

Kernel-based Impulse Response Identification with Side-Information on Steady-State Gain

M. Khosravi and R. S. Smith

Abstract—In this paper, we consider the problem of system identification when side-information is available on the steady-state (or DC) gain of the system. We formulate a general nonparametric identification method as an infinite-dimensional constrained convex program over the reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) of stable impulse responses. The objective function of this optimization problem is the empirical loss regularized with the norm of RKHS, and the constraint is considered for enforcing the integration of the steady-state gain side-information. The proposed formulation addresses both the discrete-time and continuous-time cases. We show that this program has a unique solution obtained by solving an equivalent finite-dimensional convex optimization. This solution has a closed-form when the empirical loss and regularization functions are quadratic and exact side-information is considered. We perform extensive numerical comparisons to verify the efficiency of the proposed identification methodology.

Index Terms—Kernel-based identification, side-information, steady-state gain.

I. INTRODUCTION

System identification is a well-established research area on the theory and techniques of creating appropriate mathematical abstractions for the dynamical systems using their measurement data [1]. According to the importance and numerous applications of system identification in different fields of science and technology, it has received a significant deal of attention [2]. In various situations, identifying a dynamical system can be beyond a mere model fitting to the data, and additionally, we may need to include particular known features and attributes of the system into the model. More precisely, together with the measurement data, we might be provided with certain so-called side-information, which is indeed a specific qualitative or quantitative knowledge to be incorporated in the identified model of the system. This side-information can originate from various sources, e.g., a general understanding of the intrinsic physical nature of the system, or from the observed behaviors in experimental or historical data [3]. Integrating side-information can improve the identification performance by rejecting spurious model candidates, which are common when the measurement data is scarce, highly noise-contaminated, or generated by insufficient excitation [4].

Various forms of side-information such as stability, dissipativity, region of attraction, and many others are considered in identifying nonlinear dynamical systems [5]–[9]. On the other hand, the key role of linear systems in practice has led to increased research on how to integrate different sorts

of side-information in their identification [10]. For example, the incorporation of structural side-information, that is the available knowledge on the configuration and types of the subsystems, has been studied by imposing specific model structural constraints such as being circulant [11]. Due to the importance of frequency domain analysis in controller design, a variety of relevant properties are included in the identification procedure, e.g., the location of poles of the system [12], phase constraints [13], the peak in frequency response [14], moments and derivatives of the transfer function [15], positive-realness [16], and the passivity of the system [17]. Identification with side-information such as positivity or being compartmental are considered in [18], [19]. The side-information on the low internal complexity of the system is included by means of sparsity promoting regularizations such as the rank and the nuclear norm of associated Hankel matrices [20], [21], or by employing atomic norm regularization applied on specific atomic linear representations of the system [22]. The stability side-information is integrated into the subspace identification method by ensuring that the poles of the identified models are inside the unit disc [23], [24]. The kernel-based system identification approach [25], besides addressing model order selection, robustness, and bias-variance trade-off issues, opened new avenues for the integration of various types of side-information [26]–[29], including stability, dissipativity, resonant frequencies, smoothness of the impulse response, oscillatory behaviors, relative degree, exponential decay of the impulse response, structural properties, and the presence of fast and slow poles [30]–[38]. Moreover, the incorporation of positivity and internal low-complexity are revisited in this framework [39]–[44].

The steady-state gain information has particular importance from the control perspective, e.g., in closed-loop design and model predictive control [45]–[47]. This information may be obtained, in exact or approximate form, through the structure of the system, from the experimental or historical collected data, or by designing and performing suitable experiments. Hence, integrating the steady-state gain side-information into the identified model is of particular interest. To this end, various heuristics are introduced based on the subspace identification approach [4], [48]–[51]. Indeed, to identify a finite impulse response (FIR) model for the system, the subspace method can be employed in the multi-step ahead prediction form [4], [48]. Following this and using a Bayesian approach, the steady-state gain side-information can be encoded in the covariance of the prior distribution [4]. On the other hand, a frequentist framework is employed in [48]–[51], where the steady-state gain side-information is incorporated by imposing linear constraints. Moreover, to leverage the previously mentioned advantages of the kernel-based approach, Bayesian

Mohammad Khosravi is with Delft Center for Systems and Control, Delft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands (email: Mohammad.khosravi@tudelft.nl).

Roy S. Smith is with Automatic Control Laboratory, ETH Zürich, Switzerland (email: rsmith@control.ee.ethz.ch).

FIR estimation methods are proposed in [52], [53], where kernel-based priors are employed and the steady-state gain side-information is integrated into the resulting estimation problem. The identification scheme in [52] first estimates the step response of the system, and then, the impulse response is obtained via a naïve discrete derivative calculation, which is prone to numerical imprecision and instability. On the other hand, while the method introduced in [53] improves the estimation performance approach in [52], the proposed formulation is incapable of including deterministic information on the steady-state gain of the system. The identification approaches discussed are only applicable when a large set of high-quality data is available. Furthermore, they are limited to relatively short FIR estimation and fast decaying dynamics. Therefore, these estimation methodologies are not suitable for infinite impulse responses (IIR) and continuous-time systems, particularly when the dynamics have a very slowly decaying impulse response and considerably long memory.

In this paper, we develop a nonparametric identification approach where the side-information on the steady-state gain of the system is integrated into the proposed scheme. To leverage the powerful framework of kernel-based identification, we employ RKHS of stable impulse responses as the hypothesis space [28], [54], enabling the formulation of the problem for the continuous-time and discrete-time cases together. The identification problem is expressed as a constrained optimization where a generic regularized empirical loss is minimized subject to a suitably designed constraint encoding the available side-information on the steady-state gain of the system. According to the frequentist approach employed, the resulting formulation is flexible, e.g., one can address the issue of outliers by defining the empirical loss based on the Huber function and its variants. We show that the steady-state gain linear functional is continuous on the employed RKHS, which implies that the problem is well-defined by guaranteeing the existence and uniqueness of the solution. For the initial infinite-dimensional formulation of the identification problem, we derive an equivalent finite-dimensional convex program with a unique solution. This solution has a closed-form when exact side-information is considered, and the empirical loss and regularization functions used are quadratic. Furthermore, we provide results for improving the computational complexity of the presented approach by obtaining the closed form of quantities used in the algorithm. We perform extensive numerical simulations confirming the efficacy of the proposed identification method.

II. NOTATIONS AND PRELIMINARIES

The set of natural numbers, the set of non-negative integers, the set of real numbers, the set of non-negative real numbers, the n -dimensional Euclidean space and the space of n by m real matrices are denoted by \mathbb{N} , \mathbb{Z}_+ , \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{R}_+ , \mathbb{R}^n and $\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, respectively. The i^{th} entry of vector \mathbf{a} is denoted by $[\mathbf{a}]_{(i)}$, and the entry of matrix \mathbf{A} at the i^{th} row and the j^{th} column is denoted by $[\mathbf{A}]_{(i,j)}$. To handle discrete and continuous time in the same formulation, \mathbb{T} denotes either \mathbb{Z}_+ or \mathbb{R}_+ , and \mathbb{T}_\pm is the set of scalars t where either $t \in \mathbb{T}$ or $-t \in \mathbb{T}$.

Given measure space \mathcal{X} , the space of measurable functions $g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is denoted by $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{X}}$. The element $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{X}}$ is shown entry-wise as $\mathbf{u} = (u_x)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$, or equivalently as $\mathbf{u} = (u(x))_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$. Depending on the context of discussion, \mathcal{L}^∞ refers either to $\ell^\infty(\mathbb{Z})$ or $L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, i.e., the space of bounded signals. Similarly, \mathcal{L}^1 is either $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_+)$ or $L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$, i.e., the space of stable impulse responses. For $p \in \{1, \infty\}$, the norm in \mathcal{L}^p is denoted by $\|\cdot\|_p$. Given $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathbb{X}$, the linear span of \mathcal{V} , denoted by $\text{span}\mathcal{V}$, is a linear subspace of \mathbb{X} containing linear combination of the elements of \mathcal{V} . Let \mathcal{Y} be a set and $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$. We define the function $\delta_{\mathcal{C}}$ as $\delta_{\mathcal{C}}(y) = 0$, if $y \in \mathcal{C}$, and $\delta_{\mathcal{C}}(y) = \infty$, otherwise. Similarly, function $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}}$ is defined as $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}}(y) = 1$, if $y \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}}(y) = 0$, otherwise. With respect to each bounded signal $\mathbf{u} = (u_s)_{s \in \mathbb{T}_\pm} \in \mathcal{L}^\infty$ and each $t \in \mathbb{T}_\pm$, the linear map $L_t^{\mathbf{u}} : \mathcal{L}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined as $L_t^{\mathbf{u}}(g) := \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_+} g_s u_{t-s}$, when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+$, and $L_t^{\mathbf{u}}(g) := \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} g_s u_{t-s} ds$, when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+$.

III. IDENTIFICATION WITH STEADY-STATE GAIN SIDE-INFORMATION

Let \mathcal{S} be a stable LTI system with impulse response $g^{(\mathcal{S})} := (g_t^{(\mathcal{S})})_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{T}}$, where $\mathbb{T} := \mathbb{Z}_+$, for the case of discrete-time, and, $\mathbb{T} := \mathbb{R}_+$, for the case of continuous-time. The *steady-state gain* system \mathcal{S} is equal to $\ell_0(g^{(\mathcal{S})})$, where ℓ_0 is a real-valued linear operator defined on the space of stable impulse responses as following

$$\ell_0(g) := \begin{cases} \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} g_t, & \text{if } \mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} g_t dt, & \text{if } \mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

for any $g = (g_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \in \mathcal{L}^1$.

Let $\mathbf{u} = (u_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$ be a bounded signal applied to the input of system \mathcal{S} , and the corresponding output be measured at time instants

$$\mathcal{T} := \{t_i \mid i = 1, \dots, n_{\mathcal{T}}\}, \quad (2)$$

where $n_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{N}$ denotes the number of measurement samples. From the definition of $L_t^{\mathbf{u}}$, the measured output of the system at time instant $t \in \mathcal{T}$, denoted by y_t , is

$$y_t := L_t^{\mathbf{u}}(g^{(\mathcal{S})}) + w_t, \quad t \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (3)$$

where $\{w_t \mid t \in \mathcal{T}\}$ are the measurement uncertainty. Consequently, we are provided with the set of input-output data \mathcal{D} defined as

$$\mathcal{D} = \{(u_t, y_t) \mid t \in \mathcal{T}\}. \quad (4)$$

In addition to \mathcal{D} , suppose that we know the steady-state gain of the system. Accordingly, one may ask whether the given steady-state gain side-information is naturally preserved and encoded in the identification of system \mathcal{S} . We elucidate this issue in the following demonstrative numerical example.

Example. Consider continuous-time system \mathcal{S} described by the following transfer function

$$G^{(\mathcal{S})}(s) = \frac{s+2}{s^2+s+2}, \quad (5)$$

with the step response denoted by $s^{(\mathcal{S})}$. The system is initially at rest, and then actuate it by a random switching pulse signal in the time interval $[0, 100]$. To obtain the set of data




Figure 1: The step responses for system \mathcal{S} and the estimated models.

\mathcal{D} in (4), the output of system is uniformly measured with the sampling frequency of 2Hz and the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) of 20dB. Furthermore, let the steady-state gain of the system be given, i.e., we know that $G^{(S)}(0) = 1$. The impulse response of the system can be estimated using *direct* and *indirect* methods [55]. In the direct approach, we use the `tfstrvc` function provided by `CONTSID TOOLBOX` [56] with the known order of the system. Let \hat{g}_1 and \hat{s}_1 respectively denote the impulse response and the step response of the resulting estimated system. Also, we identify the system indirectly by employing the `n4sid` function available in `MATLAB'S SYSTEM IDENTIFICATION TOOLBOX` [57] to estimate a discrete-time model, and subsequently, the continuous-time impulse response is obtained from a linear interpolation of the discrete-time estimate. Let the resulting impulse and step responses be denoted by \hat{g}_2 and \hat{s}_2 , respectively. As shown in Figure 1, the steady-state values for \hat{s}_1 and \hat{s}_2 are respectively 0.85 and 1.22, meaning that the steady-state gains have a 15% and a 22% error. Consequently, one can observe that the estimated models do not take into account the steady-state gain side-information.

Motivated by this example, the main problem discussed in this paper is the identification with side-information on the steady-state gain of the system. More precisely, we address the identification problem introduced below.

Problem 1. *Given the set of data \mathcal{D} , estimate the impulse response of stable system \mathcal{S} satisfying the side-information $\ell_0(g^{(S)}) \in [\underline{\delta}, \bar{\delta}]$, where $\underline{\delta}$ and $\bar{\delta}$ are given bounds for the steady-state gain of system \mathcal{S} .*

Compared to the above example, designed to elaborate on the rationale of our discussion and its importance, Problem 1 addresses the more common scenarios in practice where the available side-information on the steady-state gain is imprecise and provided in the form of interval $[\underline{\delta}, \bar{\delta}]$. When the steady-state gain of the system is known to be exactly equal to δ that might be any arbitrary value in \mathbb{R} , we set $\underline{\delta} = \bar{\delta} = \delta$. The precise formulation of Problem 1 is discussed in the next section.

IV. THE ESTIMATION PROBLEM: EXISTENCE AND UNIQUENESS OF THE SOLUTION

In this section, we formulate a constrained regularized empirical loss minimization to address estimation Problem 1. For this purpose, in addition to an appropriate objective function,

we introduce a suitable hypothesis space characterizing the feasible set of the optimization problem and a constraint encoding the side-information about the steady-state gain of the system. Furthermore, we study the existence and uniqueness property for the solution of the resulting problem.

A. Stable Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Spaces

The hypothesis space taken for the estimation problem is a *reproducing kernel Hilbert space* (RKHS) [58], which contains stable impulse responses. Based on the structure of RKHS, we can investigate the problem and obtain a tractable approach for solving the estimation problem. These features are provided by the *kernel function*, which characterizes the RKHS uniquely and completely.

Definition 1 ([58]). *Let $\mathbb{k} : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a non-zero symmetric measurable function. Then, we say \mathbb{k} is a positive-definite kernel, or simply kernel, if we have*

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^m a_i \mathbb{k}(t_i, t_j) a_j \geq 0, \quad (6)$$

for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $t_1, \dots, t_m \in \mathbb{T}$ and $a_1, \dots, a_m \in \mathbb{R}$. If \mathbb{k} is assumed to be continuous when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+$, then it is called a Mercer kernel. The section of kernel \mathbb{k} at $t \in \mathbb{T}$, denoted by \mathbb{k}_t , is the function defined as $\mathbb{k}(t, \cdot) : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Theorem 1 ([58]). *Given positive-definite kernel $\mathbb{k} : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, there exists a unique Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{T}}$ equipped with inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}}$, called a RKHS with kernel \mathbb{k} , such that, for any $t \in \mathbb{T}$, we have*

- i) $\mathbb{k}_t \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}$, and
- ii) $\langle g, \mathbb{k}_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}} = g_t$, for all $g = (g_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}$.

The second feature is called the reproducing property.

According to Theorem 1, a RKHS is completely characterized by the corresponding kernel. As we are interested in the stable impulse responses in the bounded-input-bounded-output (BIBO) sense, we need to employ a kernel such that we have $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}} \subseteq \mathcal{L}^1$. The following theorem provides a necessary and sufficient condition for this feature.

Theorem 2 ([28], [59]). *Let $\mathbb{k} : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a positive-definite kernel. Then, \mathbb{k} is stable if and only if, for any $u = (u_s)_{s \in \mathbb{T}} \in \mathcal{L}^\infty$, we have*

$$\sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \left| \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_+} u_s \mathbb{k}(t, s) \right| < \infty, \quad (7)$$

when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+$, and,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} u_s \mathbb{k}(t, s) ds \right| dt < \infty, \quad (8)$$

when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+$. The kernel \mathbb{k} is said to be stable when it satisfies this property.

The following stable kernels are frequently used in the literature [28]:

- *diagonally/correlated* (DC) kernel:

$$\mathbb{k}_{\text{DC}}(s, t) = \alpha^{\max(s, t)} \gamma^{|s-t|}, \quad (9)$$

- *tuned/correlated* (TC) kernel:

$$\mathbb{k}_{\text{TC}}(s, t) = \alpha^{\max(s, t)}, \quad (10)$$

- *stable spline* (SS) kernel:

$$\mathbb{k}_{\text{SS}}(s, t) = \alpha^{\max(s, t) + s + t} - \frac{1}{3}\alpha^{3\max(s, t)}, \quad (11)$$

where $\alpha, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ are such that $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $|\gamma| \in (0, \sqrt{\alpha^{-1}})$, if $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+$, and, $\gamma \in (0, \sqrt{\alpha^{-1}})$, if $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+$. Note that by setting $\rho = \sqrt{\alpha}\gamma$, the definition of DC kernel in [28] reduces to (9). Also, without loss of generality, we can drop the extra scaling factor introduced in [28].

B. Empirical Loss and Regularization Function

Given the set of data \mathcal{D} and the hypothesis space \mathcal{H}_k , the *empirical loss function*, $\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, can be defined as the sum of squared errors, i.e., for each $g \in \mathcal{H}_k$, we have

$$\mathcal{E}(g) := \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\mathcal{D}}} (\mathbb{L}_{t_i}^u(g) - y_{t_i})^2. \quad (12)$$

We can consider a more general form for the empirical loss function. More precisely, let $\mathcal{I} := \{i_k | k = 1, \dots, n_{\mathcal{I}}\}$ be a subset of $\{1, \dots, n_{\mathcal{D}}\}$, $y_{\mathcal{I}}$ be the vector defined as $y_{\mathcal{I}} = [y_{t_i}]_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$, and $\ell : \mathbb{R}^{n_{\mathcal{I}}} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_{\mathcal{I}}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a given convex function. Accordingly, we define the *generalized loss function*, $\mathcal{E}_{\ell} : \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ as follows

$$\mathcal{E}_{\ell}(g) := \ell([\mathbb{L}_{t_i}^u(g)]_{i \in \mathcal{I}}, y_{\mathcal{I}}), \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{H}_k, \quad (13)$$

where subscript ℓ is considered to highlight the role of function ℓ in the definition of \mathcal{E}_{ℓ} . When $\mathcal{I} = \{1, \dots, n_{\mathcal{D}}\}$ and function $\ell : \mathbb{R}^{n_{\mathcal{D}}} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_{\mathcal{D}}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is defined as $\ell(v_1, v_2) = \|v_1 - v_2\|^2$, for any $v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\mathcal{D}}}$, the empirical loss \mathcal{E}_{ℓ} reduces to the special case introduced in (12). Also, to be robust with respect to outliers, one may take function $\ell : \mathbb{R}^{n_{\mathcal{D}}} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_{\mathcal{D}}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ as

$$\ell(v_1, v_2) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\mathcal{D}}} L_{\sigma}([v_1]_{(i)} - [v_2]_{(i)}), \quad \forall v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\mathcal{D}}}, \quad (14)$$

where, for given $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}_+$, function $L_{\sigma} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is the *Huber loss* defined as follows

$$L_{\sigma}(e) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}e^2, & \text{if } |e| \leq \sigma, \\ \sigma(|e| - \frac{1}{2}\sigma), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

or, it can be the smoothed version of (15), known as the *pseudo-Huber* function [60], which is

$$L_{\sigma}(e) = (e^2 + \sigma^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} - \sigma^2, \quad \forall e \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (16)$$

The resulting empirical loss function \mathcal{E}_{ℓ} is more suitable to the cases where output measurements are subject to noise disturbances with large outliers.

Since the hypothesis space is a RKHS endowed with kernel \mathbb{k} , we define a regularization term, enforcing desired attributes such as stability, based on the norm in \mathcal{H}_k , i.e., $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}$. More precisely, let $\rho : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a strictly increasing convex function. Then, the regularization function, $\mathcal{R} : \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, is defined as $\mathcal{R}(g) = \rho(\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_k})$. Accordingly, the objective

function for the estimation problem, $\mathcal{J} : \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, is defined as following

$$\mathcal{J}(g) := \mathcal{E}_{\ell}(g) + \lambda \mathcal{R}(g), \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{H}_k, \quad (17)$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is the regularization weight. Note that, in addition to enforcing desired attributes such as stability, the regularization term helps avoiding over-fitting phenomena, enhancing the numerical performance, and improving the bias-variance trade-off.

C. Steady-State Gain Side-Information

Define the set $\mathcal{G}_k([\underline{\delta}, \bar{\delta}]) \subset \mathcal{H}_k$ as follows

$$\mathcal{G}_k([\underline{\delta}, \bar{\delta}]) := \left\{ g \in \mathcal{H}_k \mid \ell_0(g) \in [\underline{\delta}, \bar{\delta}] \right\}. \quad (18)$$

The elements of $\mathcal{G}_k([\underline{\delta}, \bar{\delta}])$ are exactly the ones satisfying the side-information on the steady-state gain of the system. Therefore, the estimation Problem 1 is formulated as the following optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{g \in \mathcal{H}_k} \quad & \mathcal{E}_{\ell}(g) + \lambda \mathcal{R}(g) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & g \in \mathcal{G}_k([\underline{\delta}, \bar{\delta}]). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

The existence and uniqueness of the solution of optimization problem (19) depends on the topological properties of set $\mathcal{G}_k([\underline{\delta}, \bar{\delta}])$ which is characterized by operator $\ell_0 : \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. To study these properties, we need the notion of integrable kernels [28].

Definition 2. *The positive-definite kernel $\mathbb{k} : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be integrable if*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} |\mathbb{k}(s, t)| \, ds dt < \infty, \quad (20)$$

when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+$, or, if

$$\sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} |\mathbb{k}(s, t)| < \infty, \quad (21)$$

when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+$.

One can easily see that each of the kernels \mathbb{k}_{TC} , \mathbb{k}_{DC} and \mathbb{k}_{SS} is integrable (see Appendix A). Moreover, for any integrable kernel \mathbb{k} and any $u = (u_s)_{s \in \mathbb{T}} \in \mathcal{L}^{\infty}$, we have

$$\sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \left| \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_+} u_s \mathbb{k}(t, s) \right| \leq \|u\|_{\infty} \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_+} |\mathbb{k}(t, s)| < \infty,$$

when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+$, and,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} u_s \mathbb{k}(t, s) \, ds \right| dt \leq \|u\|_{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} |\mathbb{k}(t, s)| \, ds dt < \infty,$$

when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+$. Accordingly, the integrable kernels are stable. The main importance of integrable kernels in this paper is highlighted by the following theorems. The next theorem is the cornerstone of this work.

Theorem 3. *Let $\mathbb{k} : \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an integrable Mercer kernel, and $\varphi_0 = (\varphi_{0,t})_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$ be defined as following*

$$\varphi_{0,t} = \begin{cases} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \mathbb{k}(t, s), & \text{if } \mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{k}(t, s) \, ds, & \text{if } \mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+, \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

for any $t \in \mathbb{T}$. Then, φ_0 is well-defined and $\varphi_0 \in \mathcal{H}_k$. Moreover, we have

$$\ell_0(g) = \langle \varphi_0, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k}, \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{H}_k. \quad (23)$$

Furthermore, one can see

$$\|\varphi_0\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}^2 = \begin{cases} \sum_{s,t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \mathbb{k}(t, s), & \text{if } \mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{k}(t, s) ds dt, & \text{if } \mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+. \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

Proof. See Appendix B. ■

Theorem 3 says that integrability of kernel \mathbb{k} implies that the steady-state operator $\ell_0 : \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a linear continuous functional. Accordingly, throughout this paper, we assume \mathbb{k} is an integrable kernel. More precisely, we make the following assumption.

Assumption 1. *The kernel \mathbb{k} is an integrable Mercer kernel, for which there exists $\tau \in \mathbb{T}$ such that $\sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \mathbb{k}(\tau, s) \neq 0$, when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+$, or, $\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{k}(\tau, s) ds \neq 0$, when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+$.*

The following theorem describes topological properties of set $\mathcal{G}_k([\underline{\delta}, \bar{\delta}])$, and together with Theorem 3, provides the necessary foundation to guarantee the introduced problem is well-defined.

Theorem 4. *Let Assumption 1 hold. Then, for any $\underline{\delta}$ and $\bar{\delta}$ such that $-\infty \leq \underline{\delta} \leq \bar{\delta} \leq \infty$, the set $\mathcal{G}_k([\underline{\delta}, \bar{\delta}])$ is a non-empty, closed and convex subset of \mathcal{H}_k .*

Proof. See Appendix C. ■

D. From Infinite to Finite Dimension

The optimization problem (19) is defined over the infinite-dimensional Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_k . In the following, we show that (19) admits a unique solution in \mathcal{H}_k . Furthermore, we introduce an equivalent convex finite-dimensional program which provides a tractable approach to address (19). To this end, we need to introduce additional definitions and mathematical properties for (19). Theorem 4 has provided suitable properties for the feasible set of (19). The next assumption and lemma provide foundations to show that the objective function in (19) has desired features which are latter employed in the main theorem of this paper to show the existence and uniqueness for the solution of (19).

Assumption 2. *The operator $L_\tau^\mathbb{U} : \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous for each $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$.*

When $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+$ and u is a step function as in (37), one can show the continuity of $L_\tau^\mathbb{U}$, for any $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_+$, based on an argument similar to the proof of Theorem 3. Also, for the case of $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+$, one can easily see that Assumption 2 holds if the system is initially at rest, or more generally, when $(u_t)_{t \leq t_{n\varphi}-1}$ is finitely non-zero. Given this assumption, we have the following theorem.

Lemma 5. *Let Assumption 2 hold. Then, for each $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, there exists $\varphi_\tau^{(\mathbb{U})} = (\varphi_{\tau,t}^{(\mathbb{U})})_{t \in \mathbb{T}} \in \mathcal{H}_k$ such that*

$$L_\tau^\mathbb{U}(g) = \langle \varphi_\tau^{(\mathbb{U})}, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k}, \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{H}_k. \quad (25)$$

Furthermore, for any $t \in \mathbb{T}$, we have

$$\varphi_{\tau,t}^{(\mathbb{U})} = \begin{cases} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{k}(t, s) u_{\tau-s} ds, & \text{if } \mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+, \\ \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \mathbb{k}(t, s) u_{\tau-s}, & \text{if } \mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+. \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

Proof. See Appendix D. ■

Recall the index set $\mathcal{I} = \{i_k | k = 1, \dots, n_{\mathcal{I}}\}$ introduced in Section IV-B. For $k = 1, \dots, n_{\mathcal{I}}$, let φ_k be defined as $\varphi_{t_i}^{(\mathbb{U})}$ with $i = i_k$. Accordingly, we define matrices Φ and A respectively as

$$\Phi := [\langle \varphi_i, \varphi_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k}]_{i=0, j=0}^{n_{\mathcal{I}}, n_{\mathcal{I}}} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_{\mathcal{I}}+1) \times (n_{\mathcal{I}}+1)}, \quad (27)$$

and

$$A := [\langle \varphi_i, \varphi_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k}]_{i=1, j=0}^{n_{\mathcal{I}}, n_{\mathcal{I}}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\mathcal{I}} \times (n_{\mathcal{I}}+1)}. \quad (28)$$

Note that A is a sub-matrix of Φ which contains the rows corresponding to the index set \mathcal{I} . Denote the columns of Φ by $a_0, \dots, a_{n_{\mathcal{I}}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\mathcal{I}}+1}$, i.e., we have $\Phi = [a_0, \dots, a_{n_{\mathcal{I}}}]$. Since Φ is a symmetric matrix, one can see that $A = [a_1, \dots, a_{n_{\mathcal{I}}}]^T$.

Given the above definitions and theorems, we can present our main theorem.

Theorem 6. *Let Assumption 1 and Assumption 2 hold. Then, the optimization problem (19) admits a unique solution g^* . Moreover, there exists $x^* = [x_0^*, \dots, x_{n_{\mathcal{I}}}^*]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\mathcal{I}}+1}$ such that*

$$g^* = x_0^* \varphi_0 + \dots + x_{n_{\mathcal{I}}}^* \varphi_{n_{\mathcal{I}}} = \sum_{i=0}^{n_{\mathcal{I}}} x_i^* \varphi_i. \quad (29)$$

Furthermore, x^* is the solution of following convex program

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\mathcal{I}}+1}} \quad & \ell(Ax, y_{\mathcal{I}}) + \lambda \mathcal{R}((x^T \Phi x)^{\frac{1}{2}}) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & a_0^T x \in [\underline{\delta}, \bar{\delta}]. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Proof. See Appendix E. ■

In the literature, it is common to employ the empirical loss (12) and the regularization function $\mathcal{R}(g) = \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}^2$. When the steady-state gain of the system is known to be $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, the resulting impulse response estimation problem is as following

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{g \in \mathcal{H}_k} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\varphi}} (L_{t_i}^\mathbb{U}(g) - y_{t_i})^2 + \lambda \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \ell_0(g) = \delta. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

The next corollary provides a closed-form solution for this optimization problem.

Corollary 7. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 6, the convex program (31) has a unique solution g^* . Moreover, there exist $x^* = [x_0^*, \dots, x_{n_{\varphi}}^*]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\varphi}+1}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that g^* has the parametric form (29) and $[x^{*\top}, \gamma^*]^\top$ is a solution of the following system of linear equations*

$$\begin{bmatrix} Q & a_0 \\ a_0^T & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ \gamma \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A^T y \\ \delta \end{bmatrix}, \quad (32)$$

where $Q = A^T A + \lambda \Phi$ and $y = [y_{t_i}]_{i=1}^{n_{\varphi}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\varphi}}$. Furthermore, when $\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_{n_{\varphi}}$ are linearly independent, we have

$$x^* = Q^{-1} A^T y + \frac{\delta - a_0^T Q^{-1} A^T y}{a_0^T Q^{-1} a_0} Q a_0. \quad (33)$$

Proof. See Appendix F. ■

V. THE OPTIMIZATION PROBLEM: SETTINGS AND ALGORITHM

Based on Theorem 6, addressing the estimation problem 1, or equivalently, optimization problem (19), reduces to solving the convex program (30). In this section, we discuss how to configure this optimization problem.

The main elements of optimization problems (30) are \mathbf{a}_0 , \mathbf{A} , and Φ . We know that \mathbf{A} is a sub-matrix of Φ and \mathbf{a}_0 is the first column of Φ . Hence, it suffices to calculate the matrix Φ . According to (27), the entries of Φ are inner products $\langle \varphi_i, \varphi_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k}$, for $i, j \in \{0, \dots, n_\varphi\}$. To obtain the value of these inner products, we need to calculate improper double integrals when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+$, or infinite double summations when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+$. In general, these calculations can be performed using techniques such as numerical integration. On the other hand, these values can be obtained analytically in certain but fairly general situations. For example, when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+$ and the system is initially at rest, or, when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+$, the standard kernels are employed and the input of the system is a step function. In the remainder of this section, the details of these calculations are discussed.

A. Optimization Problem Configuration: Discrete-Time Case

Let $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+$ and the system be initially at rest, i.e., we have $u_t = 0$, for $t < 0$. Also, let the measurement time instants be $\mathcal{T} = \{0, 1, \dots, n_\varphi - 1\}$. Given an integrable kernel $\mathbf{k} : \mathbb{Z}_+ \times \mathbb{Z}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and an input \mathbf{u} , define matrices $\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{T}_u \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\varphi \times n_\varphi}$ such that

$$[\mathbf{K}]_{(i,j)} = \mathbf{k}(i-1, j-1), \quad \forall i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n_\varphi\}, \quad (34)$$

and

$$[\mathbf{T}_u]_{(i,j)} = u_{i-j}, \quad \forall i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n_\varphi\}. \quad (35)$$

Following these definitions, we have the next theorem.

Theorem 8. Let $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\varphi}$ be the column vector defined as $\varphi := [\varphi_{0,i}]_{i=0}^{n_\varphi-1}$. Then, we have

$$\Phi = \begin{bmatrix} \|\varphi_0\|^2 & \varphi \mathbf{T}_u^\top \\ \mathbf{T}_u \varphi & \mathbf{T}_u \mathbf{K} \mathbf{T}_u^\top \end{bmatrix}. \quad (36)$$

Proof. See Appendix G. ■

Remark 1. Appendix H provides φ_0 and $\|\varphi_0\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}^2$ for the standard kernels introduced in (9), (10), and (11), when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+$.

B. Optimization Problem Configuration: Continuous-Time Case

The set of step functions is dense in $L^p(\mathbb{R})$, for $p \in [1, \infty)$, and also, any function in $L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is an almost everywhere the point-wise limit of a sequence of step functions [61]. In other words, any signal of interest can be approximated arbitrarily closely by step functions. Accordingly, for the case of $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+$, one can assume that the input signal $\mathbf{u} = (u_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ is a step function. More precisely, there exist $n_s \in \mathbb{N}$ real scalars

ξ_1, \dots, ξ_{n_s} and a finite increasing sequence $(s_0, s_1, \dots, s_{n_s})$ in \mathbb{R}_+ such that we have

$$u_t = \sum_{i=0}^{n_s-1} \xi_{i+1} \mathbf{1}_{[s_i, s_{i+1})}(t), \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}_+. \quad (37)$$

For $\mathbf{u} = (u_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ given in (37), a closed-form for $\varphi_\tau^{(\mathbf{u})}$ can be introduced. To this end, we require the function $\psi : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as

$$\psi(t, a, b) := \int_a^b \mathbf{k}(t, s) ds, \quad (38)$$

for any $a, b, t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. This function is denoted by ψ_{TC} , ψ_{DC} or ψ_{SS} respectively when \mathbf{k} is \mathbf{k}_{TC} , \mathbf{k}_{DC} or \mathbf{k}_{SS} .

Theorem 9. For any $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, we have

$$\varphi_{\tau,t}^{(\mathbf{u})} = \sum_{i=0}^{n_s-1} \xi_{i+1} \psi(t, \bar{s}_{i+1}(\tau), \bar{s}_i(\tau)), \quad (39)$$

where, for $i = 0, \dots, n_s$, function $\bar{s}_i : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is defined as $\bar{s}_i(\tau) := \max(\tau - s_i, 0)$, for any $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

Proof. See Appendix I. ■

For the standard kernels defined in (9), (10) and (11), one can obtain the closed-form of $\varphi_\tau^{(\mathbf{u})}$ using (39). To this end, we need ψ_{TC} , ψ_{DC} , and ψ_{SS} which are provided by the next theorem.

Theorem 10. Define the function $\eta : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\eta(s, \tau_1, \tau_2) = \min(\max(t, \tau_1), \tau_2), \quad (40)$$

for any $s, \tau_1, \tau_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and let $t, a, b \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $a \leq b$. Then, we have

$$\psi_{\text{TC}}(t, a, b) = (\eta(t, a, b) - a) \alpha^t + \frac{\alpha^b - \alpha^{\eta(t, a, b)}}{\ln(\alpha)}, \quad (41)$$

$$\psi_{\text{DC}}(t, a, b) = \frac{\gamma^{-a} - \gamma^{-\eta(t, a, b)}}{\ln(\gamma)} (\alpha \gamma)^t + \frac{(\alpha \gamma)^b - (\alpha \gamma)^{\eta(t, a, b)}}{\ln(\alpha \gamma)} \gamma^{-t}, \quad (42)$$

$$\psi_{\text{SS}}(t, a, b) = \frac{\alpha^{\eta(t, a, b)} - \alpha^a}{\ln(\alpha)} \alpha^{2t} + \frac{\alpha^{2b} - \alpha^{2\eta(t, a, b)}}{2 \ln(\alpha)} \alpha^t - \frac{1}{3} (\eta(t, a, b) - a) \alpha^{3t} - \frac{\alpha^{3b} - \alpha^{3\eta(t, a, b)}}{9 \ln(\alpha)}. \quad (43)$$

Proof. See Appendix J. ■

Similar to the previous theorem, one can obtain the closed-form of φ_0 for the standard kernels (9), (10) and (11).

Theorem 11. For any $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, we have

$$\varphi_{\text{TC},0,t} = \left(t - \frac{1}{\ln(\alpha)} \right) \alpha^t, \quad (44)$$

$$\varphi_{\text{DC},0,t} = - \left[\frac{(1 - \gamma^t)}{\ln(\gamma)} + \frac{1}{\ln(\alpha \gamma)} \right] \alpha^t, \quad (45)$$

$$\varphi_{\text{SS},0,t} = \left[\frac{11}{18 \ln(\alpha)} \alpha^t - \frac{1}{\ln(\alpha)} - \frac{t \alpha^t}{3} \right] \alpha^{2t}. \quad (46)$$

Proof. See Appendix K. ■

Given $\{\varphi_i\}_{i=0}^{n_\varphi}$, we can obtain $\langle \varphi_i, \varphi_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k}$, for $i, j = 0, \dots, n_\varphi$. To this end, define functions $\nu : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\bar{\nu} : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ respectively as

$$\nu(x, y) := \int_0^x \int_0^y \mathbb{k}(s, t) dt ds, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+, \quad (47)$$

and

$$\bar{\nu}(x) := \int_0^x \int_0^\infty \mathbb{k}(s, t) dt ds, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}_+. \quad (48)$$

When \mathbb{k} is one of the standard kernels (9), (10) and (11), we include a suitable subscript in ν and $\bar{\nu}$ to indicate the corresponding kernel. For each $i, j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n_s - 1\}$, let functions $\kappa_{ij} : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\bar{\kappa}_i : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be defined such that, for any $\tau, \tau_1, \tau_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_{ij}(\tau_1, \tau_2) &= \nu(\bar{s}_i(\tau_1), \bar{s}_j(\tau_2)) - \nu(\bar{s}_{i+1}(\tau_1), \bar{s}_j(\tau_2)) \\ &\quad - \nu(\bar{s}_i(\tau_1), \bar{s}_{j+1}(\tau_2)) + \nu(\bar{s}_{i+1}(\tau_1), \bar{s}_{j+1}(\tau_2)), \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

and

$$\bar{\kappa}_i(\tau) = \bar{\nu}(\bar{s}_i(\tau)) - \bar{\nu}(\bar{s}_{i+1}(\tau)). \quad (50)$$

Based on these definitions, the next theorem presents the closed-form for $\langle \varphi_0, \varphi_\tau^{(u)} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k}$ and $\langle \varphi_{\tau_1}^{(u)}, \varphi_{\tau_2}^{(u)} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k}$.

Theorem 12. For any $\tau, \tau_1, \tau_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \varphi_0, \varphi_\tau^{(u)} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k} &= \sum_{i=0}^{n_s-1} \xi_{i+1} \bar{\kappa}_i(\tau). \\ \langle \varphi_{\tau_1}^{(u)}, \varphi_{\tau_2}^{(u)} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k} &= \sum_{i=0}^{n_s-1} \sum_{j=0}^{n_s-1} \xi_{i+1} \xi_{j+1} \kappa_{ij}(\tau_1, \tau_2). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. See Appendix L. ■

Due to (49) and (50), in order to employ Theorem 12 to calculate the entries of Φ , we need to obtain the functions ν and $\bar{\nu}$, which can be done in general using numerical techniques. However, the closed-form of ν and $\bar{\nu}$ can be explicitly derived for the standard kernels.

Theorem 13. For any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_+$, we have

$$\nu_{\text{TC}}(x, y) = \frac{\min(x, y)(\alpha^x + \alpha^y)}{\ln(\alpha)} + \frac{2(1 - \alpha^{\min(x, y)})}{\ln(\alpha)^2}, \quad (51)$$

$$\bar{\nu}_{\text{TC}}(x) = \frac{x\alpha^x \ln(\alpha) + 2(1 - \alpha^x)}{\ln(\alpha)^2}, \quad (52)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_{\text{DC}}(x, y) &= \frac{(1 - \gamma^{-\min(x, y)})(\alpha^x + \alpha^y)}{\ln(\gamma) \ln(\alpha\gamma)} \\ &\quad + \frac{2 - 2\alpha^{\min(x, y)}}{\ln(\alpha) \ln(\alpha\gamma)}, \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

$$\bar{\nu}_{\text{DC}}(x) = \frac{\alpha^x \gamma^x - \alpha^x}{\ln(\gamma) \ln(\alpha\gamma)} + \frac{2 - 2\alpha^x}{\ln(\alpha) \ln(\alpha\gamma)}, \quad (54)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_{\text{SS}}(x, y) &= \frac{(\alpha^{\min(x, y)} - 1)(\alpha^{2x} + \alpha^{2y})}{2 \ln(\alpha)^2} \\ &\quad - \frac{\min(x, y)(\alpha^{3x} + \alpha^{3y})}{9 \ln(\alpha)} + \frac{7 - 7\alpha^{3 \min(x, y)}}{27 \ln(\alpha)^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

$$\bar{\nu}_{\text{SS}}(x) = \frac{14 - 27\alpha^{2x} + 13\alpha^{3x}}{54 \ln(\alpha)^2} - \frac{x\alpha^{3x}}{9 \ln(\alpha)}. \quad (56)$$

Proof. See Appendix M. ■

Similar to the previous theorem, we can calculate the closed-form of $\|\varphi_0\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}^2 = \langle \varphi_0, \varphi_0 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k}$ for the standard stable kernels. The next theorem presents these closed-forms.

Algorithm 1 System Identification with Steady-State Gain Side-Information

- 1: **Input:** Set of data \mathcal{D} , integrable kernel \mathbb{k} , index set \mathcal{I} , convex function ℓ , regularization weight λ , and, real scalar δ or interval $[\underline{\delta}, \bar{\delta}]$ for the steady-state gain.
 - 2: Calculate matrix Φ in (27).
 - ▷ For discrete-time case, use Theorem 8 and Remark 1.
 - ▷ For continuous-time case and step input, use (49), (50), Theorems 12, 13 and 14.
 - 3: Obtain matrix A introduced in (28) as a sub-matrix of Φ .
 - 4: Obtain vector a_0 as the first column of Φ .
 - 5: Solve convex program (30) to obtain x^* .
 - ▷ If the steady-state gain is known to be δ and the empirical loss is the sum of squared errors, obtain x^* by (33) or (32).
 - 6: Calculate φ_0 by (22), or by Theorems 11 and 15.
 - 7: Calculate $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_{n_I}$ based on (26).
 - ▷ For continuous-time case and step input, use Theorems 9 and 10.
 - 8: Given x^* and $\{\varphi_i\}_{i=0}^{n_I}$, obtain g^* based on (29).
 - 9: **Output:** g^* and x^* .
-

Theorem 14. We have $\|\varphi_{\text{TC},0}\|^2 = 2(\ln(\alpha))^{-2}$, $\|\varphi_{\text{DC},0}\|^2 = 2(\ln(\alpha) \ln(\alpha\gamma))^{-2}$, and $\|\varphi_{\text{SS},0}\|^2 = 7(27 \ln(\alpha))^{-2}$.

Proof. See Appendix N. ■

Based on the above discussion, we can derive the key elements of optimization (30) and solve Problem 1 to estimate the impulse response of system. The outline of this procedure is summarized in Algorithm 1.

C. Hyperparameter Tuning

To employ Algorithm 1, in addition to the set of data \mathcal{D} , an appropriate stable kernel \mathbb{k} and the regularization weight λ are required. The general form of the kernel depends on the shape and smoothness of the impulse response to be identified. Following specifying the type of kernel, in addition to λ , it is required to determine the hyperparameters θ_k characterizing kernel \mathbb{k} . Therefore, we need to estimate the vector of hyperparameters $\theta := [\lambda, \theta_k]$ in the admissible set $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_\theta}$. For this purpose, we use a cross-validation mechanism equipped with a Bayesian optimization heuristic [62]. More precisely, the index set of data is partitioned into disjoint sets \mathcal{I}_T and \mathcal{I}_V to be utilized respectively for training and validation. The prediction error on the validation data, the model evaluation metric $v : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, is defined as

$$v(\theta) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}_V|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_V} (y_{t_i} - L_{t_i}^u(g(\theta)))^2, \quad (57)$$

where $g(\theta)$ is the impulse response identified using the proposed identification technique given the training data and the hyperparameters θ . Then, θ is estimated as $\hat{\theta} := \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} v(\theta)$. One can see that the dependency of model evaluation metric v to the vector of hyperparameters is in a black-box oracle form. To solve this optimization problem, we use a Bayesian optimization algorithm such as GP-LCB, which is available through MATLAB's `bayesopt` function [62].




Figure 2: The step responses for system \mathcal{S} and the model estimated in Example 1. The impulse response s^* corresponds to the proposed method.

VI. NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

In this section, we demonstrate and compare the performance of the proposed method through several numerical examples.

Example 1. For the example provided in Section III, we employ the proposed identification scheme presuming that the steady-state gain of the system is given, i.e., we know that $\ell_0(g^{(S)}) = 1$. Accordingly, we apply Algorithm 1 given the set of measurement data \mathcal{D} and $\delta = 1$. For the choice of kernel, we utilize \mathbb{k}_{TC} introduced in (10). The hyperparameters of kernel are tuned based on the cross-validation mechanism introduced in Section V-C. To this end, the first 80% of data points are chosen for training and the remaining 20% for validation. Given this partitioning of the measurement data, the hyperparameters $\theta = [\lambda, \alpha]$ are estimated as $\text{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} v(\theta)$, where v is the model evaluation metric defined in (57). The solution of this optimization problem is obtained by utilizing GP-LCB Bayesian optimization approach [62].

Figure 2 shows the step response corresponding to g^* together with the step responses of the models \hat{g}_1 and \hat{g}_2 , estimated in Section III. For the estimated impulse response g^* , we have $\ell_0(g^*) = 1.00$. To evaluate and compare quantitatively the estimated impulse responses, we employ the following performance metric

$$\text{fit}(g) = 100 \times \left(1 - \frac{\|g - g^{(S)}\|_2}{\|g^{(S)}\|_2} \right), \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}. \quad (58)$$

For the estimated impulse responses, we have $\text{fit}(\hat{g}_1) = 70.88\%$, $\text{fit}(\hat{g}_2) = 58.60\%$, and $\text{fit}(g^*) = 95.84\%$. Accordingly, one can see that the proposed scheme outperforms in terms of performance metric fit and the precision of resulting steady-state gain. \triangle

Example 2. In this example, we compare the performance of the proposed identification method with the existing schemes through a Monte Carlo analysis. To this end, with respect to each (n, r) in $\{16, 17, \dots, 25\} \times \{0.8, 0.82, \dots, 0.96\}$, we employ MATLAB's `drss` function to randomly generate a discrete-time LTI system with order n and spectral radius r . We normalize these systems with their \mathcal{H}_2 -norm and set them initially at rest. For each of these systems, a random zero-mean white Gaussian input signal with length $n_{\mathcal{D}} = 200$ is generated using MATLAB's `idinput` function. By applying these input signals to the systems, we obtain their noiseless output signals. We consider three levels of signal-to-noise ratio

(SNR): high, medium, and low, which are 5 dB, 15 dB, and 25 dB, respectively. For the additive measurement uncertainty, we generate a zero-mean white Gaussian signal for each of these SNR levels and each output signal. The noiseless output signal is then corrupted with the corresponding additive noise signals, and the resulting noisy output is measured at time instants $t_i = i$, for $i = 0, 1, \dots, 199$. As a result, we have 100 sets of input-output data for each of the aforementioned SNR values as following

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_i^{(5\text{dB})} &= \{(u_s^{(i)}, y_s^{(i, 5\text{dB})}) \mid s=0, \dots, 199\}, \quad i=1, \dots, 100, \\ \mathcal{D}_i^{(15\text{dB})} &= \{(u_s^{(i)}, y_s^{(i, 15\text{dB})}) \mid s=0, \dots, 199\}, \quad i=1, \dots, 100, \\ \mathcal{D}_i^{(25\text{dB})} &= \{(u_s^{(i)}, y_s^{(i, 25\text{dB})}) \mid s=0, \dots, 199\}, \quad i=1, \dots, 100, \end{aligned}$$

where the superscript indicates the SNR value in the respective data set. We employ the above input-output data sets and the following identification methods to estimate the impulse response of corresponding systems:

- This method is a modified subspace approach incorporating steady-state features of output [49].
- This method estimates impulse response by solving a constrained optimization problem formulated based on a behavioral approach [51].
- This method considers the interpretation of subspace identification as the optimal multi-step ahead prediction and modifies it to a constrained least-squares problem where the imposed equality constraint models approximately the steady-state gain information [48].
- This method is a general Bayesian variant of the optimal multi-step ahead predictor interpretation of subspace identification approach, where steady-state gain information is integrated into the covariance of the prior distribution [4].
- In this method, the step response of system is first estimated by a kernel-based Bayesian approach, and then, the FIR is calculated using discrete derivative [52].
- This method estimates a FIR model for the system based on a kernel-based Bayesian approach where the steady-state gain information is enforced on the total summation of the estimated FIR [53].
- The last method is the scheme proposed in this paper and summarized in Algorithm 1.

The kernel-based methods E, F, and G employ the same kernel type (9) to give a fair comparison. To evaluate and compare the estimation performances of these methods, we employ the R-squared metric introduced in (58). Figure 3 demonstrates and compares the values of R-squared metric for the estimation results of the above mentioned methods and SNR levels.

Discussion: From Figure 3, we observe that the proposed identification scheme demonstrates better estimation performance than other methods. Indeed, methods A, B, C, and D are based on the subspace approach and prediction error minimization. Meanwhile, the proposed scheme is a kernel-based method in which the stability of the system is included and the model complexity tuning is implemented based on the effective approach of estimating continuous regularization hyperparameters rather than selecting an integer order [26], [28]. The methods E and F estimate a FIR model for the




Figure 3: The box-plots compare methods discussed in Example 2 via fitting metric (58) for different SNR levels. One can see the proposed method (G) shows superior performance. The y-axis range has been adjusted to improve visibility in each of these box plots.

system, which can be inexact when the spectral radius of the system is close to one, and the impulse response of system can not be approximated well by a short FIR. Moreover, the discrete derivative employed in method F makes the estimation prone to numerical sensitivity, particularly when the data is noisy. On the other hand, the proposed scheme estimates directly the impulse response without any truncation and inexact numerical procedures such as discrete derivatives. \triangle

VII. CONCLUSION

In this work, we have addressed the impulse response identification problem when side-information on the steady-state gain of the system is provided. The problem is formulated as a generic nonparametric identification in the form of an infinite-dimensional constrained convex program over the RKHS of stable impulse responses. This optimization problem is designed such that the objective function corresponds to the regularized empirical loss, and the imposed linear constraints

enforce the integration of the given side-information into the solution. We have shown that the steady-state gain is a bounded operator over the employed RKHS, which results in guaranteeing the existence and uniqueness of the solution. By using the representer theorem, the optimization problem is reduced to a finite-dimensional convex program, which can be solved efficiently. In the case of exact side-information, quadratic empirical loss, and quadratic regularization, the identification problem has a closed-form solution. Compared to the existing methods, the proposed identification approach can utilize non-uniform measurement samples and integrate steady-state gain side-information into the direct approach of continuous-time system identification. Moreover, through an extensive Monte Carlo numerical experiment, we have verified that the introduced methodology outperforms the benchmark approaches. The proposed scheme has several features which have led to the observed superior performance, including direct estimation of the impulse response without any truncation and without inexact numerical procedures such as discrete derivatives. The method uses kernel-based regularization to enforce the BIBO stability of the estimated impulse response, and, effective model selection and complexity tuning through estimating continuous variables such as regularization weight and hyperparameters.

APPENDIX

A. Integrability of the Standard Kernels

For a Mercer kernel \mathbb{k} , let assume that there exist $C \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that $|\mathbb{k}(s, t)| \leq C\alpha^{\frac{1}{2}(s+t)}$, for any $s, t \in \mathbb{T}$. Subsequently, when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s, t \geq 0} |\mathbb{k}(s, t)| &\leq C \sum_{s \geq 0} \sum_{t \geq 0} \alpha^{\frac{1}{2}(s+t)} \\ &= C \sum_{s \geq 0} \alpha^{\frac{1}{2}s} \sum_{t \geq 0} \alpha^{\frac{1}{2}t} \\ &= \frac{C}{(1 - \alpha^{\frac{1}{2}})^2} < \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

Similarly, when $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+} |\mathbb{k}(s, t)| ds dt &\leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \alpha^{\frac{1}{2}(s+t)} ds dt \\ &= C \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \alpha^{\frac{1}{2}s} ds \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \alpha^{\frac{1}{2}t} dt \\ &= \frac{4C}{(\ln(\alpha))^2} < \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

Therefore, \mathbb{k} is an integrable kernel. For any $s, t \in \mathbb{T}$, one can easily see that $|\mathbb{k}_{\text{TC}}(s, t)| \leq \alpha^{\frac{1}{2}(s+t)}$, $|\mathbb{k}_{\text{DC}}(s, t)| \leq \alpha^{\frac{1}{2}(s+t)}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{k}_{\text{SS}}(s, t)| &= \left| \alpha^{\max(s, t)} \left[\alpha^{s+t} - \frac{1}{3} \alpha^{2 \max(s, t)} \right] \right| \\ &\leq \left[|\alpha^{s+t}| + \frac{1}{3} |\alpha^{2 \max(s, t)}| \right] \alpha^{\max(s, t)} \\ &\leq \frac{4}{3} \alpha^{\frac{1}{2}(s+t)}. \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

According to our previous discussion, this implies that \mathbb{k}_{TC} , \mathbb{k}_{DC} and \mathbb{k}_{SS} are integrable kernels. \blacksquare

B. Proof of Theorem 3

Case $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+$: For each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, define $f_n = (f_{n,s})_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_+}$ as $f_n = \sum_{t=0}^n \mathbb{k}_t$. Since, for each $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, one has $\mathbb{k}_t \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}$, we know that $f_n \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}$. Furthermore, from the reproducing property, one can see that

$$\|f_n\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}}^2 = \sum_{s=0}^n \sum_{t=0}^n \mathbb{k}(s, t). \quad (62)$$

Since \mathbb{k} is an integrable kernel, we know that $\sum_{s,t \geq 0} |\mathbb{k}(s, t)| < \infty$. Accordingly, for any positive real scalar ε , there exists $N \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $\sum_{s,t \geq N} |\mathbb{k}(s, t)| \leq \varepsilon^2$. Let N_ε denote smallest non-negative integer with this property. For any $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $n > m \geq N_\varepsilon$, we have $f_n - f_m = \sum_{t=m+1}^n \mathbb{k}_t$. Accordingly, from the reproducing property, one can see that

$$\|f_n - f_m\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}}^2 = \sum_{s=m+1}^n \sum_{t=m+1}^n \mathbb{k}(s, t). \quad (63)$$

Subsequently, from $n, m \geq N_\varepsilon$, the triangle inequality and the definition of N_ε , it follows that $\|f_n - f_m\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}} \leq \varepsilon$. Therefore, $\{f_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a Cauchy sequence in Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}$, and consequently, we know that there exists $f = (f_s)_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_n - f\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}} = 0$. For any $s \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, from the reproducing property, we know that $f_s - f_{n,s} = \langle f - f_n, \mathbb{k}_s \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}}$. Accordingly, due to the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |f_s - f_{n,s}| \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f - f_n\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}} \|\mathbb{k}_s\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}} = 0, \quad (64)$$

i.e., one has $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_{n,s} = f_s$, for any $s \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, which implies that $f = \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \mathbb{k}_t$. Therefore, f coincides with φ_0 defined by (22). Moreover, from $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n = f$, the dominated convergence theorem and being \mathbb{k} an integrable kernel, we have

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}}^2 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_n\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}}^2 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{0 \leq s, t \leq n} \mathbb{k}(s, t) = \sum_{s, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \mathbb{k}(s, t),$$

which implies (24). For any $g = (g_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}$, we know that g is integrable, i.e., $\sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} |g_t| < \infty$. Therefore, from $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n = f$ and the reproducing property, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} g_t &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{0 \leq t \leq n} g_t \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\langle \sum_{0 \leq t \leq n} \mathbb{k}(\cdot, t), g \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle f_n, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}} = \langle f, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}}, \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

which implies (23) for the case of $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_+$.

Case $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}_+$: Let $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $I_r := \int_0^r \int_0^r \mathbb{k}(s, t) ds dt$, which is well-defined since \mathbb{k} is an integrable kernel. Define $f_n^{(r)} := (f_{n,s}^{(r)})_{s \in \mathbb{R}_+} \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}$ as

$$f_{n,s}^{(r)} = \frac{r}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{k}\left(\frac{i}{n}r, s\right), \quad \forall s \in \mathbb{R}_+, \quad (66)$$

for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. From the reproducing property, for any $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\langle f_n^{(r)}, f_m^{(r)} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}} - I_r \\ &= \left\langle \frac{r}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{k}\left(\frac{i}{n}r, \cdot\right), \frac{r}{m} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{k}\left(\frac{j}{m}r, \cdot\right) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}} - I_r \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \left[\mathbb{k}\left(\frac{i}{n}r, \frac{j}{m}r\right) \frac{r^2}{nm} - \int_{\frac{i}{n}r}^{\frac{i+1}{n}r} \int_{\frac{j}{m}r}^{\frac{j+1}{m}r} \mathbb{k}(s, t) ds dt \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \int_{\frac{i}{n}r}^{\frac{i+1}{n}r} \int_{\frac{j}{m}r}^{\frac{j+1}{m}r} \left[\mathbb{k}\left(\frac{i}{n}r, \frac{j}{m}r\right) - \mathbb{k}(s, t) \right] ds dt. \end{aligned}$$

Since $[0, r]^2$ is a compact region, continuity of \mathbb{k} implies that \mathbb{k} is uniformly continuous on $[0, r]^2$. Therefore, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that we have

$$|\mathbb{k}(s_1, t_1) - \mathbb{k}(s_2, t_2)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4r^2}, \quad (67)$$

for any $s_1, s_2, t_1, t_2 \in [0, r]$ where $|s_1 - s_2| + |t_1 - t_2| \leq \delta_\varepsilon$. Accordingly, if $n, m \geq n_\varepsilon$, where n_ε is the smallest positive integer larger than $\frac{1}{\delta_\varepsilon} 2r$, one has

$$\left| \left\langle f_n^{(r)}, f_m^{(r)} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}} - I_r \right| \leq \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \int_{\frac{i}{n}r}^{\frac{i+1}{n}r} \int_{\frac{j}{m}r}^{\frac{j+1}{m}r} \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4r^2} ds dt = \frac{1}{4} \varepsilon^2.$$

Therefore, we know that

$$I_r - \frac{1}{4} \varepsilon^2 \leq \left\langle f_n^{(r)}, f_m^{(r)} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}} \leq I_r + \frac{1}{4} \varepsilon^2, \quad \forall n, m \geq n_\varepsilon. \quad (68)$$

Subsequently, one can see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_n^{(r)} - f_m^{(r)}\|^2 &= \left\langle f_n^{(r)}, f_n^{(r)} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}} - 2 \left\langle f_n^{(r)}, f_m^{(r)} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}} + \left\langle f_m^{(r)}, f_m^{(r)} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}} \\ &\leq (I + \frac{1}{4} \varepsilon^2) - 2(I - \frac{1}{4} \varepsilon^2) + (I + \frac{1}{4} \varepsilon^2) = \varepsilon^2, \end{aligned}$$

for any $n, m \geq n_\varepsilon$. Accordingly, $\{f_n^{(r)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is a Cauchy sequence in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}$, which implies that there exists $f^{(r)} = (f_s^{(r)})_{s \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}$ such that $\{f_n^{(r)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$ converges to $f^{(r)}$. Due to the reproducing property, we know that $f_s^{(r)} - f_{n,s}^{(r)} = \langle f^{(r)} - f_n^{(r)}, \mathbb{k}_s \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}}$, for any $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Consequently, from the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, it follows that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |f_s^{(r)} - f_{n,s}^{(r)}| \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f^{(r)} - f_n^{(r)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}} \|\mathbb{k}_s\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{k}}} = 0, \quad (69)$$

i.e., we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_{n,s}^{(r)} = f_s^{(r)}$. On the other hand, according to (67), one can see that

$$\begin{aligned} |f_{n,s}^{(r)} - \int_0^r \mathbb{k}(s, t) dt| &= \left| \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \int_{\frac{i}{n}r}^{\frac{i+1}{n}r} \left[\mathbb{k}\left(\frac{i}{n}r, s\right) - \mathbb{k}(t, s) \right] dt \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \int_{\frac{i}{n}r}^{\frac{i+1}{n}r} \left| \mathbb{k}\left(\frac{i}{n}r, s\right) - \mathbb{k}(t, s) \right| dt \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{n} \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4r^2} = \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4r^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Subsequently, we have $f_s^{(r)} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_{n,s}^{(r)} = \int_0^r \mathbb{k}(s, t) dt$, i.e., $f^{(r)} = \int_0^r \mathbb{k}(\cdot, t) dt$. Accordingly, from $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n^{(r)} = f^{(r)}$, (68) and the definition of I_r , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \int_0^r \mathbb{k}(\cdot, t) dt \right\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}^2 &= \|f^{(r)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}^2 \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle f_n^{(r)}, f_n^{(r)} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k} = \int_0^r \int_0^r \mathbb{k}(s, t) ds dt. \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

Take an arbitrary $g = (g_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ in \mathcal{H}_k and $t, \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $t + \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Since \mathbb{k} is symmetric and continuous, and due to the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and the reproducing property, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} |g_{t+\varepsilon} - g_t| &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} |\langle \mathbb{k}_{t+\varepsilon} - \mathbb{k}_t, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k}| \\ &\leq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|\mathbb{k}_{t+\varepsilon} - \mathbb{k}_t\|_{\mathcal{H}_k} \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_k} \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} [\mathbb{k}(t + \varepsilon, t + \varepsilon) - 2\mathbb{k}(t, t + \varepsilon) + \mathbb{k}(t, t)]^{\frac{1}{2}} \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_k} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which implies the continuity of $g = (g_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ as a function of t . Therefore, the Riemann integral of g on $[0, r]$ is well-defined. Accordingly, from the definition of $f_n^{(r)}$, the reproducing property and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n^{(r)} = f^{(r)}$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^r g_t dt &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{r}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} g\left(\frac{i}{n}r\right) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle f_n^{(r)}, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k} \\ &= \langle f^{(r)}, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k} = \left\langle \int_0^r \mathbb{k}(\cdot, t) dt, g \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k}. \end{aligned}$$

With respect to each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let r_n be

$$r_n := \min \left\{ r \geq n \mid \int_r^\infty \int_r^\infty |\mathbb{k}(s, t)| ds dt \leq \frac{1}{n} \right\},$$

which is well-defined since \mathbb{k} is continuous and integrable. Moreover, one can see that $\{r_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is an unbounded strictly increasing sequence. For any $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $n \leq m$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_t^{(r_n)} - f_t^{(r_m)} &= \int_0^{r_n} \mathbb{k}(s, t) ds - \int_0^{r_m} \mathbb{k}(s, t) ds \\ &= \int_{r_m}^{r_n} \mathbb{k}(s, t) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

Accordingly, one can see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|f^{(r_n)} - f^{(r_m)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}^2 &= \langle f^{(r_n)}, f^{(r_n)} - f^{(r_m)} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k} - \langle f^{(r_m)}, f^{(r_n)} - f^{(r_m)} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k} \\ &= \int_0^{r_n} f_t^{(r_n)} - f_t^{(r_m)} dt - \int_0^{r_m} f_t^{(r_n)} - f_t^{(r_m)} dt \\ &= \int_{r_m}^{r_n} \int_{r_m}^{r_n} \mathbb{k}(s, t) ds dt \\ &\leq \int_{r_m}^{r_n} \int_{r_m}^{r_n} |\mathbb{k}(s, t)| ds dt \leq \frac{1}{m}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\{f^{(r_n)}\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is a Cauchy sequence in \mathcal{H}_k . Therefore, we know that there exists $f = (f_s)_{s \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ in \mathcal{H}_k such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f - f^{(r_n)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_k} = 0$. Subsequently, due to the reproducing property, for any $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_s &= \langle f, \mathbb{k}_s \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle f^{(r_n)}, \mathbb{k}_s \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{r_n} \mathbb{k}(s, t) dt = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{k}(s, t) dt, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds due to $\mathbb{k}_s \in \mathcal{H}_k$, $\mathcal{H}_k \subset \mathcal{L}^1$, and the dominated convergence theorem. Note that f coincides with φ_0 defined by (22). Accordingly, due to $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f^{(r_n)} = f$, (70), the definition of f , and the dominated convergence theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \int_0^\infty \mathbb{k}(\cdot, t) dt \right\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}^2 &= \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}^2 \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f^{(r_n)}\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}^2 \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{r_n} \int_0^{r_n} \mathbb{k}(s, t) ds dt \\ &= \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \mathbb{k}(s, t) ds dt. \end{aligned}$$

Based on similar arguments, for any $g = (g_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \in \mathcal{H}_k$, one can see that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \int_0^\infty \mathbb{k}(\cdot, t) dt, g \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k} &= \langle f, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle f^{(r_n)}, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\langle \int_0^{r_n} \mathbb{k}(\cdot, t) dt, g \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{r_n} g_t dt = \int_0^\infty g_t dt, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is due to the dominated convergence theorem and the fact that g is integrable. Therefore, we have $\ell_0(g) = \langle f, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k}$, which implies (23). This concludes the proof. \blacksquare

C. Proof of Theorem 4

Let δ be a real scalar such that $\underline{\delta} \leq \delta \leq \bar{\delta}$. We know that $\ell_0(\mathbb{k}_\tau) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{k}(\tau, t) dt$ is non-zero. Define h as

$$h = \frac{\delta}{\ell_0(\mathbb{k}_\tau)} \mathbb{k}_\tau \in \mathcal{H}_k. \quad (72)$$

One can see that $\ell_0(h) = \delta \in [\underline{\delta}, \bar{\delta}]$, and hence, $h \in \mathcal{G}_k([\underline{\delta}, \bar{\delta}])$. Thus, $\mathcal{G}_k([\underline{\delta}, \bar{\delta}])$ is non-empty. From Theorem 3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_k([\underline{\delta}, \bar{\delta}]) &= \{g \in \mathcal{H}_k \mid \langle \varphi_0, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k} \geq \underline{\delta}\} \\ &\quad \cap \{g \in \mathcal{H}_k \mid \langle \varphi_0, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k} \leq \bar{\delta}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

In the right-hand side of (73), each of the sets is convex and closed. Therefore, $\mathcal{G}_k([\underline{\delta}, \bar{\delta}])$ is a convex and closed subset of \mathcal{H}_k as well. This concludes the proof. \blacksquare

D. Proof of Lemma 5

The first part of theorem can be obtained directly from the Riesz representation theorem [61]. Due to the reproducing property of kernel, for each $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, we have

$$\varphi_{\tau, t}^{(u)} = \langle \varphi_\tau^{(u)}, \mathbb{k}_t \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k} = L_\tau^u(\mathbb{k}_t), \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{T}. \quad (74)$$

Subsequently, one can see (26) holds due to the definition of operator L_τ^u . This concludes the proof. \blacksquare

E. Proof of Theorem 6

Let $\mathcal{J} : \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be defined as

$$\mathcal{J}(g) := \mathcal{E}_\ell(g) + \lambda \mathcal{R}(g) + \delta_{\mathcal{G}_k([\underline{\delta}, \bar{\delta}])(g)}, \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{H}_k. \quad (75)$$

One can see that $\min_{g \in \mathcal{H}_k} \mathcal{J}(g)$ is equivalent to (19). For h introduced in (72), we know $h \in \mathcal{G}_k([\underline{\delta}, \bar{\delta}])$. Therefore, one can see that $\delta_{\mathcal{G}_k([\underline{\delta}, \bar{\delta}])(h)} = 0$, and subsequently, we have

$$0 \leq \mathcal{J}(h) = \mathcal{E}_\ell(h) + \lambda \rho(\|h\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}) < \infty, \quad (76)$$

i.e., function \mathcal{J} is proper. Due to Theorem 4, $\mathcal{G}_k([\underline{\delta}, \bar{\delta}])$ is a convex and closed subset of \mathcal{H}_k . Accordingly, $\delta_{\mathcal{G}_k([\underline{\delta}, \bar{\delta}])(\cdot)} : \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ is a proper lower semi-continuous convex function [63]. Moreover, from Lemma 5, and also the continuity and the convexity of the function ℓ , it follows that $\mathcal{E}_\ell : \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is convex and continuous. The convexity of function $\rho : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ implies its continuity. Furthermore, since ρ is strictly increasing, we know that $\mathcal{R} : \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a strictly convex continuous function. Thus, $\mathcal{J} : \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ is a proper lower semi-continuous strictly convex function, and subsequently, the optimization problem $\min_{g \in \mathcal{H}_k} \mathcal{J}(g)$ admits a unique finite solution [63], denoted by g^* . From the definition of $\mathcal{G}_k([\underline{\delta}, \bar{\delta}])$, Theorem 3, one has

$$\delta_{\mathcal{G}_k([\underline{\delta}, \bar{\delta}])(g)} = \delta_{[\underline{\delta}, \bar{\delta}]}(\langle \varphi_0, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k}), \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{H}_k. \quad (77)$$

Also, according to Lemma 5, we know that

$$\mathcal{E}_\ell(g) = \ell([\langle \varphi_i, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k}]_{i=1}^{n_I}, y_I), \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{H}_k. \quad (78)$$

Let function $e : \mathbb{R}^{n_I+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\}$ be defined as

$$e(z_0, \dots, z_{n_I}) = \ell([z_i]_{i=1}^{n_I}, y_I) + \lambda \delta_{[\underline{\delta}, \bar{\delta}]}(z_0), \quad (79)$$

for any $[z_0, \dots, z_{n_I}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n_I+1}$. Then, due to (77) and (78), one can see that

$$e(\langle \varphi_0, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k}, \dots, \langle \varphi_{n_I}, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k}) = \mathcal{E}_\ell(g) + \lambda \delta_{\mathcal{G}_k([\underline{\delta}, \bar{\delta}])(g)}, \quad (80)$$

for any $g \in \mathcal{H}_k$. Hence, from Theorem 17 and since $\min_{g \in \mathcal{H}_k} \mathcal{J}(g)$ admits a solution, it has a solution in $\text{span}\{\varphi_i\}_{i=0}^{n_I}$ as well. According to the uniqueness of this solution, we know that g^* belongs to $\text{span}\{\varphi_i\}_{i=0}^{n_I}$, i.e., g^* has the parametric form given in (30). For each $g \in \text{span}\{\varphi_i\}_{i=0}^{n_I}$, we know that there exists $x = [x_0, \dots, x_{n_I}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n_I+1}$ such that $g = \sum_{j=0}^{n_I} x_j \varphi_j$. This implies that

$$\ell_0(g) = \left\langle \varphi_0, \sum_{j=0}^{n_I} x_j \varphi_j \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k} = \sum_{j=0}^{n_I} \langle \varphi_0, \varphi_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k} x_j = a_0^T x. \quad (81)$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} [L_i^u(g)]_{i \in \mathcal{I}} &= \left[\left\langle \varphi_i, \sum_{j=0}^{n_I} x_j \varphi_j \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k} \right]_{i=1}^{n_I} \\ &= \left[\sum_{j=0}^{n_I} \langle \varphi_i, \varphi_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k} x_j \right]_{i=1}^{n_I} = Ax. \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

Moreover, from the definition of matrix Φ , one can see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}^2 &= \left\langle \sum_{i=0}^{n_I} x_i \varphi_i, \sum_{j=0}^{n_I} x_j \varphi_j \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k} \\ &= \sum_{i,j=0}^{n_I} x_i \langle \varphi_i, \varphi_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k} x_j = x^T \Phi x. \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

Accordingly, due to (81), (82) and (83), we obtain convex program (30) by replacing g in (19) with its parametric form. This concludes the proof. \blacksquare

F. Proof of Corollary 7

The convex program (31) is a special case of (19) where $\mathcal{I} = \{1, \dots, n_\varphi\}$, function $\ell : \mathbb{R}^{n_\varphi} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_\varphi} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is defined as $\ell(v_1, v_2) = \|v_1 - v_2\|^2$, for $v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\varphi}$, and, function $\rho : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is defined as $\rho(r) = r^2$, for $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Subsequently, the existence and the uniqueness of the solution, and also the parametric form (29) are provided by Theorem 6. Moreover, for the given ℓ and ρ , the optimization problem (30) is reformulated as the following quadratic program

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\varphi+1}} \quad & \|Ax - y\|^2 + \lambda x^T \Phi x \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & a_0^T x = \delta. \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

One can see that (32) is the first-order necessary optimality condition for (84), and γ is the Lagrange multiplier corresponding to the steady-state gain constraint $a_0^T x = \delta$. When $\varphi_0, \dots, \varphi_{n_\varphi}$ are linearly independent, the Gram matrix Φ is positive definite, and consequently, the objective function of (84) is strongly convex. Therefore, (84) has a unique solution x^* . By replacing γ with $\delta - a_0^T x$ in (32) and applying matrix inversion lemma, one can solve linear system of equations (32) and obtain x^* as in (33). \blacksquare

G. Proof of Theorem 8

From Lemma 5, the definition of matrices K and T_u , and since $u_t = 0$ for $t < 0$, one can see that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \varphi_i, \varphi_j \rangle &= \sum_{s=0}^{i-1} \varphi_{j,s} u_{i-1-s} \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^{i-1} \sum_{t=0}^{j-1} \mathbb{k}(s, t) u_{j-1-t} u_{i-1-s} \\ &= [T_u K T_u^T]_{(i,j)}, \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

for any $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n_\varphi\}$. Moreover, due to (22), we have

$$\langle \varphi_i, \varphi_0 \rangle = \sum_{s=0}^{i-1} \varphi_{0,s} u_{i-1-s} = [T_u \varphi]_{(i)}, \quad (86)$$

for any $i \in \{1, \dots, n_\varphi\}$. Following this, the claim concludes from the definition of matrix Φ and the fact that $\Phi = \Phi^T$. \blacksquare

H. Steady-State Gain Representer for Discrete-Time Standard Stable Kernels

Theorem 15. i) For kernel \mathbb{k}_{TC} , we have

$$\varphi_{\text{TC},0,t} = \left(t + \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \right) \alpha^t, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \quad (87)$$

ii) For kernel \mathbb{k}_{DC} , we have

$$\varphi_{\text{DC},0,t} = \left[\frac{\gamma - \gamma^{t+1}}{1-\gamma} + \frac{1}{1-\alpha\gamma} \right] \alpha^t, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \quad (88)$$

iii) For kernel \mathbb{k}_{SS} , we have

$$\varphi_{\text{SS},0,t} = \left[\frac{1+\alpha-\alpha^{t+1}}{1-\alpha^2} - \frac{\alpha^t}{3(1-\alpha^3)} - \frac{t\alpha^t}{3} \right] \alpha^{2t}, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \quad (89)$$

Proof. i) From (22), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{\text{TC},0,t} &= \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \alpha^{\max(s,t)} + \sum_{s \geq t} \alpha^{\max(s,t)} \\ &= t\alpha^t + \frac{\alpha^t}{1-\alpha} = \left(t + \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \right) \alpha^t. \end{aligned}$$

ii) Due to (22), one has

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{\text{DC},0,t} &= \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \alpha^{\max(s,t)} \gamma^{|s-t|} + \sum_{s \geq t} \alpha^{\max(s,t)} \gamma^{|s-t|} \\ &= \alpha^t \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \gamma^{-s+t} + \alpha^t \sum_{s \geq t} \alpha^{s-t} \gamma^{s-t} \\ &= \alpha^t \gamma \frac{1-\gamma^t}{1-\gamma} + \frac{\alpha^t}{1-\alpha\gamma} = \left[\frac{\gamma - \gamma^{t+1}}{1-\gamma} + \frac{1}{1-\alpha\gamma} \right] \alpha^t. \end{aligned}$$

iii) We know that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \alpha^{\max(s,t)} \alpha^{s+t} + \sum_{s \geq t} \alpha^{\max(s,t)} \alpha^{s+t} \\ &= \alpha^{2t} \sum_{s=0}^{t-1} \alpha^s + \alpha^t \sum_{s \geq t} \alpha^{2s} \\ &= \alpha^{2t} \frac{1-\alpha^t}{1-\alpha} + \frac{\alpha^{3t}}{1-\alpha^2} = \left[\frac{1+\alpha-\alpha^{t+1}}{1-\alpha^2} \right] \alpha^{2t}. \end{aligned}$$

Following this, from (22) and $\varphi_{\text{TC},0,t}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{\text{SS},0,t} &= \left[\frac{1+\alpha-\alpha^{t+1}}{1-\alpha^2} \right] \alpha^{2t} - \frac{1}{3} \left(t + \frac{1}{1-\alpha^3} \right) \alpha^{3t} \\ &= \left[\frac{1+\alpha-\alpha^{t+1}}{1-\alpha^2} - \frac{\alpha^t}{3(1-\alpha^3)} - \frac{1}{3} t \alpha^t \right] \alpha^{2t}. \end{aligned} \quad (90)$$

This concludes the proof. \blacksquare

Theorem 16. i) For kernel \mathbb{k}_{TC} , we have

$$\|\varphi_{\text{TC},0}\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}^2 = \frac{\alpha+1}{(1-\alpha)^2}. \quad (91)$$

ii) For kernel \mathbb{k}_{DC} , we have

$$\|\varphi_{\text{DC},0}\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}^2 = \frac{1+\alpha\gamma}{(1-\alpha)(1-\alpha\gamma)}. \quad (92)$$

iii) For kernel \mathbb{k}_{SS} , we have

$$\|\varphi_{\text{SS},0}\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}^2 = \frac{2}{3} \frac{\alpha^4 + \alpha^3 + 3\alpha^2 + \alpha + 1}{(\alpha^3 - 1)^2(\alpha + 1)}. \quad (93)$$

Proof. i) We know that $\|\varphi_0\|^2 = \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \varphi_{0,t}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi_{\text{TC},0}\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}^2 &= \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} t\alpha^t + \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \alpha^t \\ &= \frac{\alpha}{(1-\alpha)^2} + \frac{1}{(1-\alpha)^2} = \frac{1+\alpha}{(1-\alpha)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

ii) Similarly to the proof of part i), for $\mathbb{k} = \mathbb{k}_{\text{DC}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi_{\text{DC},0}\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}^2 &= \left[\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} + \frac{1}{1-\alpha\gamma} \right] \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \alpha^t - \frac{\gamma}{(1-\gamma)} \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} (\alpha\gamma)^t \\ &= \left[\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} + \frac{1}{1-\alpha\gamma} \right] \frac{1}{1-\alpha} - \frac{\gamma}{(1-\gamma)} \frac{1}{(1-\alpha\gamma)} \\ &= \frac{1-\alpha\gamma^2-\gamma+\alpha\gamma}{(1-\alpha)(1-\gamma)(1-\alpha\gamma)} = \frac{1+\alpha\gamma}{(1-\alpha)(1-\alpha\gamma)}. \end{aligned}$$

iii) Similar to the previous parts, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi_{\text{SS},0}\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}^2 &= \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \frac{\alpha^{2t}}{1-\alpha} - \left[\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha^2} + \frac{1}{3(1-\alpha^3)} \right] \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \alpha^{3t} - \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \frac{t\alpha^{3t}}{3} \\ &= \frac{1}{(1-\alpha)(1-\alpha^2)} - \frac{3\alpha-3\alpha^4+1-\alpha^2}{3(1-\alpha^2)(1-\alpha^3)^2} - \frac{\alpha^3}{3(1-\alpha^3)^2} \\ &= \frac{2\alpha^4 + \alpha^3 + 3\alpha^2 + \alpha + 1}{3(\alpha^3 - 1)^2(\alpha + 1)}. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. \blacksquare

I. Proof of Theorem 9

From (26) and (37), one can see that

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{\tau,t}^{(u)} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{k}(t,s) u_{\tau-s} ds \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{k}(t,s) \sum_{i=0}^{n_s-1} \xi_{i+1} \mathbf{1}_{[s_i, s_{i+1})}(\tau-s) ds \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{n_s-1} \xi_{i+1} \int_{\bar{s}_{i+1}(\tau)}^{\bar{s}_i(\tau)} \mathbb{k}(t,s) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (94)$$

Following this, the claim is implied by the definition of function ψ in (38).

J. Proof of Theorem 10

First, we consider the case of TC kernel. For $t \leq a$, we have

$$\psi_{\text{TC}}(t, a, b) = \int_a^b \alpha^s ds = \frac{\alpha^b - \alpha^a}{\ln(\alpha)}. \quad (95)$$

Also, for $t \geq b$, one has

$$\psi_{\text{TC}}(t, a, b) = \int_a^b \alpha^t ds = (b-a)\alpha^t. \quad (96)$$

Similar to the previous cases, when $t \in (a, b)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{\text{TC}}(t, a, b) &= \int_a^t \alpha^t ds + \int_t^b \alpha^s ds \\ &= (t-a)\alpha^t + \frac{\alpha^b - \alpha^t}{\ln(\alpha)}. \end{aligned} \quad (97)$$

Due to (95), (96), (97), and the definition of η , one can see (41) holds. We have a similar argument for DC kernel. More precisely, for $t \leq a$, one can see that

$$\psi_{\text{DC}}(t, a, b) = \int_a^b \alpha^s \gamma^{s-t} ds = \frac{(\alpha\gamma)^b - (\alpha\gamma)^a}{\ln(\alpha\gamma)} \gamma^{-t}. \quad (98)$$

Also, for $t \geq b$, we have

$$\psi_{\text{DC}}(t, a, b) = \int_a^b \alpha^t \gamma^{t-s} ds = \frac{\gamma^{-a} - \gamma^{-b}}{\ln(\gamma)} (\alpha\gamma)^t. \quad (99)$$

Similarly, if $t \in (a, b)$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{\text{DC}}(t, a, b) &= \int_a^t \alpha^t \gamma^{t-s} ds + \int_t^b \alpha^s \gamma^{s-t} ds \\ &= \frac{\gamma^{-a} - \gamma^{-t}}{\ln(\gamma)} (\alpha\gamma)^t + \frac{(\alpha\gamma)^b - (\alpha\gamma)^t}{\ln(\alpha\gamma)} \gamma^{-t}. \end{aligned} \quad (100)$$

From the definition of η , one can see that (98), (99) and (100) implies (41). It remains to obtain the result for SS kernel. For $t \leq a$, we have

$$\int_a^b \alpha^{\max(s,t)+s+t} ds = \int_a^b \alpha^{2s+t} ds = \frac{\alpha^{2b} - \alpha^{2a}}{2 \ln(\alpha)} \alpha^t. \quad (101)$$

Also, if $t \geq b$, one can see that

$$\int_a^b \alpha^{\max(s,t)+s+t} ds = \int_a^b \alpha^{2t+s} ds = \frac{\alpha^b - \alpha^a}{\ln(\alpha)} \alpha^{2t}. \quad (102)$$

Similarly, if $t \in (a, b)$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \int_a^b \alpha^{\max(s,t)+s+t} ds &= \int_a^t \alpha^{2t+s} ds + \int_t^b \alpha^{2s+t} ds \\ &= \frac{\alpha^t - \alpha^a}{\ln(\alpha)} \alpha^{2t} + \frac{\alpha^{2b} - \alpha^{2t}}{2 \ln(\alpha)} \alpha^t. \end{aligned} \quad (103)$$

Based on the definition of η , (101), (102), and (103), one can see that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_a^b \alpha^{\max(s,t)+s+t} ds \\ = \frac{\alpha^{\eta(t,a,b)} - \alpha^a}{\ln(\alpha)} \alpha^{2t} + \frac{\alpha^{2b} - \alpha^{2\eta(t,a,b)}}{2 \ln(\alpha)} \alpha^t. \end{aligned} \quad (104)$$

Accordingly, by replacing α with α^3 is (41) and due to the definition of \mathbb{k}_{SS} , one can obtain (43). ■

K. Proof of Theorem 11

From the definition of φ_0 and function ψ , we have

$$\varphi_{0,t} = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{k}(s,t) ds = \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^b \mathbb{k}(s,t) ds = \lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \psi(t, 0, b).$$

Subsequently, one can see that the theorem holds according to Theorem 10. ■

L. Proof of Theorem 12

Due to Theorem 3, Lemma 5 and (37), one has

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \varphi_0, \varphi_\tau^{(u)} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k} &= \int_0^\infty \varphi_{0,s} \sum_{i=0}^{n_s-1} \xi_{i+1} \mathbf{1}_{[s_i, s_{i+1})}(\tau - s) ds \\ &= \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \mathbb{k}(s,t) \sum_{i=0}^{n_s-1} \xi_{i+1} \mathbf{1}_{[s_i, s_{i+1})}(\tau - s) dt ds. \end{aligned} \quad (105)$$

Accordingly, from the definition of function $\bar{\nu}$ and functions $\bar{\kappa}_i$, $i = 0, \dots, n_s - 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \varphi_0, \varphi_\tau^{(u)} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k} &= \sum_{i=0}^{n_s-1} \xi_{i+1} \int_{\bar{s}_{i+1}(\tau)}^{\bar{s}_i(\tau)} \int_0^\infty \mathbb{k}(s,t) dt ds \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{n_s-1} \xi_{i+1} (\bar{\nu}(\bar{s}_i(\tau)) - \bar{\nu}(\bar{s}_{i+1}(\tau))) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{n_s-1} \xi_{i+1} \bar{\kappa}_i(\tau). \end{aligned} \quad (106)$$

From Lemma 5 and due to (26) and (37), we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \varphi_{\tau_1}^{(u)}, \varphi_{\tau_2}^{(u)} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_k} &= \int_0^\infty \varphi_{\tau_2,s}^{(u)} \sum_{i=0}^{n_s-1} \xi_{i+1} \mathbf{1}_{[s_i, s_{i+1})}(\tau_1 - s) ds \\ &= \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \left(\mathbb{k}(s,t) \sum_{j=0}^{n_s-1} \xi_{j+1} \mathbf{1}_{[s_j, s_{j+1})}(\tau_2 - t) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \sum_{i=0}^{n_s-1} \xi_{i+1} \mathbf{1}_{[s_i, s_{i+1})}(\tau_1 - s) \right) dt ds \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{n_s-1} \sum_{j=0}^{n_s-1} \xi_{i+1} \xi_{j+1} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \left(\mathbb{k}(s,t) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \mathbf{1}_{[s_j, s_{j+1})}(\tau_2 - t) \mathbf{1}_{[s_i, s_{i+1})}(\tau_1 - s) \right) dt ds. \end{aligned} \quad (107)$$

From (47), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \mathbb{k}(s,t) \mathbf{1}_{[s_j, s_{j+1})}(\tau_2 - t) \mathbf{1}_{[s_i, s_{i+1})}(\tau_1 - s) dt ds \\ = \int_{\bar{s}_{i+1}(\tau_1)}^{\bar{s}_i(\tau_1)} \int_{\bar{s}_{j+1}(\tau_2)}^{\bar{s}_j(\tau_2)} \mathbb{k}(s,t) dt ds \\ = \nu(\bar{s}_i(\tau_1), \bar{s}_j(\tau_2)) - \nu(\bar{s}_{i+1}(\tau_1), \bar{s}_j(\tau_2)) \\ - \nu(\bar{s}_i(\tau_1), \bar{s}_{j+1}(\tau_2)) + \nu(\bar{s}_{i+1}(\tau_1), \bar{s}_{j+1}(\tau_2)). \end{aligned} \quad (108)$$

Thus, the claim is implied from (107) and (108). ■

M. Proof of Theorem 13

Since $\bar{\nu}(x) = \lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \nu(x, y)$, it is enough to obtain $\nu(x, y)$. Throughout the proof, without loss of generality we assume $x \leq y$. Due to the definition of ν in (47), for TC kernel, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_{\text{TC}}(x, y) &= \int_0^x \int_0^s \alpha^s dt ds + \int_0^x \int_s^y \alpha^t dt ds \\ &= \int_0^x s \alpha^s ds + \int_0^x \frac{\alpha^y - \alpha^s}{\ln(\alpha)} ds \\ &= \frac{x \alpha^x \ln(\alpha) + 1 - \alpha^x}{\ln(\alpha)^2} + \frac{x \alpha^y}{\ln(\alpha)} - \frac{\alpha^x - 1}{\ln(\alpha)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (109)$$

Reordering the terms and replacing x and y respectively with $\min(x, y)$ and $\max(x, y)$, we obtain $\nu_{\text{TC}}(x, y)$. Letting y go to ∞ in $\nu_{\text{TC}}(x, y)$, we obtain $\bar{\nu}_{\text{TC}}(x)$. Similarly, from the definition of ν , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_{\text{DC}}(x, y) &= \int_0^x \int_0^s \alpha^s \gamma^{s-t} dt ds + \int_0^x \int_s^y \alpha^t \gamma^{t-s} dt ds \\ &= \int_0^x \alpha^s \gamma^s \int_0^s \gamma^{-t} dt ds + \int_0^x \gamma^{-s} \int_s^y \alpha^t \gamma^t dt ds \\ &= \int_0^x (\alpha\gamma)^s \frac{1-\gamma^{-s}}{\ln(\gamma)} ds + \int_0^x \gamma^{-s} \frac{(\alpha\gamma)^y - (\alpha\gamma)^s}{\ln(\alpha\gamma)} ds \\ &= \frac{(\alpha\gamma)^x - 1}{\ln(\gamma) \ln(\alpha\gamma)} - \frac{\alpha^x - 1}{\ln(\gamma) \ln(\alpha)} - \frac{(\alpha\gamma)^y (\gamma^{-x} - 1)}{\ln(\gamma) \ln(\alpha\gamma)} \\ &\quad - \frac{\alpha^x - 1}{\ln(\alpha) \ln(\alpha\gamma)}. \end{aligned} \quad (110)$$

Similar to the previous part, by replacing x and y respectively with $\min(x, y)$ and $\max(x, y)$, and reordering the terms, we obtain $\nu_{\text{DC}}(x, y)$. Moreover, one can see that $\bar{\nu}_{\text{TC}}(x)$ results when y goes to ∞ . Replacing α with α^3 in $\nu_{\text{TC}}(x, y)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^x \int_0^y \alpha^{3 \max(s, t)} dt ds &= \frac{\min(x, y)(\alpha^{3x} + \alpha^{3y})}{3 \ln(\alpha)} + \frac{2(1 - \alpha^{3 \min(x, y)})}{9 \ln(\alpha)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (111)$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^x \int_0^y \alpha^{\max(s, t) + s + t} dt ds &= \int_0^x \int_0^s \alpha^{2s+t} dt ds + \int_0^x \int_s^y \alpha^{s+2t} dt ds \\ &= \int_0^x \alpha^{2s} \frac{\alpha^s - 1}{\ln(\alpha)} ds + \alpha^s \frac{\alpha^{2y} - \alpha^{2s}}{2 \ln(\alpha)} ds \\ &= \frac{\alpha^{3x} - 1}{6 \ln(\alpha)^2} - \frac{\alpha^{2x} - 1}{2 \ln(\alpha)^2} + \frac{\alpha^{2y}(\alpha^x - 1)}{2 \ln(\alpha)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (112)$$

Using the definition of ν , (111), (112), replacing x and y respectively with $\min(x, y)$ and $\max(x, y)$, and reordering the terms, we obtain $\nu_{\text{SS}}(x, y)$. Also, letting $y \rightarrow \infty$, we get $\bar{\nu}_{\text{SS}}(x)$. ■

N. Proof of Theorem 14

From (24) and the definition of function ν , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi_0\|_{\mathcal{H}_k}^2 &= \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \mathbb{k}(s, t) ds dt \\ &= \lim_{x, y \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^x \int_0^y \mathbb{k}(s, t) ds dt = \lim_{x, y \rightarrow \infty} \nu(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

Accordingly, the proof of the theorem follows directly from Theorem 13. ■

O. Representer Theorem

There are several variations of the representer theorem in the literature, which vary primarily in terms of generality. The following version is borrowed from [64].

Theorem 17 ([64]). *Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space endowed with inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $r : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an increasing function. Consider the following optimization problem*

$$\min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{H}} e(\langle \mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}, \dots, \langle \mathbf{w}_m, \mathbf{w} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}) + r(\|\mathbf{w}\|_{\mathcal{H}}), \quad (113)$$

where $\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m$ are vectors in \mathcal{H} and $e : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ is a given function. Then, (113) has a solution in $\mathcal{W} := \text{span}\{\mathbf{w}_i\}_{i=1}^m$, when it admits a solution.

It is worth noting that Theorem 17 is a generalized form of the representer theorem discussed in [65, Theorem 1.3.1].

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Zadeh, "On the identification problem," *IRE Transactions on Circuit Theory*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 277–281, 1956.
- [2] L. Ljung, *System Identification: Theory For The User*. Prentice Hall, 1999.
- [3] T. A. Johansen, "Constrained and regularized system identification," *Modeling, Identification and Control*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 109–116, 1998.
- [4] P. Trnka and V. Havlena, "Subspace like identification incorporating prior information," *Automatica*, vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 1086–1091, 2009.
- [5] J. Umenberger and I. R. Manchester, "Specialized interior-point algorithm for stable nonlinear system identification," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 64, no. 6, pp. 2442–2456, 2018.
- [6] M. Khosravi and R. S. Smith, "Nonlinear system identification with prior knowledge on the region of attraction," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 1091–1096, 2021.
- [7] A. A. Ahmadi and B. El Khadir, "Learning dynamical systems with side information (short version)," *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 120, pp. 718–727, 2020.
- [8] M. Khosravi and R. S. Smith, "Convex nonparametric formulation for identification of gradient flows," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 1097–1102, 2021.
- [9] M. Khosravi, "Representer theorem for learning Koopman operators," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.01681*, 2021 (to appear in *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*).
- [10] C. Lyzell, M. Enqvist, and L. Ljung, "Handling certain structure information in subspace identification," *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 42, no. 10, pp. 90–95, 2009.
- [11] P. Massioni and M. Verhaegen, "Subspace identification of circulant systems," *Automatica*, vol. 44, no. 11, pp. 2825–2833, 2008.
- [12] D. N. Miller and R. A. De Callafon, "Subspace identification with eigenvalue constraints," *Automatica*, vol. 49, no. 8, pp. 2468–2473, 2013.
- [13] T. McKelvey and S. R. Moheimani, "Estimation of phase constrained MIMO transfer functions with application to flexible structures with mixed collocated and non-collocated actuators and sensors," *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 219–224, 2005.
- [14] J. B. Hoagg, S. L. Lacy, R. S. Erwin, and D. S. Bernstein, "Subspace identification with lower bounded modal frequencies," in *American Control Conference*, vol. 1. IEEE, 2004, pp. 867–872.
- [15] M. Inoue, "Subspace identification with moment matching," *Automatica*, vol. 99, pp. 22–32, 2019.
- [16] I. Goethals, T. Van Gestel, J. Suykens, P. Van Dooren, and B. De Moor, "Identification of positive real models in subspace identification by using regularization," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 48, no. 10, pp. 1843–1847, 2003.
- [17] L. F. Rodrigues, L. P. Ihlenfeld, and G. H. da Costa Oliveira, "A novel subspace identification approach with passivity enforcement," *Automatica*, vol. 132, p. 109798, 2021.
- [18] A. De Santis and L. Farina, "Identification of positive linear systems with Poisson output transformation," *Automatica*, vol. 38, no. 5, pp. 861–868, 2002.
- [19] L. Benvenuti, A. De Santis, and L. Farina, "On model consistency in compartmental systems identification," *Automatica*, vol. 38, no. 11, pp. 1969–1976, 2002.
- [20] R. S. Smith, "Frequency domain subspace identification using nuclear norm minimization and Hankel matrix realizations," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 59, no. 11, pp. 2886–2896, 2014.
- [21] M. Fazel, T. K. Pong, D. Sun, and P. Tseng, "Hankel matrix rank minimization with applications to system identification and realization," *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 946–977, 2013.

- [22] P. Shah, B. N. Bhaskar, G. Tang, and B. Recht, "Linear system identification via atomic norm regularization," in *Conference on Decision and Control*, 2012, pp. 6265–6270.
- [23] S. L. Lacy and D. S. Bernstein, "Subspace identification with guaranteed stability using constrained optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 48, no. 7, pp. 1259–1263, 2003.
- [24] T. Van Gestel, J. A. Suykens, P. Van Dooren, and B. De Moor, "Identification of stable models in subspace identification by using regularization," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic control*, vol. 46, no. 9, pp. 1416–1420, 2001.
- [25] G. Pillonetto and G. De Nicolao, "A new kernel-based approach for linear system identification," *Automatica*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 81–93, 2010.
- [26] L. Ljung, T. Chen, and B. Mu, "A shift in paradigm for system identification," *International Journal of Control*, vol. 93, no. 2, pp. 173–180, 2020.
- [27] M. Khosravi and R. S. Smith, "On robustness of kernel-based regularized system identification," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 54, no. 7, pp. 749–754, 2021, IFAC Symposium on System Identification.
- [28] G. Pillonetto, F. Dinuzzo, T. Chen, G. De Nicolao, and L. Ljung, "Kernel methods in system identification, machine learning and function estimation: A survey," *Automatica*, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 657–682, 2014.
- [29] M. Khosravi and R. S. Smith, "The existence and uniqueness of solutions for kernel-based system identification," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.08092*, 2021 (to appear in *Automatica*).
- [30] Y. Fujimoto, I. Maruta, and T. Sugie, "Extension of first-order stable spline kernel to encode relative degree," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 14 016–14 021, 2017.
- [31] T. Chen, H. Ohlsson, and L. Ljung, "On the estimation of transfer functions, regularizations and Gaussian processes—Revisited," *Automatica*, vol. 48, no. 8, pp. 1525–1535, 2012.
- [32] M. A. H. Darwish, G. Pillonetto, and R. Tóth, "The quest for the right kernel in Bayesian impulse response identification: The use of OBFs," *Automatica*, vol. 87, pp. 318–329, 2018.
- [33] T. Chen, "On kernel design for regularized LTI system identification," *Automatica*, vol. 90, pp. 109–122, 2018.
- [34] A. Marconato, M. Schoukens, and J. Schoukens, "Filter-based regularisation for impulse response modelling," *IET Control Theory & Applications*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 194–204, 2016.
- [35] R. S. Risuleo, G. Bottegal, and H. Hjalmarsson, "A nonparametric kernel-based approach to Hammerstein system identification," *Automatica*, vol. 85, pp. 234–247, 2017.
- [36] R. S. Risuleo, F. Lindsten, and H. Hjalmarsson, "Bayesian nonparametric identification of Wiener systems," *Automatica*, vol. 108, p. 108480, 2019.
- [37] N. Everitt, G. Bottegal, and H. Hjalmarsson, "An empirical Bayes approach to identification of modules in dynamic networks," *Automatica*, vol. 91, pp. 144–151, 2018.
- [38] M. Khosravi and R. S. Smith, "Kernel-based identification with frequency domain side-information," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.00410*, 2021 (to appear in *Automatica*).
- [39] M. Khosravi, M. Yin, A. Iannelli, A. Parsi, and R. S. Smith, "Low-complexity identification by sparse hyperparameter estimation," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 412–417, 2020, IFAC World Congress 2020.
- [40] M. Khosravi, A. Iannelli, M. Yin, A. Parsi, and R. S. Smith, "Regularized system identification: A hierarchical Bayesian approach," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 406–411, 2020, IFAC World Congress 2020.
- [41] G. Pillonetto, T. Chen, A. Chiuso, G. D. Nicolao, and L. Ljung, "Regularized linear system identification using atomic, nuclear and kernel-based norms: The role of the stability constraint," *Automatica*, vol. 69, pp. 137–149, 2016.
- [42] M. Khosravi and R. S. Smith, "Kernel-based identification of positive systems," in *Conference on Decision and Control*, 2019, pp. 1740–1745.
- [43] M. Zheng and Y. Ohta, "Bayesian positive system identification: Truncated Gaussian prior and hyperparameter estimation," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 148, p. 104857, 2021.
- [44] M. Khosravi and R. S. Smith, "Regularized identification with internal positivity side-information," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.00407*, 2021.
- [45] P. Grosdidier, M. Morari, and B. R. Holt, "Closed-loop properties from steady-state gain information," *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Fundamentals*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 221–235, 1985.
- [46] P. J. Campo and M. Morari, "Achievable closed-loop properties of systems under decentralized control: Conditions involving the steady-state gain," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 39, no. 5, pp. 932–943, 1994.
- [47] Z. Q. Zheng and M. Morari, "Robust stability of constrained model predictive control," in *American Control Conference*. IEEE, 1993, pp. 379–383.
- [48] A. Alenany, H. Shang, M. Soliman, and I. Ziedan, "Improved subspace identification with prior information using constrained least squares," *IET Control Theory & Applications*, vol. 5, no. 13, pp. 1568–1576, 2011.
- [49] S. Yoshimura, A. Matsubayashi, and M. Inoue, "System identification method inheriting steady-state characteristics of existing model," *International Journal of Control*, vol. 92, no. 11, pp. 2701–2711, 2019.
- [50] Y. Abe, M. Inoue, and S. Adachi, "Subspace identification method incorporated with a priori information characterized in frequency domain," in *European Control Conference*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 1377–1382.
- [51] I. Markovsky and G. Mercère, "Subspace identification with constraints on the impulse response," *International Journal of Control*, vol. 90, no. 8, pp. 1728–1735, 2017.
- [52] Y. Fujimoto and T. Sugie, "Kernel-based impulse response estimation with a priori knowledge on the DC gain," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 713–718, 2018.
- [53] A. H. Tan and D. S. Ong, "Kernel-based impulse response estimation with prior dc gain using built-in self-scaling technique," *IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement*, vol. 69, no. 9, pp. 7295–7305, 2020.
- [54] T. Chen and G. Pillonetto, "On the stability of reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces of discrete-time impulse responses," *Automatica*, vol. 95, pp. 529–533, 2018.
- [55] H. Garnier, L. Wang, and P. C. Young, "Direct identification of continuous-time models from sampled data: Issues, basic solutions and relevance," in *Identification of continuous-time models from sampled data*. Springer, 2008, pp. 1–29.
- [56] H. Garnier and M. Gilson, "CONTSID: a MATLAB toolbox for standard and advanced identification of black-box continuous-time models," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 51, no. 15, pp. 688–693, 2018.
- [57] L. Ljung and R. Singh, "Version 8 of the MATLAB system identification toolbox," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 45, no. 16, pp. 1826–1831, 2012.
- [58] A. Berlinet and C. Thomas-Agnan, *Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Spaces in Probability and Statistics*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.
- [59] C. Carmeli, E. De Vito, and A. Toigo, "Vector valued reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces of integrable functions and Mercer theorem," *Analysis and Applications*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 377–408, 2006.
- [60] R. A. Maronna, R. D. Martin, and V. J. Yohai, *Robust Statistics: Theory and Methods*. John Wiley & Sons, 2006.
- [61] H. Brézis, "Functional analysis, Sobolev spaces and partial differential equations," 2011.
- [62] N. Srinivas, A. Krause, S. M. Kakade, and M. W. Seeger, "Information-theoretic regret bounds for Gaussian process optimization in the bandit setting," *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 58, no. 5, pp. 3250–3265, 2012.
- [63] J. Peypouquet, *Convex Optimization in Normed Spaces: Theory, Methods and Examples*. Springer, 2015.
- [64] F. Dinuzzo and B. Schölkopf, "The representer theorem for Hilbert spaces: A necessary and sufficient condition," in *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2012, pp. 189–196.
- [65] G. Wahba, *Spline Models for Observational Data*. SIAM, 1990.