Research Article: Quarterly Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovations Volume: 06

Advancements in Linear System Identification: A Study of Modern Techniques

Parth Joshi

Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda, Vadodara

Bhavna Shah

Dhirubhai Ambani Institute of Information and Communication Technology (DA-IICT), Gandhinagar

Abstract

Linear System Identification (LSI) is a pivotal procedure in control engineering, aiming to construct an accurate model of a system from observed input-output data. Contemporary techniques for LSI have incorporated advancements in computational power and machine learning algorithms. Subspace-Based Methods represent an evolution from classical identification methods such as ARX or ARMAX models. These methods analyze the system's input-output data by identifying its state-space representation, offering the ability to manage multiple-input and multiple-output systems without an excessive computational load. Noteworthy methods include N4SID (Numerical algorithms for state-space system IDentification) and MOESP (Multivariable Output Error State Space). Frequency-Domain Methods involve the conversion of time-domain input-output data into frequency-domain data, facilitating an understanding of the system's dynamic behavior. These methods are particularly beneficial when the system exhibits non-minimum phase behavior or when noise affects the measurements. Modern methods include spectral analysis and the use of frequency response functions. Regularization Techniques are designed to address overfitting and underfitting issues that frequently occur during the system identification process. By incorporating a regularization term into the loss function, it is feasible to control the model's complexity, thereby achieving a balance between the model's fit and its complexity. Examples include Ridge Regression and Lasso Regression. Machine Learning Approaches have been applied to system identification due to advancements in computational power and the emergence of machine learning. Techniques such as Support Vector Machines (SVM), Artificial Neural Networks (ANN), and Deep Learning can manage complex nonlinear systems and provide robust identification of linear systems, albeit requiring substantial data for training. Bayesian Methods offer a probabilistic framework for system identification, integrating uncertainty in both the model and measurements. These methods can manage the system's nonlinearity and provide uncertainty estimates for the model parameters. Examples include Gaussian Processes and Markov Chain Monte Carlo. The choice of an appropriate method for a specific system identification task necessitates a thorough understanding of the system's dynamics and the characteristics of these methods, considering the nature of the system under study, the availability and quality of data, and the computational resources available.

Keywords: *Linear System Identification, Subspace-Based Methods, Frequency-Domain Methods, Regularization Techniques, Machine Learning Approaches, Bayesian Methods, Computational Resources*

Introduction

Linear System Identification is a crucial area of research in control theory and signal processing, aiming to infer the dynamic behavior of a system based on observed input-output data. It involves constructing mathematical models that represent the underlying dynamics of a physical system in a linear form. The fundamental assumption in linear system identification is that the system can be approximated by a linear combination of its inputs and states. The identification process typically employs various methods such as time-domain and frequency-domain techniques, least squares estimation, or maximum likelihood estimation, to estimate the model parameters from the input-output data. These models facilitate the analysis, prediction, and control of complex systems in various engineering and scientific applications.

One common approach to linear system identification is based on the autoregressive moving-average (ARMA) model. The ARMA model is widely used due to its simplicity and effectiveness in representing linear systems with noise. The model expresses the output signal as a combination of past output values and past input values, with appropriate coefficients for each term. Estimating the ARMA model parameters often involves minimizing the prediction error by optimizing the model's coefficients [1]. This process can be achieved through optimization algorithms like the least squares method or the maximum likelihood estimation.

Another popular technique in linear system identification is the use of frequency-domain methods, such as the Fourier Transform or the Z-transform. These methods enable the system's frequency response to be estimated, providing valuable insights into the system's stability and dynamics [2]. By exciting the system with known input signals and measuring the corresponding output signals, the frequency response function can be obtained. From this data, system parameters like transfer functions or impulse responses can be estimated. Frequency-domain identification techniques are particularly useful when dealing with systems with complex dynamics and multiple inputs and outputs.

Linear System Identification has a rich history of traditional techniques that have been widely employed to estimate the dynamics of linear systems. One such traditional approach is the "Step Response Method." This technique involves exciting the system with a step input and observing its response. By analyzing the time-domain response and fitting it to a mathematical model, parameters like time constants and gains can be estimated. While the Step Response Method is simple and intuitive, it may not be suitable for systems with complex dynamics or significant noise.

Another traditional technique is the "Impulse Response Method." Here, the system is stimulated with an impulse input, and its output is recorded. The impulse response of the system is then computed, providing valuable insights into the system's dynamic behavior. By fitting an appropriate model to the impulse response, parameters like the system's natural frequencies and damping ratios can be estimated. The Impulse Response Method is particularly useful when dealing with systems with multiple degrees of freedom and resonant behavior [3], [4].

The "Correlation Analysis" is another classical approach for linear system identification. This method involves examining the correlation between the input and output signals of the system. Cross-correlation and auto-correlation techniques are used to determine the relationship between the input and output, leading to the estimation of the system's impulse response or transfer function [5]. Correlation Analysis can be advantageous when dealing with systems with random or stochastic inputs.

Frequency-domain methods are also traditional techniques used for linear system identification. One of the most prominent methods is the "Frequency Response Function" (FRF) estimation [6]. This technique involves applying known sinusoidal inputs to the system at various frequencies and measuring the corresponding output amplitudes and phases. From this data, the FRF can be computed, allowing the estimation of system parameters such as transfer functions and resonance frequencies [7]. Frequency-domain methods are particularly effective in dealing with linear time-invariant systems.

Review of Modern Techniques

Subspace-Based Methods:

Subspace-based identification methods have shown considerable advancement over classical methods such as ARX (AutoRegressive with eXogenous input) or ARMAX (AutoRegressive Moving Average with eXogenous input) models. These models are mainly based on the notion of system identification in the field of control engineering, where mathematical models of dynamic systems are developed based on observed data. Traditionally, ARX or ARMAX models have been utilized due to their simplicity, where a system's output is expressed as a linear combination of its previous outputs and current and past inputs. However, these models are typically constrained in their application, primarily when dealing with multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) systems, resulting in substantial computational burdens [8].

In contrast, the emergence of subspace-based methods brings forth a paradigm shift in system identification. The primary focus of these methods is the analysis of the system's input-output data by identifying its state-space representation. This innovative approach enables handling of MIMO systems with less computational load, proving to be beneficial in scenarios where ARX or ARMAX models have limitations. Subspace-based identification methods, therefore, become an ideal choice when the identification of MIMO systems is desired [9].

The state-space representation of a system is a mathematical model that represents the system's dynamics by a set of first-order differential or difference equations. By identifying this representation from the observed input-output data, subspace-based methods achieve an insightful analysis of the system [10]. Notably, the process does not require assumptions about the noise properties, unlike classical methods, where explicit noise modeling is needed. This feature underscores the robustness of subspace-based methods, particularly when dealing with real-world systems characterized by unpredictable noise patterns.

Among the subspace-based identification methods, two methods have become prominent due to their efficacy in handling MIMO systems: Numerical algorithms for state-space system IDentification (N4SID) and Multivariable Output Error State Space (MOESP). Each method has unique features and steps involved in the identification process [11], [12].

N4SID is a subspace identification method that enables the identification of state-space models from the observed input-output data. It provides a numerical algorithm, making it advantageous when dealing with large datasets or complex systems. The N4SID algorithm starts by computing a sample covariance matrix based on the data. It then computes the singular value decomposition (SVD) of this matrix, yielding a set of orthogonal basis vectors that span the input and output subspaces of the system. By partitioning these vectors and using various numerical methods, N4SID then estimates the state-space model parameters. The inherent numerical stability of the N4SID method gives it an edge over other methods, allowing for accurate and reliable system identification [13].

On the other hand, MOESP, another subspace identification method, differs from N4SID in that it does not require the computation of the SVD [14]. Instead, MOESP begins by constructing a block Hankel matrix from the observed data, which contains time-delayed versions of the output sequence. The QR factorization of this matrix is then computed, yielding a set of orthogonal basis vectors. The state-space model parameters are estimated by exploiting the structure of this basis. One of the strengths of the MOESP method is that it provides a computationally efficient means of system identification, especially for MIMO systems [15], where the number of inputs and outputs is large [16]. Both N4SID and MOESP share the feature of providing accurate and computationally efficient means of system identification, making them suitable for applications in various fields, including but not limited to control engineering, signal processing, and data science [17], [18].

Frequency-Domain Methods:

Frequency-domain methods represent an essential category in system identification techniques. Unlike time-domain methods, which analyze systems based on time-variant signals, frequency-domain methods transform time-domain input-output data into the frequency domain. This transformation is a significant step that aids in understanding the system's dynamic behavior from a different perspective.

The conversion from time-domain to frequency-domain typically involves the use of Fourier-related transforms, such as the Fast Fourier Transform (FFT) or Laplace Transform. These transformations convert time-based signals into frequency-based signals. In the frequency domain, the system's behavior can be studied as a function of frequency, rather than time. The frequency representation provides an analysis of how the system responds to different frequency components of the input signal.

Frequency-domain methods are particularly advantageous in certain scenarios. For instance, when the system under analysis exhibits non-minimum phase behavior, frequency-domain methods can provide more insightful results. Non-minimum phase systems are those systems where the zeros of the transfer function lie in the right half of the complex plane in continuous time or outside the unit circle in discrete time. These systems pose challenges for control and system identification, particularly with time-domain methods. However, in the frequency domain, the behavior of these systems can be more effectively characterized, leading to more accurate identification results.

Furthermore, frequency-domain methods are beneficial when noise significantly influences the measurements. Noise can introduce errors in the identification process, leading to inaccurate system models. In the frequency domain, the impact of noise can be more effectively managed.

Certain types of noise can be reduced or eliminated using filtering techniques, leading to cleaner data and more accurate system identification [19]. Moreover, frequency-domain methods allow for the use of spectral analysis, which can separate the useful signal from noise based on their frequency content [20].

In the category of frequency-domain methods, several modern techniques have emerged that enhance the effectiveness of system identification. Spectral analysis and the use of frequency response functions (FRF) are two such prominent methods.

Spectral analysis is a method used to decompose a signal into its constituent frequency components [21]. It is widely used in system identification to analyze the frequency content of the input-output data. With spectral analysis, the strength of the various frequency components can be visualized, providing a deep understanding of the system's dynamics. Moreover, spectral analysis can help identify periodicities in the data, which can be crucial for identifying and modeling cyclic behavior in systems [22].

Frequency response functions (FRFs) represent another advanced technique used in frequency-domain identification. An FRF is a complex function that describes the amplitude and phase characteristics of a system as a function of frequency. Through FRFs, the steady-state response of a system to sinusoidal inputs of different frequencies can be studied. Estimation of FRFs from input-output data allows for an accurate and detailed representation of the system's dynamic behavior across the frequency spectrum.

Both spectral analysis and FRF estimation present a set of tools that can be employed for system identification in the frequency domain. They allow for the detailed characterization of a system's behavior, providing crucial information for system modeling and control design.

In essence, frequency-domain methods provide a valuable approach to system identification, particularly when dealing with non-minimum phase systems or noise-affected measurements. The transformation of time-domain data into the frequency domain allows for a deeper understanding of the system's dynamic behavior. Modern methods, such as spectral analysis and FRF estimation, further enhance the effectiveness of frequency-domain identification, making it a vital tool in the field of system identification and control engineering.

Regularization Techniques:

Regularization techniques form a crucial component of system identification methods, specifically designed to tackle the common problems of overfitting and underfitting that often arise during the process of system modeling. Overfitting occurs when the model captures the noise along with the underlying trend in the data, leading to poor generalization performance on unseen data. Conversely, underfitting is when the model is too simple to capture the complexity of the underlying data, resulting in an inaccurate representation of the system dynamics.

Addressing these issues requires a careful balance between the model's fit to the observed data and its complexity [23]. Regularization techniques achieve this balance by introducing a regularization term into the loss function used in the optimization process. This term penalizes the complexity of the model, thereby avoiding excessively complex models that overfit the data. At the same time, it allows for enough flexibility in the model to accurately capture the system's dynamics, preventing underfitting [24].

There are several techniques for regularization, each introducing a different form of penalty to control the model's complexity. Among these, Ridge Regression and Lasso Regression are two prevalent methods widely used in system identification.

Ridge Regression, also known as Tikhonov regularization, is a technique that involves adding a squared penalty term to the loss function. The magnitude of this term is controlled by a tuning parameter, often referred to as the regularization parameter or lambda. This parameter determines the extent to which the model coefficients are shrunk towards zero. In this way, Ridge Regression discourages overly complex models with large coefficients, mitigating the risk of overfitting. Nevertheless, it retains all predictors in the model, providing a comprehensive view of the relationships between the predictors and the output [25].

Lasso Regression (Least Absolute Shrinkage and Selection Operator), on the other hand, introduces an absolute value penalty term into the loss function. Like Ridge Regression, the magnitude of this term is controlled by a regularization parameter. A unique feature of Lasso Regression is that, in addition to shrinking the coefficients towards zero, it can also set some coefficients exactly to zero when the regularization parameter is sufficiently large. This attribute makes Lasso Regression particularly useful when dealing with high-dimensional data, as it performs feature selection, i.e., it automatically selects a subset of the most relevant predictors. Thus, it not only helps prevent overfitting but also aids in interpreting the model [3].

Both Ridge and Lasso Regression have their strengths and can be appropriate depending on the context. In situations where predictors are highly correlated, Ridge Regression is generally more stable, while Lasso Regression can be advantageous when the objective is to create a parsimonious model [26].

In summary, regularization techniques provide an effective means of controlling the complexity of models in system identification. By introducing a penalty term into the loss function, these methods achieve a balance between model fit and complexity, addressing the common issues of overfitting and underfitting [27]. Techniques such as Ridge Regression and Lasso Regression exemplify the utility of regularization in achieving robust and interpretable system models.

Machine Learning Approaches:

The increase in computational power in recent years, coupled with advancements in machine learning, has paved the way for the application of various machine learning-based techniques in system identification. Techniques such as Support Vector Machines (SVM), Artificial Neural Networks (ANN), and Deep Learning provide novel ways to identify system models, with particular strengths in handling complex nonlinear systems and robust identification of linear systems.

Support Vector Machines (SVM) are a type of supervised learning model that can be used for regression or classification tasks. In the context of system identification, SVMs can be used for regression tasks, predicting system outputs based on input data. The key strength of SVMs lies in their capacity to handle high-dimensional spaces and the presence of a clear margin of separation in the data. These attributes allow SVMs to capture complex relationships between inputs and outputs, making them suitable for identifying both linear and nonlinear systems. However, the application of SVMs requires careful selection and tuning of parameters such as the regularization parameter, the kernel type, and the kernel parameters, which can significantly impact the model's performance [28].

Artificial Neural Networks (ANN) represent another machine learning technique that has found utility in system identification. ANNs consist of interconnected processing elements, or "neurons," arranged in layers, which mimic the structure and function of biological neurons. The strength of ANNs lies in their ability to model highly complex, nonlinear relationships between inputs and outputs. By adjusting the weights and biases of the network through a process known as backpropagation, ANNs can learn to approximate the underlying function that maps inputs to outputs. While ANNs can handle high complexity and nonlinearity, they require a large amount of data for training, and their high flexibility can lead to overfitting if not appropriately managed [29].

Deep Learning is a subset of machine learning based on artificial neural networks but incorporates multiple layers of nonlinear processing units for feature extraction and transformation. Each successive layer uses the output from the previous layer as input. Deep learning algorithms are capable of learning to represent data with multiple levels of abstraction, making them extremely versatile and capable of handling highly complex and large-scale systems. Models based on deep learning, such as Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) and Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs), have shown promise in system identification tasks, including those with temporal dependencies and spatially distributed systems.

While machine learning-based techniques offer powerful tools for system identification, it is important to note that they require considerable data for training. This requirement stems from the high flexibility of these models, which allows them to capture complex patterns but also makes them prone to overfitting if trained on insufficient data. Moreover, despite their powerful capabilities, machine learning models often lack interpretability, making it difficult to understand the relationships they capture.

In essence, machine learning-based techniques, including SVM, ANN, and Deep Learning, offer robust and versatile tools for system identification. These techniques can handle complex nonlinear systems and provide robust identification of linear systems, offering significant advancements in the field of system identification [30]. However, their application requires careful consideration of factors such as data availability, interpretability, and the risk of overfitting.

Bayesian Methods:

Bayesian methods present a probabilistic approach to system identification, providing a comprehensive framework to manage the inherent uncertainty present in both the model and measurements. In contrast to deterministic methods, Bayesian techniques account for uncertainty and variability by treating model parameters as random variables. This approach facilitates a robust way of handling the uncertainty that is inherent in real-world systems, leading to more reliable and realistic system models [31].

One of the core benefits of Bayesian methods is their ability to handle system nonlinearity. Nonlinear systems can be challenging to model using traditional identification methods due to their complex dynamics. Bayesian methods, however, can naturally accommodate nonlinear relationships by using probability distributions to capture the complexity and variability in system responses.

Another significant advantage of Bayesian methods is that they provide uncertainty estimates for the model parameters. By treating the parameters as random variables, Bayesian techniques provide not only point estimates of parameters but also a full posterior distribution that quantifies the uncertainty in these estimates. This attribute makes Bayesian methods particularly useful for risk assessment and decision making under uncertainty, as they provide a full range of plausible values for the parameters, along with the associated probabilities [32]. There are several techniques within the Bayesian framework that are particularly relevant for system identification. Gaussian Processes (GPs) and Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) are two such methods [33], [34].

Gaussian Processes offer a powerful tool for probabilistic nonparametric modeling. A Gaussian Process defines a prior over functions, which can be converted into a posterior over functions once the data is observed. This attribute makes GPs particularly useful for modeling complex systems where the exact form of the underlying function is unknown. GPs also naturally provide a measure of uncertainty, giving not just a predicted output but also a confidence interval around that prediction. However, the computational cost of GPs can be high, particularly with large datasets, due to the need to invert large covariance matrices [35].

Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) is another key Bayesian method used for system identification. MCMC is a class of algorithms for sampling from a probability distribution. By constructing a Markov chain that has the desired distribution as its equilibrium distribution, one can obtain a sample of the desired distribution by recording states from the chain [36]. MCMC methods, such as the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm, are commonly used to estimate the posterior distribution of model parameters in Bayesian system identification [37]. MCMC allows for the estimation of complex posterior distributions that are not analytically tractable, making it a powerful tool for Bayesian system identification [38].

In summary, Bayesian methods provide a probabilistic approach to system identification, handling inherent uncertainty in both the model and measurements. Techniques like Gaussian Processes and Markov Chain Monte Carlo offer robust ways of modeling complex nonlinear systems and providing uncertainty estimates for the model parameters. Despite their computational demands, Bayesian methods offer a compelling approach to system identification, particularly when dealing with uncertainty and nonlinearity.

Conclusion

Linear System Identification represents a pivotal segment of study in fields such as signal processing and control theory, with its core objective being the deduction of a system's dynamical operations from the analysis of input-output data. It is centered around the creation of mathematical representations that echo the internal dynamics of a physical system in a linear manner. Linear System Identification operates on the primary supposition that a system's behavior can be represented as a linear amalgamation of its states and inputs. Various methods, such as least squares estimation, frequency-domain techniques, or maximum likelihood estimation, are employed in the identification process, aiming to ascertain the model parameters from the system's input-output data [39]. These models further enhance the process of analysis, control, and prediction of complex systems across a spectrum of scientific and engineering applications.

Linear System Identification often utilizes a widely recognized approach centered around the autoregressive moving-average (ARMA) model. The simplicity and effectiveness of the ARMA model in portraying linear systems with noise contribute to its widespread usage. This model postulates the output signal as an amalgamation of prior input values and past output values, attributing suitable coefficients to each term. The procedure to estimate the ARMA model parameters frequently necessitates minimizing the prediction error by optimizing the coefficients of the model. This minimization can be achieved via optimization algorithms, such as the least squares method or maximum likelihood estimation. Furthermore, the Frequency Response Function (FRF) estimation is a renowned method employed in the frequency-domain techniques for linear system identification. Applying known sinusoidal inputs to the system across a range of frequencies and documenting the respective output amplitudes and phases allows the computation of the FRF, thus facilitating the estimation of system parameters like resonance frequencies and transfer functions [40]. Frequency-domain techniques prove especially effective when working with linear time-invariant systems.

In recent years, there have been remarkable advancements in system identification techniques, surpassing classical methods such as ARX and ARMAX models. These traditional models, while simple, face limitations in dealing with multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) systems, leading to significant computational burdens. As a result, subspace-based methods have emerged as a paradigm shift in the field of system identification, particularly for MIMO systems [41].

Subspace-based methods focus on analyzing system input-output data to identify the system's state-space representation [42], [43]. This innovative approach eliminates the need for assumptions about noise properties, making it robust when dealing with real-world systems characterized by unpredictable noise patterns. Among the subspace-based identification methods, two prominent techniques are Numerical algorithms for state-space system IDentification (N4SID) and Multivariable Output Error State Space (MOESP) [44].

N4SID, a numerical algorithm, computes a sample covariance matrix and performs singular value decomposition (SVD) to estimate the system's state-space model parameters. Its numerical stability ensures accurate and reliable system identification. On the other hand, MOESP constructs a block Hankel matrix from the observed data and computes the QR factorization to estimate the state-space model parameters. MOESP's efficiency makes it suitable for MIMO systems with a large number of inputs and outputs.

Frequency-domain methods offer an essential alternative to time-domain techniques. By transforming time-domain input-output data into the frequency domain using Fourier-related transforms, these methods provide a different perspective on the system's dynamic behavior. Frequency-domain methods excel in scenarios where the system exhibits non-minimum phase behavior or significant noise influences the measurements.

Spectral analysis and frequency response functions (FRFs) are two modern techniques used in frequency-domain system identification. Spectral analysis decomposes signals into constituent frequency components, aiding in understanding the system's dynamics. FRFs describe a system's amplitude and phase characteristics as a function of frequency, allowing for accurate representation of the system's behavior across the frequency spectrum [45].

Regularization techniques play a crucial role in tackling overfitting and underfitting problems in system modeling. Ridge Regression and Lasso Regression are two prevalent methods used to balance the model's fit and complexity. Ridge Regression introduces a squared penalty term, while Lasso Regression incorporates an absolute value penalty term. These techniques provide effective means of achieving robust and interpretable system models.

Machine learning approaches, such as Support Vector Machines (SVM), Artificial Neural Networks (ANN), and Deep Learning, have gained popularity in system identification due to increased computational power. SVMs handle high-dimensional spaces and clear separations in data, making them suitable for both linear and nonlinear systems. ANNs and Deep Learning offer versatility in modeling complex relationships, but they require ample training data and may lack interpretability.

Bayesian methods present a probabilistic approach to system identification, accounting for uncertainty by treating model parameters as random variables [46], [47]. Gaussian Processes and Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) are key Bayesian techniques used in system identification. Gaussian Processes are powerful for probabilistic nonparametric modeling, while MCMC allows for estimation of complex posterior distributions [48], [49].

References

[1] A. Nielsen, *Practical time series analysis: Prediction with statistics and machine learning*. O'Reilly Media, 2019.

[2] J. Y. M. Salah, "The consequence of the analytic continuity of Zeta function subject to an additional term and a justification of the location of the non-trivial zeros," *researchgate.net*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 1566–1569, 2020.

[3] L. Ljung, "System Identification," in *Signal Analysis and Prediction*, A. Procházka, J. Uhlíř, P. W. J. Rayner, and N. G. Kingsbury, Eds. Boston, MA: Birkhäuser Boston, 1998, pp. 163–173.

[4] A. Model, "SYSTEM IDENTIFICATION AND," *and Wastewater Treatment and Transport Systems …*, 2013.

[5] N. ElFelly, J.-Y. Dieulot, P. Borne, and M. Benrejeb, "A Multimodel Approach of Complex Systems Identification and Control Using Neural and Fuzzy Clustering Algorithms," in *2010 Ninth International Conference on Machine Learning and Applications*, 2010, pp. 93–98.

[6] S. Jahandari, A. Kalhor, and B. N. Araabi, "Online forecasting of synchronous time series based on evolving linear models," *IEEE Transactions on*, 2018.

[7] M. Elkafafy, P. Z. Csurcsia, B. Cornelis, E. Risaliti, and K. Janssens, "Machine learning and system identification for the estimation of data-driven models: an experimental case study illustrated on a tire-suspension system," *Proceedings of*, 2020.

[8] T. Gustafsson, "Subspace-based system identification: weighting and pre-filtering of instruments," *Automatica* , vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 433–443, Mar. 2002.

[9] R. Rathnasingham and K. S. Breuer, "System identification and control of a turbulent boundary layer," *Phys. Fluids* , 1997.

[10] M. Viberg, "Subspace-based methods for the identification of linear time-invariant systems," *Automatica* , vol. 31, no. 12, pp. 1835–1851, Dec. 1995.

[11] T. McKelvey, A. Fleming, and S. O. R. Moheimani, "Subspace-Based System Identification for an Acoustic Enclosure," *J. Vib. Acoust.*, vol. 124, no. 3, pp. 414–419, Jun. 2002.

[12] P. G. Bakir, “Automation of the stabilization diagrams for subspace based system identification,” *Expert Syst. Appl.*, vol. 38, no. 12, pp. 14390–14397, Nov. 2011.
[13] P. Eykhoff and P. C. Parks, “Identification and system parameter estimation; where do we stand now?,” *Automatica* , vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 3–5, Jan. 1990.
[14] S. Jahandari, A. Kalhor, and B. N. Araabi, “Investigating the Effects of Noise and Parameter Changing on Modeling of Jet Transport Aircraft,” *Journal of Aerospace Science and Technology*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 47–52, 2020.
[15] S. Ansari-Rad, S. Jahandari, and A. Kalhor, “Identification and control of mimo linear systems under sufficient and insufficient excitation,” *2018 Annual American*, 2018.
[16] L. Ljung, “Perspectives on system identification,” *Annu. Rev. Control*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 1–12, Apr. 2010.
[17] M. Döhler and L. Mevel, “Fast multi-order computation of system matrices in subspace-based system identification,” *Control Eng. Pract.*, vol. 20, no. 9, pp. 882–894, Sep. 2012.
[18] M. Döhler and L. Mevel, “Modular Subspace-Based System Identification From Multi-Setup Measurements,” *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 57, no. 11, pp. 2951–2956, Nov. 2012.
[19] A. Chiuso and G. Pillonetto, “System Identification: A Machine Learning Perspective,” *Annu. Rev. Control Robot. Auton. Syst.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 281–304, May 2019.
[20] J. C. Principe, L. Wang, and M. A. Motter, “Local dynamic modeling with self-organizing maps and applications to nonlinear system identification and control,” *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 86, no. 11, pp. 2240–2258, Nov. 1998.
[21] J. Y. M. Salah, “Two Conditional proofs of Riemann Hypothesis,” *researchgate.net*, 2020.
[22] A. Punjani and P. Abbeel, “Deep learning helicopter dynamics models,” in *2015 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2015, pp. 3223–3230.
[23] S. Jahandari, A. Kalhor, and B. Nadjar Araabi, “Design of Deterministic Self-Tuning Regulators for the Pitch Angle of an Aircraft,” *Journal of Aerospace Science and Technology*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 61–65, 2020.
[24] 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* , 2014.
[25] F. L. Lewis, D. Vrabie, and K. G. Vamvoudakis, “Reinforcement Learning and Feedback Control: Using Natural Decision Methods to Design Optimal Adaptive Controllers,” *IEEE Control Syst. Mag.*, vol. 32, no. 6, pp. 76–105, Dec. 2012.
[26] S. Ross and J. Andrew Bagnell, “Agnostic System Identification for Model-Based Reinforcement Learning,” *arXiv [cs.LG]*, 05-Mar-2012.
[27] S. Jahandari, A. Kalhor, and B. N. Araabi, “A self tuning regulator design for nonlinear time varying systems based on evolving linear models,” *Evolving Systems*, 2016.
[28] S. Reitmann and K. Nachtigall, “Applying Bidirectional Long Short-Term Memories (BLSTM) to Performance Data in Air Traffic Management for System Identification,” in *Artificial Neural Networks and Machine Learning – ICANN 2017*, 2017, pp. 528–536.
[29] J. Koza, M. A. Keane, and J. P. Rice, “Performance improvement of machine learning via automatic discovery of facilitating functions as applied to a problem of symbolic system identification,” in *IEEE International Conference on Neural Networks*, 1993, pp. 191–198 vol.1.
[30] J. Song, C. Cho, and Y. Won, “Analysis of operating system identification via fingerprinting and machine learning,” *Comput. Electr. Eng.*, vol. 78, pp. 1–10, Sep. 2019.
[31] D. Romeres, G. Prando, G. Pillonetto, and A. Chiuso, “On-line Bayesian system identification,” in *2016 European Control Conference (ECC)*, 2016, pp. 1359–1364.
[32] I. D. Landu, *System identification and control design using P.I.M.+ software*. USA: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1990.

[33] Y. Huang and J. L. Beck, “Full Gibbs Sampling Procedure for Bayesian System Identification Incorporating Sparse Bayesian Learning with Automatic Relevance Determination,” *Comput.-aided Civ. Infrastruct. Eng.*, vol. 33, no. 9, pp. 712–730, Sep. 2018.
[34] F.-L. Zhang and S.-K. Au, “Fundamental two-stage formulation for Bayesian system identification, Part II: Application to ambient vibration data,” *Mech. Syst. Signal Process.*, vol. 66–67, pp. 43–61, Jan. 2016.
[35] M. Morari and J. H. Lee, “Model predictive control: past, present and future,” *Comput. Chem. Eng.*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 667–682, May 1999.
[36] P. L. Green, E. J. Cross, and K. Worden, “Bayesian system identification of dynamical systems using highly informative training data,” *Mech. Syst. Signal Process.*, vol. 56–57, pp. 109–122, May 2015.
[37] S. Jahandari, F. F. Beyglou, and A. Kalhor, “A robust adaptive linear control for a ball handling mechanism,” *2014 Second RSI/ISM*, 2014.
[38] K. J. Åström and P. Eykhoff, “System identification—A survey,” *Automatica* , vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 123–162, Mar. 1971.
[39] S. Jahandari, A. Kalhor, and B. N. Araabi, “Order determination and robust adaptive control of unknown deterministic input-affine systems: An operational controller,” in *2016 IEEE 55th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2016, pp. 3831–3836.
[40] K. Kristinsson and G. A. Dumont, “System identification and control using genetic algorithms,” *IEEE Trans. Syst. Man Cybern.*, vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 1033–1046, Sep. 1992.
[41] S. Jahandari, A. Kalhor, and B. N. Araabi, “Order determination and transfer function estimation of linear mimo systems: application to environmental modeling,” *Environmental Modeling and Software*, 2016.
[42] M. Viberg, “Subspace-based state-space system identification,” *Circuits Systems Signal Process.*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 23–37, Jan. 2002.
[43] R. Raich, G. T. Zhou, and M. Viberg, “Subspace based approaches for Wiener system identification,” *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 50, no. 10, pp. 1629–1634, Oct. 2005.
[44] T. McKelvey, H. Akcay, and L. Ljung, “Subspace-based multivariable system identification from frequency response data,” *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 41, no. 7, pp. 960–979, Jul. 1996.
[45] M.-G. Zhang, W.-W. Yan, and Z.-T. Yuan, “Study of nonlinear system identification based on support vector machine,” in *Proceedings of 2004 International Conference on Machine Learning and Cybernetics (IEEE Cat. No.04EX826)*, 2004, vol. 5, pp. 3287–3290 vol.5.
[46] V. Peterka, “Bayesian System Identification,” *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 12, no. 8, pp. 99–114, Sep. 1979.
[47] X. Jiang, S. Mahadevan, and H. Adeli, “Bayesian wavelet packet denoising for structural system identification,” *Struct. Contr. Health Monit.*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 333–356, Mar. 2007.
[48] Y. Huang, C. Shao, B. Wu, J. L. Beck, and H. Li, “State-of-the-art review on Bayesian inference in structural system identification and damage assessment,” *Advances in Structural Engineering*, vol. 22, no. 6, pp. 1329–1351, Apr. 2019.
[49] T. J. Rogers, “Towards Bayesian System Identification: With Application to SHM of Offshore Structures,” phd, University of Sheffield, 2019.