac{\dot{f}_i}{\tilde{F}_i} + \sum_{i=0}^m S_k^i \frac{\tilde{f}_i^2}{\tilde{F}_i^2}. \end{aligned}$$

From $\mathbb{E}[S_k^i] = \mathbb{E}[\sum_{l=1}^k I_{\{s_l=i\}}/k] = (F_{i+1} - F_i) = \tilde{F}_i$ in both cases, where $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$, we have

$$\sigma_{\text{CR}}(k) = -\left(\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\partial^2 l_k}{\partial \delta_y^2} \right] \right)^{-1} = \frac{1}{k} \left(\sum_{i=0}^m \frac{\tilde{f}_i^2}{\tilde{F}_i} \right)^{-1}. \quad (56)$$

Define $\tilde{w} \triangleq [\tilde{F}_0, \tilde{F}_1, \dots, \tilde{F}_{m-1}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $\tilde{W} \triangleq \text{diag}(\tilde{F}_0, \tilde{F}_1, \dots, \tilde{F}_{m-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$. Additionally, let $\tilde{a} \triangleq (1 - \tilde{w}^T \tilde{W}^{-1} \tilde{w})^{-1}$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{W} - \tilde{w} \tilde{w}^T)^{-1} &= \tilde{W}^{-1/2} (I_m - \tilde{W}^{-1/2} \tilde{w} \tilde{w}^T \tilde{W}^{-1/2})^{-1} \tilde{W}^{-1/2} \\ &= \tilde{W}^{-1/2} (I_m + \tilde{a} \tilde{W}^{-1/2} \tilde{w} \tilde{w}^T \tilde{W}^{-1/2}) \tilde{W}^{-1/2} \\ &= \tilde{W}^{-1} + \tilde{a} \tilde{W}^{-1} \tilde{w} \tilde{w}^T \tilde{W}^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

Define $\tilde{U} \triangleq \text{diag}(\tilde{f}_0, \tilde{f}_1, \dots, \tilde{f}_{m-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ and $\tilde{X} \triangleq \tilde{U} (\tilde{W} - \tilde{w} \tilde{w}^T)^{-1} \tilde{U}$. It follows that

$$\tilde{X} = \tilde{U} \tilde{W}^{-1} \tilde{U} + \tilde{a} \tilde{U} \tilde{W}^{-1} \tilde{w} \tilde{w}^T \tilde{W}^{-1} \tilde{U}. \quad (58)$$

Note that $\mathbf{1}_m^T \tilde{U} \tilde{W}^{-1} \tilde{U} \mathbf{1}_m = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \tilde{f}_i^2 / \tilde{F}_i$, $\tilde{a}^{-1} = 1 - \tilde{w}^T \tilde{W}^{-1} \tilde{w} = 1 - \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \tilde{F}_i = \tilde{F}_m$, and $\tilde{w}^T \tilde{W}^{-1} \tilde{U} \mathbf{1}_m = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \tilde{f}_i = -\tilde{f}_m$. Then, we have

$$\mathbf{1}_m^T \tilde{X} \mathbf{1}_m = \sum_{i=0}^m \tilde{f}_i^2 / \tilde{F}_i. \quad (59)$$

Define $X \triangleq (U + G)(W - ww^T)^{-1}(U + G^T)$ and

$$Z_1 \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & \cdots & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

which is formed by subtracting columns $i = 2, \dots, m$ from the first column of the identity matrix. Since $\mathbf{1}_m^T G = [0, 0, \dots, 0] \in \mathbb{R}^m$, one may obtain $\mathbf{1}_m^T X \mathbf{1}_m = \mathbf{1}_m^T U Z_1 (Z_1^T W Z_1 - Z_1^T w w^T Z_1)^{-1} Z_1^T U \mathbf{1}_m$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{1}_m^T U Z_1 &= [f_1, f_2 - f_1, \dots, f_m - f_1], \\ w^T Z_1 &= [F_1, F_2 - F_1, \dots, F_m - F_1], \end{aligned}$$

$$Z_1^T W Z_1 = \begin{bmatrix} F_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & F_2 - F_1 & \cdots & F_2 - F_1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & F_2 - F_1 & \cdots & F_m - F_1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

This process can be repeated. For instance, we denote

$$Z_2 \triangleq Z_1 \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & \cdots & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

where the later matrix is formed by subtracting columns $i = 3, 4, \dots, m$ from the second column of I_m . After $m-1$ such elementary operations, we obtain $\mathbf{1}_m^T U Z_{m-1} = \mathbf{1}_m^T \tilde{U}$ and

$$w^T Z_{m-1} = \tilde{w}, \quad Z_{m-1}^T W Z_{m-1} = \tilde{W}. \quad (60)$$

By (56) and (59), we have

$$\mathbf{1}_m^T X \mathbf{1}_m = \mathbf{1}_m^T \tilde{X} \mathbf{1}_m = \frac{1}{k\sigma_{\text{CR}}(k)}. \quad (61)$$

Part 2 : Establish the convergence properties of $\hat{\delta}_k$.

We first prove that $\|\hat{\mu}_k\| = O(1)$.

Define $\tilde{w}_k \triangleq [\tilde{F}_k^0, \tilde{F}_k^1, \dots, \tilde{F}_k^{m-1}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $\tilde{W}_k \triangleq \text{diag}(\tilde{F}_k^0, \tilde{F}_k^1, \dots, \tilde{F}_k^{m-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ and $\tilde{a}_k \triangleq (1 - \tilde{w}_k^T \tilde{W}_k^{-1} \tilde{w}_k)^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}$, where $\tilde{f}_k^l \triangleq \hat{f}_k^{l+1} - \hat{f}_k^l$ and $\tilde{F}_k^l \triangleq \hat{F}_k^{l+1} - \hat{F}_k^l$ for $l = 0, 1, 2, \dots, m$. Then, similarly with (57), one can get $(\tilde{W}_k - \tilde{w}_k \tilde{w}_k^T)^{-1} = \tilde{W}_k^{-1} + \tilde{a}_k \tilde{W}_k^{-1} \tilde{w}_k \tilde{w}_k^T \tilde{W}_k^{-1}$.

Since $\hat{\delta}_{k-1}$ has a positive lower bound and a bounded upper bound, \tilde{F}_k^l and \tilde{f}_k^l also has positive lower bounds and bounded upper bounds. This indicates that $\|\tilde{W}_k^{-1}\|$, $|\tilde{w}_k|$ and $\|\hat{U}_k + \hat{G}_k\|$ are all bounded. Besides, since $\tilde{a}_k^{-1} = \tilde{F}_k^m$, $|\tilde{a}_k|$ is bounded. Thus, from $\|(\tilde{W}_k - \tilde{w}_k \tilde{w}_k^T)^{-1}\| \leq \|\tilde{W}_k^{-1}\| + \|\tilde{a}_k\| \|\tilde{W}_k^{-1}\|^2 \|\tilde{w}_k\|^2$, we know $\|(\tilde{W}_k - \tilde{w}_k \tilde{w}_k^T)^{-1}\|$ is bounded.

Note that $(\tilde{W}_k - \tilde{w}_k \tilde{w}_k^T)^{-1} = Z_{m-1} (\tilde{W}_k - \tilde{w}_k \tilde{w}_k^T)^{-1} Z_{m-1}^T$. Then, we have $\|(\hat{W}_k - \hat{w}_k \hat{w}_k^T)^{-1}\|$ is bounded. Consequently, $\|(\hat{U}_k + \hat{G}_k)(\hat{W}_k - \hat{w}_k \hat{w}_k^T)^{-1}(\hat{U}_k + \hat{G}_k^T)\|$ is bounded.

In addition, similarly with (59) and (61), we have $\mathbf{1}_m^T (\hat{U}_k + \hat{G}_k)(\hat{W}_k - \hat{w}_k \hat{w}_k^T)^{-1}(\hat{U}_k + \hat{G}_k^T) \mathbf{1}_m = \sum_{i=0}^m (\tilde{f}_k^i)^2 / \tilde{F}_k^i$, where the positive lower bound and the bounded upper bound of $\hat{\delta}_{k-1}$ ensures that $|\mathbf{1}_m^T (\hat{U}_k + \hat{G}_k)(\hat{W}_k - \hat{w}_k \hat{w}_k^T)^{-1}(\hat{U}_k + \hat{G}_k^T) \mathbf{1}_m|$ is also bounded. Therefore, by (15), we have

$$\|\hat{\mu}_k\| = O(1). \quad (62)$$

For $C_j \neq 0$, according to (38), (39) and (43), we have

$$|\tilde{\delta}_k^j| = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log \log k}{k}}\right), \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (63)$$

For $C_j = 0$ with $j > 1$, a similar argument based on (53) demonstrates that (63) remains valid. Likewise, in the case where $C_1 = 0$, the same conclusion holds, establishing that (63) is satisfied in all cases.

Since the positive constant c is sufficiently small, we assume $\delta_y \in (c, 1/c)$. Then, by (12) and Lemma 5.4, we have $|\tilde{\delta}_k| \leq \|\hat{\mu}_k\| [\tilde{\delta}_k^1, \tilde{\delta}_k^2, \dots, \tilde{\delta}_k^m] \leq \|\hat{\mu}_k\| \|\tilde{\delta}_k\|$. By (63), one can get (16) holds, i.e., the almost sure convergence rate is $O(\sqrt{\log \log k/k})$.

Define $\hat{\delta}_k \triangleq [\hat{\delta}_k^1, \hat{\delta}_k^2, \dots, \hat{\delta}_k^m] \hat{\mu}_k$ and $\bar{\delta}_k \triangleq \hat{\delta}_k - \delta_y$. Note that for $C_j \neq 0$ and $C_j = 0$ with $j > 1$, (50) remains valid. Similarly, the same conclusion holds where $C_1 = 0$. By applying (50) and the C_r -inequality [49], we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|\bar{\delta}_k|^{2p} \right] \leq \|\hat{\mu}_k\|^p 2^{m-1} \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E} \left[|\tilde{\delta}_k^j|^{2p} \right] = O\left(\frac{1}{k^p}\right). \quad (64)$$

Then, by Lemma 5.4 and Hölder's inequality [48], we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|\tilde{\delta}_k|^p \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[|\bar{\delta}_k|^p \right] \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[|\bar{\delta}_k|^{2p} \right]} = O\left(\frac{1}{k^{p/2}}\right), \quad (65)$$

which directly indicates that (17) holds, i.e., the L^p convergence rate is $O(k^{p/2})$.

Define $\underline{c} \triangleq \min\{\delta_y - c, 1/c - \delta_y\}$. Then, by the Markov inequality [49], one can get

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\hat{\delta}_k \notin [c, 1/c] \right) \leq \mathbb{P} \left(|\bar{\delta}_k| > \underline{c} \right) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[|\bar{\delta}_k|^2 \right]}{\underline{c}^2} = O\left(\frac{1}{k}\right).$$

Thus, by (64), (65) and Hölder's inequality [48], we have

$$\begin{aligned} & k \mathbb{E} \left[|\bar{\delta}_k - \tilde{\delta}_k|^2 \right] \\ &= k \mathbb{E} \left[|\bar{\delta}_k - \tilde{\delta}_k|^2 I_{\{\hat{\delta}_k \notin [c, 1/c]\}} \right] \\ &\leq k \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[|\bar{\delta}_k - \tilde{\delta}_k|^4 \right] \mathbb{E} \left[I_{\{\hat{\delta}_k \notin [c, 1/c]\}}^2 \right]} \\ &\leq k \sqrt{\left(\mathbb{E} \left[|\bar{\delta}_k|^4 \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[|\tilde{\delta}_k|^4 \right] \right) \mathbb{P} \left(\hat{\delta}_k \notin [c, 1/c] \right)} = O\left(\frac{1}{k^{1/2}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Using Hölder's inequality [48] again, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & k \mathbb{E} \left[\bar{\delta}_k (\tilde{\delta}_k - \bar{\delta}_k) \right] \\ &\leq k \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[|\bar{\delta}_k|^2 \right] \mathbb{E} \left[|\tilde{\delta}_k - \bar{\delta}_k|^2 \right]} = O\left(\frac{1}{k^{1/4}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, one can get

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sqrt{k} \tilde{\delta}_k \right|^2 \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sqrt{k} \bar{\delta}_k \right|^2 \right] \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} 2k \mathbb{E} \left[\bar{\delta}_k (\tilde{\delta}_k - \bar{\delta}_k) \right] + k \mathbb{E} \left[(\bar{\delta}_k - \tilde{\delta}_k)^2 \right] = 0. \quad (66) \end{aligned}$$

Besides, by (15) and (16), we obtain $(\hat{U}_k + \hat{G}_k)(\hat{W}_k - \hat{w}_k \hat{w}_k^T)^{-1}(\hat{U}_k + \hat{G}_k^T)$ converges to X almost surely. Then, by (15), we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left| \sqrt{k} \bar{\delta}_k \right|^2 - k \frac{\mathbf{1}_m^T X \tilde{\Delta}_k \tilde{\Delta}_k^T X \mathbf{1}_m}{(\mathbf{1}_m^T X \mathbf{1}_m)^2} = 0, \quad \text{a.s.}$$

By Lemma 5.3 and Proposition 3.2, it holds that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sqrt{k} \bar{\delta}_k \right|^2 \right] - k\sigma_{\text{CR}}(k) = 0. \quad (67)$$

Then, by (66), one can get (18) holds, i.e., the asymptotic efficiency is established.

The proof is completed.

E. Proof of Theorem 3.2

This proof will be divided into the following three parts.

Part 1 : Establish the almost sure convergence of $\hat{\theta}_k$.

Define $\tilde{\gamma}_k \triangleq \hat{\gamma}_k - \gamma$ for $k \geq 0$. From Remark 3.5, we have $\tilde{\gamma}_k = P_k \left((\sum_{l=1}^k \beta_l s_l \phi_l) + P_0^{-1} \hat{\gamma}_0 - P_k^{-1} \gamma \right)$ and $P_k = (\sum_{l=1}^k \beta_l \phi_l \phi_l^T + P_0^{-1})^{-1}$, which follows that

$$\tilde{\gamma}_k = P_k \sum_{l=1}^k \beta_l \phi_l (s_l - \phi_l^T \gamma) + P_k P_0^{-1} (\hat{\gamma}_0 - \gamma). \quad (68)$$

For the simplicity of description, we denote $x_k \triangleq s_k \phi_k - \phi_k \phi_k^T \gamma$. From Proposition 3.1, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} [x_k] = H\gamma - H\gamma = \mathbf{0}_n. \quad (69)$$

Since $\{\phi_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is Gaussian iid, $\mathbb{E}[\|\phi_l\|^4] < \infty$. Together with $\|\gamma\| = \|\sum_{i=1}^m \exp(-C_i^2/(2\delta_y^2))\theta/(\sqrt{2\pi}\delta_y)\| < \infty$, by the C_r -inequality [49], for $l \geq 1$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|x_k\|^2] &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[2\left(s_k^2 + (\phi_k^T \gamma)^2\right)\|\phi_k\|^2\right] \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E}\left[m^2\|\phi_k\|^2 + \|\gamma\|^2\|\phi_k\|^4\right] < \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

Then, by the law of the iterated logarithm [44], we have

$$\left\|\sum_{l=1}^k x_l\right\| = O\left(\sqrt{k \log \log k}\right), \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (71)$$

By the law of the iterated logarithm [44], it holds that $\sum_{l=1}^k \phi_l \phi_l^T / k$ converges to H almost surely, which indicates that $\|k(\sum_{l=1}^k \phi_l \phi_l^T)^{-1}\|$ converges to $\|H^{-1}\|$ almost surely. Since $\|P_k\| = \|(\sum_{l=1}^k \beta_l \phi_l \phi_l^T + P_0^{-1})^{-1}\| \leq \|(\sum_{l=1}^k \phi_l \phi_l^T)^{-1}\|/\underline{\beta}$, it holds that

$$\|P_k\| = O\left(\frac{1}{k}\right), \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (72)$$

Therefore, by substituting (71) and (72) into (68), we obtain

$$\|\tilde{\gamma}_k\| = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log \log k}{k}}\right), \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (73)$$

In addition, by the mean value theorem [47], there exists a point η_k between $\hat{\delta}_k$ and δ_y such that $\rho(\hat{\delta}_k) - \rho(\delta_y) = \dot{\rho}(\eta_k)\tilde{\delta}_k$, where $\dot{\rho}(\cdot)$ is the derivative of $\rho(\cdot)$. Note that $\dot{\rho}(\eta_k) = \sum_{i=1}^m ((C_i^2 - \eta_k^2) \exp(-C_i^2/(2\eta_k^2)))/\sqrt{2\pi}\eta_k^4$. Since $|\hat{\delta}_k|$ is bounded, $|\dot{\rho}(\eta_k)|$ is also bounded. By Theorem 3.2, it holds that

$$\left|\rho(\hat{\delta}_k) - \rho(\delta_y)\right| = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log \log k}{k}}\right), \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (74)$$

By $\tilde{\theta}_k = \hat{\gamma}_k/\rho(\hat{\delta}_k) - \gamma/\rho(\delta_y)$, one can get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\theta}_k\| &= \left\|\frac{\hat{\gamma}_k \rho(\delta_y) - \gamma \rho(\hat{\delta}_k) + \gamma \rho(\hat{\delta}_k) - \gamma \rho(\hat{\delta}_k)}{\rho(\hat{\delta}_k) \rho(\delta_y)}\right\| \\ &\leq \left\|\frac{\tilde{\gamma}_k}{\rho(\hat{\delta}_k)}\right\| + \left\|\frac{(\rho(\hat{\delta}_k) - \rho(\delta_y))\gamma}{\rho(\hat{\delta}_k) \rho(\delta_y)}\right\|. \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

Since $\hat{\delta}_k$ has a positive lower bound, $\rho(\hat{\delta}_k)$ has a positive lower bound. By substituting (73) and (74) into (75), we obtain (24), i.e., the almost sure convergence rate is $O(\sqrt{\log \log k/k})$.

Part 2 : Establish the L^p convergence of $\hat{\theta}_k$.

By (68) and the C_r -inequality [49], we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\sqrt{k}\tilde{\gamma}_k\right\|^{2p}\right] &\leq 2^{2p-1}\underline{\beta}^{2p}k^p\mathbb{E}\left[\|P_k\|^{2p}\left\|\sum_{l=1}^k x_l\right\|^{2p}\right] \\ &\quad + 2^{2p-1}k^p\mathbb{E}\left[\|P_k\|^{2p}\|P_0\|^{2p}\|\hat{\gamma}_0 - \gamma\|^{2p}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\{\phi_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ and $\{s_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ are iid, one can get that $\{x_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is also iid. By (69), it holds that $\mathbb{E}[x_u^T x_v] = (\mathbb{E}[x_u])^T \mathbb{E}[x_v] = 0$, for $u, v = 1, 2, \dots, k$, where $u \neq v$, which implies that $\mathbb{E}[\|\sum_{l=1}^k x_l\|^{4p}] = O(\mathbb{E}[\sum_{l=1}^k \prod_{i=1}^{2p} \|x_{l_i}\|^2]) = O(k^{2p})$.

Besides, since $\sum_{l=1}^k \phi_l \phi_l^T$ follows a Wishart distribution, by Lemma 5.5, we have $\mathbb{E}[\|(\sum_{l=1}^k \phi_l \phi_l^T)^{-1}\|^{4p}] = O(1/k^{4p})$. Note that $\|P_k\| \leq \|(\sum_{l=1}^k \phi_l \phi_l^T)^{-1}\|/\underline{\beta}$. Then, it holds that $\mathbb{E}[\|P_k\|^{4p}] = O(1/k^{4p})$.

By Hölder's inequality [48], $k^p\mathbb{E}[\|P_k\|^{2p}\|\sum_{l=1}^k x_l\|^{2p}] \leq k^p(\mathbb{E}[\|P_k\|^{4p}])^{1/2}(\mathbb{E}[\|\sum_{l=1}^k x_l\|^{4p}])^{1/2} = O(1)$, which implies that $\mathbb{E}[\|\sqrt{k}\tilde{\gamma}_k\|^{2p}] = O(1)$.

By Theorem 3.1 and $\rho(\hat{\delta}_k) - \rho(\delta_y) = \dot{\rho}(\eta_k)\tilde{\delta}_k$, the boundedness of $|\dot{\rho}(\eta_k)|$ implies that $\mathbb{E}[\|\sqrt{k}(\rho(\hat{\delta}_k) - \rho(\delta_y))\|^{2p}] = O(1)$.

Then, by (75) and the C_r -inequality [49], we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\sqrt{k}\tilde{\theta}_k\right\|^{2p}\right] \\ &\leq 2^{2p-1}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\frac{\sqrt{k}\tilde{\gamma}_k}{\rho(\hat{\delta}_k)}\right\|^{2p} + \left\|\frac{\sqrt{k}(\rho(\hat{\delta}_k) - \rho(\delta_y))\gamma}{\rho(\hat{\delta}_k)\rho(\delta_y)}\right\|^{2p}\right] = O(1). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, by Hölder's inequality [48], it holds that $\mathbb{E}[\|\sqrt{k}\tilde{\theta}_k\|^p] \leq (\mathbb{E}[\|\sqrt{k}\tilde{\theta}_k\|^{2p}])^{1/2} = O(1)$ which indicates (25) holds, i.e., the L^p convergence rate is $O(1/k^{p/2})$.

Part 3 : Establish the asymptotic normality and determine the limit of the estimation error variance of $\hat{\theta}_k$.

In this section, we set the weight coefficient β_k such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=1}^k \beta_l/k = \beta^*$ and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=1}^k \beta_l^2/k = \beta^{**}$.

First, we claim that $\mathbb{E}[\|x_k\|^4] = O(1)$, which can be proven using a similar approach of (70). Consequently, since $\beta_l \leq \bar{\beta} < \infty$, $l \geq 1$, it holds that $\sum_{l=1}^k \mathbb{E}[\|\beta_l x_l\|^4] = O(k)$. Besides, since $\{x_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is iid, we have $(\sum_{l=1}^k \mathbb{E}[\beta_l^2 \|x_l\|^2])^4 \geq \beta^8 k^4 (\mathbb{E}[\|x_1\|^2])^4$, which indicates that $\{\beta_k x_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ satisfies Liapounov's condition [48]. Thus, by Lindeberg's Theorem [48], it holds that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \sum_{l=1}^k \beta_l x_l \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}_n, \beta^{**}\Lambda). \quad (76)$$

By the strong law of large numbers [48], $\sum_{l=1}^k \beta_l \phi_l \phi_l^T / k$ converges to $\beta^* H$ almost surely, which indicates that kP_k converges to H^{-1}/β^* almost surely. Then, by (19), (68), (74) and (76), we obtain (26), i.e., the asymptotic normality is established.

Furthermore, by Lemma 5.3, (25) and (26), we have (27) holds, i.e., the asymptotic efficiency is established.

The proof is completed.

F. Proof of Proposition 4.1

Since $A(z)$ and $B(z)$ are coprime, there exists a specific row in the matrix $[b_0, b_1, \dots, b_q]$ that is coprime to $[1, a_1, \dots, a_p]$. Without loss of generality, we denote this row vector as $[b_0^*, b_1^*, \dots, b_q^*] \in \mathbb{R}^{q+1}$. Define the polynomial $B^*(z) \triangleq b_0^* + b_1^* z + b_q^* z^q$. Correspondingly, let $H^*(z)$ be the transfer function $H^*(z) \triangleq B^*(z)/A(z) = \sum_{i=0}^\infty h_i^* z^i$. Define the matrix Γ^* as

$$\Gamma^* \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} h_q^* & h_{q-1}^* & \cdots & h_{q+1-p}^* \\ h_{q+1}^* & h_q^* & \cdots & h_{q+2-p}^* \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ h_{q+p-1}^* & h_{q+p-2}^* & \cdots & h_q^* \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}.$$

By a similar argument to Lemma 1 in [50], it follows that $\text{rank}(\Gamma^*) = p$. Additionally, since $H^*(z)$ is constructed as a component of the original transfer function, each row of Γ^* corresponds to a row in Γ . Consequently, $\text{rank}(\Gamma) = p$.

G. Proof of Theorem 4.1

The main idea of this proof is to construct an auxiliary i.i.d. sequence, demonstrate its convergence, and then analyze the difference between the auxiliary and original sequences, thereby establishing the convergence of the original sequence.

Given that $A(z)$ has no poles on or outside the unit circle, there exists a positive constant ν such that

$$\|h_i\| = O(\exp(-\nu i)). \quad (77)$$

For simplicity, the analysis will consider $l = 1, 2, \dots, k$ and omit further emphasis on this point.

The system output at time l , prior to time k , can then be expressed as $y_l = \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} \phi_{l-i}^T h_i + d_l$. To facilitate the analysis, we introduce a corresponding truncated variable for y_l as $y_l^* = \sum_{i=0}^{\min\{m_k-1, l-1\}} \phi_{l-i}^T h_i + d_l$, where $m_k \triangleq \lceil 4 \log k / \nu \rceil$.

Additionally, the quantized observation s_l has a corresponding truncated variable defined as $s_l^* \triangleq Q(y_l^*)$, where the quantizer $Q(\cdot)$ is defined by (2). For $u = 1, 2, \dots, m_k$, the subsequences $\{z_{u+vm_k}^*\}_{v=0}^{\lceil k/m_k \rceil}$ are iid.

Define the truncation error as $\tilde{y}_l^* \triangleq y_l^* - y_l$, which can be written as $\tilde{y}_l^* = \sum_{i=m_k}^{l-1} \phi_{l-i}^T h_i$. Let $\delta_l = \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[(y_l)^2]}$, $\delta_l^* = \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[(y_l^*)^2]}$ and $\hat{\delta}_l^* = \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[(\tilde{y}_l^*)^2]}$. Then, by (77), we have $(\delta_l^*)^2 = \sum_{i=m_k}^{l-1} h_i^T H h_i = O(\exp(-2\nu m_k)) = O(1/k^8)$, implying that $\delta_l^* = O(1/k^4)$.

Define $\varepsilon_l^* \triangleq \hat{\delta}_l^* \sqrt{6 \log k}$. For sufficient larger k , it holds that $\varepsilon_l^* < \delta_l/k^3$. Hence, for sufficient larger k , one can get

$$\mathbb{P}(|y_l| < \varepsilon_l^*) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{y_l}{\delta_l}\right| < \frac{1}{k^3}\right) = \int_{-1/k^3}^{1/k^3} f(x) dx = O\left(\frac{1}{k^3}\right).$$

Besides, by Lemma 5.6, it holds that $\mathbb{P}(|y_l^*| > \varepsilon_l^*) = \mathbb{P}(|\tilde{y}_l^*|/\delta_l^* > (6 \log k)^{1/2}) = O(1/k^3)$. Since $\mathbb{P}(s_l \neq s_l^*) \leq \mathbb{P}(\bigcup_{i=1}^m \{|y_l - C_i| < \varepsilon_l^*\}) + \mathbb{P}(\{|\tilde{y}_l^*| > \varepsilon_l^*\}) \leq m\mathbb{P}(|y_l| < \varepsilon_l^*) + \mathbb{P}(\{|\tilde{y}_l^*| > \varepsilon_l^*\})$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(s_l \neq s_l^*) = O\left(\frac{1}{k^3}\right). \quad (78)$$

Based on (78), the following proof will be divided into the following two parts.

Part 1 : Establish the almost sure convergence of the ML-type algorithm.

By (77), δ_k^2 converges to a finite limit δ_∞^2 , which can be written as $\delta_\infty^2 = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \delta_k^2 = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} h_i^T H h_i + \delta_d^2 < \infty$. Note that $\delta_\infty \geq \delta_l^* \geq \delta_1 = h_1^T H h_1 + \delta_d^2$. Then, for $l > m_k$, by (77), we have

$$|\delta_l^* - \delta_\infty| = \frac{\delta_\infty^2 - (\delta_l^*)^2}{\delta_l^* + \delta_\infty} \leq \sum_{i=m_k}^{\infty} \frac{h_i^T H h_i}{2\delta_1} = O\left(\frac{1}{k^8}\right). \quad (79)$$

Using the mean value theorem [47], there exists a point $\psi_{k,1}^{j,l}$ between $F(C_j/\delta_\infty)$ and $F(C_j/\delta_l^*)$ such that $F(C_j/\delta_\infty) - F(C_j/\delta_l^*) = f(\psi_{k,1}^{j,l})C_j(\delta_l^* - \delta_\infty)/(\delta_l^* \delta_\infty)$, where $|f(\psi_{k,1}^{j,l})| < 1$, $|C_j| < m$ and $|\delta_l^* \delta_\infty| \geq |\delta_1^2| = |h_1^T H h_1 + \delta_d^2|$. Hence, for

$l > m_k$, by (79), one can get $|F(C_j/\delta_l^*) - F(C_j/\delta_\infty)| = O(1/k^8)$, and for $1 \leq l \leq m_k$, it holds that $|F(C_j/\delta_l^*) - F(C_j/\delta_\infty)| = O(1)$. Consequently,

$$\sum_{l=1}^k \left| F\left(\frac{C_j}{\delta_l^*}\right) - F\left(\frac{C_j}{\delta_\infty}\right) \right| = O(m_k) = O(\log k). \quad (80)$$

Define $z_l^j \triangleq I_{\{s_l^* < j\}} - F(C_j/\delta_l^*)$. Then, $\sum_{l=1}^k z_l^j$ can be expressed as $\sum_{u=1}^{m_k} \sum_{v=0}^{\lceil k/m_k \rceil} z_{u+vm_k}^j$, where we stipulate that $z_w^j = 0$ for $w > k$. Since for $u = 1, 2, \dots, m_k$, each sequence $\{z_{u+vm_k}^j\}_{v=1}^{\lceil k/m_k \rceil}$ is an iid sequence with finite variance, the law of the iterated logarithm [44] implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{l=1}^k z_l^j \right| &= O\left(m_k \sqrt{\frac{k}{m_k} \log \log \left(\frac{k}{m_k}\right)}\right), \quad \text{a.s.}, \\ &= O\left(\sqrt{k \log k \log \log k}\right), \quad \text{a.s.} \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

In addition, by (78), for any positive constant ε_1 , we have $\mathbb{P}(\sum_{l=1}^k |I_{\{s_l < j\}} - I_{\{s_l^* < j\}}| > \varepsilon_1) \leq \sum_{l=1}^k \mathbb{P}(s_l \neq s_l^*) = O(1/k^2)$. By the Borel-Cantelli Lemma [48], we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{l=1}^k |I_{\{s_l < j\}} - I_{\{s_l^* < j\}}| = 0, \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (82)$$

Since $\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i = \sum_{l=1}^k I_{\{s_l < j\}}/k$, by (80)-(82), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i - F\left(\frac{C_j}{\delta_\infty}\right) \right| &\leq \frac{1}{k} \sum_{l=1}^k |I_{\{s_l < j\}} - I_{\{s_l^* < j\}}| + \frac{1}{k} \left| \sum_{l=1}^k z_l^j \right| \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{k} \sum_{l=1}^k \left| F\left(\frac{C_j}{\delta_l^*}\right) - F\left(\frac{C_j}{\delta_\infty}\right) \right| \\ &= O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log k \log \log k}{k}}\right), \quad \text{a.s.} \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

Without loss of generality, we suppose that $C_j \neq 0$. Then, by (13) and the mean value theorem [47], for $\hat{\delta}_k^j$ given by the ML-type algorithm, where $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$, there exists a point $\psi_{k,2}^j$ between $\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i$ and $F(C_j/\delta_\infty)$ such that $\hat{\delta}_k^j - \delta_\infty = \delta_\infty g(\psi_{k,2}^j)(F(C_j/\delta_\infty) - \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i)/F^{-1}(\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} S_k^i)$. Similarly to the Section V-C, one can get

$$|\hat{\delta}_k^j - \delta_\infty| = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log k \log \log k}{k}}\right), \quad \text{a.s.},$$

where the above formula can be proven similarly when $C_j = 0$. Since the positive constant c is sufficiently small, we assume $\delta_\infty \in (c, 1/c)$. Then, by (12) and Lemma 5.4, for $\hat{\delta}_k$ given by the ML-type algorithm, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{\delta}_k - \delta_\infty| &\leq \|\hat{\mu}_k\| \left\| \left[\hat{\delta}_k^1 - \delta_\infty, \hat{\delta}_k^2 - \delta_\infty, \dots, \hat{\delta}_k^m - \delta_\infty \right] \right\| \\ &= O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log k \log \log k}{k}}\right), \quad \text{a.s.} \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

Part 2 : Establish the almost sure convergence of the WLS-type algorithm and the DM-type algorithm.

Similarly to Proposition 3.1, when $m_k \geq \kappa$, one can get

$$\mathbb{E}[s_l^* \varphi_l] = \rho(\delta_l^*) \mathbb{E}[\varphi_l \varphi_l^T] h = \rho(\delta_l^*) \mathbf{H} h,$$

where $\mathbf{H} = \text{diag}(H, H, \dots, H) \in \mathbb{R}^{n(\kappa+1) \times n(\kappa+1)}$. For simplicity, the analysis below assumes $m_k \geq \kappa$ and omits further emphasis on this point.

Using the mean value theorem [47], there exists a point $\psi_{k,3}^{j,l}$ between δ_l^* and δ_∞ such that $\rho(\delta_l^*) - \rho(\delta_\infty) = \dot{\rho}(\psi_{k,3}^{j,l})(\delta_l^* - \delta_\infty)$, where $|\dot{\rho}(\psi_{k,3}^{j,l})|$ has a uniform bound. For $l > m_k$, (79) follows that $|\rho(\delta_l^*) - \rho(\delta_\infty)| = O(1/k^8)$, and for $1 \leq l \leq m_k$, $|\rho(\delta_l^*) - \rho(\delta_\infty)| = O(1)$. Note that

$$\|\varphi_l\| = O(1), \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Then, we have

$$\left\| \sum_{l=1}^k (\rho(\delta_l^*) - \rho(\delta_\infty)) \varphi_l \varphi_l^T h \right\| = O(\log k), \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (85)$$

Define $x_l^* \triangleq s_l^* \varphi_l - \rho(\delta_l^*) \varphi_l \varphi_l^T h$. Then, $\sum_{l=1}^k x_l^*$ can be expressed as $\sum_{u=1}^{m_k} \sum_{v=0}^{\lceil k/m_k \rceil} x_{u+vm_k}^*$, where we stipulate that $x_w^* = 0$ for $w > k$. Since for $u = 1, 2, \dots, m_k$, each sequence $\{x_{u+vm_k}^*\}_{v=1}^{\lceil k/m_k \rceil}$ is an iid sequence with finite variance, the law of the iterated logarithm [44] implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{l=1}^k x_l^* \right\| &= O\left(m_k \sqrt{\frac{k}{m_k} \log \log \left(\frac{k}{m_k}\right)}\right), \quad \text{a.s.} \\ &= O\left(\sqrt{k \log k \log \log k}\right), \quad \text{a.s.} \end{aligned} \quad (86)$$

Besides, by (78), for any positive constant ε_2 , we have $\mathbb{P}(\left|\sum_{l=1}^k s_l^* \varphi_l - \sum_{l=1}^k s_l \varphi_l\right| > \varepsilon_2) \leq \sum_{l=1}^k \mathbb{P}(s_l \neq s_l^*) = O(1/k^2)$. By the Borel-Cantelli Lemma [48], it holds that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \sum_{l=1}^k s_l^* \varphi_l - \sum_{l=1}^k s_l \varphi_l \right\| = 0, \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (87)$$

By (85)-(87), similarly with the approach of (83), one can get

$$\left\| \sum_{l=1}^k s_l \varphi_l - \rho(\delta_\infty) \varphi_l \varphi_l^T h \right\| = O\left(\sqrt{\log k \log \log k}\right), \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Note that $\sum_{l=1}^k \varphi_l \varphi_l^T = \sum_{u=1}^{\kappa+1} \sum_{v=0}^{\lceil k/(\kappa+1) \rceil} \varphi_{u+v(\kappa+1)} \varphi_{u+v(\kappa+1)}^T$, where we stipulate that $\varphi_w = 0$ for $w > k$. Then, since for $u = 1, 2, \dots, \kappa+1$, each sequence $\{\varphi_{u+v(\kappa+1)} \varphi_{u+v(\kappa+1)}^T\}_{v=1}^{\lceil k/(\kappa+1) \rceil}$ is an iid sequence with finite variance, the law of the iterated logarithm [44] implies that $\sum_{l=1}^k \varphi_l \varphi_l^T / k$ converges to \mathbf{H} almost surely, which indicates that $\|k(\sum_{l=1}^k \varphi_l \varphi_l^T)^{-1}\|$ converges to $\|\mathbf{H}^{-1}\|$ almost surely. Thus, for P_k given by the WLS-type algorithm, by $\|P_k\| \leq \|(\sum_{l=1}^k \varphi_l \varphi_l^T)^{-1}\| / \underline{\beta}$, we have (72) holds. Then, for $\hat{\gamma}_k$ given by the WLS-type algorithm, similarly to the Section V-C, one can get

$$|\hat{\gamma}_k - \rho(\delta_\infty)\theta| = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log k \log \log k}{k}}\right), \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Together with (84), similarly to the proof of Theorem 3.2, we obtain

$$\|\hat{h}_k - h\| = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log k \log \log k}{k}}\right), \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Finally, by Proposition 4.1, similarly with the proof of Theorem 2 in [13], it holds that (34) holds.

The proof is completed.

VI. NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

This section will illustrate the theoretical results with simulation examples.

Example 1: Consider a linear system with the quantized observation as:

$$y_k = \phi_k^T \theta + d_k, \quad s_k = I_{\{y_k \leq 0\}} + I_{\{y_k \leq 1\}},$$

where the unknown parameter is $\theta = [0.2, -0.1, 0.5]^T$; the system noise d_k follows $\mathcal{N}(0, 0.25)$; the system input ϕ_k follows $\mathcal{N}(0_3, H)$, where

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} 2.5 & 0.6 & -0.4 \\ -0.6 & 2 & 0.6 \\ -0.4 & 0.6 & 1.5 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Here we apply the ML-type algorithm and the WLS-type algorithm to give the estimates, initializing with $P_0 = I_3/10$ and $\hat{\gamma} = [0, 0, 0]^T$, and using weight coefficients $\beta_k \equiv 1$ and projection operator parameters $c = 10^{-6}$ and $c^* = 10^{-6}$. Figure 2 illustrates the estimates given by the WLS-type algorithm, demonstrating the boundedness of the trajectory of $\sqrt{k} \log \log k \|\hat{\theta}_k\|$, which indicates almost sure convergence with a convergence rate of $O(\sqrt{\log \log k/k})$.

Besides, we conducted 200 Monte Carlo simulations to compare the mean square error (MSE) of the WLS-type algorithm with the variationally optimal approximation (VOA) method introduced in [31]. Additionally, we performed 1000 Monte Carlo trials to give the sample $\text{tr}(H^{-1} \Lambda H^{-1} / (\rho(\delta_y))^2)$, which serves as the theoretical limit of the MSE of the WLS-type algorithm.

As illustrated in Figure 2, the trajectory of the $k \mathbb{E}[\hat{\theta}_k^T \hat{\theta}_k]$ converges to the $\text{tr}(H^{-1} \Lambda H^{-1} / (\rho(\delta_y))^2)$. Furthermore, Figure 2 demonstrates that while the MSE of the WLS-type algorithm is initially higher than that of the VOA method, it surpasses the VOA in performance as iterations proceed. This result is consistent with the analysis in [31], where it was shown that the VOA method might fail to achieve an MSE convergence rate of $O(1/k)$.




Fig. 2. Convergence of the WLS-type algorithm for estimating θ

In addition, the convergence of the ML-type algorithm is shown in Figure 3, demonstrating $\hat{\delta}_k$ converges to $\hat{\delta}_y$ almost surely with the convergence rate of $O(\sqrt{\log \log k/k})$ and is an asymptotically efficient estimate for estimating the variance of Gaussian variables based on quantized observations.




Fig. 3. Convergence of the ML-type algorithm for estimating $\hat{\delta}_y$

Example 2: Consider an OE system with the quantized observation as:

$$y_k = (b_0 + b_1 z + b_2 z^2) \phi_k / (1 + a_1 z) + d_k,$$

$$s_k = I_{\{y_k \leq 1.5\}},$$

where the unknown parameter is $\theta^* = [a_1, b_0, b_1, b_2]^T = [0.2, 1, -0.2, 0.6]^T$; the system noise d_k follows $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$; the system input ϕ_k follows $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.

We employ DM-type algorithms to obtain parameter estimates. Figure 4 illustrates the convergence of the DM-type algorithm, showing almost sure convergence with a rate of $O(\sqrt{\log k \log \log k/k})$. To evaluate its estimation accuracy, we perform 200 simulations comparing it with the stochastic approximation algorithm with expanding truncations (SAAWET) from [13]. The results in Figure 4 indicate that the DM-type algorithm, leveraging second-order information, achieves better MSE near the convergence point. In contrast, while SAAWET can converge to a minimum using single-sample updates, its reliance on first-order information prevents it from attaining an MSE convergence rate of $O(1/k)$.

VII. CONCLUSION

This paper introduces a WLS-type criterion for quantized identification problems and proposes a corresponding unified recursive identification algorithm. This identification algorithm can adapt to noisy and noise-free scenarios under fixed thresholds and Gaussian inputs. Under mild conditions, the convergence properties of this identification algorithm are established. Moreover, this algorithm offers an asymptotically efficient estimation of the variance of Gaussian variables based on quantized observations. Furthermore, the proposed methods and results are extended to OE systems.




Fig. 4. Convergence of the DM-type algorithm for estimating θ^*

Here we give some topics for future research. Firstly, the design of the weight coefficients is left as an open question. Second, how can we assess the explicit expression of the asymptotic variance? Thirdly, how can we remove the Gaussian restriction of the input and noise?

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Anwar, "An anti-lock braking control system for a hybrid electromagnetic/electrohydraulic brake-by-wire system," in *Proc. Amer. Control Conf.*, vol. 3, pp. 2699–2704, 2004.
- [2] J. Sun, Y. W. Kim, and L. Wang, "Aftertreatment control and adaptation for automotive lean burn engines with HEGO sensors," *Int. J. Adapt. Control Signal Process.*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 145–166, 2004.
- [3] X. Cai, K. Shi, S. Zhong, and X. Pang, "Dissipative sampled-data control for high-speed train systems with quantized measurements," *IEEE Trans. Intell. Transp. Syst.*, vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 5314–5325, 2021.
- [4] B. Jiang, H. Dong, Z. Gao, Y. Shen, and F. Yang, "Linear-fitting-based recursive filtering for nonlinear systems under encoding-decoding mechanism," *Sci. China Inf. Sci.*, vol. 67, no. 5, pp. 1–14, 2024.
- [5] A. Ghysen, "The origin and evolution of the nervous system," *Int. J. Dev. Biol.*, vol. 47, no. 7–8, pp. 555–562, 2003.
- [6] L. Y. Wang, J. F. Zhang, and G. G. Yin, "System identification using binary sensors," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 48, no. 11, pp. 1892–1907, 2003.
- [7] J. Guo, L. Y. Wang, G. Yin, Y. L. Zhao, and J. F. Zhang, "Asymptotically efficient identification of FIR systems with quantized observations and general quantized inputs," *Automatica*, vol. 57, pp. 113–122, 2015.
- [8] L. Y. Wang and G. G. Yin, "Asymptotically efficient parameter estimation using quantized output observations," *Automatica*, vol. 43, no. 7, pp. 1178–1191, 2007.
- [9] B. I. Godoy, G. C. Goodwin, J. C. Agüero, D. Marelli, and T. Wigren, "On identification of FIR systems having quantized output data," *Automatica*, vol. 47, no. 9, pp. 1905–1915, 2011.
- [10] D. Marelli, K. You, and M. Fu, "Identification of ARMA models using intermittent and quantized output observations," *Automatica*, vol. 49, no. 2, pp. 360–369, 2013.
- [11] Y. Zhao, W. Bi, and T. Wang, "Iterative parameter estimate with batched binary-valued observations," *Sci. China Inf. Sci.*, vol. 59, no. 5, pp. 1–18, 2016.
- [12] J. Guo and Y. Zhao, "Recursive projection algorithm on FIR system identification with binary-valued observations," *Automatica*, vol. 49, no. 11, pp. 3396–3401, 2013.
- [13] Q. Song, "Recursive identification of systems with binary-valued outputs and with ARMA noises," *Automatica*, vol. 93, pp. 106–113, 2018.
- [14] Z. Huang and Q. Song, "Identification of linear systems using binary sensors with random thresholds," *J. Syst. Sci. Complex.*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 907–923, 2024.

- [15] T. Wang, X. Li, J. Guo, and Y. L. Zhao, "Identification of ARMA models with binary-valued observations," *Automatica*, vol. 149, 2023, Art. no. 110832.
- [16] L. T. Zhang, Y. L. Zhao, and L. Guo, "Identification and adaptation with binary-valued observations under non-persistent excitation condition," *Automatica*, vol. 138, 2022, Art. no. 110158.
- [17] Y. Wang, Y. Zhao, and J. F. Zhang, "Asymptotically efficient quasi-newton type identification with quantized observations under bounded persistent excitations," *Automatica*, vol. 166, 2024, Art. no. 111722.
- [18] Y. Wang, X. Li, Y. L. Zhao, and J. F. Zhang, "Threshold selection and resource allocation for quantized identification," *J. Syst. Sci. Complex.*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 204–229, 2024.
- [19] M. Casini, A. Garulli, and A. Vicino, "Time complexity and input design in worst-case identification using binary sensors," in *Proc. 46th IEEE Conf. Decis. Control*, pp. 5528–5533, 2007.
- [20] M. Casini, A. Garulli, and A. Vicino, "Input design in worst-case system identification using binary sensors," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 56, no. 5, pp. 1186–1191, 2011.
- [21] B. C. Csáji and E. Weyer, "Recursive estimation of ARX systems using binary sensors with adjustable thresholds," in *Proc. 16th IFAC Symp. Syst. Identif.*, vol. 45, pp. 1185–1190, 2012.
- [22] W. Zhao, H. F. Chen, R. Tempo, and F. Dabbene, "Recursive nonparametric identification of nonlinear systems with adaptive binary sensors," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 62, no. 8, pp. 3959–3971, 2017.
- [23] K. You, "Recursive algorithms for parameter estimation with adaptive quantizer," *Automatica*, vol. 52, pp. 192–201, 2015.
- [24] Y. Wang, Y. L. Zhao, J. F. Zhang, and J. Guo, "A unified identification algorithm of FIR systems based on binary observations with time-varying thresholds," *Automatica*, vol. 135, 2022, Art. no. 109990.
- [25] T. Wigren, "Adaptive filtering using quantized output measurements," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 46, no. 12, pp. 3423–3426, 1998.
- [26] E. Colinet and J. Juillard, "A weighted least-squares approach to parameter estimation problems based on binary measurements," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 148–152, 2009.
- [27] K. Jafari, J. Juillard, and M. Roger, "Convergence analysis of an online approach to parameter estimation problems based on binary observations," *Automatica*, vol. 48, no. 11, pp. 2837–2842, 2012.
- [28] A. Mestrah, H. Oualla, M. Pouliquen, and E. Pigeon, "An identification algorithm for fir systems from binary output measurements," in *Proc. 9th Int. Conf. Control, Decis. Inf. Technol.*, pp. 1826–1831, 2023.
- [29] G. Bottegal, H. Hjalmarsson, and G. Pillonetto, "A new kernel-based approach to system identification with quantized output data," *Automatica*, vol. 85, pp. 145–152, 2017.
- [30] Y. L. Zhao, H. Zhang, T. Wang, and G. Kang, "System identification under saturated precise or set-valued measurements," *Sci. China Inf. Sci.*, vol. 66, 2023, Art. no. 112204.
- [31] R. S. Risuleo, G. Bottegal, and H. Hjalmarsson, "Identification of linear models from quantized data: a midpoint-projection approach," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 65, no. 7, pp. 2801–2813, 2020.
- [32] H. F. Chen and G. Yin, "Asymptotic properties of sign algorithms for adaptive filtering," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 48, no. 9, pp. 1545–1556, 2003.
- [33] L. Ljung, *System identification, theory for the user (2nd ed.)*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1999.
- [34] N. J. Bershad, E. Eweda, and J. C. M. Bermudez, "Stochastic analysis of the lms and nlms algorithms for cyclostationary white gaussian inputs," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 62, no. 9, pp. 2238–2249, 2014.
- [35] S. Rangan, "Generalized approximate message passing for estimation with random linear mixing," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory*, pp. 2168–2172, 2011.
- [36] S. Jacobsson, G. Durisi, M. Coldrey, and C. Studer, "Linear precoding with low-resolution dacs for massive mu-mimo-ofdm downlink," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 1595–1609, 2019.
- [37] A. Grancharova, J. Kocijan, and T. A. Johansen, "Explicit stochastic predictive control of combustion plants based on gaussian process models," *Automatica*, vol. 44, no. 6, pp. 1621–1631, 2008.
- [38] M. Shao, W. K. Ma, J. Liu, and Z. Huang, "Accelerated and deep expectation maximization for one-bit mimo-ofdm detection," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 72, pp. 1094–1113, 2024.
- [39] A. W. Van der Vaart, *Asymptotic statistics*. Cambridge university press, 2000.
- [40] D. G. Luenberger, *Optimization by vector space methods*. New York, NY, USA: Wiley, 1969.
- [41] H. F. Chen and L. Guo, "Convergence rate of least-squares identification and adaptive control for stochastic systems," *International Journal of Control*, vol. 44, no. 5, pp. 1459–1476, 1986.
- [42] J. Durbin, "The fitting of time-series models," *Revue l'Institut Int. Statistique*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 233–244, 1960.
- [43] V. Romanovsky, "Note on the moments of a binomial $(p + q)n$ about its mean," *Biometrika*, vol. 15, no. 3/4, pp. 410–412, 1923.
- [44] K. L. Chung, *A Course in Probability Theory (3rd ed.)*. New York, NY, USA: Academic, 2001.
- [45] R. M. Latif and A. H. Joarder, "Moments and identities involving inverted wishart distribution," *WSEAS Trans. Math.*, vol. 19, pp. 139–153, 2020.
- [46] Y. S. Chow and H. Teicher, *Probability theory: independence, interchangeability, martingales (3rd ed.)*. New York, NY, USA: Springer-Verlag, 2012.
- [47] V. A. Zorich and O. Paniagua, *Mathematical analysis I (2nd ed.)*. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer, 2016.
- [48] R. B. Ash, *Real Analysis and Probability*. New York, NY, USA: Academic, 1972.
- [49] M. Loève, *Probability Theory, Volumes I and II (4th ed.)*. New York, NY, USA: Springer-Verlag, 1977.
- [50] W. Zhao and H. F. Chen, "Markov chain approach to identifying wiener systems," *Sci. China Inf. Sci.*, vol. 55, pp. 1201–1217, 2012.



Xingrui Liu received the B.S. degree in statistics from Shandong University, Jinan, China, in 2022. He is working toward a Ph.D. in system science at the Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science (AMSS), Chinese Academy of Science (CAS), Beijing, China.

His research interests include the identification of quantized systems and information theory.



Ying Wang (Member, IEEE) received the B.S. degree in mathematics from Wuhan University, Wuhan, China, in 2017, and the Ph.D. degree in systems theory from the Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science (AMSS), Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS), Beijing, China, in 2022.

She is currently a Postdoctoral Research Associate with AMSS, CAS, and KTH Royal Institute of Technology. Her research interests include the identification and control of quantized systems and multiagent systems.



Yanlong Zhao (Senior Member, IEEE) received the B.S. degree in mathematics from Shandong University, Jinan, China, in 2002, and the Ph.D. degree in systems theory from the Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science (AMSS), Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS), Beijing, China, in 2007.

Since 2007, he has been with the AMSS, CAS, where he is currently a full Professor. His research interests include the identification and control of quantized systems and information theory and modelling of financial systems.

Dr. Zhao has been a Deputy Editor-in-Chief of *Journal of Systems Science and Complexity*, an Associate Editor for *Automatica*, *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, and *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics: Systems*. He was a Vice-President of Asian Control Association and a Vice-President of IEEE CSS Beijing Chapter, and is now a Vice General Secretary of Chinese Association of Automation (CAA) and the Chair of Technical Committee on Control Theory, CAA.