# Leveraging Non-Steady-State Frequency-Domain Data in Willems' Fundamental Lemma

T. J. Meijer, M. Wind, V. S. Dolk, and W. P. M. H. Heemels

Abstract— Willems' fundamental lemma enables data-driven analysis and control by characterizing an unknown system's behavior directly in terms of measured data. In this work, we extend a recent frequency-domain variant of this result– previously limited to steady-state data-to incorporate nonsteady-state data including transient phenomena. This approach eliminates the need to wait for transients to decay during data collection, significantly reducing the experiment duration. Unlike existing frequency-domain system identification methods, our approach integrates transient data without preprocessing, making it well-suited for direct data-driven analysis and control. We demonstrate its effectiveness by isolating transients in the collected data and performing FRF evaluation at arbitrary frequencies in a numerical case study including noise.

#### I. INTRODUCTION

Willems' fundamental lemma (WFL) [1] states that all finite-length input-output trajectories of an unknown linear time-invariant (LTI) system can be fully characterized using a single input-output trajectory, provided that the input sequence is persistently exciting (PE). This result has been instrumental in system identification through subspace methods [2], [3] and has more recently enabled significant advances in data-driven analysis and control. Notable applications of WFL include data-driven simulation [4], state-feedback control [5]-[8], and data-driven predictive control [9], [10]. The success of WFL has also led to extensions for broader system classes, including linear parametervarying systems [11], descriptor systems [12], stochastic systems [13], [14], continuous-time systems [15], and various nonlinear systems [16], [17]. For a more comprehensive overview, we refer the reader to [13, Table 1].

Recently, a frequency-domain version of Willems' fundamental lemma (FD-WFL) was introduced in [18], [19] and applied to data-driven analysis and control, including frequency-domain data-driven predictive control (FreePC) [18]. Unlike the original WFL and its associated data-driven methods, which rely on time-domain data, FD-WFL utilizes frequency-domain data, such as frequencyresponse-function (FRF) measurements, to characterize the behavior of an unknown system. This enables FD-WFL to exploit the abundance of frequency-domain data that is available after decades of working with classical frequencydomain (loop-shaping) control techniques, and to use the available expertise on collecting, interpreting and exploiting such data for control purposes. Importantly, FD-WFL achieves this without the need to turn the frequency-domain data into a parametric (state-space) model. Another benefit of using frequency-domain data is that, compared to timedomain data, it is typically more dense in information, leading to smaller data sets, and we can work with easilycomputable and interpretable uncertainty descriptions [20]. Opposed to time-domain WFL (TD-WFL), FD-WFL in its current form can deal with steady-state data only. In practice, this limitation can be mitigated by pre-stabilizing the system if necessary and conducting sufficiently-long experiments in which transient effects have damped out and can effectively be ignored. While this approach-commonly used in practice for frequency-domain system identification, see, e.g., [20]-is straightforward and often effective, it can be time-consuming and costly, especially for systems with slow time constants [21]. This challenge contrasts sharply with the increasing demands for higher productivity and throughput in many industrial applications, see, e.g., [22].

To overcome this limitation, we introduce an extension of FD-WFL that can effectively deal with transient phenomena. This extension, thereby, provides a rigorous mathematical framework for describing an unknown system's behavior using non-steady-state frequency-domain data, which can be used directly by many state-of-the-art data-driven analysis and control methods, such as, e.g., FreePC [18], [23]. Consequently, we are able to establish formal theoretical guarantees for these methods also when using non-steady-state data, which eliminates the need to wait for transients to decay and, thereby, significantly reduces experiment duration. To demonstrate their usefulness for data-driven analysis and control, we apply our results to data-driven FRF and transient evaluation, for which we also present a numerical case study. This application complements the FRF evaluation method based on time-domain data presented in [24].

In system identification literature, various methods have been proposed to handle transient frequency-domain data, including the local polynomial method (LPM) [20], [21], [25] and subspace identification methods [26]. However, by embedding non-steady-state data directly within FD-WFL, our approach eliminates the need for additional processing steps, making it well-suited for direct data-driven analysis and control.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section II introduces some notation and relevant preliminaries.

This research received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the Advanced ERC grant agreement PROACTHIS, no. 101055384.

The authors are with the Control Systems Technology Section, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Eindhoven University of Technology, P.O. Box 513, 5600 MB Eindhoven, The Netherlands. t.j.meijer@tue.nl, m.wind@tue.nl, v.s.dolk@tue.nl, m.heemels@tue.nl

In Section III, we formalize the problem solved in the present paper. Next, Section IV presents an extension of the frequency-domain WFL to incorporate transient data, which constitutes our main contributions. Subsequently, Sections V and VI present, respectively, an application of this result to data-driven frequency-response-function evaluation and a numerical case study thereof. Finally, we provide some conclusions in Section VII and the proofs of our results in the Apppendix.

#### II. NOTATION AND PRELIMINARIES

Let  $\mathbb{R}$  denote the field of reals,  $\mathbb{C}$  the complex plane, and  $\mathbb{Z}$  the integers. We denote  $\mathbb{Z}_{[m,n]} = \{m, m+1, \ldots, n\}$  and  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq m} = \{m, m+1, \ldots\}$ , where  $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $n \geq m$ . The imaginary unit is denoted j, i.e.,  $j^2 = -1$ . For a complex-valued matrix  $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$ ,  $A^{\top}$ ,  $A^{\mathsf{H}}$ , and  $A^*$  are its transpose, its complex-conjugate transpose, and its complex conjugate.

For any complex-valued function  $v : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{C}^{n_v}$ , let

$$v_{[r,s]} \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix} v_r^{\mathsf{H}} & v_{r+1}^{\mathsf{H}} & \dots & v_s^{\mathsf{H}} \end{bmatrix}^{\mathsf{H}}$$

denote the vectorized restriction of v to the interval  $\mathbb{Z}_{[r,s]}$ . With some abuse of notation, we also use  $v_{[r,s]}$  to refer to the sequence  $\{v_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[r,s]}}$ . Similarly, we use  $0_{[r,s]}$  to refer to the length-s - r + 1 sequence of null vectors of appropriate dimensions or their vectorized form

$$0_{[r,s]} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix}^\top$$

depending on the context. Finally,  $0_{m \times n}$  denotes the *m*-by-*n* zero matrix,  $\otimes$  denotes the Kronecker product, and  $\lceil \cdot \rceil$  the ceiling function.

#### A. Persistence of excitation in frequency domain

Let  $\{\hat{\omega}_k^M\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}}$  be the *equidistant*<sup>1</sup> frequency grid with

$$\hat{\omega}_k^M = \frac{\pi k}{M} \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}.$$
(1)

Next, we recall the notion of persistence of excitation [18], [23] for the *spectrum*  $S_{[0,M-1]}$ , with  $S_k \in \mathbb{C}^{n_s}$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}$ , obtained by sampling the discrete-time Fourier transform (DTFT) of a time-domain sequence  $\{s_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$  of  $n_s$ -dimensional vectors  $s_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_s}$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ , at the frequencies  $\hat{\omega}_{[0,M-1]}^M$ , i.e.,

$$S_k = S(\hat{\omega}_k^M) \coloneqq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} s_n e^{-j\hat{\omega}_k^M n} \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0, M-1]}.$$
(2)

Since the sequence  $\{s_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$  is real-valued,  $S(\omega)$  is symmetric, i.e.,  $S(-\omega) = S^*(\omega)$  for all  $\omega \in [0, \pi)$ . For  $L \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ ,  $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  with  $n \geq m$ , let  $F_L : \mathbb{C}^{n_s(n-m+1)} \to \mathbb{C}^{n_sL \times (n-m+1)}$  be the function of  $S_{[m,n]}$  given by

$$F_L(S_{[m,n]}) = \begin{bmatrix} W_L(e^{j\hat{\omega}_m^M}) \otimes S_m & \dots & W_L(e^{j\hat{\omega}_n^M}) \otimes S_n \end{bmatrix}$$

<sup>1</sup>The preliminary results introduced in Section II also apply to non-equidistant grids [27].

where  $W_L(z) := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & z & \dots & z^{L-1} \end{bmatrix}^\top$ ,  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ , and, similarly, let  $\Psi_L : \mathbb{C}^{n_s(n-m+1)} \to \mathbb{C}^{n_sL \times (2(n-m)+1)}$  be the matrix-valued function of  $S_{[m,n]}$  given by

$$\Psi_L(S_{[m,n]}) = \begin{bmatrix} F_L(S_{[m,n]}) & F_L^*(S_{[m+1,n]}) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Using  $F_L$ , we recall the notion of PE for the complexvalued sequence  $S_{[0,M-1]}$  [18], [23].

**Definition 1.** The spectrum  $S_{[0,M-1]}$  is said to be persistently exciting of order  $L \in \mathbb{Z}_{[1,2M-1]}$ , if the matrix  $\Psi_L(S_{[0,M-1]})$  has full row rank.

Observe that Definition 1 exploits the symmetry of  $S(\hat{\omega}_k^M)$ by including also  $F_L^*(S_{[1,M-1]})$  in  $\Psi_L(S_{[0,M-1]})$ . Consequently, using M frequencies, we can achieve up to  $(2M - 1)/n_s$  orders of PE, i.e.,  $L \leq (2M - 1)/n_s$ .

**Remark 1.** As detailed in [23], the conjugate symmetry in  $\Psi_L(S_{[0,M-1]})$  allows it to be transformed to the real-valued matrix

$$\left[\operatorname{Re}(F_L(S_{[0,M-1]})) \quad \operatorname{Im}(F_L(S_{[1,M-1]}))\right]$$

which can be beneficial for certain numerical solvers. Hence, Definition 1 and other results in the sequel can be equivalently formulated in terms of real-valued matrices.

#### B. Frequency-domain Willems' fundamental lemma

Next, we recall the frequency-domain version of WFL presented in [18], [23]. To this end, we consider discrete-time LTI systems, governed by

$$\Sigma : \begin{cases} x_{k+1} = Ax_k + Bu_k, \tag{3a} \end{cases}$$

$$\bigcup_{k} y_k = Cx_k + Du_k, \tag{3b}$$

where  $x_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ ,  $u_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ , and  $y_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y}$  denote, respectively, the state, input, and output at time  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . The system (3), i.e., the quadruplet of matrices (A, B, C, D), is unknown. Let  $\ell_{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{Z}_{[1,n_x]}$  denote the observability index of  $\Sigma$ , given by

$$\ell_{\Sigma} = \min \arg \max_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} \operatorname{rank} \mathcal{O}_k,$$

where  $\mathcal{O}_k$  denotes the k-step observability matrix, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{O}_k = \begin{bmatrix} C^\top & (CA)^\top & \dots & (CA^{k-1})^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top.$$
(4)

**Assumption 1.** The pair (A, B), is controllable.

Below, we formalize when two *trajectories*  $u_{[0,N-1]}$  and  $y_{[0,N-1]}$  of length  $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$  are a solution to  $\Sigma$ .

**Definition 2.** A pair of trajectories  $(u_{[0,N-1]}, y_{[0,N-1]})$  is called an input-output trajectory of  $\Sigma$  in (3), if there exists a state sequence  $x_{[0,N-1]}$  satisfying (3a) for  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,N-2]}$  and (3b) for  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,N-1]}$ .

Similarly, let us formalize *steady-state* frequency-domain solutions to  $\Sigma$ , which are used as data in FD-WFL [23].

**Definition 3.** A pair of spectra  $(U_{[0,M-1]}, Y_{[0,M-1]})$  is called a steady-state input-output spectrum of  $\Sigma$ , if there exists a state spectrum  $X_{[0,M-1]}$  satisfying

$$e^{j\hat{\omega}_{k}^{M}}X_{k} = AX_{k} + BU_{k},$$
  

$$Y_{k} = CX_{k} + DU_{k},$$
(5)

for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}$ . In that case, the triplet  $(U_{[0,M-1]}, X_{[0,M-1]}, Y_{[0,M-1]})$  is called a steady-state input-state-output spectrum of  $\Sigma$ .

Definition 3 does not account for any transient phenomena in (5) and, therefore, these solutions are referred to as *steady-state* input-(state-)output spectra. By eliminating  $X_k$ from (5), it can be seen that Definition 3 includes the important special case where we are given data in the form of  $M \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$  FRF measurements  $\{H(e^{j\hat{\omega}_k^M})\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}}$ (see [23, Example 1]), where  $H : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}^{n_y \times n_u}$  denotes the transfer function of  $\Sigma$  given by

$$H(z) = C(zI - A)^{-1}B + D, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}.$$
 (6)

We are now ready to recall FD-WFL based on steady-state frequency-domain data [18], [23], below.

**Lemma 1.** Let  $(\hat{U}_{[0,M-1]}, \hat{X}_{[0,M-1]}, \hat{Y}_{[0,M-1]})$  be a steadystate input-state-output spectrum of  $\Sigma$  in (3) satisfying Assumption 1. Suppose that  $\hat{U}_{[0,M-1]}$  is PE of order  $L + n_x$ . Then, the following statements hold:

(i) The matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Psi_1(\hat{X}_{[0,M-1]}) \\ \Psi_L(\hat{U}_{[0,M-1]}) \end{bmatrix}$$

has full row rank;

(ii) The pair of trajectories  $(u_{[0,L-1]}, y_{[0,L-1]})$  is an inputoutput trajectory of  $\Sigma$ , if and only if there exist  $G_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and  $G_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{M-1}$  such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} u_{[0,L-1]} \\ y_{[0,L-1]} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} F_L(\hat{U}_{[0,M-1]}) & F_L^*(\hat{U}_{[1,M-1]}) \\ F_L(\hat{Y}_{[0,M-1]}) & F_L^*(\hat{Y}_{[1,M-1]}) \end{bmatrix} \begin{vmatrix} G_0 \\ G_1 \\ G_1 \\ G_1 \end{vmatrix}$$

An extension of Lemma 1, which is particularly useful when dealing with MIMO systems, that allows for the careful combination of multiple data sets, i.e., multiple input-output spectra, is also presented in [23].

#### **III. PROBLEM STATEMENT**

In general, Lemma 1 requires infinitely-long measurements because the DTFT (2) runs from  $-\infty$  to  $\infty$ . This problem is also mentioned in [18], [19], [23]. In practice, this is often mitigated by waiting for transient phenomena to decay and, subsequently, collecting data that is (approximately) periodic. In this paper, we instead formulate an extension of FD-WFL that directly applies to non-steady-state data. This not only eliminates the need to wait for transients to decay during data collection, but it also provides a formal mathematical treatment of transient data. To formally state this problem, we consider the discrete Fourier transform (DFT)

$$S_k = S(\hat{\omega}_k^M) \coloneqq \sum_{n=0}^{2M-1} s_n e^{-j\hat{\omega}_k^M n} \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]},$$
(7)

which, in contrast with (2) on which Lemma 1 is based, only requires a finite-length data sequence to compute. Here, we recall that  $\{\hat{\omega}_k^M\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}}$  are the equidistant frequencies in (1). Applying (7) to (3a) yields

$$AX_{k} + BU_{k} = \sum_{n=0}^{2M-1} x_{n+1} e^{-j\hat{\omega}_{k}^{M}n} = \sum_{n=1}^{2M} x_{n} e^{-j\hat{\omega}_{k}^{M}(n-1)},$$
  
$$= e^{j\hat{\omega}_{k}^{M}} X_{k} - x_{0} e^{j\hat{\omega}_{k}^{M}} + x_{2M} e^{-j\hat{\omega}_{k}^{M}(2M-1)},$$
  
$$\stackrel{(1)}{=} e^{j\hat{\omega}_{k}^{M}} \left(X_{k} + x_{2M} - x_{0}\right), \quad (8)$$

where  $X_k = \sum_{n=0}^{2M-1} x_n e^{-j\hat{\omega}_k^M n}$  and  $U_k = \sum_{n=0}^{2M-1} u_n e^{-j\hat{\omega}_k^M n}$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}$ . This relation leads to the following notion of an input-output spectrum, in which the output equation is unchanged with respect to Definition 3.

**Definition 4.** A pair of spectra  $(U_{[0,M-1]}, Y_{[0,M-1]})$  is called an input-output spectrum of  $\Sigma$ , if there exists a state sequence  $\{x_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,2M]}}$  such that the state spectrum  $X_{[0,M-1]}$ , with  $X_k = \sum_{n=0}^{2M-1} x_n e^{-j\hat{\omega}_k^M n}$  for  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}$ , satisfies  $e^{j\hat{\omega}_k^M} X_k = AX_k + BU_k + e^{j\hat{\omega}_k^M} (x_0 - x_{2M}),$  $Y_k = CX_k + DU_k,$  (9)

for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}$ . In that case, the triplet  $(U_{[0,M-1]}, X_{[0,M-1]}, Y_{[0,M-1]})$  is called an input-stateoutput spectrum of  $\Sigma$ .

Compared to the steady-state input-(state-)output spectra defined in Definition 3, (9) contains an additional term  $e^{j\hat{w}_k^M}(x_0 - x_{2M})$ , which is not accounted for in Lemma 1. While  $x_0$  and  $x_{2M}$  appear in both (8) and Definition 4, they are assumed to be unknown in the sequel, i.e., our data consists only of the input-(state-)output spectra  $(\hat{U}_k, \hat{X}_k, \hat{Y}_k)$ themselves. Observe that, for 2*M*-periodic data, i.e.,  $x_0 = x_{2M}$ , we recover Definition 3 as a special case. Moreover, by eliminating  $X_k$  from (9), we find that the output data satisfies

$$Y_k = H(e^{j\hat{\omega}_k^M})U_k + T(e^{j\hat{\omega}_k^M}),$$

where *H* is the transfer function (6) of  $\Sigma$ , and  $T : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}^{n_y}$  is the transient given by

$$T(z) = C(zI - A)^{-1}z(x_0 - x_{2M}).$$
 (10)

The objective of this paper is to characterize the behavior of the unknown system  $\Sigma$  directly in terms of data, similar to TD-WFL and FD-WFL in Lemma 1, where the data consists of non-steady-state input-(state-)output spectra, as defined in Definition 4. We stress once more that  $x_0$  and  $x_{2M}$  are *not* part of the data and, like the matrices A, B, C, and D, are unknown, making the approach in the sequel purely frequency-domain data driven. Additionally, we address the problem of data-driven transfer function and transient evaluation based on non-steady-state frequencydomain data. This enables us to separate the transfer function H(z) in (6) and transient T(z) in (10) contained in the collected data at any desired  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ .

# IV. WILLEMS' FUNDAMENTAL LEMMA USING NON-STEADY-STATE FREQUENCY-DOMAIN DATA

In this section, we extend Lemma 1 to incorporate nonsteady-state data. To this end, we first introduce an augmented system in which we embed the transient and to which we, subsequently, apply Lemma 1.

# A. Augmented system

To be able to deal with frequency-domain data consisting of general non-steady-state input-(state-)output spectra generated by  $\Sigma$ , we first introduce an augmented system  $\tilde{\Sigma}$ . This augmented system, which is inspired by (9), is governed by

$$\tilde{\Sigma} : \begin{cases} x_{k+1} = Ax_k + \tilde{B}v_k, \quad (11a) \\ \tilde{\Sigma} : \tilde{\zeta} = \tilde{\zeta} \end{cases}$$

$$\bigcup y_k = Cx_k + Dv_k, \tag{11b}$$

where  $v_k = (u_k, w_k) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u+1}$  and

$$\tilde{B} := \begin{bmatrix} B & x_0 - x_{2M} \end{bmatrix}$$
$$\tilde{D} := \begin{bmatrix} D & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

In defining  $\tilde{\Sigma}$ , we have embedded the transient phenomena into the *B* matrix by considering  $e^{j\hat{\omega}_k^M}$  as an additional input spectrum. Consequently, the augmented system  $\tilde{\Sigma}$  has some useful properties, as stated below.

# **Lemma 2.** The solutions to $\tilde{\Sigma}$ in (11) satisfy the following:

- (i) The triplet of spectra  $(U_{[0,M-1]}, X_{[0,M-1]}, Y_{[0,M-1]})$ is an input-state-output spectrum of  $\Sigma$ , if and only if  $(V_{[0,M-1]}, X_{[0,M-1]}, Y_{[0,M-1]})$ , with  $V_k = (U_k, \Omega_k)$ and  $\Omega_k = e^{j\hat{\omega}_k^M}$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}$ , is a steady-state input-state-output spectrum of  $\hat{\Sigma}$ ;
- (ii) The triplet of trajectories  $(u_{[0,L-1]}, x_{[0,L-1]}, y_{[0,L-1]})$ is an input-state-output trajectory of  $\Sigma$ , if and only if  $(v_{[0,L-1]}, x_{[0,L-1]}, y_{[0,L-1]})$ , with  $v_k = (u_k, 0)$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,L-1]}$ , is an input-state-output trajectory of  $\tilde{\Sigma}$ .

The proof of Lemma 2 can be found in the Appendix. In the next section, we will exploit these properties in order to develop an extension of Lemma 1 that characterizes the behavior of the original system  $\Sigma$  directly in terms of general (non-steady-state) input-(state-)output spectra.

# B. Willems' fundamental lemma

Next, we will present our main result, which is a version of WFL that utilizes non-steady-state frequency-domain data.

**Theorem 1.** Let  $(\hat{U}_{[0,M-1]}, \hat{X}_{[0,M-1]}, \hat{Y}_{[0,M-1]})$  be an inputstate-output spectrum of  $\Sigma$  in (3) satisfying Assumption 1. Suppose that  $\hat{U}_{[0,M-1]}$  is such that  $\hat{V}_{[0,M-1]} = {(\hat{U}_k, \hat{\Omega}_k)}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}}$ , with  $\hat{\Omega}_k = e^{j\hat{\omega}_k^M}$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}$ , is PE of order  $L + n_x$ . Then, the following statements hold: (i) The matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Psi_1(\dot{X}_{[0,M-1]}) \\ \Psi_L(\hat{U}_{[0,M-1]}) \\ \Psi_L(\hat{\Omega}_{[0,M-1]}) \end{bmatrix}$$

has full row rank;

(ii) The pair of trajectories  $(u_{[0,L-1]}, y_{[0,L-1]})$  is an inputoutput trajectory of  $\Sigma$ , if and only if there exist  $G_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and  $G_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{M-1}$  such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} u_{[0,L-1]} \\ 0_{[0,L-1]} \\ y_{[0,L-1]} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} F_L(\hat{U}_{[0,M-1]}) & F_L^*(\hat{U}_{[1,M-1]}) \\ F_L(\hat{\Omega}_{[0,M-1]}) & F_L^*(\hat{\Omega}_{[1,M-1]}) \\ F_L(\hat{Y}_{[0,M-1]}) & F_L^*(\hat{Y}_{[1,M-1]}) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} G_0 \\ G_1 \\ G_1 \\ G_1^* \end{bmatrix}$$

Theorem 1 provides a FD-WFL that can deal with general non-steady-state frequency-domain data of the form introduced in Definition 4. This is powerful because such data can be collected without having to wait for transients to decay. Theorem 1 can be directly used in many datadriven analysis and control methodologies, such as, e.g., FreePC [18]. In these methodologies, it enables us to provide theoretical guarantees also when using non-steady-state frequency-domain data, which is generally not possible using Lemma 1 because any finite-length experiment will always contain some non-zero transient. In Section V, we will demonstrate such an application to data-driven FRF and transient evaluation. Finally, we note that Theorem 1 can also be formulated in terms of real-valued matrices (see Remark 1).

Compared to the steady-state FD-WFL (Lemma 1), the FD-WFL in Theorem 1 requires additional data in the form of  $\{\Omega_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}}$  (which we can compute directly from  $\{\hat{\omega}_k^M\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}}$ ) and a stronger PE condition on  $\hat{V}_{[0,M-1]}$  =  $\{(\hat{U}_k, \hat{\Omega}_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}}$  instead of  $\hat{U}_{[0,M-1]}$  alone. Note that  $\hat{V}_{[0,M-1]} = \{(\hat{U}_k, \hat{\Omega}_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}}$  being PE of order L requires that  $2M - 1 \ge L(n_u + 1)$ , while  $\hat{U}_{[0,M-1]}$  itself being PE of order L would only require that  $2M - 1 \ge$  $Ln_{u}$ . In particular, we achieve this stronger PE condition by including  $L' \geqslant \lceil L/2 \rceil$  additional frequencies in our data (i.e., increasing M by L'), and setting  $\hat{U}_k = 0$  at L' of those frequencies (while still measuring  $\ddot{Y}_k$ ) as also illustrated in Section VI. Interestingly, when dealing with non-steady-state time-domain data, TD-WFL does not require additional data nor a stronger PE condition. Compared to time-domain data, however, frequency-domain data is often denser in information and, as such, the use of non-steady-state frequencydomain data can still be more efficient than time-domain data.

**Remark 2.** Analogous to the extensions to multiple data sets presented in [8, Theorem 2] for time-domain data and [23, Theorem 2] for steady-state frequency-domain data, Theorem 1 can be extended to allow for multiple data sets. Doing so, enables us to utilize multiple input spectra  $\hat{U}_k$ corresponding to the same frequency  $\hat{\omega}_k^M$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}$ , which is particularly useful when dealing with multi-input multi-output systems. In this case, it is generally not true that all data sets share common initial states  $x_0$  and terminal states  $x_{2M}$ . However, this can be taken into account as follows. Let  $E \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$  denote the number of data sets, then the extension to multiple data sets can be obtained by applying [23, Theorem 2] to the augmented system  $\tilde{\Sigma}$  with  $v_k = (u_k, w_k) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u + E}$  and

$$\tilde{B} = \begin{bmatrix} B & x_0^1 - x_{2M}^1 & \dots & x_0^E - x_{2M}^E \end{bmatrix}$$

where  $x_0^e$  and  $x_{2M}^e$  denote, respectively, the initial and terminal state corresponding to the *e*-th data set.

# V. FREQUENCY-RESPONSE-FUNCTION EVALUATION AND TRANSIENT SEPARATION

In this section, we use Theorem 1 to perform data-driven evaluation of the transfer function H(z) and transient T(z)at any  $z \in \mathbb{C}$  that is not an eigenvalue of A. Additionally, we also isolate and evaluate the transient component T(z)in (10) in the collected data.

**Theorem 2.** Let  $(\hat{U}_{[0,M-1]}, \hat{Y}_{[0,M-1]})$  be an input-output spectrum of  $\Sigma$  in (3) satisfying Assumption 1. Let  $L_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq \ell_{\Sigma}}$  and suppose that  $\hat{U}_{[0,M-1]}$  is such that  $\hat{V}_{[0,M-1]} = \{(\hat{U}_k, \hat{\Omega}_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}}$ , with  $\hat{\Omega}_k = e^{j\hat{\omega}_k^M}$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}$ , is PE of order  $L_0 + 1 + n_x$ . Then, for any  $z \in \mathbb{C}$  that is not an eigenvalue of A, the following statements hold:

(i) For any sample  $U_z \in \mathbb{C}^{n_u}$  of the input spectrum at z, the system of linear equations

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \Psi_{L_0+1}(\hat{U}_{[0,M-1]}) \\ 0 & \Psi_{L_0+1}(\hat{\Omega}_{[0,M-1]}) \\ -W_{L_0+1}(z) \otimes I_{n_y} & \Psi_{L_0+1}(\hat{Y}_{[0,M-1]}) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} Y_z \\ G_Y \end{bmatrix}$$
$$= \begin{bmatrix} W_{L_0+1}(z) \otimes U_z \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$
(12)

has a unique solution for  $Y_z$ , which is such that the pair  $(U_z, Y_z)$  is a sample of a steady-state input-output spectrum of  $\Sigma$  at z, i.e.,  $Y_z = H(z)U_z$ ;

(ii) The system of linear equations

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \Psi_{L_0+1}(\hat{U}_{[0,M-1]}) \\ 0 & \Psi_{L_0+1}(\hat{\Omega}_{[0,M-1]}) \\ -W_{L_0+1}(z) \otimes I_{n_y} & \Psi_{L_0+1}(\hat{Y}_{[0,M-1]}) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} T_z \\ G_T \end{bmatrix} \\ = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \frac{W_{L_0+1}(z) \otimes z}{0} \end{bmatrix}$$
(13)

has a unique solution for  $T_z \in \mathbb{C}^{n_y}$ , which corresponds to the transient (10) present in the data, i.e.,  $T_z = T(z)$ .

Theorem 2.(i) allows us to evaluate the frequencyresponse-function of  $\Sigma$  in the specific input "direction"  $U_z$ , which not only performs what is essentially an *exact* interpolation of the data but also eliminates the transient T(z). In fact, using Theorem 2.(ii), we can also compute this transient separately. If we are interested in finding both  $Y_z$  and  $T_z$ , we can also solve (12) and (13) simultaneously. Moreover, Theorem 2 extends [23, Proposition] to allow for non-steadystate frequency-domain data, and complements [24, Theorem 2] for time-domain data.

### VI. NUMERICAL CASE STUDY

In this section, we use Theorem 2 (and, thereby, Theorem 1) to perform data-driven FRF and transient analysis based on non-steady-state frequency-domain data. To this end, we consider the benchmark of [3], which is the fourth order single-input single-output system  $\Sigma$  of the form (3) with transfer function

$$\begin{split} H(z) = & \\ \frac{0.9626z^4 + 0.4095z^3 - 0.9718z^2 + 0.26z + 0.8618}{z^4 - 0.3306z^3 - 0.5025z^2 - 0.2347z + 0.7925}. \end{split}$$

Next, we consecutively consider noise-free data and data in which the output is corrupted by measurement noise.

# A. Noise-free data

First, we consider the case with noise-free data, which we obtain by performing a multi-sine experiment with the M = 20 frequencies in (1). We excite the M/2 = 10 odd frequencies, i.e.,  $\hat{U}_k = 1$  for  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}^{\text{odd}} := \{1,3,\ldots,M-1\}$ , and use the remaining even frequencies to do the transient estimation by taking  $\hat{U}_k = 0$  for  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}^{\text{even}} := \{0,2,\ldots,M-2\}$ . It can be easily verified that the resulting spectrum  $\hat{V}_{[0,M-1]} = \{(\hat{U}_k,\hat{\Omega}_k)\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}}$  of the augmented input is PE of order  $L_0 + 1 + n_x$  with  $L_0 = 4 \ge n_x = 4$  so that we can apply Theorem 2.

The resulting FRF and transient estimates obtained using Theorem 2.(i) and Theorem 2.(ii), respectively, are shown in Fig. 1, along with the measured output spectrum  $\hat{Y}_{[0,M-1]}$ . Note that, for the even frequencies  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}^{\text{even}}$ , the measured output spectrum coincides precisely with the true transient, i.e.,  $\hat{Y}_k = T(e^{j\hat{\omega}_k^M})$  for  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}^{\text{even}}$ , because  $\hat{U}_k = 0$ . For the odd frequencies  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}^{\text{odd}}$ , the measured output spectrum contains both the transfer function and the transient (and, thus, does not coincide with the true transfer function), i.e.,  $\hat{Y}_k = H(e^{j\hat{\omega}_k^M}) + T(e^{j\hat{\omega}_k^M})$ . It can be seen that the obtained estimates closely resemble the true FRF and the true transient. In fact, Fig. 2 shows the corresponding estimation errors, which are found to be close to machine precision.

#### B. Noisy data

Next, we consider the case with noisy data, for which we modify the method based on Theorem 2 to include preprocessing of the data with the goal of approximating the noise-free data. To this end, we adopt the popular heuristic for observable systems, discussed in, e.g., [24], that noisefree data, for  $L_0 \ge \ell_{\Sigma}$  and under the appropriate PE conditions, satisfies

$$\operatorname{rank} \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_{L_0+1}(\hat{U}_{[0,M-1]}) \\ \Psi_{L_0+1}(\hat{\Omega}_{[0,M-1]}) \\ \Psi_{L_0+1}(\hat{Y}_{[0,M-1]}) \end{bmatrix} = (n_u+1)(L_0+1) + n_x.$$
(14)



Fig. 1. Estimated (using Theorem 2) FRF  $Y_z$  (—) and transient  $T_z$  (—) of the system, for  $z = e^{j\omega}$  with  $\omega \in [0, \pi)$ , based on the data  $\hat{Y}_{[0, M-1]}$  split into odd (**O**) and even (**O**) frequencies. The true transfer function H(z) and transient T(z) (--) are also depicted.



Fig. 2. Estimation errors  $|H(z) - Y_z|$  (---) and  $|T(z) - T_z|$  (---) when using noise-free data.

This heuristic follows from Theorem 1.(i) and the fact that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Psi_{L_0+1}(\hat{U}_{[0,M-1]}) \\ \Psi_{L_0+1}(\hat{Y}_{[0,M-1]}) \\ \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ \mathcal{O}_{L_0+1} & \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{L_0+1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_1(\hat{X}_{[0,M-1]}) \\ \Psi_{L_0+1}(\hat{U}_{[0,M-1]}) \\ \Psi_{L_0+1}(\hat{\Omega}_{[0,M-1]}) \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{L} := \begin{bmatrix} D & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ C\tilde{B} & \tilde{D} & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ CA^{L-2}\tilde{B} & CA^{L-3}\tilde{B} & \dots & C\tilde{B} & \tilde{D} \end{bmatrix},$$

and the observability matrix  $\mathcal{O}_{L_0+1}$ , given by (4), is full column rank since  $L_0 \ge \ell_{\Sigma}$ . We exploit (14) in the following algorithm, which is inspired by [24, Algorithm 1].

Algorithm 1 uses the fact that there exists a singular value decomposition in which  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  are real, which is guaranteed by the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.** Let  $\mathcal{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{A}_0 & \mathcal{A}_1 & \mathcal{A}_1^* \end{bmatrix}$  with  $\mathcal{A}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m_0}$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times m_1}$  and  $m = m_0 + 2m_1$ . Then,  $\mathcal{A}$  admits a singular value decomposition  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{USV}^{\mathsf{H}}$  with  $\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ 

# Algorithm 1: FRF and transient estimation.

**Data:** Input-output spectrum  $(\hat{U}_{[0,M-1]}, \hat{Y}_{[0,M-1]})$ , frequencies  $\hat{\omega}_{[0,M-1]}^M$  and model order  $n_x$ .

Input:  $U_z \in \mathbb{C}^{n_u}$  and  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ .

1 Let  $L_0 = n_x$ .

2 Compute singular value decomposition

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Psi_{L_0+1}(U_{[0,M-1]}) \\ \Psi_{L_0+1}(\hat{\Omega}_{[0,M-1]}) \\ \Psi_{L_0+1}(Y_{[0,M-1]}) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{U}_1 & \mathcal{U}_2 \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{SV}^{\mathsf{H}},$$

with  $\mathcal{U}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{(L_0+1)(n_u+1+n_y)\times(n_u+1)(L_0+1)+n_x}$ . 3 Solve the system

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0\\ -W_{L_0+1}(z) \otimes I_{n_y} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{U}_1\\ \mathcal{U}_1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} Y_z & T_z\\ G_Y & G_T \end{bmatrix}$$
$$= \begin{bmatrix} W_{L_0+1}(z) \otimes U_z & 0\\ 0 & W_{L_0+1}(z) \otimes z\\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$
Output:  $Y_z = H(z)U_z$  and  $T_z = T(z).$ 

such that  $\mathcal{U}^{\top}\mathcal{U} = I$ ,  $\mathcal{V} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{V}_0 & \mathcal{V}_1 & \mathcal{V}_1^* \end{bmatrix}^{\mathsf{H}}$ ,  $\mathcal{V}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m_0}$ ,  $\mathcal{V}_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m_1}$ , such that  $\mathcal{V}^{\mathsf{H}}\mathcal{V} = I$ , and

$$\mathcal{S} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{S}_1 & 0_{r \times (m-r)} \\ 0_{(n-r) \times r} & 0_{(n-r) \times (m-r)} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-r) \times (m-r)}, \quad (15)$$

where  $r = \operatorname{rank} \mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{S}_1$  is diagonal and positive definite.

As in the previous section, we perform a multi-sine experiment with the M = 20 frequencies in (1), of which we excite the odd frequencies, i.e.,  $\hat{U}_k = 1$  for  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}^{\text{odd}}$ , and use the remaining transient frequencies to do the transient estimation by taking  $\hat{U}_k = 0$  for  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}^{\text{even}}$ . The resulting spectrum  $\hat{V}_{[0,M-1]} = \{(\hat{U}_k, \hat{\Omega}_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}}$  of the augmented input is PE of order  $L_0 + 1 + n_x$  with  $L_0 = 4 \ge n_x = 4$ . The measurements are obtained by measuring 100 periods of the multi-sine, in which the output is corrupted by zero-mean Gaussian white noise with signal-to-noise-ratio of 20 (i.e., 26.02 dB), and computing the corresponding inputoutput spectrum.

We use Algorithm 1 to estimate the FRF and transient of the system, which yields the estimates shown in Fig. 3 along with the measured output spectrum  $\hat{Y}_{[0,M-1]}$ . Despite the significant level of measurement noise, the obtained estimates remain close to the true transfer function and transient. In fact, the error remains below -10 dB for all frequencies, as seen in Fig. 4 which shows the estimation errors.

#### VII. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we extended the recently-introduced variant of Willems' fundamental lemma of [18], [23] to incorporate non-steady-state frequency-domain data. This advancement provides a formal mathematical framework for characterizing an unknown system's behavior using such data. Additionally,



Fig. 3. Estimated (using Theorem 2) FRF  $Y_z$  (—) and transient  $T_z$  (—) of the system, for  $z = e^{j\omega}$  with  $\omega \in [0, \pi)$ , based on the noisy data  $\hat{Y}_{[0,M-1]}$  split into odd (**O**) and even (**O**) frequencies. The true transfer function H(z) and transient T(z) (–) are also depicted.



Fig. 4. Estimation errors  $|H(z) - Y_z|$  (---) and  $|T(z) - T_z|$  (---) when using noisy data.

it significantly reduces measurement time by eliminating the need to wait for transients to decay. Importantly, Theorem 1 can be directly used in direct data-driven analysis and control methodologies, such as, e.g., FreePC [18], to incorporate non-steady-state data. To illustrate this, we demonstrated its application in data-driven FRF and transient evaluation at arbitrary complex-valued frequencies, demonstrating the approach through a numerical case study. Future work will focus on incorporating noise in the analysis, and showing the effectiveness in the context of data-driven (predictive) control (FreePC).

#### APPENDIX

# A. Proof of Lemma 2

(i): By Definition 3,  $(U_{[0,M-1]}, X_{[0,M-1]}, Y_{[0,M-1]})$  is an input-state-output spectrum of  $\Sigma$ , if and only if (9) holds for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}$ . This is equivalent to, for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}$ ,

$$e^{j\hat{\omega}_{k}^{M}}X_{k} = AX_{k} + \tilde{B}\begin{bmatrix}U_{k}\\e^{j\hat{\omega}_{k}^{M}}\end{bmatrix},$$
$$Y_{k} = CX_{k} + \tilde{D}\begin{bmatrix}U_{k}\\e^{j\hat{\omega}_{k}^{M}}\end{bmatrix},$$

which is equivalent to  $(V_{[0,M-1]}, X_{[0,M-1]}, Y_{[0,M-1]})$ , with  $V_k = (U_k, \Omega_k)$  and  $\Omega_k = e^{j\hat{\omega}_k^M}$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}$ ,

being a steady-state input-state-output spectrum of  $\tilde{\Sigma}$ . Hence, Lemma 2.(i) holds.

(ii): By Definition 2,  $(u_{[0,L-1]}, x_{[0,L-1]}, y_{[0,L-1]})$  is an input-state-output trajectory of  $\Sigma$ , if and only if, for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,L-2]}$ ,

$$x_{k+1} = Ax_k + Bu_k = Ax_k + \tilde{B} \begin{bmatrix} u_k \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

and, for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,L-1]}$ ,

$$y_k = Cx_k + Du_k = Cx_k + \tilde{D} \begin{bmatrix} u_k \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

This is equivalent to  $(v_{[0,L-1]}, x_{[0,L-1]}, y_{[0,L-1]})$ , with  $v_k = (u_k, 0)$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,L-1]}$ , being an input-state-output trajectory of  $\tilde{\Sigma}$ , whereby Lemma 2.(ii) holds.

# B. Proof of Theorem 1

Let  $(\hat{U}_{[0,M-1]}, \hat{X}_{[0,M-1]}, \hat{Y}_{[0,M-1]})$  be an input-stateoutput spectrum of  $\Sigma$  satisfying Assumption 1. Suppose that  $\hat{U}_{[0,M-1]}$  is such that  $\hat{V}_{[0,M-1]} = \{(\hat{U}_k, \hat{\Omega}_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}}$  with  $\hat{\Omega}_k = e^{j\hat{\omega}_k^M}$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}$ , is PE of order  $L + n_x$ . Note that, due to Assumption 1,  $\tilde{\Sigma}$  is also controllable. By Lemma 2.(i),  $(\hat{V}_{[0,M-1]}, \hat{X}_{[0,M-1]}, \hat{Y}_{[0,M-1]})$  is a steadystate input-state-output spectrum of  $\tilde{\Sigma}$ .

(i): Since  $V_{[0,M-1]}$  is PE of order  $L + n_x$ , it follows from Lemma 1.(i) that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Psi_1(\hat{X}_{[0,M-1]}) \\ \Psi_L(\hat{V}_{[0,M-1]}) \end{bmatrix}$$

has full row rank. Rearranging the rows yields Theorem 1.(i).

(ii): It follows from Lemma 1.(ii) that the pair of trajectories  $(v_{[0,L-1]}, y_{[0,L-1]})$  is an input-output trajectory of  $\tilde{\Sigma}$ , if and only if there exist  $G_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $G_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{M-1}$  such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} v_{[0,L-1]} \\ y_{[0,L-1]} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} F_L(\hat{Y}_{[0,M-1]}) & F_L^*(\hat{Y}_{[1,M-1]}) \\ F_L(\hat{Y}_{[0,M-1]}) & F_L^*(\hat{Y}_{[1,M-1]}) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} G_0 \\ G_1 \\ G_1 \\ G_1^* \end{bmatrix}.$$

Using Lemma 2.(ii) and by rearranging rows, we obtain Theorem 1.(ii).  $\Box$ 

# C. Proof of Theorem 2

Let  $(\hat{U}_{[0,M-1]}, \hat{Y}_{[0,M-1]})$  be an input-output spectrum of  $\Sigma$ in (3) satisfying Assumption 1. Let  $L_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq \ell_{\Sigma}}$  and suppose that  $\hat{U}_{[0,M-1]}$  is such that  $\hat{V}_{[0,M-1]} = \{(\hat{U}_k, \hat{\Omega}_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}}$ , with  $\hat{\Omega}_k = e^{j\hat{\omega}_k^M}$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,M-1]}$ , is PE of order  $L_0 + 1 + n_x$ .

By Lemma 2.(i),  $(\hat{V}_{[0,M-1]}, \hat{Y}_{[0,M-1]})$  is a steady-state input-output spectrum of  $\tilde{\Sigma}$ . The transfer function  $\tilde{H} : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}^{n_y \times (n_u+1)}$  of  $\tilde{\Sigma}$  is given by

$$\tilde{H}(z) = C(zI - A)^{-1}\tilde{B} + \tilde{D},$$
  
=  $[C(zI - A)^{-1}B + D \quad C(zI - A)^{-1}(x_0 - x_{2M})].$ 

By [23, Proposition 2], for any sample  $V_z \in \mathbb{C}^{n_u+1}$  of the input spectrum at z, the system of linear equations

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \Psi_{L_0+1}(\hat{V}_{[0,M-1]}) \\ -W_{L_0+1}(z) \otimes I_{n_y} & \Psi_{L_0+1}(\hat{Y}_{[0,M-1]}) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{Y}_z \\ G \end{bmatrix} \\ = \begin{bmatrix} W_{L_0+1}(z) \otimes V_z \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$
(16)

has a unique solution for  $\tilde{Y}_z$ , which is such that the complexvalued pair  $(V_z, \tilde{Y}_z)$  is a sample of the input-output spectrum of  $\tilde{\Sigma}$  at z (i.e.,  $\tilde{Y}_z = \tilde{H}(z)V_z$ ).

(i): By taking  $V_z = (U_z, 0)$  and rearranging rows, we find that  $\tilde{Y}_z$  satisfies  $\tilde{Y}_z = H(z)U_z$ , and (16) reduces to (12). Thereby, Theorem 2. (i) holds.

(ii): By taking  $V_z = (0, z)$  and rearranging rows, we find that  $\tilde{Y}_z$  satisfies

$$\tilde{Y}_z = C(zI - A)^{-1} z(x_0 - x_{2M}) \stackrel{(10)}{=} T(z).$$

Moreover, (16) reduces to (13), whereby Theorem 2.(ii) holds.  $\hfill \Box$ 

# D. Proof of Lemma 3

Let  $\mathcal{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{A}_0 & \mathcal{A}_1 & \mathcal{A}_1^* \end{bmatrix}$  with  $\mathcal{A}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m_0}$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times m_1}$  and  $m = m_0 + 2m_1$ . Then,  $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^{\mathsf{H}}$  is real and symmetric. Thus, there exists  $\mathcal{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  such that  $\mathcal{U}^{\top}\mathcal{U} = I$  and  $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^{\mathsf{H}} = \mathcal{U}S^2\mathcal{U}^{\top}$  with S as in (15), where  $r = \operatorname{rank} \mathcal{A}$  and  $S_1$  is diagonal and positive definite. Let

$$\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{A}^{\mathsf{H}} \mathcal{U} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{S}_1^{-1} & 0\\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix}$$

Clearly,  $\mathcal{USV}^{\mathsf{H}} = \mathcal{U} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{S}_1 & 0\\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{S}_1^{-1} & 0\\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{U}^{\top} \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A} \text{ and}$ 

$$\mathcal{V}^{\mathsf{H}}\mathcal{V} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{S}_{1}^{-1} & 0\\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{U}^{\top} \mathcal{A}^{\mathsf{H}} \mathcal{A} \mathcal{U} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{S}_{1}^{-1} & 0\\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} = I.$$

Finally,  $\mathcal{V}$  has the desired structure  $\mathcal{V} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{V}_0 & \mathcal{V}_1 & \mathcal{V}_1^* \end{bmatrix}^{\mathsf{H}}$  with

$$\mathcal{V}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{S}_1^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{U}^\top A_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m_0},$$

and

$$\mathcal{V}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{S}_1^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{U}^\top A_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times m_1}.$$

#### REFERENCES

- J. C. Willems, P. Rapisarda, I. Markovsky, and B. L. M. De Moor, "A note on persistency of excitation," *Syst. Control Lett.*, vol. 54, no. 4, pp. 325–329, 2005.
- [2] M. Verhaegen and P. Dewilde, "Subspace model identification Part 1. The output-error state-space model identification class of algorithms," *Int. J. Control*, vol. 56, no. 5, pp. 1187–1210, 1992.
- [3] T. McKelvey, H. Akcay, and L. Ljung, "Subspace-based multivariable system identification from frequency response data," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 41, no. 7, pp. 960–979, 1996.
- [4] I. Markovsky and P. Rapisarda, "Data-driven simulation and control," *Int. J. Control*, vol. 81, no. 12, pp. 1946–1959, 2008.
- [5] C. De Persis and P. Tesi, "Formulas for data-driven control: Stabilization, optimality, and robustness," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 65, no. 3, pp. 909–924, 2020.

- [6] F. Dörfler, P. Tesi, and C. De Persis, "On the certainty-equivalence approach to direct data-driven LQR design," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 68, no. 12, pp. 7989–7996, 2023.
- [7] J. Berberich, A. Koch, C. W. Scherer, and F. Allgöwer, "Robust datadriven state-feedback design," in *Amer. Control Conf.*, 2020, pp. 1532– 1538.
- [8] H. J. van Waarde, C. De Persis, M. K. Camlibel, and P. Tesi, "Willems' fundamental lemma for state-space systems and its extension to multiple datasets," *IEEE Control Syst. Lett.*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 602–607, 2020.
- [9] J. Coulson, J. Lygeros, and F. Dörfler, "Data-enabled predictive control: In the shallows of the DeePC," in *Eur. Control Conf.*, 2019, pp. 307–312.
- [10] J. Berberich, J. Köhler, M. A. Müller, and F. Allgöwer, "Data-driven model predictive control with stability and robustness guarantees," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 66, no. 4, 2021.
- [11] C. Verhoek, R. Tóth, S. Haesaert, and A. Koch, "Fundamental lemma for data-driven analysis of linear parameter-varying systems," in 60th IEEE Conf. Decis. Control, 2021, pp. 5040–5046.
- [12] P. Schmitz, T. Faulwasser, and K. Worthmann, "Willems' fundamental lemma for linear descriptor systems and its use for data-driven outputfeedback MPC," *IEEE Control Syst. Lett.*, vol. 6, pp. 2443–2448, 2022.
- [13] T. Faulwasser, R. Ou, G. Pan, P. Schmitz, and K. Worthmann, "Behavioral theory for stochastic systems? A data-driven journey from Willems to Wiener and back again," *Annu. Rev. Control*, vol. 55, pp. 92–117, 2023.
- [14] G. Pan, R. Ou, and T. Faulwasser, "On a stochastic fundamental lemma and its use for data-driven optimal control," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 2022.
- [15] R. Rapisarda, M. K. Çamlibel, and H. J. van Waarde, "A "fundamental lemma" for continuous-time systems, with applications to data-driven simulation," *Syst. Control Lett.*, vol. 179, p. 105603, 2023.
- [16] J. Berberich and F. Allgöwer, "A trajectory-based framework for datadriven system analysis and control," in *Eur. Control Conf.*, 2020, pp. 1365–1370.
- [17] O. Molodchyk and T. Faulwasser, "Exploring the links between the fundamental lemma and kernel regression," *IEEE Control Syst. Lett.*, vol. 8, pp. 2045–2050, 2024.
- [18] T. J. Meijer, S. A. N. Nouwens, K. J. A. Scheres, V. S. Dolk, and W. P. M. H. Heemels, "Frequency-domain data-driven predictive control," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 58, no. 18, pp. 86–91, 2024.
- [19] M. Ferizbegovic, H. Hjalmarsson, P. Mattsson, and T. B. Schön, "Willems' fundamental lemma based on second-order moments," in 60th IEEE Conf. Decis. Control, 2021, pp. 396–401.
- [20] R. Pintelon and J. Schoukens, System Identification: A Frequency Domain Approach. Wiley, 2012.
- [21] E. Evers, N. van Tuijl, R. Lamers, B. de Jager, and T. Oomen, "Fast and accurate identification of thermal dynamics for precision motion control: Exploiting transient data and additional disturbance inputs," *Mechatronics*, vol. 70, p. 102401, 2020.
- [22] P. van Gerven, "ASML eyes common EUV platform and massive throughput increases," https://bits-chips.com/article/its-official-high-na-euv-will-get-a-successor/, 2024, accessed: 03/22/2025.
- [23] T. J. Meijer, K. J. A. Scheres, S. A. N. Nouwens, V. S. Dolk, and W. P. M. H. Heemels, "From a frequency-domain Willems' lemma to data-driven predictive control," 2025, preprint: https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.19390.
- [24] I. Markovsky and H. Ossareh, "Finite-data nonparametric frequency response evaluation without leakage," *Automatica*, vol. 159, p. 111351, 2024.
- [25] R. Pintelon, J. Schoukens, G. Vandersteen, and L. Barbé, "Estimation of nonparametric noise and FRF models for multivariable systems–Part I: Theory," *Mech. Syst. Signal Process.*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 573–595, 2010.
- [26] B. Cauberghe, P. Guillaume, R. Pintelon, and P. Verboven, "Frequencydomain subspace identification using FRF data from arbitrary signals," *J. Sound Vib.*, vol. 290, pp. 555–571, 2006.
- [27] T. J. Meijer, S. A. N. Nouwens, V. S. Dolk, and W. P. M. H. Heemels, "A frequency-domain version of Willems' fundamental lemma," 2023, preprint: https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.15284.