

Data-Driven Adversarial Online Control for Unknown Linear Systems [★]

Zishun Liu ^a, Yongxin Chen ^a

^a*Department of Aerospace Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA 30332, USA*

Abstract

We consider the online control problem with an unknown linear dynamical system in the presence of adversarial perturbations and adversarial convex loss functions. Although the problem is widely studied in model-based control, it remains unclear whether data-driven approaches, which bypass the system identification step, can solve the problem. In this work, we present a novel data-driven online adaptive control algorithm to address this online control problem. Our algorithm leverages the behavioral systems theory to learn a non-parametric system representation and then adopts a perturbation-based controller updated by online gradient descent. We prove that our algorithm guarantees an $\tilde{O}(T^{2/3})$ regret bound with high probability, which matches the best-known regret bound for this problem. Furthermore, we extend our algorithm and performance guarantee to the cases with output feedback.

Key words: Data-Driven Control, Behavioral Systems Theory, Online Learning, Adaptive Control

1 Introduction

In recent years, the popularity of data-driven control approaches has surged. Unlike model-based methods which hinge on the accurate identification of system parameters, algorithms for data-driven control bypass the system identification step. Instead, they leverage the Fundamental Lemma in Behavioral System Theory [1] to construct a non-parametric system representation based directly on data [2]. In applications where the system is complex and process data are readily available, data-driven control method stands out for its simplicity, generality, and robustness, offering a viable and practical alternative to the conventional model-based approach [3]. By now, data-driven scheme has already been successfully implemented in a variety of control problems, e.g., system stabilization [4,5], LQR [6] and model predictive control [7,8].

Despite the successes of data-driven control in various domains, one of the significant challenges that persist is the problem of adversarial online control, whose significance has grown alongside the flourishing of online learning in adversarial environments. It aims to design a control policy

to address the following problem

$$\min J = \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} c_t(u_t, x_t) \quad (1a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } x_{t+1} = g_t(x_t, u_t) + w_t \quad (1b)$$

where c_t is the instantaneous cost function, x_t is the state, u_t is the control and w_t is the disturbance. At each time step t , the learner makes a decision based on its observations and historical data, and subsequently receives the next state x_{t+1} along with the instantaneous cost c_t . Unlike standard stochastic control, both c_t and w_t in online control can be given in an adversarial form and there is no assumption on their statistical properties, making it impossible to find the optimal control policy by Riccati Equation or HJB Rule *a priori*. Under this circumstance, the performance of an adversarial online control algorithm is typically evaluated by the cost gap between the algorithm and a specified policy. This evaluation can be either asymptotic, considering an infinite number of time steps, or non-asymptotic, focusing on a finite number of time steps.

Research efforts in adversarial online control span a wide array of scenarios, addressing challenges in known time-varying systems [9], unknown time-invariant systems [10,11], and nonlinear systems [12,13]. However, the algorithms proposed in these works rely either on a pre-known system model or an estimation of the parameterized model. Concerning data-driven approaches, although there have been works in handling data-driven stochastic online control problems, e.g., [14,15], existing studies on adversarial

[★] This paper was not presented at any IFAC meeting.

Email addresses: zliu910@gatech.edu (Zishun Liu), yongchen@gatech.edu (Yongxin Chen).

online control with data-driven approaches are scarce. The work [8] delves into online control problems with output feedback, unknown system models, and adversarial measurement noises, and proposes a data-driven model predictive control scheme. While this approach ensures the stability of the system, it falls short in providing insights into its performance. In [5] the authors investigate the optimal control problem with adversarial disturbance and propose a data-driven algorithm based on semi-definite programming (SDP), but it only guarantees a bounded asymptotic performance, which corresponds to a linear non-asymptotic regret bound. The absence of online updates to the controller leads to a lack of guarantees on achieving sublinear non-asymptotic regret bounds. To this end, the question of whether methods in a data-driven manner are capable of tackling adversarial online control as well as model-based methodologies naturally arises.

For adversarial online control problem with an unknown dynamical system, can we develop an algorithm that 1) is in data-driven manner, 2) guarantees a sublinear regret bound?

In this work, we address the adversarial online control problem over a linear time-invariant (LTI) system. The contributions of our algorithm are as follows. First, instead of identifying the system matrices (A, B) , our algorithm leverages techniques in Statistics and Behavioral Systems Theory to learn a non-parametric representation of the system. To the best of the authors' knowledge, this is the first work that bridges the fundamental lemma and adversarial online control algorithm. Second, the algorithm refers to the accumulated disturbance-action controller (ADAC) and adopts an adaptive ADAC to generate an input sequence. Compared to the disturbance-action controller (DAC) in model-based adversarial online control, our method is more suitable for a data-driven framework and can be extended to the output feedback case directly. Third, in theoretical analysis, we prove that under mild assumptions, our algorithm guarantees an $\tilde{O}(T^{2/3})$ regret bound with high probability, which matches the best-known result achieved by model-based methods. Moreover, we show that just changing state sequence $\{x_t\}$ to output sequence $\{y_t\}$ and our algorithm can be directly applied to the output feedback case while keeping the same $\tilde{O}(T^{2/3})$ regret bound.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 formulates the adversarial online control problem and provides background on behavioral systems theory and perturbation-based controllers. Section 3 focuses on a special case of the problem we study. We present the main algorithm of this paper in Section 4 and the regret analysis in Section 5. In Section 6 we extend our method to systems with output feedback. This is followed by a concluding remark in Section 7.

Notations. For an integer a , $[a] = \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} : n \geq a\}$. For a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\|x\|$ is its Euclidean norm. For a matrix $A = \{a_{ij}\}_{m \times n}$, a_{ij} denotes its (i, j) -th element, A^T denotes its transpose, $\text{tr}(A)$ denotes its trace if A is square, $\|A\|$ denotes its operator norm, and $M_t^{(a:b)} = \{M_t^{(a)}, \dots, M_t^{(b)}\}$.

For a bounded set \mathbb{X} , $\dim(\mathbb{X}) = \max_{x, y \in \mathbb{X}} \|x - y\|$. For a sequence $x = \{x_k\}_{k=1}^{N-1}$, $x_{a:b}$ denotes $\{x_a, \dots, x_b\}$ listed in a column, and we define its Hankel matrix with length L as

$$H_L(x) = \begin{bmatrix} x_0 & x_1 & \cdots & x_{N-L} \\ x_1 & x_2 & \cdots & x_{N-L+1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_{L-1} & x_L & \cdots & x_{N-1} \end{bmatrix} \quad (2)$$

and $H_L(x)[k, :] = [x_{k-1} \ x_k \ \cdots \ x_{N-L+k-1}]$. We adopt \mathcal{O} notation for complexity and $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ to omit log terms. We use \mathcal{S}^{n-1} to denote the unit sphere on \mathbb{R}^n and $\text{Unif}(\mathcal{S}^{n-1})$ to denote the uniform distribution on it.

2 Problem Formulation and Preliminaries

2.1 Problem Formulation

Consider the online control problem over an LTI system

$$\min J = \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} c_t(u_t, x_t) \quad (3a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } x_{t+1} = Ax_t + Bu_t + w_t, \quad (3b)$$

where $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $u_t \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and $w_t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a disturbance. Here the true dynamics $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ are unknown and we have no prior knowledge of how w_t is generated other than its boundness. To permit a discussion on non-asymptotic regret bounds, we assume (A, B) is controllable and A is (κ, ρ) -exponentially stable (see e.g., [13]), as defined below.

Definition 2.1 *System (3) is said to be (κ, ρ) -exponentially stable if $\|A^k\| \leq \kappa \rho^k$ with some $\kappa > 0$, $0 < \rho < 1$ and $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}_+$.*

Assumption 1 *The pair (A, B) is controllable and A is $(1, \rho)$ -exponentially stable with some $0 < \rho < 1$.*

Assumption 2 *w_t is bounded by $\|w_t\| \leq \varepsilon$.*

At every time step t , the learner plays u_t and then observes x_{t+1} and instantaneous cost $c_t(u_t, x_t) : \mathbb{R}^{m+n} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$. It should be noted that c_t is revealed only after playing u_t , meaning it could be given in an adversarial form.

Assumption 3 *At any time t , $c_t(u_t, x_t)$ is a convex and differentiable function of x_t and u_t , and $\|\nabla_{u_t, x_t} c_t\| \leq G$ with some finite constant $G > 0$.*

Since we have no assumption on the statistical properties of w_t , it is impossible to chase the "minimal" total cost $\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} c_t(u_t, x_t)$ over a finite timeline T [16]. However, if we fix a reference policy class Π and suppose that there exists an oracle that knows everything *a priori* and can choose

the best policy $\pi^* = \arg \min_{\pi \in \Pi} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} c_t(u_t^\pi, x_t^\pi)$ based on prior knowledge, then we can use *policy regret* to measure how good a policy is compared to π^* . The policy regret is defined as follows, and Π used throughout this paper will be given in Section 3.1.

Definition 2.2 *Given a policy class Π , the policy regret between the learner’s policy \mathcal{A} and Π over T steps is defined as*

$$\text{rgt}_T(\mathcal{A}, \Pi) = \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} c_t(u_t, x_t) - \min_{\pi \in \Pi} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} c_t(u_t^\pi, x_t^\pi) \quad (4)$$

where x_t is the actual state, u_t is generated by \mathcal{A} , and (u_t^π, x_t^π) are the artificial state sequence and controls under the policy π , i.e., $x_{t+1}^\pi = Ax_t^\pi + Bu_t^\pi + w_t$, $x_0^\pi = x_0$, $u_t^\pi = \pi(x_t^\pi)$.

Our goal is to design a data-driven algorithm that can achieve a sub-linear regret, i.e., $\text{rgt}_T(\mathcal{A}, \Pi) \leq \tilde{O}(T^\alpha)$ with some $\alpha < 1$ for a reasonable Π . Before presenting our method, we introduce the data-driven representation.

2.2 Non-Parametric Representation of LTI Systems

Consider the setting where we can acquire a noise-free trajectory of (3) with $w_t = 0$. In this case, by making use of Fundamental Lemma, we can give a precise non-parametric representation of the LTI system, which is stated in the following theorem.

Theorem 1 ([17], Theorem 3) *Suppose $\{u, x\}$ is a noise-free trajectory of the system (3), where $\{u\}$ is persistently exciting of order $L + 2n$. Then, $\{\hat{u}, \hat{x}\} = \{(\hat{u}_1, \hat{x}_1), \dots, (\hat{u}_L, \hat{x}_L)\}$ is a noise-free trajectory of system (3) if and only if there exists $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{N-L+1}$ such that*

$$\begin{bmatrix} H_L(u) \\ H_L(x) \end{bmatrix} \alpha = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{u} \\ \hat{x} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5)$$

The above theorem indicates that if we can obtain a noise-free trajectory $\{x, u\}$ of an LTI system, then the Hankel matrices $H_L(u), H_L(x)$ give a precise non-parametric representation of the system behaviors. Throughout this paper, we use this representation of LTI systems for control tasks.

3 Simplified Setting: Control with A Clean Trajectory

We begin with a simplified setting where we assume access to a clean trajectory $\{u^d, x^d\} = \{u_t^d, x_t^d\}_{t=0}^{N-1}$ such that $x_{t+1}^d = Ax_t^d + Bu_t^d$. The results will be extended to general settings via an Explore-Then-Commit (ETC) strategy in Section 4. An algorithm using ETC first explores system behavior randomly, meanwhile estimates the system by exploration, and then treats the estimated system as true and

conducts decision-making methods on it. In the adversarial online control problem, if we can find an efficient data-driven algorithm \mathcal{A}_0 which invokes $\{u^d, x^d\}$ and guarantees sublinear regret, then it becomes possible to design an algorithm \mathcal{A} which first estimates a clean trajectory $\{u^d, \hat{x}^d\}$ from perturbed data and then deploy \mathcal{A}_0 while substituting $\{u^d, x^d\}$ for $\{u^d, \hat{x}^d\}$ to achieve a sublinear regret.

In the following, we discuss the reference policy class considered in this paper, including the concept of “accumulated disturbance”, and propose an algorithm in a data-driven manner that requires a clean trajectory as input and guarantees $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$ regret bound.

3.1 Accumulated Disturbance and ADAC

Before designing an adversarial online control algorithm, one needs to fix a reference policy class. While the linear feedback controller (LFC) $u_t = Kx_t$ is a common choice in many control problems, it is not suitable for online control problems (3) due to the non-convexity of $J(K) = \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} c_t(u_t(K), x_t(K))$ with respect to K [18, Lemma 2].

A more suitable alternative to the LFC is the perturbation-based controller, which generates control input based on the historical disturbance. For model-based methods, a widely used perturbation-based controller is the disturbance action controller (DAC) proposed in [9] defined as follows.

Definition 3.1 *Given the LTI system (3) and one of its stabilizing K , i.e., $A + BK$ is (κ, ρ) -exponentially stable, if we have historical access to w_τ , $\tau \leq t$ at each time t , then Disturbance Action Controller (DAC) parameterized by $\mathbf{M} = [M^{(1)}, \dots, M^{(L)}]$, $M^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, $i = 1, \dots, L$ and K is defined as*

$$u_t^{(DAC)} = Kx_t + \sum_{i=1}^L M^{(i)} w_{t-i} \quad (6)$$

It turns out that if $c_t(u_t, x_t)$ is convex for all t , and u_t is generated by DAC, then the function $J(\mathbf{M}) = \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} c_t(u_t(\mathbf{M}), x_t(\mathbf{M}))$ is a convex function with respect to \mathbf{M} [10].

In the data-driven problem context, however, w_t is not accessible as the value of (A, B) is unknown. Despite the inaccessibility of w_t , one with a clean trajectory $\{u^d, x^d\}$ can get access to the “accumulation” of disturbance by leveraging the properties of Hankel matrices $H_L(u^d), H_L(x^d)$. To begin with, let us give a formal definition of accumulated disturbance.

Definition 3.2 *Given the LTI system (3), the accumulated disturbance w_t is defined as*

$$w_t = \sum_{i=0}^t A^i w_{t-i}. \quad (7)$$

For the system (3) with $x_0 = 0$, we have

$$x_t = \sum_{i=1}^t A^{i-1} B u_{t-i} + \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} A^i w_{t-1-i}. \quad (8)$$

Define $x_t^c = \sum_{i=1}^t A^{i-1} B u_{t-i}$, then x_t^c satisfies

$$x_t = x_t^c + \mathbf{w}_{t-1}, \quad (9)$$

and

$$x_t^c = A x_{t-1}^c + B u_{t-1}, \quad x_0^z = x_0 = 0. \quad (10)$$

Equation (10) indicates $\{x_\tau^c, u_\tau\}_{\tau \leq t}$ is a clean trajectory of the system (A, B) . Since \mathbf{w}_{t-1} can be regarded as the *accumulation* of disturbance w_τ , $\tau = 1, \dots, t-1$ on a clean state x_t^z , we termed \mathbf{w}_t the *accumulated disturbance*.

Next is about how to calculate \mathbf{w}_t . Since both $\{u_t, x_t^c\}$ in (9) and $\{x^d, u^d\}$ are clean trajectories of (3), by Theorem 1, we know there exists an $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{N-L+1}$ such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} u_{t-L+1:t} \\ x_{t-L+1:t} - \mathbf{w}_{t-L:t-1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} H_L(u^d) \\ H_L(x^d) \end{bmatrix} \alpha \quad (11)$$

When $H_L(u^d)$ is full row rank, then every α that satisfies (11) also satisfies

$$\begin{bmatrix} u_{t-L+1:t} \\ x_{t-L+1} - \mathbf{w}_{t-L} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} H_L(u^d) \\ H_L(x^d)[1, :] \end{bmatrix} \alpha, \quad (12)$$

and each row of $x_{t-L+2:t} - \mathbf{w}_{t-L+1:t-1}$ can be represented by the elements of (12). This discovery provides a way to calculate \mathbf{w}_t in a data-driven manner, which is stated in the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1 *Suppose Assumption 1, 2 hold. Then, given a clean trajectory $\{x^d, u^d\} = \{x_1^d, u_1^d, \dots, x_N^d, u_N^d\}$ of (3) where u^d is persistently exciting of order $L+2n$, the sequence $\{x_0, u_0, \dots, x_{L-1}, u_{L-1}\}$ is a trajectory of (3) if and only if there exists an $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{N+L-1}$ such that*

$$\begin{bmatrix} u_{1:L} \\ x_1 - \mathbf{w}_0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} H_L(u^d) \\ H_L(x^d)[1, :] \end{bmatrix} \alpha. \quad (13)$$

Moreover, in this case,

$$\mathbf{w}_{i-1} = x_i - H_L(x^d)[i, :] \alpha, \quad 1 \leq i \leq L. \quad (14)$$

Based on Lemma 3.1, we present a pseudo-code, AccNoise(), for computing \mathbf{w}_t , as depicted in Algorithm 1. By running this program,

$$\mathbf{w}_t = \text{AccNoise}(u_{t-L+2:t}, x_{t-L+2}, x_{t+1}, \mathbf{w}_{t-L+1}, H_L(u^d), H_L(x^d)). \quad (15)$$

With access to \mathbf{w}_t , we can define a class of controller named *Accumulated Disturbance Action Controller* in a similar manner to DAC. An assumption is given hereafter to make gradient-based methods feasible.

Definition 3.3 *Given the LTI system (3), one of its stabilizing K , a set \mathbb{M} , and accumulated disturbance \mathbf{w}_τ , $\tau < t$ at each time t , then Accumulated Disturbance Action Controller (ADAC) parameterized by $\mathbf{M} = [M^{(1)}, \dots, M^{(L)}] \in \mathbb{M}$ and K is*

$$u_t^{(ADAC)} = K x_t + \sum_{i=1}^L M^{(i)} \mathbf{w}_{t-i} \quad (16)$$

Assumption 4 *\mathbb{M} is a convex set and $\|M^{(i)}\| \leq D$ for any $\mathbf{M} = [M^{(1)}, \dots, M^{(L)}] \in \mathbb{M}$.*

Since $u_t^{(ADAC)}$ is composed of a stabilizing state feedback and a bounded input, the LTI system (3) remains stable while applying ADAC. Besides, $J(\mathbf{M}) = \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} c_t(\tilde{u}_t(\mathbf{M}), \tilde{x}_t(\mathbf{M}))$ is a convex function w.r.t \mathbf{M} since $u_t^{(ADAC)}$ is a linear combination of past accumulated disturbances. Moreover, [19] shows that if the cost function is quadratic and stationary, then the optimal controller is exactly in the form of ADAC. For these reasons, we choose ADAC as the reference policy class of the problem we study, and specify the regret as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rgt}_T(\mathcal{A}, \Pi) &= \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} c_t(u_t, x_t) - \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} c_t(u_t(\mathbf{M}^*|\{\mathbf{w}_t\}), x_t(\mathbf{M}^*|\{\mathbf{w}_t\})) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{M}^* = \arg \min_{\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{M}} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} c_t(u_t(\mathbf{M}|\{\mathbf{w}_t\}), x_t(\mathbf{M}|\{\mathbf{w}_t\})) \\ u_t(\mathbf{M}|\{\mathbf{w}_t\}) = \sum_{i=1}^L M^{(i)} \mathbf{w}_{t-i} \\ x_{t+1}(\mathbf{M}|\{\mathbf{w}_t\}) = A x_t(\mathbf{M}|\{\mathbf{w}_t\}) + B u_t(\mathbf{M}|\{\mathbf{w}_t\}) + w_t \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

3.2 Algorithm with Clean-Trajectory Input

To reduce the regret, we develop an adaptive ADAC policy whose parameter \mathbf{M} is updated by online gradient descent (OGD) as

$$\begin{aligned} u_t &= \sum_{i=1}^L M_t^{(i)} \mathbf{w}_{t-i} \\ f_t(\mathbf{M}_t) &= c_t(u_t(\mathbf{M}_t|\{\mathbf{w}_t\}), x_t(\mathbf{M}_t|\{\mathbf{w}_t\})) \\ \mathbf{M}_{t+1} &= \text{Proj}_{\mathbb{M}}(\mathbf{M}_t - \lambda \nabla f_t(\mathbf{M}_t)) \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

It can be seen that the value of $x_t(\mathbf{M}_t|\{\mathbf{w}_t\})$ is necessary for operating OGD. Fortunately, given $\{\mathbf{w}_\tau\}$, $\tau \leq t$, one can simulate $x_\tau(\mathbf{M}_t|\{\mathbf{w}_t\})$ for any $\tau \leq t$ by leveraging Lemma 3.1, just letting $u_t = \sum_{i=1}^L M_t^{(i)} \mathbf{w}'_{t-i}$ in (13) and computing (14). The simulation program PiTraj() is organized in

Algorithm 2. One with clean trajectory $\{x^d, u^d\}$ is able to recover $x_t(\mathbf{M}_t|\{\mathbf{w}_t\})$ by

$$x_t(\mathbf{M}_t|\{\mathbf{w}_t\}) = \text{PiTraj}(\mathbf{w}_{0:t-1}, \mathbf{M}_t, H_L(u^d), H_L(x^d), t). \quad (19)$$

Our algorithm for adversarial control with a clean trajectory is summarized in Algorithm 3. At every time step t , the algorithm plays $u_t = \sum_{i=1}^L M_t^{(i)} w'_{t-i}$, receives x_{t+1} and c_t thereafter, then calculates \mathbf{w}_t and simulates $x_t(\mathbf{M}_t|\{\mathbf{w}_t\})$ respectively, and finally updates \mathbf{M}_t by OGD.

3.3 Regret Guarantees

The following result shows that Algorithm 3 guarantees an $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$ regret bound in the scenario where a clean trajectory is known.

Theorem 2 *Suppose Assumption 1,2,3 hold and u^d is persistently exciting of order $L+2n$. Then Algorithm 1 denoted as \mathcal{A}_0 guarantees that*

$$\text{rgt}_T(\mathcal{A}_0, \Pi) \leq C_0 \sqrt{T}$$

with some constant $C_0 = \text{poly}(G, \|B\|, m, n, \rho, L)$.

We omit the proof of Theorem 2 as it is a simplified version of Theorem 3 in Section 5. This $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$ regret bound is on par with model-based adversarial online control methods with a known system model.

Algorithm 1 AccNoise ($u_{t-L+2:t}, x_{t-L+2}, x_{t+1}, \mathbf{w}_{t-L+1}, H_L(u^d), H_L(x^d)$)

1: Find an α such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u} \\ x_{t-L+2} - \mathbf{w}_{t-L+1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} H_L(u^d) \\ H_L(x^d)[1, :] \end{bmatrix} \alpha$$

2: Calculate $\mathbf{w}_t = x_{t+1} - H_L(x^d)[L, :]\alpha$.

3: **return** \mathbf{w}_t .

Algorithm 2 PiTraj ($\mathbf{w}_{0:t-1}, \mathbf{M}_t, H_L(u^d), H_L(x^d), t$)

1: Initialization: $\tilde{x}_{t \leq 0} = 0, \tilde{u}_{t \leq 0} = 0, \mathbf{w}_{t \leq 0} = 0$.

2: Set $\tilde{u}_\tau = \sum_{i=1}^L M_t^{(i)} \mathbf{w}_{\tau-i}, \tau = 0, \dots, t$.

3: **for** $\tau = 0, 1, \dots, t-1$ **do**

4: Find an α such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{u}_{\tau-L+2:\tau+1} \\ \tilde{x}_{\tau-L+2} - \mathbf{w}_{\tau-L+1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} H_L(u^d) \\ H_L(x^d)[1, :] \end{bmatrix} \alpha$$

5: $\tilde{x}_{\tau+1} = H_L(x^d)[L, :]\alpha + \mathbf{w}_\tau$

6: **end for**

7: **return** \tilde{x}_t .

Algorithm 3 Data-Driven Online Adaptive Control Policy with Clean-Trajectory Input (\mathcal{A}_0)

1: **Inputs:**

T, L, N such that

$2n \leq L \leq N/(m+n+1)$, set \mathbb{M} , gradient bound G , clean trajectory $\{u^d, x^d\}$.

2: Initialization: $t = 0, x_0 = 0, x_{t \leq 0} = 0, u_{-L \leq t \leq T} = 0, \mathbf{w}_{t \leq 0} = 0, M_{i \leq 0}^{(j)} = 0, \forall 1 \leq j \leq L, \lambda = \frac{2LD}{G\sqrt{T}}$, build

Hankel matrices $H_L(u^d), H_L(x^d)$.

3: **for** $t = 0, \dots, T$ **do**

4: Set $u_t = \sum_{i=1}^L M_t^{(i)} \mathbf{w}_{t-i}$.

5: Receive x_{t+1} and $c_t(u_t, x_t)$.

6: Invoke Algorithm 1. Calculate \mathbf{w}_t by (15).

7: Invoke Algorithm 2. Simulate $x_t(\mathbf{M}_t|\{\mathbf{w}_t\})$ by (19).

8: $f_t(\mathbf{M}_t) = c_t(u_t, x_t(\mathbf{M}_t|\{\mathbf{w}_t\}))$.

9: OGD: $\mathbf{M}_{t+1} = \text{Proj}_{\mathbb{M}}(\mathbf{M}_t - \lambda \nabla f_t(\mathbf{M}_t))$.

10: **end for**

4 Data-Driven Online Adaptive Control

In this section, we consider the adversarial online learning problem in a general setting without accessibility to a clean trajectory. Compared to the simplified case discussed in Section 3, the main challenge of the adversarial online control problem is that we only have access to perturbed data, making it impossible to build a noise-free and non-parametric representation for the system 3. Nevertheless, since Algorithm 3 guarantees a sublinear regret bound, we address this challenge by combining Algorithm 3 with the ETC framework. Specifically, during the exploration stage, the algorithm obtains a sequence $\{u^d, \hat{x}^d\}$ which is sufficiently close to a clean trajectory $\{u^d, x^d\}$ with high probability. As for the commitment stage, the algorithm deploys Algorithm 3 while substituting $\{x^d\}$ for $\{\hat{x}^d\}$. Now the main difficulty becomes obtaining a good estimation of a clean trajectory.

4.1 Estimation on A Clean Trajectory

To obtain a good estimation, we choose $u_t = \{\pm 1\}_{i.i.d}^m$ and collect I_0 independent trajectories starting from $x_0 = 0$. Define $x^{(i)} = \{x_1^{(i)T}, \dots, x_N^{(i)T}\}^T$ as the i -th state trajectory, $u^{(i)} = \{u_0^{(i)T}, \dots, u_{N-1}^{(i)T}\}^T$ as the control sequence and $\mathbf{w}^{(i)} = \{\mathbf{w}_0^{(i)T}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{N-1}^{(i)T}\}^T$ as the accumulated disturbance respectively. Let $X = [x^{(1)} \dots x^{(I_0)}]$, $U = [u^{(1)} \dots u^{(I_0)}]$ and $\mathbf{W} = [\mathbf{w}^{(1)} \dots \mathbf{w}^{(I_0)}]$, then

$$X = \Phi U + \mathbf{W} \quad (20)$$

where

$$\Phi = \begin{bmatrix} B & & & & \\ AB & B & & & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & & \\ A^{N-1}B & A^{N-2}B & \dots & B & \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since $\mathbb{E}(U) = 0$ and u_t is independent from w_t , we right-multiply (20) by U^T and take expectation of both side to get

$$\mathbb{E}(XU^T) = \mathbb{E}_U(\Phi UU^T) + \mathbb{E}_U(\mathbf{W}U^T) = I_0\Phi \quad (21)$$

This suggests that $\frac{1}{I_0}XU^T$ is a good estimation of Φ . Given a control sequence $u^d = \{u_0^d, \dots, u_{N-1}^d\}$, $x^d = \Phi u^d$ is a clean trajectory of the system (3), and thus $\hat{x}^d = \frac{1}{I_0}XU^T u^d$ is close to the x^d . Consequently, we can treat $\{u^d, \hat{x}^d\}$ as an estimation of a clean trajectory, and construct Hankel matrices $H_L(u^d)$ and $H_L(\hat{x}^d)$ as a data-driven representation of the dynamics.

4.2 Algorithm Design

To this end, we are ready to propose the main algorithm for solving adversarial online control problems, see Algorithm 4. For the inputs of Algorithm 4, to ensure that Hankel matrices built in Algorithm 4, Step 12 is full row rank, we require $N - L + 1 > (m + n)L$ and $L \geq 2n$ [1, Corollary 2]. Besides, to avoid redundant discussions on the length of the period, we set $L = \log T$ and $N < T^{2/3}$. The two requirements are captured in the following assumptions.

Assumption 5 $L = \log T \geq 2n$.

Assumption 6 $(m + n + 1)L \leq N < T^{2/3}$.

During the exploration stage (*Stage 1*), the algorithm collects I_0 independent trajectories that start from $x_0 = 0$ with $u_t = \{\pm 1\}_{i.i.d.}^m$, and compute \hat{x}^d by $\hat{x}^d = \frac{1}{I_0}XU^T u^d$ with some well-designed u^d . To ease the calculation in regret analysis while keeping the condition of persistent excitation of order $L + 2n$, we choose $u_t^d \sim \text{Unif}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\mathcal{S}^{m-1}\right)$.

In the commitment stage (*Stage 2*), we follow the same scheme shown in Algorithm 3. The algorithm is an adaptive ADAC policy, where u_t responds to the estimation of w_t , denoted as \hat{w}_t , and the parameter \mathbf{M}_t is updated by OGD. The estimation \hat{w}_t is calculated by Algorithm 1 while replacing $H_L(x^d)$ by $H_L(\hat{x}^d)$. To acquire $x_t(\mathbf{M}_t|\{\hat{w}_t\})$ which is necessary for OGD, we run Algorithm 2 while treating $H_L(\hat{x}^d)$ and \hat{w}_t as the true values.

5 Theoretical Analysis

In this section, we analyze the regret bound of the proposed algorithm. The main result is summarized in Theorem 3.

Theorem 3 *Suppose that all the assumptions hold, then it holds that when $I_0 \geq$, for $\forall \delta > 0$, the following statement holds with probability at least $1 - 4 \exp(-\delta^2)$,*

$$\text{rgt}_T(\mathcal{A}, \Pi^{\text{ADAC}}) \leq \tilde{O}(C\delta T^{2/3})$$

where $C = \text{poly}(\rho, \varepsilon, m, n, M, G, N, \|B\|)$.

Algorithm 4 Data-Driven Online Adaptive Control Policy \mathcal{A}

- 1: **Inputs:**
Time horizon T , numbers I_0, L, N , dimension m, n , set \mathbb{M} , gradient bound G .
 - 2: **Stage 1: Online exploration**
 - 3: Initialization: $t = 0, x_0 = 0$,
 - 4: **for** $k = 0, 1, \dots, I_0$ **do**
 - 5: **for** $t = 0, 1, \dots, N$ **do**
 - 6: Set $u_t^k = \{\pm 1\}_{i.i.d.}^m$ and collect u_t^k, x_{t+1}^k .
 - 7: **end for**
 - 8: **end for**
 - 9: Build matrix X and U as shown in Section 4.1.
 - 10: Set $u^d = \{u_0^d, \dots, u_{N-1}^d\}, u_t^d \sim \text{Unif}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\mathcal{S}^{m-1}\right)$.
 - 11: Calculate $\hat{x}^d = \frac{1}{I_0}XU^T u^d$.
 - 12: Build Hankel matrices $H(\hat{x}^d)$ and $H(u^d)$.
 - 13: **Stage 2: Commitment in Noisy Environment**
 - 14: Initialization: $t = 0, T_s = NI_0, x_{t \leq 0} = 0, u_{[-L:T-T_s]} = 0, \hat{w}_{t \leq 0} = 0, M_{i \leq 0}^{(j)} = 0, \forall 1 \leq j \leq L, \lambda = \frac{2LD}{G\sqrt{T}}$.
 - 15: **for** $t = 0, \dots, T - T_s$ **do**
 - 16: Set $u_t = \sum_{i=1}^L M_t^{(i)} \hat{w}_{t-i}$.
 - 17: Receive x_{t+1} and $c_t(u_t, x_t)$.
 - 18: Calculate $\hat{w}_t = \text{AccNoise}(u_{t-L+2:t}, x_{t-L+2}, x_{t+1}, w_{t-L+1}, H_L(u^d), H_L(\hat{x}^d))$.
 - 19: Calculate $\tilde{x}_t(\mathbf{M}_t) = \text{PiTraj}(\hat{w}_{0:t-1}, \mathbf{M}_t, x_{0:L}, u_{0:L-1}, H_L(u^d), H_L(\hat{x}^d), t)$.
 - 20: $f_t(\mathbf{M}_t) = c_t(u_t, \tilde{x}_t(\mathbf{M}_t))$.
 - 21: OGD: $\mathbf{M}_{t+1} = \text{Proj}_{\mathbb{M}}(\mathbf{M}_t - \lambda \nabla f_t(\mathbf{M}_t))$.
 - 22: **end for**
-

The main ideas of the proof are summarized as follows. First we show that for the system (3), a non-parametric representation based on the Hankel matrix is equivalent to a linear system model parameterized by some matrices (H_1, H_2) , and the true trajectory $\{u_t, x_t\}$, which is a trajectory of (H_1, H_2) subject to w_t , can also be regarded as a trajectory of some (\hat{H}_1, \hat{H}_2) perturbed by \hat{w}_t . Next, we give the bound of the estimation error of the clean trajectory $\|\hat{x}^d - x^d\|$ and then bound the error $\|\hat{H}_1 - H_1\|, \|\hat{H}_2 - H_2\|$ and $\|\hat{w}_t - w_t\|$ that are caused by $\|\hat{x}^d - x^d\|$. Then we decompose the regret into three parts and bound each separately by using the result of error bounds. Finally, we put the two parts of regret together and obtain the result shown in Theorem 3. Most proof details are included in Appendix A-D.

5.1 L -step Representation of LTI Systems

We demonstrate the equivalence of system (3), presented in a 1-step iterative format, to an L -step representation. The dynamics of this L -step representation can be inferred from $H_L(x^d), H_L(u^d)$ and w_t .

Lemma 5.1 *Let $\{u^d, x^d\}$ be a clean trajectory of (3) and $H_L(u^d), H_L(x^d)$ be associated Hankel matrices.*

Define $u_{t,L-1} = u_{t-L+2:t}$, $H_{ux} = \begin{bmatrix} H_L(u^d) \\ H_L(x^d)[1, :] \end{bmatrix}$ and

$H = H_L(x^d)[L, :] H_{ux}^T (H_{ux} H_{ux}^T)^{-1}$. Spilt H into three blocks $H = \begin{bmatrix} H_1 & H_0 & H_2 \end{bmatrix}$ with $H_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m(L-1)}, H_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$

and $H_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, and define $v_t = \mathbf{w}_t - H_2 \mathbf{w}_{t-L+1}$. Provided that $x_{t \leq 0} = 0$, $u_{t \leq 0} = 0$ and $w_{t \leq 0} = 0$, the system (3) is equivalent to the following LTI system

$$x_{t+1} = H_2 x_{t-L+2} + H_1 \mathbf{u}_{t,L-1} + v_t \quad (22)$$

Thanks to Lemma 5.1, we can see that Stage 2 of Algorithm 1 chooses \mathbf{M}_t to optimize for the cost of the controller on a fictitious linear dynamical system (\hat{H}_1, \hat{H}_2) perturbed by $\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t$, where (\hat{H}_1, \hat{H}_2) follows the same definition of (H_1, H_2) while replacing x^d by \hat{x}^d . The following lemma illustrates that the way we generate $\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t$ ensures that the state-control sequence visited by Algorithm 4 coincides with the sequence visited by the regret-minimizing algorithm on the fictitious system.

Lemma 5.2 *Suppose that all the assumptions hold. Define $\mathbf{u}_{t,L-1} = u_{t-L+2:t}$, $\hat{H}_{ux} = \begin{bmatrix} H_L(u^d) \\ H_L(\hat{x}^d)[1, :] \end{bmatrix}$ and $\hat{H} = H_L(\hat{x}^d)[L, :] \cdot \hat{H}_{ux}^T (\hat{H}_{ux} \hat{H}_{ux}^T)^{-1}$. Split \hat{H} into three blocks $\hat{H} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{H}_1 & \hat{H}_0 & \hat{H}_2 \end{bmatrix}$ with $\hat{H}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m(L-1)}$, $\hat{H}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ and $\hat{H}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, and define $\hat{v}_t = \hat{\mathbf{w}}_t - \hat{H}_2 \hat{\mathbf{w}}_{t-L+1}$. Provided that $x_{t \leq 0} = 0$, $u_{t \leq 0} = 0$ and $w_{t \leq 0} = 0$, at any time step t of Stage 2, $\{u_t, x_t\}$ satisfies*

$$x_{t+1} = \hat{H}_2 x_{t-L+2} + \hat{H}_1 \mathbf{u}_{t,L-1} + \hat{v}_t \quad (23)$$

5.2 Estimation Errors and Stability Requirements

We first bound $\delta_d = \|\hat{x}^d - x^d\|$ and then analyze the estimation errors $\|\hat{H}_1 - H_1\|$, $\|\hat{H}_2 - H_2\|$ and $\|\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t - \mathbf{w}_t\|$.

Lemma 5.3 *Suppose that all the assumptions hold. Given a control sequence $u^d = \{u_0^d, \dots, u_{N-1}^d\}$ where $u_t^d \sim \text{Unif}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \mathcal{S}^{n-1})$, let \hat{x}^d and T_s be as Step 11 and 14 of Algorithm 4 separately. Then for any $\delta > 0$, the following statement holds with probability at least $1 - 4 \exp(-\delta^2)$ and some constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$:*

$$\delta_d \leq \frac{C_x}{\sqrt{T_s}}, \text{ where}$$

$$C_x = \frac{C_1 \varepsilon (\sqrt{mN} + \sqrt{nN} + \delta) + C_2 \|B\| N (\sqrt{mN} + \delta)}{(1 - \rho) / \sqrt{N}}$$

Next we bound the errors $\|\hat{H}_1 - H_1\|$, $\|\hat{H}_2 - H_2\|$ and $\|\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t - \mathbf{w}_t\|$, and discuss the requirements on T_s to ensure stability.

Lemma 5.4 *Suppose that all the assumptions hold. Define H_{ux}, H, H_1, H_2 as defined in Lemma 5.1, $\hat{H}_{ux}, \hat{H}, \hat{H}_1, \hat{H}_2$ as defined in Lemma 5.2, and $\delta_H = \|\hat{H} - H\|$. Given a $\delta_d > 0$, then as long as $\delta_d \leq \frac{1}{2}$, we have $\delta_H \leq C_H \delta_d$, where*

$$\begin{cases} C_H = (3h - N + 1)(8h^3 - 4h^2 + 1) - h \\ h = N + \frac{N\|B\|}{1-\rho} \end{cases}$$

Lemma 5.5 *Suppose that all the assumptions hold. During Stage 2 of the algorithm, given a $\delta_d > 0$, we have, as long as $\delta_d < C_3$,*

$$\begin{cases} \|\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t - \mathbf{w}_t\| \leq C_4 \delta_d \\ \|x_t\| \leq \frac{\|B\|LD}{1-\rho} C_4 \delta_d + C_5 \end{cases}$$

where

$$\begin{cases} C_3 = \frac{(1-\rho)^2}{2(1-\rho^2)(LD^2+1)+2(1+\rho)\|B\|LD} \\ C_4 = \frac{2\|B\|LD\varepsilon(1+\rho)+2(1-\rho^2)(LD^2+2)\varepsilon}{(1-\rho)^3} \\ C_5 = \frac{(\|B\|LD+1-\rho)\varepsilon}{(1-\rho)^2} \end{cases}$$

Remark 5.1 *It should be noted that since Algorithm 4 produces u_t on the system specialized by the pair (\hat{H}_1, \hat{H}_2) , this fictitious system is required to be (κ, ρ_1) -stable with high probability with some $\kappa > 0$ and $0 < \rho_1 < 1$. Without loss of generality, let $\kappa = 1$. To meet the stability requirement, δ_H should satisfy*

$$\delta_H + \|H_2\| < 1 \quad (24)$$

Notice that for system (3), define $\phi_{L-1} = [A^{L-2}B \ \dots \ B]$, then x_{t+1} can also be represented as

$$x_{t+1} = A^{L-1}x_{t-L+2} + \phi_{L-1}\mathbf{u}_{t,L-1} + \mathbf{w}_t - A^{L-1}\mathbf{w}_{t-L+1} \quad (25)$$

Since both (22) and (25) hold for any clean trajectories, we can get that $H_2 = A^{L-1}$ and $\|H_2\| \leq \rho^L$. Therefore, condition (24) is satisfied as long as $\delta_H \leq \frac{1-\rho^L}{2}$. This condition together with Lemma 5.3, 5.4 and 5.5 implies that in order to establish Lemma 5.4 and 5.5, T_s defined in Algorithm 4, Step 14 should satisfy

$$T_s \geq \max\left\{\frac{4C_H^2 C_x^2}{(1-\rho^L)^2}, 4C_x^2, \frac{C_x^2}{C_3^2}\right\}. \quad (26)$$

5.3 Regret Decomposition and Final Result

We decompose the regret into rgt_1 in Stage 1 and rgt_2 in Stage 2. We further decompose rgt_2 into $R_1 + R_2$ and bound each of them by using the result of error bounds. Finally, we put rgt_1, R_1 , and R_2 altogether to obtain the regret bound.

Given a $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{M}$ that operates on a linear system specified via (H_1, H_2) , define $x_t(\mathbf{M}|H_1, H_2, \{\mathbf{w}_t\})$ as the state driven by $u_t(\mathbf{M}|\{\mathbf{w}_t\})$ and $c_t(\mathbf{M}, H_1, H_2, \{\mathbf{w}_t\}) = c_t(u_t(\mathbf{M}|\{\mathbf{w}_t\}), x_t(\mathbf{M}|H_1, H_2, \{\mathbf{w}_t\}))$, where $u_t(\mathbf{M}|\{\mathbf{w}_t\})$ is defined in (17).

In Stage 1 of Algorithm 4, we do not chase a good policy. Define $T_s = NI_0$, then the regret at this stage is bounded by $\text{rgt}_1 \leq \mathcal{O}(T_s)$.

In Stage 2, the regret can be decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{rgt}_2 &= \sum_{t=0}^{T-T_s-1} c_t(u_t, x_t) - \sum_{t=0}^{T-T_s-1} c_t(\mathbf{M}^*, H_1, H_2, \{\mathbf{w}_t\}) \\
&\leq \sum_{t=0}^{T-T_s-1} c_t(u_t, x_t) - c_t(\mathbf{M}^*, \hat{H}_1, \hat{H}_2, \{\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t\}) \\
&\quad + \sum_{t=0}^{T-T_s-1} c_t(\mathbf{M}^*, \hat{H}_1, \hat{H}_2, \{\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t\}) - c_t(\mathbf{M}^*, H_1, H_2, \{\mathbf{w}_t\}) \\
&\stackrel{i.e.}{=} R_1 + R_2
\end{aligned}$$

The following two lemmas ensure that $R_1 \leq \tilde{O}(\sqrt{T-T_s})$ and $R_2 \leq \tilde{O}(\delta_d(T-T_s))$.

Lemma 5.6 *Suppose all the assumptions hold. During Stage 2 of the algorithm, as long as T_s satisfies (26), we have $R_1 \leq C_6\sqrt{T-T_s}$, where*

$$\begin{cases} C_6 = 2LDG\left(\frac{L\rho}{(1-\rho)^2}\left(\frac{\|B\|}{1-\rho} + C_H\right)\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{1-\rho} + C_4\right)\right) \\ \rho = \left(\frac{1+\rho^L}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{L}} \end{cases}$$

Lemma 5.7 *Suppose that all the assumptions hold. During Stage 2 of the algorithm, given a $\delta_d > 0$, as long as T_s satisfies (26), we have $R_2 \leq (C_7 + o(1))\delta_d(T-T_s)$, where*

$$\begin{cases} C_7 = GC_8 + GLDC_4 \\ C_8 = \frac{\|B\|LDC_4}{(1-\rho)^2} + \frac{LDC_H\varepsilon}{(1-\rho)^2}\left(1 + \frac{\|B\|}{(1-\rho)^2}\right) + C_4 \\ \rho = \left(\frac{1+\rho^L}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{L}} \end{cases}$$

Note that if $\{\hat{x}^d\}$ in Algorithm4 is exactly a clean state trajectory, then $\delta_d = 0$ and $T_s = 0$. By Lemma 5.6 and Lemma 5.7 we know that $\text{rgt}_T(\mathcal{A}, \Pi^{ADAC}) \leq 0 + R_1 + 0 \leq \tilde{O}(\sqrt{T})$, which is the result of Theorem 2. In typical cases, put Lemma 5.6, Lemma 5.7 and Lemma 5.3 altogether and we obtain

$$\text{rgt}_T(\mathcal{A}, \Pi^{ADAC}) \quad (27a)$$

$$= \text{rgt}_1 + R_1 + R_2 \quad (27b)$$

$$\leq \tilde{O}(T_s + C_6\sqrt{T-T_s} + C_7C_x\frac{T-T_s}{\sqrt{T_s}}) \quad (27c)$$

By [16, Chapter 10], (27) yields the result of Theorem 3 by setting $T_s = NI_0 = \lceil \max\{T^{2/3}, C_9\} \rceil$, where C_9 is the right-hand side of (26).

6 Data-driven control with output feedback

An advantage of our algorithm is that it can be directly applied to the output feedback case with minimal modifications. We first formulate the problem, then show how Algorithm 4 works with output sequence, and finally state the regret bound, which remains to be $\tilde{O}(T^{2/3})$.

6.1 Problem Formulation

Consider the following adversarial online control problem with output feedback

$$\min J = \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} c_t(u_t, y_t) \quad (28a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } x_{t+1} = Ax_t + Bu_t + w_t \quad (28b)$$

$$y_t = Cx_t + e_t, \quad (28c)$$

where $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the state, $u_t \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the control, $w_t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the disturbance on the state, $y_t \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the output, and $e_t \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the measurement disturbance. In this case, both w_t and e_t satisfy Assumption 2, (A, B) satisfies Assumption 1, c_t satisfies Assumption 3 and $C \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$ is bounded to keep the (κ, ρ) stability of the system.

At each time step t , the learner plays u_t and then observes y_{t+1} and the cost $c_t(u_t, y_t)$. The system matrices (A, B, C) are unknown. In the procedure of model-based algorithm [20], since (A, B, C) are not detectable with output feedback, it requires identifying a sequence of Markov operator $\hat{G}^{\{1:h\}}$, which is complicated and time-consuming. On the contrary, Algorithm 4 can be directly extended to this problem while bypassing the identification of any parameters.

6.2 Application of Algorithm 4

To begin with, for clean trajectories $\{u^d, y^d\}$ and $\{\hat{u}, \hat{y}\}$, the following statement holds as the corollary of the fundamental lemma.

Corollary 1 (Corollary of Fundamental Lemma)

Suppose $\{u^d, y^d\}$ is a noise-free trajectory of the system (28), where $\{u^d\}$ is persistently exciting of order $L + 2n$. Then, $\{\hat{u}, \hat{y}\} = \{(\hat{u}_1, \hat{y}_1), \dots, (\hat{u}_L, \hat{y}_L)\}$ is a noise-free trajectory of system (3) if and only if there exists $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{N-L+1}$ such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} H_L(u^d) \\ H_L(y^d) \end{bmatrix} \alpha = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{u} \\ \hat{y} \end{bmatrix} \quad (29)$$

This corollary implies that the precise non-parametric representation of the system (28) can be built upon Hankel matrices of a clean output trajectory $\{H_L(u^d), H_L(y^d)\}$.

Now define $\mathbf{w}_t^o = e_t + \sum_{i=0}^t CA^i w_{t-i}$, which can be treated as the *observation* of the accumulated disturbance \mathbf{w}_t , then y_t can be expressed as

$$y_t = \sum_{i=1}^t CA^{i-1} Bu_{t-i} + \mathbf{w}_{t-1}^o \quad (30)$$

The first item of on the RHS of (30) can be treated as the output of a clean trajectory driven by u_t . By Corollary 1, there exists an $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{N-L+1}$ such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} u_{t-L+1:t} \\ y_{t-L+1:t} - \mathbf{w}_{t-L:t-1}^o \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} H_L(u^d) \\ H_L(y^d) \end{bmatrix} \alpha \quad (31)$$

Therefore, we can calculate \mathbf{w}_t^o by Algorithm 1 while replacing H_x by $H_y = H_L(y^d)$ and x_{t-L+2}, x_{t+1} by y_{t-L+2}, y_{t+1} , provided that $\{y^d\}$ is clean. To this end, we modify ADAC as an observed disturbance-action controller (ODAC) as

$$u_t^{(ODAC)} = \sum_{i=1}^L M^{(i)} \mathbf{w}_{t-i}^o, \quad M \in \mathbb{M},$$

and choose ODAC as a reference policy class. [16, Chapter 8,9] provides further discussion on the rationality of the ODAC. The regret in this problem is therefore specified as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rgt}_T(\mathcal{A}_y, \Pi) &= \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} c_t(u_t, y_t) \\ &- \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} c_t(u_t(M^*|\{\mathbf{w}_t^o\}), y_t(M^*|\{\mathbf{w}_t^o\})) \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where

$$\begin{cases} M^* = \arg \min_{M \in \mathbb{M}} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} c(u_t(M|\{\mathbf{w}_t^o\}), y_t(M|\{\mathbf{w}_t^o\})) \\ y_t(M|\{\mathbf{w}_t^o\}) = Cx_t(M|\{\mathbf{w}_t^o\}) \\ x_{t+1}(M|\{\mathbf{w}_t^o\}) = Ax_t(M|\{\mathbf{w}_t^o\}) + Bu_t(M|\{\mathbf{w}_t^o\}) + w_t \\ u_t(M|\{\mathbf{w}_t^o\}) = \sum_{i=1}^L M^{*(i)} \mathbf{w}_{t-i}^o \end{cases}$$

In the case where we only have noise-corrupted output data, we can estimate a trajectory $\{\hat{y}^d\}$ by the same strategy as shown in *Stage 1*, Algorithm 4. Here we still choose $u_t = \{\pm 1\}_{i.i.d}^m$ and collect I_0 independent trajectories starting from $x_0 = 0$. Define $y^{(i)} = \{y_1^{(i)T}, \dots, y_N^{(i)T}\}^T$ as the i -th state trajectory, $u^{(i)} = \{u_0^{(i)T}, \dots, u_{N-1}^{(i)T}\}^T$ as the control sequence and $\mathbf{w}^{o(i)} = \{\mathbf{w}_0^{o(i)T}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{N-1}^{o(i)T}\}^T$ as the disturbance sequence respectively. Let $Y = [y^{(1)} \dots y^{(I_0)}]$, $U = [u^{(1)} \dots u^{(I_0)}]$ and $\mathbf{W}^o = [\mathbf{w}^{o(1)} \dots \mathbf{w}^{o(I_0)}]$ then we have

$$Y = \Phi_y U + \mathbf{W}^o \quad (33)$$

where

$$\Phi_y = \begin{bmatrix} CB \\ CAB & CB \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \\ CA^{N-1}B & CA^{N-2}B & \dots & CB \end{bmatrix}$$

By right-multiplying U^T to both sides of (33) and taking expectation, we can find that $\hat{\Phi}_y = \frac{1}{I_0} Y U^T$ is a good estimation of Φ_y . An approximated clean trajectory can be constructed by choosing $u^d = \{u_0^d, \dots, u_{N-1}^d\}$, $u_t^d \sim \text{Unif}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \mathcal{S}^{m-1}\right)$ and setting $\hat{y}^d = \hat{\Phi}_y u^d$. By following the same steps of the proof of Lemma 5.3, we can show the estimation error $\|\hat{y}^d - y^d\|$ is on the same level as $\|\hat{x}^d - x^d\|$ shown in Lemma 5.3.

With $\{u^d, \hat{y}^d\}$ in hand, we treat $\{u^d, \hat{y}^d\}$ as a clean trajectory and operate an adaptive ODAC, just as *Stage 2*, Al-

gorithm 4 does. The controller is with respect to the estimation of \mathbf{w}_t^o , denoted as $\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t^o$, which is calculated by Algorithm 1 while replacing $H_L(x^d)$ by $H_L(\hat{y}^d)$. The parameter M_t is updated by OGD. In order to acquire $y_t(M_t|\{\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t^o\})$ which is necessary for OGD, we run Algorithm 2 by treating $H_L(\hat{y}^d)$ and $\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t^o$ as the true values.

We are ready to provide the output-feedback edition of Algorithm 4, denoted as Algorithm 5. Since the two algorithms are almost the same, only changing state variables x to output variables y and $\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t$ to $\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t^o$, we include Algorithm 5 in Appendix E. Following the same steps as in Section 5, we establish an $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{2/3})$ regret bound for Algorithm 5.

Theorem 4 *Suppose that all the assumptions hold, then it holds that when $I_0 \geq$, for $\forall \delta > 0$, the following statement holds with probability at least $1 - 4\exp(-\delta^2)$,*

$$\text{rgt}_T(\mathcal{A}_y, \Pi^{ODAC}) \leq \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(C_y \delta \cdot T^{2/3})$$

where $C_y = \text{poly}(\rho, \varrho, m, p, M, G, N, \|B\|, \|C\|)$.

Remark 6.1 *Theorem 4 tells that the regret guarantee of our algorithm is at the same level as [20], which solves the adversarial online control problem with output feedback by a model-based algorithm. However, the computational cost of our algorithm is lower. The most time-consuming calculation in Algorithm 5 is solving a linear equation in the form of*

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u} \\ y_{t-L+2} - \hat{\mathbf{w}}_{t-L+1}^o \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} H_L(u^d) \\ H_L(y^d)[1, :] \end{bmatrix} \alpha,$$

which can be done efficiently. As for the model-based algorithm, the heaviest computation task is solving an optimization problem formulated as

$$\{G_1, \dots, G_N\} = \arg \min \sum_{t=N+1}^{I_0} \|y_t - \sum_{i=1}^N G_i u_{t-i}\|^2,$$

where $G \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times m}$ is a matrix. The computational cost of solving it is $\tilde{\Omega}(I_0 N p m^3)$, depending on the optimization method. When L is relatively small, our algorithm has a lower computational cost.

7 Conclusions

In this paper we propose an efficient data-driven algorithm for control an unknown linear dynamical system in the face of adversarial disturbances and adversarial convex loss functions. The data-driven representation is based on Hankel matrices in behavioral systems theory and the controller is chosen as an adaptive ADAC whose parameter is updated by OGD. Our algorithm coordinates these parts under the framework of ETC, and guarantees an $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(T^{2/3})$ regret bound with high probability. Moreover, our algorithm is versatile, extending naturally to scenarios where only output feedback is available. A limitation of this work is that it needs to collect multiple trajectories during the exploration stage. Whether a single perturbed trajectory is

enough for this data-driven scheme is considered as a future topic.

References

- [1] Ivan Markovskiy Jan C. Willems, Paolo Rapisarda and Bart L.M. De Moor. A note on persistency of excitation. *Systems and Control Letters*, 54:325–329, 2005.
- [2] Zhong-Sheng Hou and Zhuo Wang. From model-based control to data-driven control: Survey, classification and perspective. *Information Sciences*, 235:3–35, 2013.
- [3] Ivan Markovskiy and Florian Dörfler. Behavioral systems theory in data-driven analysis, signal processing, and control. *Annual Reviews in Control*, 52:42–64, 2021.
- [4] Claudio De Persis and Pietro Tesi. Formulas for data-driven control: Stabilization, optimality, and robustness. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 65(3):909–924, 2019.
- [5] Claudio De Persis and Pietro Tesi. Low-complexity learning of linear quadratic regulators from noisy data. *Automatica*, 128:109548, 2021.
- [6] Gustavo R. Gonçalves da Silva, Alexandre S. Bazanella, Charles Lorenzini, and Lucíola Campestrini. Data-driven lqr control design. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 3(1):180–185, 2019.
- [7] Jeremy Coulson, John Lygeros, and Florian Dörfler. Data-enabled predictive control: In the shallows of the deepc. In *2019 18th European Control Conference (ECC)*, pages 307–312, 2019.
- [8] Julian Berberich, Johannes Köhler, Matthias A Müller, and Frank Allgöwer. Data-driven model predictive control with stability and robustness guarantees. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 66(4):1702–1717, 2020.
- [9] Naman Agarwal, Brian Bullins, Elad Hazan, Sham Kakade, and Karan Singh. Online control with adversarial disturbances. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 111–119. PMLR, 2019.
- [10] Elad Hazan, Sham Kakade, and Karan Singh. The nonstochastic control problem. In *Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 408–421. PMLR, 2020.
- [11] Xinyi Chen and Elad Hazan. Black-box control for linear dynamical systems. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1114–1143. PMLR, 2021.
- [12] Dimitar Ho, Hoang Le, John Doyle, and Yisong Yue. Online robust control of nonlinear systems with large uncertainty. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 3475–3483. PMLR, 2021.
- [13] Yingying Li, James A Preiss, Na Li, Yiheng Lin, Adam Wierman, and Jeff Shamma. Online switching control with stability and regret guarantees. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.08445*, 2023.
- [14] Jeremy Coulson, John Lygeros, and Florian Dörfler. Regularized and distributionally robust data-enabled predictive control. In *2019 IEEE 58th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 2696–2701, 2019.
- [15] Gianluca Bianchin, Miguel Vaquero, Jorge Cortés, and Emiliano Dall’Anese. Online stochastic optimization for unknown linear systems: Data-driven controller synthesis and analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2023.
- [16] Elad Hazan and Karan Singh. Introduction to online nonstochastic control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.09619*, 2022.
- [17] Julian Berberich and Frank Allgöwer. A trajectory-based framework for data-driven system analysis and control. In *2020 European Control Conference (ECC)*, pages 1365–1370. IEEE, 2020.
- [18] Maryam Fazel, Rong Ge, Sham Kakade, and Mehran Mesbahi. Global convergence of policy gradient methods for the linear quadratic regulator. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1467–1476. PMLR, 2018.
- [19] Dylan Foster and Max Simchowitz. Logarithmic regret for adversarial online control. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3211–3221. PMLR, 2020.
- [20] Max Simchowitz, Karan Singh, and Elad Hazan. Improper learning for non-stochastic control. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 3320–3436. PMLR, 2020.
- [21] R. Vershynin. *High-Dimensional Probability: An Introduction with Applications in Data Science*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- [22] Kenneth S. Miller. On the inverse of the sum of matrices. *Mathematics Magazine*, 54(2):67–72, 1981.

A Technical Lemmas

This section states three classical conclusions in high-dimensional probability and linear algebra that are used in the proof.

Lemma A.1 [21, Chapter 4] *Let $A = \{a_{ij}\}_{m \times n} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ where each element a_{ij} is independently drawn from a sub-Gaussian distribution G_{ij} with variance proxy σ_{ij}^2 , then it holds that for $K = \max_{i,j} |\sigma_{ij}|$, some constant $C > 0$ and any $\delta > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(\|A\| \leq CK(\sqrt{m} + \sqrt{n} + \delta)) \geq 1 - 2\exp(-\delta^2).$$

Lemma A.2 [1, Corollary 2] *Suppose that $\{u^d, x^d\}$ is a clean trajectory of (3) and $\{u^d\}$ is persistently exciting of order $L + 2n$, then H_{ux} defined by Lemma 5.1 is full row rank.*

Lemma A.3 [22] *Given an invertible matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, let $\sigma_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ be its eigenvalues. Then for any $\delta_A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ such that $\delta_A \neq -A$, it holds that,*

$$(A + \delta_A)^{-1} = A^{-1} - A^{-1}\delta_A A^{-1}(I + \delta_A A^{-1})^{-1}$$

B Proof and Analysis for Section 5.1

B.1 Proof of Lemma 5.1

By Algorithm 1,

$$\mathbf{w}_t = x_{t+1} - H_L(x^d)[L, :] \alpha, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where α satisfies

$$\begin{bmatrix} u_{t-L+2:t+1} \\ x_{t-L+2} - \mathbf{w}_{t-L+1} \end{bmatrix} = H_{ux} \alpha \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Although typically α is not unique, it’s easy to find the one with the smallest norm when H_{ux} is full row rank as

$$\alpha = H_{ux}^T (H_{ux} H_{ux}^T)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} u_{t-L+2:t+1} \\ x_{t-L+2} - \mathbf{w}_{t-L+1} \end{bmatrix} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Plug (B.3) into (B.1) and apply the notation $H = \begin{bmatrix} H_1 & H_0 & H_2 \end{bmatrix}$, we obtain

$$x_{t+1} = H_1 u_{t-L+2:t} + H_0 u_{t+1} + H_2 (x_{t-L+2} - \mathbf{w}_{t-L+1}) + \mathbf{w}_t \quad (\text{B.4})$$

It should be noted that whatever the value of u_{t+1} is in (B.2), it does not affect states in this trajectory. Therefore, we set $u_{t+1} = 0$ and plug it in (B.4) to get

$$x_{t+1} = H_1 u_{t-L+2:t} + H_2 x_{t-L+2} + (\mathbf{w}_t - H_2 \mathbf{w}_{t-L+1}) \quad (\text{B.5})$$

which is exactly the conclusion of Lemma 5.1.

B.2 Proof of Lemma 5.2

Since *Stage 2* invokes Algorithm 1 to calculate $\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t$, by Lemma 5.1 we know that

$$\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t = x_{t+1} - \hat{H}_2 x_{t-L+2} - \hat{H}_1 \mathbf{u}_{t,L-1} + \hat{H}_2 \hat{\mathbf{w}}_{t-L+1} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Move x_{t+1} to the LHS of (B.6) and the other parts to the RHS, then it becomes (23) in Lemma 5.2.

C Proof and Analysis for Section 5.2

C.1 Proof of Lemma 5.3

To begin with, we derive the concentration inequality of $\mathbf{W}U^T$. Define ϖ_{ij} as elements of $\mathbf{W}U^T$, since u_t is independent from each other, it's enough to derive $\|\varpi_{11}\|_{\psi_2}$ and generalize to any ϖ_{ij} . Calculate $\mathbf{W}U^T$ and we have

$$\varpi_{11} = \sum_{i=0}^{I_0} \mathbf{w}_{01}^{(i)} u_{01}^{(i)}, \quad u_{01}^{(i)} = \begin{cases} 1 & p = \frac{1}{2}; \\ -1 & p = \frac{1}{2} \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Define $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{01} = [\mathbf{w}_{01}^{(1)} \dots \mathbf{w}_{01}^{(I_0)}]$ and $\tilde{u}_{01} = [u_{01}^{(1)} \dots u_{01}^{(I_0)}]$. By the definition of \mathbf{w}_t , we have that

$$|\mathbf{w}_{01}^{(i)}| \leq \|\mathbf{w}_0^{(i)}\| \leq \varepsilon \sum_k \rho^k \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{1-\rho} \quad (\text{C.2})$$

$$\Rightarrow \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{01}\|^2 \leq \frac{I_0 \varepsilon^2}{(1-\rho)^2} \quad (\text{C.3})$$

Using Hoeffding's Inequality, we have for $\forall \delta > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}(|\varpi_{11}| \geq \delta) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\delta^2}{2\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{01}\|^2}\right) \quad (\text{C.4a})$$

$$\leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\delta^2(1-\rho)^2}{2I_0 \varepsilon^2}\right) \quad (\text{C.4b})$$

This means that $\|\varpi_{ij}\|_{\psi_2} = \frac{C\varepsilon\sqrt{I_0}}{1-\rho}$, $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, nN\}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, mN\}$ with some constant C . Therefore,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{I_0} \varpi_{ij} \right\|_{\psi_2} = \frac{C\varepsilon}{(1-\rho)\sqrt{I_0}} \quad (\text{C.5})$$

Plug (C.5) into Lemma A.1 and we have the following statement holds with probability at least $1 - 2 \exp(-\delta^2)$ and some constant $C_1 > 0$,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{I_0} \mathbf{W}U^T \right\| \leq \frac{C_1 \varepsilon (\sqrt{mN} + \sqrt{nN} + \delta)}{(1-\rho)\sqrt{I_0}} \quad (\text{C.6})$$

Next, we move to the concentration inequality of UU^T . Define ν_{ij} as elements of UU^T . Notice that $(u_{tk}^{(i)})^2 = 1$ for any $t \leq N$, $k \leq m$ and $i \leq I_0$, so we have $\nu_{ii} = I_0$ for any $i \in \{1, \dots, mN\}$. For the elements not on the diagonal, since u_t is independent of each other, it's enough to derive $\|\nu_{12}\|_{\psi_2}$ and generalize to any ν_{ij} . Calculating UU^T points to

$$\nu_{12} = \sum_{i=1}^{I_0} u_{01}^{(i)} u_{02}^{(i)}, \quad u_{01}^{(i)} u_{02}^{(i)} = \begin{cases} 1 & p = \frac{1}{2}; \\ -1 & p = \frac{1}{2} \end{cases}, \quad (\text{C.7})$$

which implies that each $u_{01}^{(i)} u_{02}^{(i)}$ is a symmetric Bernoulli random variable. By Hoeffding's Inequality, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}|\nu_{ij}| \geq \delta \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\delta^2}{2I_0}\right) \quad (\text{C.8})$$

which indicates that $\|\nu_{ij}\|_{\psi_2} = C\sqrt{I_0}$ with some constant C , $\forall i, j \in \{1, \dots, mN\}$, $i \neq j$. Let $\frac{1}{I_0} UU^T = I + V$, then we have

$$\|v_{ij}\|_{\psi_2} = \begin{cases} 0 & i = j; \\ \frac{C}{\sqrt{I_0}} & i \neq j \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.9})$$

Plugging (C.9) into Lemma A.1 yields that, for any $\delta > 0$ and some constant C_2 , with probability of at least $1 - 2 \exp(-\delta^2)$,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{I_0} UU^T - I \right\| = \|V\| \leq \frac{C_2(\sqrt{mN} + \delta)}{\sqrt{I_0}}, \quad (\text{C.10})$$

Define $\hat{\Phi} = \frac{1}{I_0} XU^T$. Now we consider combining (C.10) and (C.6) to bound $\|\hat{\Phi} - \Phi\|$ as well as δ_d , where Φ is defined in (20). Multiplying the left-hand side of (C.10) by Φ we obtain

$$\|\Phi \cdot \frac{1}{I_0} UU^T - \Phi\| \leq \|\Phi\| \cdot \left\| \frac{1}{I_0} UU^T - I \right\| \quad (\text{C.11})$$

Therefore, we have for any $\delta > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \Phi \cdot \frac{1}{I_0} UU^T - \Phi \right\| \geq \|\Phi\| \frac{C(\sqrt{mN} + \delta)}{\sqrt{I_0}} \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \Phi \right\| \cdot \left\| \frac{1}{I_0} UU^T - I \right\| \geq \|\Phi\| \frac{C(\sqrt{mN} + \delta)}{\sqrt{I_0}} \right) \quad (\text{C.12}) \\ & = \mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \frac{1}{I_0} UU^T - I \right\| \geq \frac{C(\sqrt{mN} + \delta)}{\sqrt{I_0}} \right) \\ & \leq 2 \exp(-\delta^2) \end{aligned}$$

Consider events $E_1 = \{ \|\frac{1}{I_0} \mathbf{W} U^T\| \leq \frac{C_1 \varepsilon (\sqrt{mN} + \sqrt{nN} + \delta)}{(1-\rho)\sqrt{I_0}} \}$ and $E_2 = \{ \|\Phi \cdot \frac{1}{I_0} UU^T - \Phi\| \leq \|\Phi\| \frac{C_2(\sqrt{mN} + \delta)}{\sqrt{I_0}} \}$ with some $C_1, C_2 > 0$. By (C.12) and (C.6) we have

$$\mathbb{P}(E_1 \cap E_2) \geq 1 - 4 \exp(-\delta^2) \quad (\text{C.13})$$

Also, note that

$$\|\hat{\Phi} - \Phi\| = \|\Phi \cdot \frac{1}{I_0} UU^T - \Phi + \mathbf{W} U^T\| \quad (\text{C.14a})$$

$$\leq \|\Phi \cdot \frac{1}{I_0} UU^T - \Phi\| + \|\mathbf{W} U^T\| \quad (\text{C.14b})$$

Combining (C.13) and (C.14), we have that with probability at least $1 - 4 \exp(-\delta^2)$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\Phi} - \Phi\| & \leq \frac{C_1 \varepsilon (\sqrt{mN} + \sqrt{nN} + \delta)}{(1-\rho)\sqrt{I_0}} \\ & \quad + \frac{C_2 \|B\| N (\sqrt{mN} + \delta)}{(1-\rho)\sqrt{I_0}} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.15})$$

By the definition of \hat{x}^d we know that with probability at least $1 - 4 \exp(-\delta^2)$ we have

$$\|\hat{x}^d - x^d\| \leq \|u^d\| \|\hat{\Phi} - \Phi\| \quad (\text{C.16})$$

Combining (C.15) and (C.16), in view of $T_s = (N+1)I_0$ and $\|u^d\| = \sqrt{\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} (u_i^d)^2} = 1$ when $u_i^d \sim \text{Unif}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \mathcal{S}^{m-1})$, we arrive at the conclusion of Lemma 5.3.

C.2 Proof of Lemma 5.4

Recall that $H = H_L(x^d)[L, :] \cdot H_{ux}^T (H_{ux} H_{ux}^T)^{-1}$ and $\hat{H} = H_L(\hat{x}^d)[L, :] \cdot \hat{H}_{ux}^T (\hat{H}_{ux} \hat{H}_{ux}^T)^{-1}$. Define $\delta_1 = H_L(\hat{x}^d)[L, :] - H_L(x^d)[L, :]$, $\delta_2 = \hat{H}_{ux}^T - H_{ux}^T$ and $\delta_3 = (\hat{H}_{ux} \hat{H}_{ux}^T)^{-1} - (H_{ux} H_{ux}^T)^{-1}$. Next, we derive the bound on δ_1 , δ_2 and δ_3 .

- Bound of $\|\delta_1\|$. Notice that $H_L(\hat{x}^d)[L, :]$ is part of \hat{x}^d , so as $H_L(\hat{x}^d)[L, :]$, we have

$$\|\delta_1\| \leq \|x^d - \hat{x}^d\| = \delta_d \quad (\text{C.17})$$

- Bound of $\|\delta_2\|$. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_2 & = \begin{bmatrix} H_L(u^d) \\ H_L(\hat{x}^d)[1, :] \end{bmatrix}^T - \begin{bmatrix} H_L(u^d) \\ H_L(x^d)[1, :] \end{bmatrix}^T \\ & = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ H_L(\hat{x}^d)[1, :] - H_L(x^d)[1, :] \end{bmatrix}^T \end{aligned}$$

and $H_L(\hat{x}^d)[1, :]$ is part of \hat{x}^d , so as $H_L(x^d)[1, :]$. Consequently,

$$\|\delta_2\| \leq \|x^d - \hat{x}^d\| = \delta_d \quad (\text{C.18})$$

- Bound of $\|\delta_3\|$. Define $P = H_{ux} H_{ux}^T$, $\hat{P} = \hat{H}_{ux} \hat{H}_{ux}^T$. First we bound $\delta_P = \|P - \hat{P}\|$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_P & = \|(H_{ux} + \delta_2)(H_{ux} + \delta_2)^T - H_{ux} H_{ux}^T\| \\ & = \|H_{ux} \delta_2^T + \delta_2 H_{ux}^T + \delta_2 \delta_2^T\| \\ & \leq 2 \|H_{ux}\| \delta_d + \delta_d^2 \quad (\text{Apply (C.18)}) \end{aligned}$$

Then applying Lemma A.3 we get

$$\|\delta_3\| = \|(P + \delta_P)^{-1} - P^{-1}\| \quad (\text{C.19a})$$

$$= \|P^{-1} \delta_P P^{-1} (I + \delta_P P^{-1})^{-1}\| \quad (\text{C.19b})$$

$$\leq \frac{\|\delta_P\|}{\|I + \delta_P P^{-1}\| \cdot \|P\|^2} \quad (\text{C.19c})$$

$$\leq \frac{2 \|H_{ux}\| \delta_d + \delta_d^2}{(1 - \frac{2 \|H_{ux}\| \delta_d + \delta_d^2}{\|H_{ux}\|^2}) \|H_{ux}\|^4} \quad (\text{C.19d})$$

On the one hand

$$\|H_{ux}\| \geq \|H_L(u^d)\| \geq \sqrt{\frac{L(N-L+1)}{N}} \geq 1$$

On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned} \|H_{ux}\| & \leq N + \|\Phi\| \leq N + \|B\| \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} (N-i)\rho^i \\ & \Rightarrow 1 \leq \|H_{ux}\| \leq N + \frac{N\|B\|}{1-\rho} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.20})$$

By (C.20) as well as $\delta_d \leq \frac{1}{2}$, we have

$$\|\delta_3\| \leq \frac{2 \|H_{ux}\| \delta_d + \delta_d^2}{(1 - \frac{2 \|H_{ux}\| \delta_d + \delta_d^2}{\|H_{ux}\|^2}) \|H_{ux}\|^4} \quad (\text{C.21a})$$

$$\leq 4N^2 (1 + \frac{\|B\|}{1-\rho})^2 (2N(1 + \frac{\|B\|}{1-\rho}) + 1) \delta_d \quad (\text{C.21b})$$

Define $h = N(1 + \frac{\|B\|}{1-\rho})$. Put δ_1 , δ_2 and δ_3 together and apply (C.20) as well as the condition that $\delta_d \leq \frac{1}{2} < 1$, then

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\hat{H} - H\| \\
&= \|(H_L(x^d)[L, :] + \delta_1)(H_{ux}^T + \delta_2)((H_{ux}H_{ux}^T)^{-1} + \delta_3) \\
&\quad - H_L(x^d)[L, :] \cdot H_{ux}^T (H_{ux}H_{ux}^T)^{-1}\| \\
&\leq \left(\frac{\|x^d\| + h + 1}{\|H_{ux}\|^2} + (h+1)(8h^3 + 4h^2) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (\|x^d\| + h)(8h^3 + 4h^2) \right) \delta_d \\
&\leq ((3h - N + 1)(8h^3 - 4h^2 + 1) - h) \delta_d
\end{aligned}$$

According to the definition, we have

$$\hat{H} - H = \left[\hat{H}_1 - H_1 \mid \hat{H}_0 - H_0 \mid \hat{H}_2 - H_2 \right].$$

It follows that

$$\|\hat{H}_1 - H_1\|, \|\hat{H}_2 - H_2\| \leq \|\hat{H} - H\|$$

which completes the proof of Lemma 5.4.

C.3 Proof of Lemma 5.5

We use mathematical induction to prove this lemma. Suppose that there exist $\beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\|\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{\tau-1} - \mathbf{w}_{\tau-1}\| \leq \beta$ and $\|x_\tau\| \leq \gamma$ hold for all $\tau \leq t$. When $t = 0$, the initialization tells us

$$\begin{cases} \|\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{t<0} - \mathbf{w}_{t<0}\| = 0 \leq \beta \\ \|x_{t \leq 0}\| = 0 \leq \gamma \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.23})$$

When $t \rightarrow t + 1$:

- Since $x_{t+1} = Ax_t + Bu_t + w_t$ and $u_t = \sum_{i=1}^L M_t^{(i)} \hat{\mathbf{w}}_{t-i}$, we have for any $1 \leq i \leq L$,

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{t-i}\| \leq \|\mathbf{w}_{t-i}\| + \|\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{t-i} - \mathbf{w}_{t-i}\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{1-\rho} + \beta$$

and thus

$$\|x_{t+1}\| = \|Ax_t + B \sum_{i=1}^L M_t^{(i)} \hat{\mathbf{w}}_{t-i} + w_t\| \quad (\text{C.24a})$$

$$\leq \rho\gamma + \|B\|LD\left(\beta + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-\rho}\right) + \varepsilon \leq \gamma \quad (\text{C.24b})$$

- To calculate $\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t$, recall that $\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t = x_{t+1} - H_L(\hat{x}^d)[L, :]\alpha$, where α satisfies (B.3). Define

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_k^{(t)} = x_{t-L+k+1} - H_L(\hat{x}^d)[k, :]\alpha, 1 \leq k \leq L \\ \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_k^{(t)} = x_{t-L+k+1} - A(x_{t-L+k} - \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{k-1}^{(t)}) - Bu_{t-L+k}, \end{cases}$$

then $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1^{(t)} = \hat{\mathbf{w}}_{t-L+1}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_L^{(t)} = \hat{\mathbf{w}}_t$. When $k \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_k^{(t)} - \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_k^t\| \\
&\leq \|AH_L(\hat{x}^d)[k-1, :] + BH_L(u^d)[k-1, :] - H_L(\hat{x}^d)[k, :]\| \cdot \|\alpha\| \\
&\leq \|AH_L(\hat{x}^d)[k-1, :] + BH_L(u^d)[k-1, :] - H_L(x^d)[k, :]\| \cdot \|\alpha\| \\
&\quad + \|H_L(x^d)[k, :] - H_L(\hat{x}^d)[k, :]\| \cdot \|\alpha\| \\
&= \|AH_L(\hat{x}^d)[k-1, :] - AH_L(x^d)[k-1, :]\| \cdot \|\alpha\| \\
&\quad + \|H_L(x^d)[k, :] - H_L(\hat{x}^d)[k, :]\| \cdot \|\alpha\| \\
&\leq (\rho\|\hat{x}^d - x^d\| + \|\hat{x}^d - x^d\|)\|\alpha\| \\
&= (1 + \rho)\delta_d\|\alpha\|
\end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.25})$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_k^{(t)} - \mathbf{w}_{t-L+k}\| &= \|A(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{k-1}^{(t)} - \mathbf{w}_{t-L+k-1})\| \\ &\leq \rho\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{k-1}^{(t)} - \mathbf{w}_{t-L+k-1}\| \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.26})$$

Combine (C.25) and (C.26) and we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_k^{(t)} - \mathbf{w}_{t-L+k}\| \\ &\leq \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_k^{(t)} - \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_k^t\| + \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_k^t - \mathbf{w}_{t-L+k}\| \\ &\leq (1 + \rho)\delta_d\|\alpha\| + \rho\|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{k-1}^{(t)} - \mathbf{w}_{t-L+k-1}\| \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.27})$$

Since $\|\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t - \mathbf{w}_t\| = \|\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_L^{(t)} - \mathbf{w}_{t-L+L}\|$ and $\|\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{t-L+1} - \mathbf{w}_{t-L+1}\| \leq \beta$, by (C.27),

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t - \mathbf{w}_t\| \leq \left(\beta - \frac{(1+\rho)\|\alpha\|\delta_d}{1-\rho}\right)\rho^L + \frac{(1+\rho)\|\alpha\|\delta_d}{1-\rho} \quad (\text{C.28})$$

To further bound the RHS of (C.27), we need to bound $\|\alpha\|$. Notice that $\frac{\|H_{ux}\|}{\|H_{ux}H_{ux}^T\|} = \frac{1}{\|H_{ux}\|}$, then by (B.3) and (C.20) we can bound $\|\alpha\|$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \|\alpha\| &\leq \frac{1}{\|H_{ux}\|} (\|u_{t-L+2:t+1}\| + \|x_{t-L+2} - \hat{\mathbf{w}}_{t-L+1}\|) \\ &\leq LD\sqrt{L-1}\left(\beta + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-\rho}\right) + \gamma + \beta + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-\rho} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.29})$$

Combine (C.28) and (C.29), then we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t - \mathbf{w}_t\| \\ &\leq \rho^L\beta + \frac{1+\rho}{1-\rho^L}\delta_d((LD\sqrt{L-1}+1)(\beta + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-\rho}) + \gamma) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.30})$$

Let $\delta_d \leq C_3$, $\beta = C_4\delta_d$ and $\gamma = \frac{\|B\|LD}{1-\rho}C_4\delta_d + C_5$ where C_3, C_4, C_5 are defined in Lemma 5.5. Then it can be verified that both (C.23) and (C.24) hold, and RHS of (C.30) $\leq \beta$. This completes the proof.

D Proof and Analysis for Section 5.3

D.1 Proof of Lemma 5.6

Define

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{\mathbf{M}}^* = \arg \min_{\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{M}} \sum_{t=0}^{T-T_s-1} c_t(\mathbf{M}, \hat{H}_1, \hat{H}_2, \{\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t\}) \\ \tilde{f}_t(\mathbf{M}_t) = c_t(\mathbf{M}_t, \hat{H}_1, \hat{H}_2, \{\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t\}) \\ \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{t,L-1} = u_{t-L+2:t}(\mathbf{M}_t | \{\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t\}) \end{cases}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 &= \sum_{t=0}^{T-T_s-1} c_t(u_t, x_t) - \sum_{t=0}^{T-T_s-1} c_t(u_t(\mathbf{M}^*, \hat{H}_1, \hat{H}_2, \{\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t\})) \\ &\leq \sum_{t=0}^{T-T_s-1} c_t(u_t, x_t) - \sum_{t=0}^{T-T_s-1} c_t(u_t(\tilde{\mathbf{M}}^*, \hat{H}_1, \hat{H}_2, \{\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t\})) \\ &\leq \left\| \sum_{t=0}^{T-T_s-1} c_t(u_t, x_t) - \sum_{t=0}^{T-T_s-1} \tilde{f}_t(\mathbf{M}_t) \right\| \\ &\quad + \left\| \sum_{t=0}^{T-T_s-1} \tilde{f}_t(\mathbf{M}_t) - \sum_{t=0}^{T-T_s-1} \tilde{f}_t(\tilde{\mathbf{M}}^*) \right\| \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.1})$$

By Lemma 5.1 and Lemma 5.2, it follows that for x_{t+1} and $x_t(\mathbf{M}_t | \hat{H}_1, \hat{H}_2, \{\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t\})$

$$\begin{aligned} x_{t+1} &= \sum_{k=1}^{[(t+1)/(L-1)]} H_2^{k-1} H_1 \mathbf{u}_{t-(k-1)(L-1), L-1} + \mathbf{w}_t \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{[(t+1)/(L-1)]} \hat{H}_2^{k-1} \hat{H}_1 \mathbf{u}_{t-(k-1)(L-1), L-1} + \hat{\mathbf{w}}_t \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &x_{t+1}(\mathbf{M}_t | \hat{H}_1, \hat{H}_2, \{\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t\}) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{[(t+1)/(L-1)]} \hat{H}_2^{k-1} \hat{H}_1 \mathbf{u}_{t-(k-1)(L-1), L-1}(\mathbf{M}_t | \{\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t\}) + \hat{\mathbf{w}}_t \end{aligned}$$

Also, by Lemma 5.5 and the property of OGD, we get that for $\forall i \leq t$

$$\begin{aligned} &\|u_{t-i} - u_{t-i}(\mathbf{M}_t | \{\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t\})\| \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^L \|M_{t-i}^{(j)} - M_t^{(j)}\| \cdot \|\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{t-i-j}\| \\ &\leq \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{1-\rho} + C_4 \delta_d\right) L \lambda G i \\ &= \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{1-\rho} + C_4 \delta_d\right) \frac{2L^2 D}{\sqrt{T-T_s}} i \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\mathbf{u}_{t-(k-1)(L-1), L-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{t-(k-1)(L-1), L-1}\| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=(k-2)(L-1)+1}^{(k-1)(L-1)} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{1-\rho} + C_4 \delta_d\right) \frac{2L^2 D}{\sqrt{T-T_s}} i \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.4})$$

Define $\varrho = \left(\frac{1+\rho^L}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{L}}$. By (26) and Lemma 5.4 we have $C_H \delta_d \leq \varrho^L - \rho^L$. Combine this with (D.2), (D.1) and (D.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|x_t - x_t(\mathbf{M}_t | \hat{H}_1, \hat{H}_2, \{\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t\})\| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{[(t+1)/(L-1)]} \|\hat{H}_2^{k-1} \hat{H}_1\| \cdot \|\mathbf{u}_{t-(k-1)(L-1), L-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{t-(k-1)(L-1), L-1}\| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{[(t+1)/(L-1)]} \|\hat{H}_1\| \|\hat{H}_2\|^{k-1} \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{1-\rho} + C_4 \delta_d\right) \cdot \sum_{i=(k-2)(L-1)+1}^{(k-1)(L-1)} \frac{2L^2 D}{\sqrt{T-T_s}} i \\ &\leq \left(\frac{\|B\|}{1-\rho} + \delta_H\right) \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{1-\rho} + C_4 \delta_d\right) \frac{2L^2 D}{\sqrt{T-T_s}} \sum_{j=1}^t j \varrho^j \\ &\leq \frac{2L^2 D \varrho}{(1-\varrho)^2 \sqrt{T-T_s}} \left(\frac{\|B\|}{1-\rho} + \delta_H\right) \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{1-\rho} + C_4 \delta_d\right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.5})$$

On the other hand, by the properties of OGD, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \sum_{t=0}^{T-T_s-1} \tilde{f}_t(\mathbf{M}_t) - \sum_{t=0}^{T-T_s-1} \tilde{f}_t(\tilde{\mathbf{M}}^*) \right\| \\ &\leq 2LDG \sqrt{T-T_s} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.6})$$

Applying (D.5) and (D.6) to (D.1) and in view of $u_t(\mathbf{M}_t | \{\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t\}) = u_t$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 &\leq \left\| \sum_{t=0}^{T-T_s-1} c_t(u_t, x_t) - \sum_{t=0}^{T-T_s-1} \tilde{f}_t(\mathbf{M}_t) \right\| \\ &\quad + \left\| \sum_{t=0}^{T-T_s-1} \tilde{f}_t(\mathbf{M}_t) - \sum_{t=0}^{T-T_s-1} \tilde{f}_t(\tilde{\mathbf{M}}^*) \right\| \\ &\leq G \sum_{t=0}^{T-T_s-1} \frac{2L^2 D \varrho}{(1-\varrho)^2 \sqrt{T-T_s}} \left(\frac{\|B\|}{1-\rho} + \delta_H\right) \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{1-\rho} + C_4 \delta_d\right) \\ &\quad + 2LDG \sqrt{T-T_s} \\ &\leq 2LDG \left(\frac{L\varrho}{(1-\varrho)^2} \left(\frac{\|B\|}{1-\rho} + \delta_H\right) \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{1-\rho} + C_4 \delta_d\right) + 1\right) \sqrt{T-T_s} \\ &\leq 2LDG \left(\frac{L\varrho}{(1-\varrho)^2} \left(\frac{\|B\|}{1-\rho} + C_H\right) \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{1-\rho} + C_4\right) + 1\right) \sqrt{T-T_s} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.7})$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 5.6.

D.2 Proof of Lemma 5.7

Given a certain $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{M}$, define $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{t,L-1} = u_{t-L+2:t}(\mathbf{M}|\{\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t\})$ and $\bar{\mathbf{u}}_{t,L-1} = u_{t-L+2:t}(\mathbf{M}|\{\mathbf{w}_t\})$, by Lemma 5.1 and Lemma 5.2, it holds for $x_{t+1}(\mathbf{M}|H_1, H_2, \{\mathbf{w}_t\})$ and $x_t(\mathbf{M}|\hat{H}_1, \hat{H}_2, \{\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t\})$ that

$$\begin{cases} x_{t+1}(\mathbf{M}|H_1, H_2, \{\mathbf{w}_t\}) \\ = \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor (t+1)/(L-1) \rfloor} H_2^{k-1} H_1 \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{t-(k-1)(L-1), L-1} + \mathbf{w}_t \\ x_{t+1}(\mathbf{M}|\hat{H}_1, \hat{H}_2, \{\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t\}) \\ = \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor (t+1)/(L-1) \rfloor} \hat{H}_2^{k-1} \hat{H}_1 \hat{\mathbf{u}}_{t-(k-1)(L-1), L-1} + \hat{\mathbf{w}}_t \end{cases} \quad (\text{D.8})$$

We next quantify $\|\hat{\mathbf{u}}\|$, $\|\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{t,L-1} - \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{t,L-1}\|$ and $\|H_2^k H_1 - \hat{H}_2^k \hat{H}_1\|$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$.

- Quantify $\|\hat{\mathbf{u}}\|$ and $\|\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{t,L-1} - \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{t,L-1}\|$: By Lemma 5.5, we have $\forall t = 0, 1, \dots, T - T_s - 1$,

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{t,L-1}\| \leq \sum_{\tau=t-L+2}^t \sum_{i=1}^L \|M_\tau^{(i)}\| \|\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{t-i}\| \quad (\text{D.9a})$$

$$\leq L(L-1)D(C_4\delta_d + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-\rho}) \quad (\text{D.9b})$$

and also

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{t,L-1} - \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{t,L-1}\| \\ & \leq \sum_{\tau=t-L+2}^t \sum_{i=1}^L \|M_\tau^{(i)}\| \|\hat{\mathbf{w}}_{t-i} - \mathbf{w}_{t-i}\| \quad (\text{D.10}) \\ & \leq L(L-1)DC_4\delta_d \end{aligned}$$

- Quantify $\|H_2^k H_1 - \hat{H}_2^k \hat{H}_1\|$: By Lemma 5.4 and the condition that $\delta_d \leq \frac{\varrho^L - \rho^L}{C_H}$, we have

$$\|H_2^k H_1 - \hat{H}_2^k \hat{H}_1\| \quad (\text{D.11a})$$

$$\leq \|H_2^k H_1 - H_2^k \hat{H}_1\| + \|H_2^k \hat{H}_1 - \hat{H}_2^k \hat{H}_1\| \quad (\text{D.11b})$$

$$\leq \|H_2^k\| \|H_1 - \hat{H}_1\| + \|\hat{H}_1\| \|H_2^k - \hat{H}_2^k\| \quad (\text{D.11c})$$

$$\leq C_H \delta_d \rho^{Lk} + (\frac{\|B\|}{1-\rho} + C_H \delta_1) \|H_2^k - \hat{H}_2^k\| \quad (\text{D.11d})$$

Define $\varrho = (\frac{1+\rho^L}{2})^{\frac{1}{L}}$. By (26) and Lemma 5.4 we have $C_H \delta_d \leq \varrho^L - \rho^L$. By [10, Lemma 17],

$$\|H_2^k - \hat{H}_2^k\| \leq k\varrho^{Lk} \|H_2 - \hat{H}_2\|$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|H_2^k H_1 - \hat{H}_2^k \hat{H}_1\| \\ & \leq C_H \delta_d \rho^{Lk} + (\frac{\|B\|}{1-\rho} + C_H \delta_d) C_H \delta_d k \varrho^{Lk} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.12})$$

Combining (D.9), (D.10) with (D.12) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \|x_{t+1}(\mathbf{M}|H_1, H_2, \{\mathbf{w}_t\}) - x_{t+1}(\mathbf{M}|\hat{H}_1, \hat{H}_2, \{\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t\})\| \\ & \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor (t+1)/(L-1) \rfloor} \|H_2^{k-1} H_1\| \|\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{t-(k-1)(L-1), L-1} - \bar{\mathbf{u}}_{t-(k-1)(L-1), L-1}\| \\ & \quad + \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor (t+1)/(L-1) \rfloor} \|H_2^k H_1 - \hat{H}_2^k \hat{H}_1\| \|\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{t-(k-1)(L-1), L-1}\| \\ & \quad + \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor (t+1)/(L-1) \rfloor} \|\mathbf{w}_t - \hat{\mathbf{w}}_t\| \\ & \leq \frac{\|B\|}{1-\rho} \sum_{k=0}^t LDC_4 \delta_d \rho^k + LD(C_4 \delta_d + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-\rho}) \sum_{k=0}^t C_H \delta_d \rho^k \\ & \quad + LD(C_4 \delta_d + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-\rho}) \sum_{k=0}^t (\frac{\|B\|}{1-\rho} + C_H \delta_d) C_H \delta_d k \varrho^k + C_4 \delta_d \\ & = \left(\frac{\|B\| LDC_4}{(1-\rho)^2} + \frac{LDC_H \varepsilon}{(1-\rho)^2} (1 + \frac{\|B\|}{(1-\varrho)^2}) + C_4 \right) \delta_d + o(\delta_d) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.13})$$

Apply (D.13), (D.9) and the definition of C_8, C_7 to R_2 and we get

$$\begin{aligned} R_2 & = \sum_{t=0}^{T-T_s-1} c_t(\mathbf{M}^*, \hat{H}_1, \hat{H}_2, \{\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t\}) - c_t(\mathbf{M}^*, H_1, H_2, \{\mathbf{w}_t\}) \\ & \leq G \sum_{t=0}^{T-T_s-1} \|x_t(\mathbf{M}^*|H_1, H_2, \{\mathbf{w}_t\}) - x_t(\mathbf{M}^*|\hat{H}_1, \hat{H}_2, \{\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t\})\| \\ & \quad + G \sum_{t=0}^{T-T_s-1} \|u_t(\mathbf{M}^*|\{\hat{\mathbf{w}}_t\}) - u_t(\mathbf{M}^*|\{\mathbf{w}_t\})\| \\ & \leq (GC_8 + GLDC_4) \delta_d (T - T_s) + o(\delta_d) (T - T_s) \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.

E Algorithm with Output Feedback

Algorithm 5 Data-Driven Online Adaptive Control Policy with Output Feedback (\mathcal{A}_y)

- 1: **Inputs:**
 Time horizon T , numbers I_0, L, N ,
 dimension m, n, p set \mathbb{M} , gradient bound G .
 - 2: **Stage 1: Online exploration.**
 - 3: Initialization: $t = 0, x_0 = 0$,
 - 4: **for** $k = 0, 1, \dots, I_0$ **do**
 - 5: **for** $t = 0, 1, \dots, N$ **do**
 - 6: Set $u_t^k = \{\pm 1\}_{i.i.d}^m$ and collect u_t^k, y_{t+1}^k .
 - 7: **end for**
 - 8: **end for**
 - 9: Build matrix Y and U as shown in Section 4.
 - 10: Calculate $\hat{\Phi}_y = \frac{1}{I_0} Y U^T$.
 - 11: Set $u^d = \{u_0^d, \dots, u_{N-1}^d\}$, $u_t^d \sim \text{Unif}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \mathcal{S}^{m-1}\right)$
 - 12: $\hat{y}^d = \hat{\Phi}_y u^d$.
 - 13: Build Hankel matrices $H(\hat{y}^d)$ and $H(u^d)$.
 - 14: **Stage 2: Commitment in Noisy Environment.**
 - 15: Initialization: $t = 0, T_s = NI_0, x_{t \leq 0} = 0$,
 $u_{-L \leq t \leq T - T_s} = 0, \hat{w}_{t \leq 0} = 0, M_{i \leq 0}^{(j)} = 0, \forall 1 \leq j \leq L$,
 $\lambda = \frac{2LD}{G\sqrt{T}}$.
 - 16: **for** $t = 0, \dots, T - T_s$ **do**
 - 17: Set $u_t = \sum_{i=1}^L M_t^{(i)} \hat{w}_{t-i}^o$.
 - 18: Receive y_{t+1} and $c_t(u_t, y_t)$.
 - 19: Calculate $\hat{w}_t = \text{AccNoise}(u_{t-L+2:t}, y_{t-L+2}, y_{t+1}, \hat{w}_{t-L+1}^o, H_L(u^d), H_L(\hat{y}^d))$.
 - 20: Calculate $\tilde{y}_t(\mathbf{M}_t) = \text{PiTraj}(\hat{w}_{0:t-1}^o, \mathbf{M}_t, H_L(u^d), H_L(\hat{y}^d), t)$.
 - 21: $f_t(\mathbf{M}_t) = c_t(u_t, \tilde{y}(\mathbf{M}_t))$.
 - 22: OGD: $\mathbf{M}_{t+1} = \text{Proj}_{\mathbb{M}}(\mathbf{M}_t - \lambda \nabla f_t(\mathbf{M}_t))$.
 - 23: **end for**
-