

Regret-Optimal Defense Against Stealthy Adversaries: A System Level Approach

Hiroyasu Tsukamoto^{*‡}, Joudi Hajar[†], Soon-Jo Chung^{†‡}, and Fred Y. Hadaegh^{†‡}

Abstract—Modern control designs in robotics, aerospace, and cyber-physical systems heavily depend on real-world data obtained through the system outputs. In the face of system faults and malicious attacks, however, these outputs can be compromised to misrepresent some portion of the system information that critically affects their secure and trustworthy operation. In this paper, we introduce a novel regret-optimal control framework for designing controllers that render a linear system robust against stealthy attacks, including sensor and actuator attacks, as well as external disturbances. In particular, we establish (a) a convex optimization-based system metric to quantify the regret with the worst-case stealthy attack (the true performance minus the optimal performance in hindsight with the knowledge of the stealthy attack), which improves and adaptively interpolates \mathcal{H}_2 and \mathcal{H}_∞ norms in the presence of stealthy adversaries, (b) an optimization problem for minimizing the regret of 1 expressed in the system level parameterization, which is useful for its localized and distributed implementation in large-scale systems, and (c) a rank-constrained optimization problem (i.e., optimization with a convex objective subject to convex constraints and rank constraints) equivalent to the optimization problem of (b). Finally, we conduct a numerical simulation which showcases the effectiveness of our approach.

I. INTRODUCTION

Recent significant progress in autonomous control, sometimes with the infusion of machine learning, has identified crucial roles of real-world data in designing resilient autonomous systems and their decision-making strategies. One of the fundamental questions we need to answer in utilizing such real-world data with robotics, aerospace, and cyber-physical systems is “What if the outputs of these systems are compromised and do not represent some portion of crucial real-world data, which could be an indicator of possible system anomaly?”

In this paper, we consider a discrete-time linear time-varying system with stealthy actuator and sensor disturbances. In this paper, if the difference between the system outputs with and without disturbances is less than a certain threshold, such disturbance is referred to as stealthy attack. This could result in the loss of critical adversarial information contained in raw real-world data, which happens in various types of scenarios with 1) malicious sensor and actuator attacks, 2) system faults including actuator and sensor failures, and 3) disturbances and

system uncertainties simply hidden in the null space of the system output. A general framework to detect and optimally mitigate the effects of these stealthy disturbances is very relevant to research problems in cybersecurity, Fault Detection, Identification, and Recovery (FDIR), and trustworthy system-level autonomy of robotics and aerospace systems.

Contributions: We derive a novel rank minimization framework to find the regret-optimal system level parameterization, specifically designed for resiliency against stealthy actuator and sensor disturbances. Here, the regret under the presence of adversarial disturbances is defined as $\text{Regret} = J_t - J_c$, where J_t is the performance computed only with causal information and J_c is the one with non-causal information, i.e.,

$J_t = \text{true performance with access to only past attacks}$

$J_c = \text{clairvoyant performance with access to past, present, and future attacks}$

This explains the reason why this notion is called regret as originally derived in [1]–[3]. Our method also uses the System-Level Synthesis (SLS) parameterization introduced in [4]–[7]. As the name suggests, SLS provides a necessary and sufficient characterization of the achievable system response of *the entire closed-loop system*. It thus equivalently rewrites the conventional problem of control synthesis as the design of the entire closed-loop system, which allows for incorporating a wide range of system-level constraints, such as distributed constraints, localizability, and robustness in a convex formulation [6]. Exploiting these two approaches of regret optimality and SLS in our system with stealthy adversaries results in the following contributions.

- 1) We derive a novel convex optimization-based system metric to quantify the regret with the worst-case stealthy attack, which improves and adaptively interpolates the average and robust performances of \mathcal{H}_2 and \mathcal{H}_∞ norms in the presence of stealthy adversaries.
- 2) We formulate an optimization problem for minimizing the regret of 2 expressed in terms of the system level parameterization, which is useful for its localized and distributed implementation in large-scale systems.
- 3) We equivalently reformulate the problem of 2 as a rank-constrained optimization problem, i.e., an optimization problem with a convex objective subject to convex constraints and rank constraints.

Since the optimization problem in our third contribution is convex except for the rank constraints, it can be solved by a large number of convex rank minimization tools available in the literature, including, but not limited to, [8]–[12].

Related Work: Regret-optimal control [1]–[3] is an adaptive and robust framework to design a family of controllers that min-

* Department of Aerospace Engineering, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL, hiroyasu@illinois.edu.

† Division of Engineering and Applied Science, Caltech, Pasadena, CA, {jhajar, sjchung, hadaegh}@caltech.edu.

‡ Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, CA. This project is funded by the Technology Innovation Institution (TII) with a contract with Caltech. The first author is funded by the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Part of the research was carried out at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, under a contract with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

minimizes the performance deviation between a causal controller and a clairvoyant non-causal controller, which is called regret. Motivated by the regret analysis in the online learning and adaptive control community [13]–[19], it dynamically adjusts its control input with the online causal observations of system disturbances, thereby yielding the system performance with minimal worst-case regret. It inherits the game-theoretic ideas of the \mathcal{H}_∞ control [20], where we design the parameters of the causal controller solving a minimax optimization problem. However, it is less conservative than \mathcal{H}_∞ due to the presence of the clairvoyant non-causality in the optimization objective, and at the same time, it is not too optimistic as in \mathcal{H}_2 due to the worst-case minimization for robustness. It is consistently shown (e.g., in [1]–[3], [7], [21]–[23]) that regret-optimal control interpolates the robust and average performances of \mathcal{H}_∞ and \mathcal{H}_2 control.

Recent work [7] shows that a dynamic regret optimal controller can be synthesized using the system-level parameterization, which is introduced and summarized in [4]–[6] and the references therein. The key benefit of this parameterization is that, instead of synthesizing a controller as a mapping from sensor measurements to control actions of a given linear system, it provides an explicit way to parameterize and design the system response of the entire closed-loop system. This enables significantly expanding the class of constrained and structured controllers that admit a convex formulation.

This paper further extends these two approaches to more challenging scenarios with the presence of stealthy adversaries (see, e.g., [24]–[28] and the references therein for the details of stealthy adversaries). In particular, the security metric to be derived is the generalization of the output-to-output ℓ_2 gain [24], [25] with the use of the regret optimal control and system level parameterization. Therefore, our approach still fully enjoys the benefits listed above, which makes it suitable for an adaptive and robust defense strategy against stealthy adversaries for large-scale linear systems. In Sec. V, we also propose several ways to augment this with the useful properties of the system level parameterization and regret-optimal formulation, such as sparsity and localizability in the context of online learning, thereby indicating the strong potential of its predictive, data-driven formulation [29]–[32].

II. PRELIMINARIES AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

A. Notation

For $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, we use $A > 0$, $A \geq 0$, $A < 0$, and $A \leq 0$ for the positive definite, positive semi-definite, negative definite, and negative semi-definite matrices, respectively. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we let $\|x\|$ denote the Euclidean norm. Also, we define blkdiag , rank , and vec as the functions that return the block diagonal matrix, matrix rank, and matrix vectorization, respectively. The identity matrix and zero matrix are denoted as \mathbb{I} and \mathbb{O} , respectively.

B. Linear Dynamical System

In this paper, we consider the following discrete-time, time-varying, networked linear control system:

$$x_{k+1} = A_k x_k + B_{u,k} u(y_k, v_k) + B_{a,k} a_k \quad (1a)$$

$$y_k = C_{y,k} x_k + D_{ya,k} a_k \quad (1b)$$

$$z_k = C_{z,k} x_k + D_{zu,k} u_k \quad (1c)$$

where v_k is the topology representation of the network (e.g., adjacency matrix), x_k is the stacked system state, u is the stacked system control input, a_k is the stacked attack control input, y_k is the stacked system measurement, z_k is the stacked regulated output for quantifying the control performance. When a includes general finite-energy disturbances, we could still combine our metric with the ones of \mathcal{H}_∞ or the regret-optimal control to handle them.

Operator Formalism: As in [6], we use the following notations for the system signals: $\mathbf{x} = [x_0^\top, \dots, x_T^\top]^\top$, $\mathbf{u} = [u_0^\top, \dots, u_T^\top]^\top$, $\mathbf{a} = [a_0^\top, a_0^\top, \dots, a_{T-1}^\top]^\top$, $\mathbf{y} = [y_0^\top, \dots, y_T^\top]^\top$, and $\mathbf{z} = [z_0^\top, \dots, z_T^\top]^\top$, where $u_k = u(y_k, v_k)$ and T is the time horizon. We also use the following notations for the system matrices: $\mathcal{A} = \text{blkdiag}(A_0, \dots, A_{T-1}, \mathbb{O})$, $\mathcal{B}_u = \text{blkdiag}(B_{u,0}, \dots, B_{u,T-1}, \mathbb{O})$, $\mathcal{B}_a = \text{blkdiag}(\mathbb{I}, B_{a,0}, \dots, B_{a,T-1})$, $C_p = \text{blkdiag}(C_{p,0}, \dots, C_{p,T})$, and $\mathcal{D}_{pq} = \text{blkdiag}(D_{pq,0}, \dots, D_{pq,T})$, where $q \in \{u, a\}$, $p \in \{y, z\}$, and blkdiag denotes the block diagonalization. Then (1) can be written as

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathcal{Z} \mathcal{A} \mathbf{x} + \mathcal{Z} \mathcal{B}_u \mathbf{u} + \mathcal{B}_a \mathbf{a} \quad (2a)$$

$$\mathbf{y} = C_y \mathbf{x} + \mathcal{D}_{ya} \mathbf{a} \quad (2b)$$

$$\mathbf{z} = C_z \mathbf{x} + \mathcal{D}_{zu} \mathbf{u} \quad (2c)$$

where \mathcal{Z} is the block-downshift operator, i.e., a matrix with identity matrices along its first block sub-diagonal and zeros elsewhere.

Control: Throughout this paper, we consider the following output feedback control, which depends on the network topology $\mathbf{v} = (v_0, \dots, v_T)$:

$$\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{v}) \mathbf{y} \quad (3)$$

which includes the feedback control with state estimation [5] given as $\xi_{k+1} = A_{e,k} \xi_k + B_{e,k} y_k$ and $u_k = C_{e,k} \xi_k + D_{e,k} y_k$, where ξ_k is the internal state of the controller.

C. System Level Parameterization

Applying the feedback control of (3), we get

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{u} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R} \mathcal{B}_a + \mathbf{N} \mathcal{D}_{ya} \\ \mathbf{M} \mathcal{B}_a + \mathbf{L} \mathcal{D}_{ya} \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{a} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Phi}_x \\ \mathbf{\Phi}_u \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{a} \quad (4a)$$

$$\mathbf{R} = (\mathbb{I} - \mathcal{Z} \mathcal{A} - \mathcal{Z} \mathcal{B}_u \mathbf{K} C_y)^{-1} \quad (4b)$$

$$\mathbf{N} = \mathbf{R} \mathcal{Z} \mathcal{B}_u \mathbf{K} \quad (4c)$$

$$\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{K} C_y \mathbf{R} \quad (4d)$$

$$\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{K} + \mathbf{K} C_y \mathbf{R} \mathcal{Z} \mathcal{B}_u \mathbf{K} \quad (4e)$$

They satisfy the following affine relations due to (4):

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{I} - \mathcal{Z} \mathcal{A} & -\mathcal{Z} \mathcal{B}_u \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R} & \mathbf{N} \\ \mathbf{M} & \mathbf{L} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{I} & \mathbb{O} \end{bmatrix} \quad (5a)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R} & \mathbf{N} \\ \mathbf{M} & \mathbf{L} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{I} - \mathcal{Z} \mathcal{A} \\ -C_y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{I} \\ \mathbb{O} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5b)$$

The conditions (5a) and (5b) are not just necessary but also *sufficient* to ensure the existence of the output feedback controller, which allows us to directly work with the system level parameterization of (4) [4]–[6].

Lemma 1. *The affine subspace defined by (5) parameterizes all possible system responses (4) achievable by the output feedback control (3). Furthermore, for any matrices $(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{N}, \mathbf{L})$ satisfying (5), the feedback control (3) with*

$$\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{L} - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{N}$$

achieves the desired response (4).

Proof. The first part can be shown just by verifying (5) for $(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{N}, \mathbf{L})$ of (4). The second part follows from substituting $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{L} - \mathbf{M}\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{N}$ into (2) with the conditions of (5), which results in (4). See [4]–[6] for details. \square

Thanks to Lemma 1, we can directly work with the system level parameterization (4) and the affine conditions to look for a controller (3) with a desired property. It also enables localized and distributed control implementation, which is suitable for large-scale networked control systems in this paper.

D. Regret-Optimal Control

Let $J(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{a})$ be some performance objective to be minimized, for the control and attack input defined in (2). The dynamic regret of J , which is the true optimal performance minus the optimal performance in hindsight, is defined as follows:

$$\text{Regret}_J(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{a}) = J(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{a}) - J^*(\mathbf{a}) \quad (6a)$$

$$J^*(\mathbf{a}) = J(\mathbf{u}_{nc}(\mathbf{a}), \mathbf{a}) \quad (6b)$$

where \mathbf{u}_{nc} is the optimal non-causal control policy, i.e., the optimal policy with the full knowledge of the past, present, and future attack histories \mathbf{a} .

Regret-optimal control is for designing a control policy that minimizes the worst-case regret $\text{Regret}_J^*(\mathbf{u})$ [1]–[3], i.e.,

$$\mathbf{u}^* = \arg \min_{\mathbf{u}} \text{Regret}_J^*(\mathbf{u}) \quad (7a)$$

$$\text{Regret}_J^*(\mathbf{u}) = \max_{\|\mathbf{a}\| \leq 1} \text{Regret}_J(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{a}) \quad (7b)$$

This metric is shown to elegantly and adaptively interpolate 1) the robust performance of \mathcal{H}_∞ , which can be conservative as it considers only the worst-case performance, and 2) the average performance of \mathcal{H}_2 , which can be too optimistic under the presence of adversarial disturbances [1], [3]. It can be used also in the output feedback setting of this paper as discussed in [21]–[23]. It has also been shown recently in [7] that regret-optimal control works nicely with the system level parameterization of Sec. II-C.

E. Problem Formulation

We consider the following broad type of stealthy attack, which we call an α -stealthy attack. This definition is consistent with the one introduced in [25] in their attempt to broaden the idea of stealthiness. It reduces to conventional stealthy attacks with the anomaly detector's output being zero at all times (e.g., zero dynamics attacks [26], [27]) when $\alpha = 0$, while allowing our

approach to handling situations where the detector's output is less than a certain threshold α .

Definition 1. *For a given time horizon T , an attack \mathbf{a} of (2a) is α -stealthy in $k = 1, \dots, T$ if the following holds:*

$$\exists \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+ \text{ s.t. } \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}_n\|^2 \leq \alpha$$

where \mathbf{y} is given by (2b) and \mathbf{y}_n is by \mathbf{y} of (2b) with $\mathbf{a} = 0$.

The problems of our interest, in designing a general defense strategy against the α -stealthy network adversaries, are summarized in the following.

- The regret-optimal control (7) considers the worst-case regret for $\|\mathbf{a}\| \leq 1$. How can we derive a metric for the worst-case regret over the α -stealthy attacks of Definition 1, instead of $\|\mathbf{a}\| \leq 1$ (see Theorem 1)?
- How can we formulate the problem of finding the controller that minimizes the metric of (a), with the system level parameterization for localized and distributed implementation in large-scale networks (see Proposition 1)?
- How can we solve the problem (b) for the network topology \mathbf{v} of (3) in a computationally tractable manner, so we can optimally detect and attenuate the α -stealthy attacks (see Theorem 2)?

III. REGRET-OPTIMAL DEFENSE AGAINST STEALTHY ATTACKS

Consistently with the problem statement (a), let us consider the following optimization problem for measuring the worst-case regret under the α -stealthy attacks of Definition 1:

$$\sigma(\mathbf{u}) = \max_{\mathbf{a}} \text{Regret}_J(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{a}) \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{a} \text{ is } \alpha \text{ stealthy.} \quad (8)$$

This metric allows us to consider the regret-based robustness simultaneously with the stealthiness of the attacks a_k of (1a), as in the output-to-output gain derived for the \mathcal{H}_∞ -based robustness [25].

A. Optimal Non-Causal Control

Let us define the performance objective $J(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{a})$ of (6) as $J(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{a}) = \|\mathbf{z}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{u}\|^2$, where \mathbf{z} is the regulated output for the control performance given in (2c), and \mathbf{u} is the control input. The non-causal optimal performance $\mathcal{J}^*(\mathbf{a})$ as in $J^*(\mathbf{a})$ of (6) (where \mathcal{J} is introduced just to distinguish the performance objective of this section with J of Sec. II-D) can be expressed as follows:

$$\mathcal{J}^*(\mathbf{a}) = \min_{\mathbf{u}} \|\mathcal{E}\mathbf{u} + \mathcal{F}\mathcal{B}_a\mathbf{a}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 \quad (9)$$

where $\mathcal{E} = C_z(\mathbb{I} - \mathcal{Z}\mathcal{A})^{-1}\mathcal{Z}\mathcal{B}_u + \mathcal{D}_{zu}$, $\mathcal{F} = C_z(\mathbb{I} - \mathcal{Z}\mathcal{A})^{-1}$. This problem is clearly convex and can be solved as [3], [7]

$$\mathcal{J}^*(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{a}^\top \mathcal{B}_a^\top \mathcal{F}^\top (\mathcal{I} + \mathcal{E}\mathcal{E}^\top)^{-1} \mathcal{F}\mathcal{B}_a\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{a} \quad (10)$$

where \mathbf{Q} is defined appropriately. The optimal non-causal control policy \mathbf{u}_{nc} of (6) is then given as

$$\mathbf{u}_{nc}(\mathbf{a}) = -(\mathcal{I} + \mathcal{E}^\top \mathcal{E})^{-1} \mathcal{E}^\top \mathcal{F}\mathcal{B}_a\mathbf{a}.$$

B. System Level Approach to Worst-Case Stealthy Attack

Let $\Omega = (\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{N}, \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{L})$ for the system level parameterization (4). Then the constraint of (8) can be written as

$$\mathbf{a}^\top \Phi(\Omega)^\top \Phi(\Omega) \mathbf{a} \leq \alpha, \quad (11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\Omega) &= [C_y(\mathbf{R}\mathcal{B}_a + \mathbf{N}\mathcal{D}_{ya}) + \mathcal{D}_{ya}] = [C_y\phi_x + \mathcal{D}_{ya}] \\ &= [C_y \quad 0] \begin{bmatrix} \phi_x \\ \phi_u \end{bmatrix} + \mathcal{D}_{ya} \end{aligned}$$

by Definition 1. Also, $J(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{a}) = \mathcal{J}(\Omega, \mathbf{a}) = \|\mathbf{z}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{u}\|^2$ is given as

$$\mathcal{J}(\Omega, \mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{a}^\top (\Psi(\Omega)^\top \Psi(\Omega) + \Phi_u(\Omega)^\top \Phi_u(\Omega)) \mathbf{a} \quad (12)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(\Omega) &= [C_z \mathbf{R}\mathcal{B}_a + \mathcal{D}_{zu} \mathbf{M}\mathcal{B}_a + C_z \mathbf{N}\mathcal{D}_{ya} + \mathcal{D}_{zu} \mathbf{L}\mathcal{D}_{ya}] \\ &= [C_z \phi_x + \mathcal{D}_{zu} \phi_u] = [C_z \quad \mathcal{D}_{zu}] \begin{bmatrix} \phi_x \\ \phi_u \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

and $\Phi_u(\Omega)$ is as in (4a). The metric (8) thus becomes the following quadratically constrained quadratic program (QCQP), expressed in terms of the system level parameterization of (4) and (5):

$$\zeta(\Omega) = \max_{\mathbf{a}} \mathbf{a}^\top (\Psi^\top \Psi + \Phi_u^\top \Phi_u - \mathbf{Q}) \mathbf{a} \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{a}^\top \Phi^\top \Phi \mathbf{a} \leq \alpha \quad (13)$$

where the argument Ω for Φ , Ψ and Φ_u are omitted for notational simplicity, and \mathbf{Q} , Φ , Ψ and Φ_u are given in (10), (11), (12) and (4a), respectively. QCQPs are known to enjoy strong duality if Slater's condition holds [33, pp. 653-658], [7], which leads to the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *The QCQP for the regret-optimal metric for α -stealthy attacks (13) is equivalent to the following convex optimization problem:*

$$\mu(\Omega) = \min_{\lambda \geq 0} \lambda \alpha \quad (14)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \lambda \Phi(\Omega)^\top \Phi(\Omega) - \Psi(\Omega)^\top \Psi(\Omega) - \Phi_u(\Omega)^\top \Phi_u(\Omega) + \mathbf{Q} \geq 0$$

and thus $\mu(\Omega) = \zeta(\Omega)$ for ζ of (13).

Proof. The Lagrangian of the QCQP (13) is given as follows:

$$L(\mathbf{a}, \lambda) = \lambda (\mathbf{a}^\top \Phi^\top \Phi \mathbf{a} - \alpha) + \mathbf{a}^\top (-\Psi^\top \Psi - \Phi_u^\top \Phi_u + \mathbf{Q}) \mathbf{a}$$

which gives the Lagrange dual function $g(\lambda)$ defined as

$$g(\lambda) = \min_{\mathbf{a}} L = \begin{cases} -\lambda \alpha & \lambda \Phi^\top \Phi - \Psi^\top \Psi - \Phi_u^\top \Phi_u + \mathbf{Q} \geq 0 \\ -\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

As a result, we get the following convex optimization problem:

$$\min_{\lambda \geq 0} \lambda \alpha \text{ s.t. } \lambda \Phi^\top \Phi - \Psi^\top \Psi - \Phi_u^\top \Phi_u + \mathbf{Q} \geq 0.$$

Since the original QCQP (13) is strictly feasible for $\mathbf{a} = 0$ when $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+$, strong duality holds [33, pp. 653-658]. \square

Again, the metric (14) provides a novel approach for quantifying the worst-case regret for controllers with the system level parameterization of Sec. II-C. As discussed for the case of the output-to-output gain in [25], this metric can be viewed as one of the system gains from the α -stealthy attack \mathbf{a} of (2a) to the regret of the regulated performance output \mathbf{z} (2c), which gives our answer to the problem (a). Theorem 1 thereby

establishes an alternative but more sophisticated measure to evaluate the systems' resilience against stealthy attacks via convex optimization, adaptively with the use of the regret, in lieu of the conventional system gains including \mathcal{H}_∞ and \mathcal{H}_2 .

C. Regret-Optimal Defense via Topology Switching

We are now ready to design a feedback control policy in terms of the system level parameterization of Sec. II-C, which minimizes the novel metric μ of (14) in Theorem 1 for regret-optimal stealthy attack attenuation.

Proposition 1. *Consider the following optimization problem in terms of the system level parameterization $\Omega = (\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{N}, \mathbf{L})$ of (4):*

$$\mu^* = \min_{\Omega, \lambda} \lambda \alpha \quad (15a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \lambda \Phi(\Omega)^\top \Phi(\Omega) - \Psi(\Omega)^\top \Psi(\Omega) - \Phi_u(\Omega)^\top \Phi_u(\Omega) + \mathbf{Q} \geq 0 \quad (15b)$$

$$[\mathbb{I} - \mathcal{Z}\mathcal{A} \quad -\mathcal{Z}\mathcal{B}_u] \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R} & \mathbf{N} \\ \mathbf{M} & \mathbf{L} \end{bmatrix} = [\mathbb{I} \quad \mathbf{0}] \quad (15c)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{R} & \mathbf{N} \\ \mathbf{M} & \mathbf{L} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{I} - \mathcal{Z}\mathcal{A} \\ -C_y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{I} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \quad (15d)$$

$$\Omega \in \mathfrak{S} (= \text{set for system level constraints}), \lambda \geq 0 \quad (15e)$$

where \mathbf{Q} , Φ , and Ψ are given in (10), (11), and (12), respectively, and the other notations are given in (2). The output feedback control of (3) with $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{K}^* = \mathbf{L}^* - \mathbf{M}^* \mathbf{R}^{*-1} \mathbf{N}^*$ achieves the desired response (4) and the regret-optimal resilience against α -stealthy attacks of Definition 1, where $\Omega^* = (\mathbf{R}^*, \mathbf{M}^*, \mathbf{N}^*, \mathbf{L}^*)$ is the optimizer of (15). In particular, for the dynamic regret given as $\text{Regret}_{\mathcal{J}}(\Omega, \mathbf{a}) = \mathcal{J}(\Omega, \mathbf{a}) - \mathcal{J}^*(\mathbf{a})$ for \mathcal{J}^* and \mathcal{J} of (9) and (12), the optimal value μ^* of (15) satisfies

$$\text{Regret}_{\mathcal{J}}(\Omega^*, \mathbf{a}) \leq \mu^*, \forall \alpha\text{-stealthy attacks } \mathbf{a} \quad (16)$$

and also, for the worst-case α -stealthy attack $\mathbf{d}_{\text{wc}}(\Omega)$ (i.e., the minimizer of (13), with the optimal value given in Theorem 1), we have

$$\mu^* = \text{Regret}_{\mathcal{J}}(\Omega^*, \mathbf{a}^*) \leq \text{Regret}_{\mathcal{J}}(\Omega, \bar{\mathbf{a}}), \forall \Omega \text{ with } (5) \quad (17)$$

where $\mathbf{a}^* = \mathbf{d}_{\text{wc}}(\Omega^*)$ and $\bar{\mathbf{a}} = \mathbf{d}_{\text{wc}}(\Omega)$.

Proof. As discussed in Lemma 1, the conditions (15c) and (15d) ensures that the feedback controller with $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{K}^* = \mathbf{L}^* - \mathbf{M}^* \mathbf{R}^{*-1} \mathbf{N}^*$ achieves the desired response (4). Since the problem (15) is formulated to find Ω that minimizes the metric μ of (14) in Theorem 1, the relations (16) and (17) naturally follow by construction of ζ in (13). \square

Because of the affine nature of the system level parameterization given in Lemma 1, the system level constraints \mathfrak{S} can handle a large variety of system properties, including, but limited to, temporal and spatial locality, distributed control, and scalability [4]–[6]. Specifically, for networked control systems, the control gain can be modified by switching the topology as in (3) and we can easily add distributed control constraints *affinely* in terms of the network topology directly in (4). This leads to the following assumption.

Assumption 1. *Given the history of topologies of \mathbf{v} (4) and their adjacency matrices, we can define a convex constraint $\Omega \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathbf{v})$ for restricting Ω to be in a set consistent with the network topologies and the system's causality.*

However, the optimization problem (15) of Proposition 1 is still nonlinear even with $\mathfrak{S} = \mathfrak{C}(\mathbf{v})$ using Assumption 1. Before proceeding, let us introduce the following lemma useful for convexification (see also, e.g., [8], [9]).

Lemma 2. *For any real column vector $a \in \mathbb{R}^b$ and real symmetric matrix $S \in \mathbb{S}^{b \times b}$, we have the following:*

$$\{(a, S) | S = aa^\top\} = \left\{ (a, S) \left| \begin{bmatrix} S & a \\ a^\top & 1 \end{bmatrix} \geq 0 \ \& \ \text{rank}(S) = 1 \right. \right\} \quad (18)$$

where $\text{rank}(S)$ denotes the matrix rank of S .

Proof. Let (LHS) = \mathfrak{L} and (RHS) = \mathfrak{R} .

($\mathfrak{L} \subset \mathfrak{R}$): Since $\text{rank}(S) = \text{rank}(aa^\top) = 1$ and $S = aa^\top \Rightarrow S \geq aa^\top$, applying Schur's complement lemma [33, pp. 650-651] shows $\mathfrak{L} \subset \mathfrak{R}$.

($\mathfrak{R} \subset \mathfrak{L}$): Since S is real symmetric, we can always write S as $S = V \text{diag}(\varpi_1, \dots, \varpi_b) V^\top$, where V is an orthogonal matrix of the orthonormal eigenvectors and ϖ_i are the real eigenvalues of S . Also, since $\text{rank}(S) = 1$, S has at most one non-zero eigenvalue ϖ , which implies $S = \varpi vv^\top$ for the corresponding unit eigenvector v . Defining a as $a = \sqrt{\varpi}v$ shows $\mathfrak{R} \subset \mathfrak{L}$. \square

The following theorem provides one way to reformulate the problem (15) of Proposition 1 into an almost equivalent optimization problem in a computationally efficient form.

Theorem 2. *Suppose that Assumption 1 holds and $\mathfrak{S} = \mathfrak{C}(\mathbf{v})$ in (15). Consider the following optimization problem, the objective and the constraints of which are all convex except for the rank constraints of (19e):*

$$\bar{\mu}^* = \min_{\Omega, \lambda, \mathcal{X}, \Lambda} \lambda \alpha \quad (19a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_{\text{inv}} \mathcal{Q} + \ell(\mathcal{X}) & \Psi(\Omega)^\top & \Phi_u(\Omega)^\top \\ \Psi(\Omega) & \lambda \mathbb{I} & \mathbb{O} \\ \Phi_u(\Omega) & \mathbb{O} & \lambda \mathbb{I} \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \quad (15c), (15d) \quad (19b)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{X} & \text{vec}(\Phi(\Omega)) \\ \text{vec}(\Phi(\Omega))^\top & 1 \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \quad \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda & \lambda \\ \lambda^\top & 1 \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \quad (19c)$$

$$\Omega \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathbf{v}), \quad \lambda = [\lambda, \lambda_{\text{inv}}]^\top, \quad \lambda > 0, \quad \Lambda_{12} = \Lambda_{21} = 1 \quad (19d)$$

$$\text{rank}(\mathcal{X}) = 1, \text{rank}(\Lambda) = 1 \quad (19e)$$

where ℓ is a linear function of the decision variable \mathcal{X} defined by $\ell(\mathcal{X}) = \Phi(\Omega)^\top \Phi(\Omega)$, $\text{vec}(\Phi(\Omega))$ denotes the vectorization of the matrix $\Phi(\Omega)$, and the other notations are consistent with the ones of Proposition 1. If $\lambda^* \neq 0$ for the optimizer (λ^*, Ω^*) of (15), which is the case when the optimal regret $\mu^* = \text{Regret}_{\mathcal{J}}(\Omega^*, \mathbf{a}^*) > 0$ in (17), then we have

$$\bar{\mu}^* = \mu^*. \quad (20)$$

If $\lambda^* = 0$, which is the case when the optimal regret $\mu^* = \text{Regret}_{\mathcal{J}}(\Omega^*, \mathbf{a}^*) = 0$, then we have

$$\bar{\mu}^* \geq \mu^*. \quad (21)$$

Proof. If $\lambda^* \neq 0$ in (15), i.e., $\mu^* = \text{Regret}_{\mathcal{J}}(\Omega^*, \mathbf{a}^*) > 0$ in (17), the constraint (15b) can be equivalently expressed as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \lambda_{\text{inv}} \mathcal{Q} + \mathcal{P} & \Psi(\Omega)^\top & \Phi_u(\Omega)^\top \\ \Psi(\Omega) & \lambda \mathbb{I} & \mathbb{O} \\ \Phi_u(\Omega) & \mathbb{O} & \lambda \mathbb{I} \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \quad (22)$$

$$\lambda \lambda_{\text{inv}} = 1, \quad \mathcal{P} = \Phi(\Omega)^\top \Phi(\Omega) \quad (23)$$

using Schur's complement lemma [33, pp. 650-651], which is nonlinear due to the equality constraints (23). Still, since the nonlinearity is at most quadratic/bilinear, these constraints can be written as a function of additional decision variables (i.e., liftings) for $\Lambda = \lambda \lambda^\top$ and $\mathcal{X} = \text{vec}(\Phi(\Omega)) \text{vec}(\Phi(\Omega))^\top$, where $\lambda = [\lambda, \lambda_{\text{inv}}]^\top$. This observation leads to the following equivalent constraints of (23) due to (18) of Lemma 2:

$$(23) \Leftrightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{X} & \text{vec}(\Phi(\Omega)) \\ \text{vec}(\Phi(\Omega))^\top & 1 \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \quad \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda & \lambda \\ \lambda^\top & 1 \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \\ \text{rank}(\mathcal{X}) = 1, \quad \text{rank}(\Lambda) = 1.$$

Rewriting the constraints (22) and (23) using these additional lifted variables completes the proof for (20).

The relation (21) can be immediately obtained by the fact that $\{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} | \lambda > 0\} \subset \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} | \lambda \geq 0\}$. \square

Since the optimization problem derived in Theorem 2 is convex except for the rank constraint, we can readily apply a large number of convex rank minimization tools available in the literature, including, but not limited to, [8]–[12].

D. Relaxed Regret-Optimal Control

As in the relaxed, suboptimal \mathcal{H}_∞ control (see e.g., [34]), we could also suboptimally consider a bounded regret-optimal gain for stealthy attacks in Proposition 1, instead of optimizing it, which results in a simpler optimization problem as follows.

Corollary 1. *If we consider a relaxed problem with a fixed $\lambda = \bar{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}_+$ in (15) of Proposition 1, then the problem (19) can be simplified to the following feasibility problem as follows:*

$$\text{Find } (\Omega, \mathcal{X}) \quad (24a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{Q} + \lambda \ell(\mathcal{X}) & \Psi(\Omega)^\top & \Phi_u(\Omega)^\top \\ \Psi(\Omega) & \mathbb{I} & \mathbb{O} \\ \Phi_u(\Omega) & \mathbb{O} & \mathbb{I} \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \quad (15c), (15d) \quad (24b)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{X} & \text{vec}(\Phi(\Omega)) \\ \text{vec}(\Phi(\Omega))^\top & 1 \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \quad \Omega \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathbf{v}), \quad (24c)$$

$$\text{rank}(\mathcal{X}) = 1 \quad (24d)$$

which is convex except for the rank condition (24d).

Proof. This follows from Theorem 2 by fixing $\lambda = \bar{\lambda}$. \square

Also, dropping the rank constraints in the problems (19) and (24) results in a convex optimization problem with a well-known relaxation approach.

Corollary 2. *Applying Shor's relaxation [35] to the problem (15) of Proposition 1 yields the problem (19) of Theorem 2 without the rank constraints (19e). The solution of this problem $\bar{\mu}_{\text{shor}}^*$ gives the lower bound of μ^* in (15a), i.e.,*

$$\bar{\mu}_{\text{shor}}^* \leq \mu^*.$$

Proof. This follows from (18) of Lemma 2, which indicates that dropping the rank constraint there results in Shor's relaxation. See also, e.g., [36, pp. 220-225], [8]. \square

IV. NUMERICAL EXAMPLE

This section presents results of numerical simulation to demonstrate the efficacy of our proposed method.

Two approaches are taken to demonstrate practical utility in implementing our method. 1) With a fixed λ , solve the feasibility problem defined in Corollary 1 using an iterative rank minimization method [9], then employ a linear search on λ until a satisfactory sub-optimal solution is obtained (i.e., until the rank constraint is minimized). 2) With a fixed λ , solve the relaxed problem defined in Corollary 2, then compute the worst-case regret cost (14) of the resulting controller under stealthy attacks, and re-iterate by employing a linear search on λ until (14) is sub-optimally minimized.

Using the above, we implement our proposed controller utilizing a spring-damper system comprising 2 masses with a sampling time of $T_s = 0.5s$. We set the stealthiness measure α to $\alpha = 0.1$. We compare it to the classical robust controller, H_∞ , for which we show the results in this section. We have also performed the comparison of our approach with the typical regret-optimal controller with the formulation consistent with (25), however we have omitted the results here for the sake of brevity, as its performance under stealthy attacks closely resembles that of H_∞ for this example. Also, note that our formulation enables the implementation of controllers resilient against stealthy attacks using any quadratic cost functions. For instance, using the H_∞ cost function along with stealthiness constraints would prioritize robustness over adaptability.

The classical H_∞ controller is not specifically designed to be robust against stealthy attacks but rather against attacks that have bounded energy; it solves the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\Omega \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{v})} \max_{\|\mathbf{a}\| \leq 1} \mathcal{J}(\Omega, \mathbf{a}) \\ & = \min_{\Omega, \lambda} \lambda \alpha \end{aligned} \quad (25a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \begin{bmatrix} \lambda \mathcal{I} & \Psi(\Omega)^\top & \Phi_u(\Omega)^\top \\ \Psi(\Omega) & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{O} \\ \Phi_u(\Omega) & \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \quad (15c), (15d) \quad (25b)$$

$$\Omega \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{v}) \quad (25c)$$

where $\mathcal{J}(\Omega, \mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{a}^\top (\Psi(\Omega)^\top \Psi(\Omega) + \Phi_u(\Omega)^\top \Phi_u(\Omega)) \mathbf{a}$ as in (12).

We compare the worst-case regret cost of H_∞ and our controller under stealthy attacks, quantified by (13),(14). The results are shown in Table I where our controller consistently enhances the cost of the classical controller as the horizon increases.

Additionally, we compute the stealthy attacks that yield the worst cost for each controller and apply them to our system dynamics (2) with both H_∞ and our controller. Figure 1 illustrates that these attacks remain α -stealthy (here, $\alpha = 0.1$), while our controller achieves a 15 \times lower cost compared to H_∞ . Figure 2 depicts the regulated output over time under these stealthy attacks, demonstrating that only our controller successfully regulates the output near 0.




Fig. 1. (Left) Stealthiness of the attacks measured as $\|y - y_n\|^2 = \alpha^T \Phi(\Omega)^\top \Phi(\Omega) \alpha$, for H_∞ and our controller. Both attacks satisfy the constraint: $\|y - y_n\|^2 \leq 0.1$. (Right): Worst-case regret cost (13). Our controller achieves a 15 \times lower cost compared to H_∞ .




Fig. 2. Regulated output z (2c) under H_∞ and our controller. For a horizon of $T = 5$, our controller manages to keep the regulated output near 0, while the regulated output under H_∞ shows big oscillations.

This numerical example illustrates the strong potential of our system level approach in detecting and mitigating stealthy attacks in a regret-optimal manner. Again, as to be detailed in the next section, the system level and regret-optimal frameworks admit significantly expanding the class of constrained and structured controllers that admit a convex formulation even with the use of predictive control and online learning, beyond the ones we demonstrated in this section. Also note that for computational reasons, we opted for the horizon $T = 5$. In practice, we can alleviate this limitation by adopting a model predictive control horizon scheme.

TABLE I
WORST-CASE REGRET UNDER STEALTHY ATTACKS AS IN (13) FOR DIFFERENT TIME HORIZONS ($T=2, T=5$).

	T=2	T=5
H_∞ controller	41.38	1312.6
Proposed approach	10.19	87.10
Improvement Factor: $\frac{H_\infty(\text{Cost})}{\text{Proposed approach}(\text{Cost})}$	4.02	15.07

V. EXTENSIONS

This section discusses several extensions of the topology switching strategy of Proposition 1 and Theorem 2, which implies broad applicability of our regret-optimal metric under stealthy attacks in a wide variety of more general problem settings. We also discuss several research directions and fields that this paper has opened up.

A. Sparsity on System Responses

If the convex constraint $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{v})$ of (19d) in Theorem 2 includes sparsity constraints due to, e.g., distributed communi-

cations of the network, we could use the following corollary for additional simplification.

Corollary 3. *Suppose that we have sparsity constraints for Ω , which leads to linear constraints of the form $\text{vec}(\Phi(\Omega))_i = 0$. Then all the entries in the i th column and i th row of the matrix \mathcal{X} of (19) in Theorem 2 are also equal to zero.*

Proof. This follows from the definition of \mathcal{X} introduced in the proof of Theorem 2. \square

Another potential direction for addressing sparsity is considering spatial regret (SpRegret) defined in [37] as the regret between the cost of a topology Ω which belongs to a sparse set $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbf{v})$, and that of a topology $\hat{\Omega}$ which belongs to a denser set $\mathfrak{C}(\hat{\mathbf{v}})$: $\text{SpRegret}(\Omega, \hat{\Omega}) = \max_{\|a\| \leq 1} J(\Omega, a) - J(\hat{\Omega}, a)$. Under no further constraints, ideally, the constraint set should satisfy a quadratic invariance condition to ensure the optimality of the control strategy. In cases where it is not, there exist methods that allow for the synthesis of the controller even when the set is not Quadratic Invariance (QI). As in [37], we could use the denser topology as the one that satisfies the QI condition.

We could further extend the notion of regret to SpatioTemporal-Regret by defining it as the difference in costs of a sparse topology and of a denser topology that also knows the future attacks. In this case, the challenge we face is ensuring that the problem is well-posed (i.e., regret > 0), and finding the closest QI, noncausal sparse set.

B. Data-Driven Control and Robustness

The system level parameterization is also useful for the case where we have access only to the system's input and output data $u_{[0, T_{\text{data}}-1]} = \{u_0, \dots, u_{T_{\text{data}}-1}\}$ and $y_{[0, T_{\text{data}}-1]} = \{y_0, \dots, y_{T_{\text{data}}-1}\}$ of the system (1) with $a_k = 0$. Let $\mathcal{H}(\sigma_{[0, j]})$ be the Hankel matrix of depth D , associated with the signal $\sigma_{[0, T_{\text{data}}-1]}$ defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{H}(\sigma_{[0, T_{\text{data}}-1]}) = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_0 & \cdots & \sigma_{T_{\text{data}}-D} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \sigma_{D-1} & \cdots & \sigma_{T_{\text{data}}-1} \end{bmatrix} \quad (26)$$

where $D \leq T_{\text{data}}$.

Definition 2. *The signal $\sigma_{[0, T_{\text{data}}-1]}$ is persistently exciting of order D if the Hankel matrix $\mathcal{H}(\sigma_{[0, T_{\text{data}}-1]})$ (26) has full row rank.*

The Hankel matrix of (26) leads to the following lemma essential in the data-driven system level synthesis [38], [39].

Lemma 3. *Suppose that the input data $u_{[0, T_{\text{data}}-1]}$ is persistently exciting of order $n+D$ as in Definition 2, where n is the number of the system state x of (1a). Suppose also that the system (1a) is time-invariant and controllable. Then $(\bar{u}_{[0, D-1]}, \bar{y}_{[0, D-1]})$ is a valid input/output trajectory of (1) with $a_k = 0$ if and only if $\exists g \in \mathbb{R}^{T_{\text{data}}-D+1}$ s.t.*

$$\begin{bmatrix} u_{[0, T_{\text{data}}-1]} \\ y_{[0, T_{\text{data}}-1]} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}(u_{[0, T_{\text{data}}-1]}) \\ \mathcal{H}(y_{[0, T_{\text{data}}-1]}) \end{bmatrix} g. \quad (27)$$

Proof. See, e.g., [38], [39]. \square

It is shown in [29] that g of (27) in Lemma 3 can be characterized by the system level parameterization of (4) for the case of full-state feedback. Its robust properties allow for extending this idea to perturbed trajectory data as also shown in [29]. These observations imply the great potential of our approach to model-free settings as in [29], [31], [32].

C. Additional Constraints

1) *Performance Constraints:* We can clearly see that the control input \mathbf{u} in (4) of Sec. II-C is linear in the system level parameters Ω , the constraint

$$\|\mathbf{u}\| = \|\mathbf{M}\mathbf{d}_x + \mathbf{D}\mathbf{d}_y\|_* \leq u_{\max}$$

where $u_{\max} \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is some constant, is always a convex constraint for any norm $*$. We can also consider other performance requirements as convex constraints on top of the problems (19) of Theorem 2 and (24) of Corollary 24, the examples of which are given in [4]–[6].

2) *Localizability:* For large-scale networks, we could apply spatiotemporal constraints to further reduce the computational burden thanks to the system level parameterization. In particular, if we assume that 1) the closed-loop disturbance responses have finite-impulse responses and that 2) the effects of disturbances are felt only in local neighborhoods of each agent, then we can decompose the problems (19) of Theorem 2 into small subproblems that can be solved locally [4]–[6]. This allows the model predictive control-like formulation of the system level synthesis [30].

3) *Controllability, Observability, and Sensitivity:* As discussed in [5], [40], [41], the localizability of Sec. V-C2 allows for verifying the observability and controllability conditions using a set of affine constraints, which can be readily added to the problem (19) in Theorem 2 while preserving its convex structure. The minimum attack sensitivity (or detectability in the original paper [28]) could potentially be considered directly as a constraint in this problem using a similar approach. Alternatively, we could enforce the sensitivity constraint by using the \mathcal{H}_- index [24]–[26], [42], [43] as in [44], with the same lifting procedure of Theorem 2.

4) *Stability:* For infinite-horizon problems, we can still ensure the internal stability of our formulation in a convex manner as discussed in [4]–[6]. Even in our finite-horizon setting, we could still enforce the Lyapunov-type stability constraint as in [44] due to the affine nature of the system level parameterization as to be implied in the numerical example.

VI. CONCLUSION

This paper presents a system level, regret-optimal framework for designing linear systems resilient against stealthy attacks and disturbances. It is shown that the nonlinear problem of minimizing regret under the presence of stealthy adversaries can be equivalently reformulated as rank-constrained optimization, which is an optimization problem with a convex objective subject to convex constraints and rank constraints. Our approach also provides a new system metric to quantify the resilience of linear systems, in lieu of the conventional system gains such as the \mathcal{H}_2 , \mathcal{H}_∞ , and output-to-output ℓ_2 gains. Section V

further discusses promising ways to augment our approach with the useful properties of the system level parameterization and regret-optimal formulation, such as sparsity and localizability in the context of online learning. These extensions strongly indicate the potential of our approach with its predictive, data-driven formulation expressed in a theoretically interpretable manner.

REFERENCES

- [1] O. Sabag, G. Goel, S. Lale, and B. Hassibi, "Regret-optimal controller for the full-information problem," in *Proc. Amer. Control Conf.*, 2021, pp. 4777–4782.
- [2] —, "Regret-optimal LQR control," arXiv:2105.01244, 2023.
- [3] G. Goel and B. Hassibi, "Regret-optimal estimation and control," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 68, no. 5, pp. 3041–3053, 2023.
- [4] J. C. Doyle, N. Matni, Y.-S. Wang, J. Anderson, and S. Low, "System level synthesis: A tutorial," in *IEEE CDC*, 2017, pp. 2856–2867.
- [5] Y.-S. Wang, N. Matni, and J. C. Doyle, "A system-level approach to controller synthesis," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 64, no. 10, pp. 4079–4093, 2019.
- [6] J. Anderson, J. C. Doyle, S. H. Low, and N. Matni, "System level synthesis," *Annu. Rev. Control*, vol. 47, pp. 364–393, 2019.
- [7] A. Didier, J. Sieber, and M. N. Zeilinger, "A system level approach to regret optimal control," *IEEE Control Syst. Lett.*, vol. 6, pp. 2792–2797, 2022.
- [8] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Semidefinite Programming Relaxations of Non-Convex Problems in Control and Combinatorial Optimization*. Boston, MA: Springer US, 1997, pp. 279–287.
- [9] S. Ibaraki and M. Tomizuka, "Rank minimization approach for solving BMI problems with random search," in *Proc. Amer. Control Conf.*, vol. 3, 2001, pp. 1870–1875.
- [10] M. Fazel, H. Hindi, and S. Boyd, "Rank minimization and applications in system theory," in *Proc. Amer. Control Conf.*, vol. 4, 2004, pp. 3273–3278 vol.4.
- [11] S. Shalev-Shwartz, A. Gonen, and O. Shamir, "Large-scale convex minimization with a low-rank constraint," in *28th Int. Conf. Mach. Learn.* Omnipress, 2011, p. 329–336.
- [12] C. Sun and R. Dai, "Rank-constrained optimization and its applications," *Automatica*, vol. 82, pp. 128–136, 2017.
- [13] S. Dean, H. Mania, N. Matni, B. Recht, and S. Tu, "Regret bounds for robust adaptive control of the linear quadratic regulator," in *Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*, vol. 31, 2018.
- [14] N. Agarwal, B. Bullins, E. Hazan, S. Kakade, and K. Singh, "Online control with adversarial disturbances," in *36th Int. Conf. Mach. Learn.*, ser. Proc. Mach. Learn. Res., vol. 97, Jun. 2019, pp. 111–119.
- [15] G. Goel and A. Wierman, "An online algorithm for smoothed regression and LQR Control," in *22nd Int. Conf. Artif. Intell. Statist.*, ser. Proc. Mach. Learn. Res., vol. 89, Apr., 16–18 Apr 2019, pp. 2504–2513.
- [16] E. Hazan, S. Kakade, and K. Singh, "The nonstochastic control problem," in *31st Int. Conf. Algorithmic Learn. Theory*, ser. Proc. Mach. Learn. Res., vol. 117, Feb. 2020, pp. 408–421.
- [17] N. M. Boffi, S. Tu, and J.-J. E. Slotine, "Regret bounds for adaptive nonlinear control," in *LADC*, ser. Proc. Mach. Learn. Res., vol. 144, Jun. 2021, pp. 471–483.
- [18] C. Yu, G. Shi, S.-J. Chung, Y. Yue, and A. Wierman, "The power of predictions in online control," in *Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*, vol. 33, 2020, pp. 1994–2004.
- [19] Y. Li, X. Chen, and N. Li, "Online optimal control with linear dynamics and predictions: Algorithms and regret analysis," in *Adv. Neural Inf. Process. Syst.*, H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d'Alché-Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett, Eds., vol. 32, 2019.
- [20] T. Basar and P. Bernhard, *H_∞ Optimal Control and Related Minimax Design Problems: A Dynamic Game Approach*. Birkhauser, 1995.
- [21] G. Goel, "Regret-optimal control," Ph.D. dissertation, California Institute of Technology, 2022.
- [22] G. Goel and B. Hassibi, "Regret-optimal measurement-feedback control," in *LADC*, ser. Proc. Mach. Learn. Res., vol. 144, Jun. 2021, pp. 1270–1280.
- [23] J. Hajar, O. Sabag, and B. Hassibi, "Regret-optimal control under partial observability," arXiv:2311.06433, 2023.
- [24] A. Teixeira, *Security Metrics for Control Systems*. Springer Int. Publishing, 2021, pp. 99–121.
- [25] A. Teixeira, H. Sandberg, and K. H. Johansson, "Strategic stealthy attacks: The output-to-output ℓ_2 -gain," in *IEEE CDC*, 2015, pp. 2582–2587.
- [26] A. Teixeira, I. Shames, H. Sandberg, and K. H. Johansson, "A secure control framework for resource-limited adversaries," *Automatica*, vol. 51, pp. 135–148, 2015.
- [27] A. Teixeira, D. Pérez, H. Sandberg, and K. H. Johansson, "Attack models and scenarios for networked control systems," in *Int. Conf. High Confidence Netw. Syst.*, 2012, p. 55–64.
- [28] F. Pasqualetti, F. Dörfler, and F. Bullo, "Attack detection and identification in cyber-physical systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 58, no. 11, pp. 2715–2729, 2013.
- [29] A. Xue and N. Matni, "Data-driven system level synthesis," in *Proc. Conf. Learn. Dyn. Control*, ser. Proc. Mach. Learn. Res., vol. 144. PMLR, Jun. 2021, pp. 189–200.
- [30] C. A. Alonso and N. Matni, "Distributed and localized closed loop model predictive control via a system level synthesis," in *IEEE CDC*, 2020, pp. 5598–5605.
- [31] C. A. Alonso, F. Yang, and N. Matni, "Data-driven distributed and localized model predictive control," *IEEE Open J. Control Syst.*, vol. 1, pp. 29–40, 2022.
- [32] Y. Lian and C. N. Jones, "From system level synthesis to robust closed-loop data-enabled predictive control," in *IEEE CDC*, 2021, pp. 1478–1483.
- [33] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, Mar. 2004.
- [34] A. J. Van der Schaft, " \mathcal{L}_2 -gain analysis of nonlinear systems and nonlinear state-feedback \mathcal{H}_∞ control," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 37, no. 6, pp. 770–784, Jun. 1992.
- [35] N. Z. Shor, "Quadratic optimization problems," *Sov. J. Circuits Syst. Sci.*, vol. 25, no. 6, pp. 1–11, 1987.
- [36] —, *Algorithms for Constructing Optimal on Volume Ellipsoids and Semidefinite Programming*. Boston, MA: Springer US, 1998, pp. 169–225.
- [37] D. Martinelli, A. Martin, G. Ferrari-Trecate, and L. Furieri, "Closing the gap to quadratic invariance: a regret minimization approach to optimal distributed control," 2023.
- [38] J. Willems, I. Markovsky, P. Rapisarda, and B. De Moor, "A note on persistency of excitation," in *IEEE CDC*, vol. 3, 2004, pp. 2630–2631.
- [39] 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.
- [40] Y.-S. Wang, N. Matni, and J. C. Doyle, "Localized LQR optimal control," in *IEEE CDC*, 2014, pp. 1661–1668.
- [41] Y.-S. Wang and N. Matni, "Localized LQG optimal control for large-scale systems," in *Proc. Amer. Control Conf.*, 2016, pp. 1954–1961.
- [42] J. L. Wang, G.-H. Yang, and J. Liu, "An LMI approach to \mathcal{H}_∞ index and mixed $\mathcal{H}_\infty/\mathcal{H}_\infty$ fault detection observer design," *Automatica*, vol. 43, no. 9, pp. 1656–1665, 2007.
- [43] J. Liu, J. L. Wang, and G.-H. Yang, "An LMI approach to minimum sensitivity analysis with application to fault detection," *Automatica*, vol. 41, no. 11, pp. 1995–2004, 2005.
- [44] H. Tsukamoto, J. Hajar, J. Ibrahim, J. Ragan, A. Rahmani, S.-J. Chung, and F. Y. Hadaegh, "Robust and optimal network topology switching for zero dynamics attack," in *IEEE CDC*, under review, 2024.