

Data-Driven Adaptive Output Regulation of Unknown Linear Systems [★]

Shangkun Liu ^{*}, Lei Wang ^{*}, Bowen Yi ^{**}

^{*} College of Control Science and Engineering, Zhejiang University,
Hangzhou 310027, China

^{**} Department of Electrical Engineering, Polytechnique Montréal &
GERAD, Montréal, Canada

E-mail: {shangkun.liu, lei.wangzju}@zju.edu.cn,
bowen.yi@polymtl.ca

Abstract: This paper investigates the linear output regulation problem with both the exosystem and the plant fully unknown. A data-driven regulator is proposed to achieve asymptotic regulation and closed-loop stability without performing model identification. The method constructs a nominal approximate internal model and filters of input and outputs, thereby yielding a stabilizable cascaded nominal system whose states are available. For this nominal system, a stabilizing law is derived from an offline dataset that has been acquired from the plant during experiments, such that the system states exponentially converge to a subspace. An identifier in discrete-time is, then, implemented to correct the internal model and update the stabilizing law; as a result, the regulation error can be steered to zero asymptotically under some persistent excitation conditions.

Keywords: Data-driven control, adaptive output regulation, internal model principle.

1. INTRODUCTION

The output regulation problem aims to design a controller that enables the system output to track a reference signal or reject disturbances generated by an autonomous exosystem. A seminal regulator design framework has been proposed by introducing a certain copy of the exosystem dynamics to compensate for the effect of exosystem, i.e., the internal model principle Francis and Wonham (1975, 1976). In recent decades, such an internal model-based framework has attracted extensive attention in the control community, particularly for nonlinear systems ranging from single-input single-output (SISO) systems Isidori and Byrnes (1990); Huang and Rugh (1990); Huang (2004), to multi-input multi-output (MIMO) Wang et al. (2016, 2020a,b) and multi-agent Isidori (2017); Su and Huang (2011) scenarios.

In the output-regulation problem, a conventional assumption is that the steady-state control input satisfies an immersion condition Huang (2004), which requires a priori knowledge of the exogenous dynamics and imposes structural conditions on the plant. To handle such issue, Marconi et al. (2007); Marconi and Praly (2008) propose a Luenberger observer-based design scheme. However, the design of the corresponding steady-state compensator of control input turns out non-trivial. Subsequent works then have been developed by proposing identification-based approximate/adaptive design schemes Bin et al. (2019). Besides, several other notable adaptive internal model regu-

lators have also been proposed in Wang and Kellett (2019); Priscoli et al. (2006); Serrani et al. (2002). These contributions predominantly address minimum-phase systems, while very few results treat adaptive regulation issues for non-minimum-phase plants, with the exception of Bin et al. (2019). In Bin et al. (2019) a general linear plant with an unknown exosystem is considered, and a discrete-time identifier is designed to handle internal-model parameter identification. Nevertheless, how to extend this result to accommodate uncertainties in the plant itself remains an open problem.

Recently, data-driven control has emerged as a powerful paradigm for scenarios in which the plant model is unknown. Berberich et al. (2021) and Bosso et al. (2025b) extended these ideas to continuous-time linear systems and proposed a suite of solutions for the case of unknown plant models. Building on results in Hu et al. (2025); Bosso et al. (2025a), this approach has been further developed for output regulation by designing controllers directly from data, which has given rise to cascade-based design methods such as those in Mao et al. (2025a,b). However, in the most of the foregoing data-driven output-regulation works the exosystem is assumed known; the more general and challenging scenario where both the exosystem and the plant structure are unknown remains open.

To bridge this gap, this paper develops a data-driven adaptive output regulator for linear systems in which both the plant dynamics and the exosystem are fully unknown. A stabilizable nominal cascaded structure is constructed from measured input-output data, within which an adaptive internal model with online parameter updates is embedded. Building on this structure, a data-driven

[★] This work was supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 62573383 and by Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) under Grant RGPIN-2024-0478, and the Programme PIED.

stabilizing law together with an adaptive mechanism is designed to achieve asymptotic tracking and ensure closed-loop stability, all without identifying either the plant or the exosystem model.

Notation. $|\cdot|$ denotes the Euclidean norm and \dagger denotes the Moore–Penrose pseudoinverse. We use \mathbb{C} to represent the complex plane, and \mathbb{C}_+ for the closed right half-plane. For square matrices A and B , the notion $A \prec B$ (or $A \preceq B$) indicates that $(A-B)$ is negative definite (or semidefinite). We use $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^{m \times m}$ (or $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{m \times m}$) to represent the set of $m \times m$ positive definite (or semidefinite) matrices. $\sigma(A)$ denotes the spectrum of the matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. When clear from the context, the arguments of mappings and operators are omitted. We use $\tilde{y}(t)$ to represent the measured data corresponding to the true state $y(t)$ at time t . For a vector $\Xi = \text{col}(x_1, \dots, x_m) \in \mathbb{R}^{nm}$, where $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we define the reshape operator $\gamma(\Xi) := [x_1 \ \dots \ x_m] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, i.e. $\text{vec}(\gamma(\Xi)) = \Xi$.

2. PROBLEM FORMULATION & PRELIMINARY

2.1 Problem Formulation

Consider the SISO linear time-invariant (LTI) system given by

$$\dot{x} = Ax + Bu, \quad y = Cx, \quad (1)$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the state, $u \in \mathbb{R}$ is the control input, $y \in \mathbb{R}$ is the measured output. The matrix triplet $(A, B, C) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n}$ is *unknown* except the dimension $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$, and satisfies the following.

Assumption 1. The pair (A, B) is controllable, and the pair (C, A) is observable.

In this paper, we are interested in the output regulation problem, where we design a controller such that the output y asymptotically converges to the reference output $y_r \in \mathbb{R}$ that is generated by an exogenous system

$$\dot{w} = Sw, \quad y_r = C_r w, \quad (2)$$

with $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$ the exogenous system state. The pair (C_r, S) is *unknown* in the controller synthesis but assumed to be observable. Additionally, the eigenvalues of S are distinct on the imaginary axis, thus w being bounded over time.

We further impose the following assumptions.

Assumption 2. There exists a known compact set $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ such that for any $\theta := \text{col}(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_d) \in \mathcal{E}$, there holds

$$\text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} A - \lambda I_n & B \\ C & 0 \end{bmatrix} = n + 1$$

for all roots λ of the characteristic polynomial $p(\lambda, \theta) = \lambda^d + \theta_d \lambda^{d-1} + \dots + \theta_2 \lambda + \theta_1$. Moreover, the characteristic polynomial of S is $p(\lambda, \theta^*)$ for some (unknown) $\theta^* \in \mathcal{E}$.

Assumption 3. The initial condition $w(0)$ guarantees that $w(t)$ lies within a known compact set $W \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ for all $t \geq 0$.

In this paper, we are interested in the following problem.

Problem 1. Suppose that the input-output dataset

$$\mathcal{S}_* := \{\tilde{u}(t), \tilde{y}(t)\}_{[0, t_*]}$$

has been collected from the plant (1) during a prior experiment of duration $t_* > 0$, where $\tilde{u}(\cdot)$ and $\tilde{y}(\cdot)$ denote the recorded input and output trajectories over $[0, t_*]$.

The objective is to design a controller that leverages the offline dataset \mathcal{S}_* , together with the online measurements (u, y, y_r) obtained from systems (1)-(2). The matrices (A, B, C, S, C_r) are assumed to be unknown, except for the state dimension n and the exosystem order d . The controller needs to ensure that all closed-loop states are bounded and that the tracking error $e := y - y_r$ satisfies

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e(t) = 0. \quad (3)$$

Remark 4. An intuitive approach to achieve the desired regulation objective relies on transforming (2) into an observable canonical form and identifying the matrix S from y_r . However, when y_r is not directly available, e.g., in multi-agent scenarios where (2) serves as the leader and most followers do not have access to y_r , such a method becomes infeasible. The approach proposed here avoids explicit identification of S and is therefore particularly well suited for multi-agent scenarios.

2.2 Preliminaries

For output regulation, we adopt the “approximate” internal model

$$\dot{\eta} = \Phi(\theta)\eta + Ge, \quad (4)$$

with matrices

$$\Phi := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & & \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \\ 0 & & & 1 \\ -\theta_1 & -\theta_2 & \dots & -\theta_d \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}, \quad G = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad (5)$$

where Φ is parameterized by a vector $\theta \in \mathcal{E}$. If the exosystem matrix S is known, one can set $\theta = \theta^*$ such that S has the same characteristic polynomial as $p(\lambda, \theta^*)$. When the system matrices (A, B, C) are also known, this problem is fully addressed by the internal model principle Francis and Wonham (1976).

For the case where the system (1) is unknown but the exosystem matrix S is available, a data-driven control method was recently proposed in Bosso et al. (2025a). In contrast, Problem 1 deals with an unknown matrix S , which represents a more practical yet more challenging scenario. Before presenting our approach, we briefly recall the key results from Bosso et al. (2025a), in which a linear filter is constructed for the input u and the output y , i.e.

$$\dot{\zeta}_y = F\zeta_y + Ly, \quad \dot{\zeta}_u = F\zeta_u + Lu. \quad (6)$$

Here, we select a Hurwitz matrix $F \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with distinct eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ and a vector $L \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that (F, L) is controllable. It has shown the following.

Lemma 5. Let Assumption 1 hold. There exist matrices (Π_1, H_1) and $(\Pi_2, H_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \times \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n}$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_1 F &= (A - \Pi_1 LC)\Pi_1, & H_1 &= C\Pi_1, \\ \Pi_2 F &= (A - \Pi_1 LC)\Pi_2, & \Pi_2 L &= B, & H_2 &= C\Pi_2, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where $[\Pi_1 \ \Pi_2]$ has full row rank. Additionally, for matrices

$$\mathcal{A} = \begin{bmatrix} F + LH_1 & LH_2 \\ 0 & F \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{B} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ L \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{C} = [H_1 \ H_2], \quad (8)$$

we can then establish the following properties.

P1: The pair $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is stabilizable, and $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{A})$ detectable;
P2: For any $\theta \in \mathcal{E}$, there holds

$$\text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{A} - \lambda I_{2n} & \mathcal{B} \\ \mathcal{C} & 0 \end{bmatrix} = 2n + 1, \quad \forall \lambda \in \sigma(\Phi(\theta)). \quad (9)$$

An important observation from the above lemma is that the system (7), together with the output

$$y = H_1\zeta_y + H_2\zeta_u,$$

is a non-minimal realization of (1). To be precise,

$$x(0) = \Pi_1\zeta_y(0) + \Pi_2\zeta_u(0) \Rightarrow x(t) = \Pi_1\zeta_y(t) + \Pi_2\zeta_u(t), \forall t.$$

When implementing the filter (7), although the initial conditions $(\zeta_y(0), \zeta_u(0))$ cannot be properly selected, it is evident that the transverse coordinate

$$\rho := x - \Pi_1\zeta_y - \Pi_2\zeta_u$$

is exponentially stable. Its dynamics are given by

$$\dot{\rho} = (A - \Pi_1LC)\rho,$$

where $(A - \Pi_1LC)$ is, similar to F , Hurwitz. That being said, the plant (1) can be exactly represented by the dynamics of (ζ_y, ζ_u, ρ) in order to overcome the unavailability of the signal $x(t)$. As a consequence, we translate Problem 1 into the output regulation of the cascaded system composed of the filter (6), the internal model, and the exogenous system (2).

3. THE REGULATOR STRUCTURE

In this section, we propose our approach that is independent of the unknown signal w , consisting of a post-processing internal model, an online parameter identifier for θ^* , and a filter. The internal model guarantees that the regulation error e converges to zero; the identifier updates the inexact parameter θ using the discrete mechanism in Bin et al. (2019); and the filter estimates the unknown states x , thus providing reliable data for controller computation.

3.1 Nominal Approximate Internal Model

Instead of using (4), we consider the following internal model

$$\dot{\eta}_y = \Phi(\theta)\eta_y + Gy, \quad (10)$$

which is, indeed, a nominal formulation independent of the exogenous signal w . Together with the filter (6) and the algebraic relation in Lemma 5, the dynamics of (η_y, x) can be represented by the non-minimal realization

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{\eta}_y \\ \dot{\zeta}_y \\ \dot{\zeta}_u \\ \dot{\rho} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \Phi(\theta) & GH_1 & GH_2 & GC \\ 0 & F + LH_1 & LH_2 & LC \\ 0 & 0 & F & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & A - \Pi_1LC \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \eta_y \\ \zeta_y \\ \zeta_u \\ \rho \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ L \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} u. \quad (11)$$

The above system satisfies the following.

Lemma 6. With Assumptions 1-2, the system (11) is stabilizable for any $\theta \in \mathcal{E}$.

Proof. In terms of the structure of the system matrix, the state ρ is within the uncontrollable subsystem. Since the matrix $(A - \Pi_1LC)$ is Hurwitz, the stabilizability of equivalent to the one of the point pair

$$\left(\begin{bmatrix} \Phi(\theta) & GC \\ 0 & \mathcal{A} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \mathcal{B} \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

with $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C})$ defined in (8). Applying the PBH test, this is equivalent to for any $\theta \in \mathcal{E}$,

$$\text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} \Phi(\theta) - \lambda I_d & GC & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{A} - \lambda I_{2n} & \mathcal{B} \end{bmatrix} = d + 2n, \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+. \quad (12)$$

To facilitate the analysis, we transform the column of matrix (12) corresponding to $\Phi(\theta)$ by right-multiplying a lower triangular Toeplitz matrix $T_{\Phi_{\text{right}}} = [\lambda^{i-j}]_{i,j=1}^d$, with $\lambda^{i-j} = 0$ for $i < j$. As a result, the condition (12) is equivalent to for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+$

$$\text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{d-1} & 0 \\ 0 & -p(\lambda, \theta) \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \mathcal{C} \end{bmatrix} \\ 0 & \mathcal{A} - \lambda I_{2n} & \mathcal{B} \end{bmatrix} = d + 2n, \quad (13)$$

where the definition of G in (5) is used.

For $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}_+ \setminus \sigma(\Phi(\theta))$, we have $p(\lambda, \theta) \neq 0$. Then matrix (13) is full-row rank if and only if there holds $\text{rank} [\mathcal{A} - \lambda I_{2n} \ \mathcal{B}] = 2n$. This is true by recalling the Property P1 that the pair $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is stabilizable. For $\lambda \in \sigma(\Phi(\theta))$, matrix (13) is full-row rank if and only if there holds the non-resonance condition (9). \square

From the above, there exists a linear feedback that exponentially stabilizes system (11). For convenience, we write

$$\zeta_{oi} := \text{col}(\zeta_y, \zeta_u).$$

However, although the signals (η_y, ζ_{oi}) are available for controller design—whether model-based or data-driven—the signal ρ is not accessible. To this end, similarly to Bosso et al. (2025a), we perform a change of coordinate

$$(\eta_y, \zeta_{oi}, \rho) \mapsto (\eta_y, \zeta_{oi}, T_\rho \rho)$$

with the nonsingular matrix $T_\rho \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ satisfying $\Lambda_F = T_\rho(A - \Pi_1LC)T_\rho^{-1}$ and $\Lambda_F := \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$. It always exists since $(A - \Pi_1LC)$ is similar to F , equivalently to Λ_F , and $\frac{d}{dt}(T_\rho \rho) = \Lambda_F(T_\rho \rho)$. Therefore, we use the following dynamics

$$\dot{\chi} = \Lambda_F \chi, \quad \chi(0) = \mathbf{1}_n, \quad (14)$$

and there exists a matrix $M_\rho \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n}$ such that $C\rho = M_\rho \chi$. The stabilizable plant (11) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{\eta}_y \\ \dot{\zeta}_{oi} \\ \dot{\chi} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \Phi(\theta) & GC & GM_\rho \\ 0 & \mathcal{A} & \begin{bmatrix} LM_\rho \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ 0 & 0 & \Lambda_F \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \eta_y \\ \zeta_{oi} \\ \chi \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \mathcal{B} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} u. \quad (15)$$

This system is also stabilizable, but all the signals $(\eta_y, \zeta_{oi}, \chi)$, along with their time derivatives, are available in both online and offline contexts.

3.2 Post-processing Data

For the continuous-time signals in the dataset \mathcal{S}_* , we sample their values at times t_0, \dots, t_k and define the data matrices accordingly

$$Y := [\tilde{y}(t_0) \ \dots \ \tilde{y}(t_k)], \quad U := [\tilde{u}(t_0) \ \dots \ \tilde{u}(t_k)].$$

Now we post-process the dataset \mathcal{S}_* . To be precise, we simulate the filters (6) and (14) and the nominal internal model (10) by injecting $\tilde{u}(\cdot)$ and $\tilde{y}(\cdot)$ over $[0, t_*]$. Accordingly, we obtain the “post-processed” dataset

$$\mathcal{S}_p^\theta := \{\tilde{\eta}_y^\theta(t), \tilde{\zeta}_{oi}(t), \tilde{\chi}(t)\}_{[0, t_*]}.$$

Note that we add the superscript $(\cdot)^\theta$ to indicate that the post-processed signal η_y is dependent on the parameter θ in the nominal internal model.

Similarly, we sample the dataset \mathcal{S}_p^θ and obtain the following data matrices:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{\eta,+}^\theta &:= [\dot{\eta}_y^\theta(t_0) \dots \dot{\eta}_y^\theta(t_k)], \quad Z_\eta^\theta := [\tilde{\eta}_y^\theta(t_0) \dots \tilde{\eta}_y^\theta(t_k)], \\ Z_{\zeta_{oi},+}^\theta &:= [\dot{\zeta}_{oi}^\theta(t_0) \dots \dot{\zeta}_{oi}^\theta(t_k)], \quad Z_{\zeta_{oi}}^\theta := [\tilde{\zeta}_{oi}^\theta(t_0) \dots \tilde{\zeta}_{oi}^\theta(t_k)], \\ X &:= [\tilde{\chi}(t_0) \dots \tilde{\chi}(t_k)]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the superscript in the matrices $Z_{\eta,+}^\theta$ and Z_η^θ is included to emphasize their dependence on θ in the internal model.

Obviously, for a fixed θ , the above matrices satisfy

$$Z_+^\theta = \mathcal{A}_c^\theta Z^\theta + \mathcal{B}_c U + \mathcal{D} M_\rho X, \quad (16)$$

with $Z_+^\theta = \text{col}(Z_{\eta,+}^\theta, Z_{\zeta_{oi},+}^\theta)$, $Z^\theta = \text{col}(Z_\eta^\theta, Z_{\zeta_{oi}}^\theta)$, where

$$\mathcal{A}_c^\theta := \begin{bmatrix} \Phi(\theta) & GC \\ 0 & \mathcal{A} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{B}_c = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \mathcal{B} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{D} = \begin{bmatrix} G \\ L \\ 0_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note that the matrices (H_1, H_2, M_ρ) are unknown. We make the important observation that the matrices $(Z_{\zeta_{oi}}, X)$ do not rely on the parameter θ , and thus we impose the following excitation condition on the post-processed data.

Assumption 7. For the sampling instances $\{t_0, \dots, t_k\}$, the post-processed dataset satisfies the excitation condition

$$\text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} Z_{\zeta_{oi}} \\ X \end{bmatrix} = 3n.$$

Lemma 8. Let Assumptions 1, 2 and 7 hold. Then, there exists $P \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{(2n+d) \times (2n+d)}$ such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{\mathcal{A}}^{\theta^\top} P + P \hat{\mathcal{A}}^\theta + Q & P \mathcal{B}_c \\ \mathcal{B}_c^\top P & R \end{bmatrix} \preceq 0, \quad (17)$$

for some $Q \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{(2n+d) \times (2n+d)}$ and $R \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{A}}^\theta &= \mathcal{A}_n^\theta + (Z_+^\theta - \mathcal{A}_n^\theta Z^\theta - \mathcal{B}_c U) \begin{bmatrix} Z_{\zeta_{oi}} \\ X \end{bmatrix}^\dagger \begin{bmatrix} I_{2n} \\ 0_{d \times 2n} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0_{2n} & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \\ \mathcal{A}_n^\theta &= \text{diag}(\Phi(\theta), I_2 \otimes F). \end{aligned}$$

The dynamic output-feedback (6), (10), (14), and

$$u = K^\theta \begin{bmatrix} \eta_y \\ \zeta_{oi} \end{bmatrix} \quad (18)$$

with $K^\theta = R^{-1} \mathcal{B}_c^\top P$ globally exponentially stabilize the system (11) at the origin.

We have the following.

Theorem 9. Let K^θ be such that the state feedback law (18) globally exponentially stabilizes system (11) at the origin, and consider the filter (6) and

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\eta}_e &= \Phi(\theta) \eta_e + G e \\ \dot{\zeta}_r &= F \zeta_r + L y_r. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Then, the subspace

$$\mathcal{M} = \{\eta_e, \zeta_u, \zeta_y, \zeta_r, w : \text{col}(\eta_e, \zeta_y - \zeta_r, \zeta_u) = \Psi w\} \quad (20)$$

is globally exponentially stable (GES)¹ for any $\theta \in \mathcal{E}$, for the system (19), where $\Psi = \text{col}(\Psi_{\eta_e}, \Psi_{\zeta_y - \zeta_r}, \Psi_{\zeta_u}) \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+2n) \times d}$ and obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\eta_{ei}} S &= \Psi_{\eta_{e(i+1)}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, d-1, \\ \Psi_{\eta_{ed}} S &= -\theta_1 \Psi_{\eta_{e1}} - \theta_2 \Psi_{\eta_{e2}} \dots - \theta_d \Psi_{\eta_{ed}} + C \Psi_x - C_r, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where $\Psi_x = H_1 \Psi_{\zeta_y - \zeta_r} + H_2 \Psi_{\zeta_u} + C \Psi_e$.

¹ This is in the sense of global exponential stability with respect to a closed invariant set; see, for example, (Lin et al., 1996, Def. 2).

Proof. The proof can be found in Appendices.

Remark 10. Theorem 9 shows that the feedback gain K^θ , computed offline from the nominal system (11) independently of the exogenous signal w and using the prior datasets S_\star and S_p^θ , can exponentially stabilize the subspace \mathcal{M} in (20). Note that when $\theta = \theta^\star$, Problem 1 can be fully solved. Therefore, the next section investigates the online identification of θ in the exogenous system.

Remark 11. To relax the excitation condition in Assumption 7, one may adopt the idea in Mao et al. (2025a) by observing that (11) satisfies the cascaded structure. Moreover, one may also adopt a direct data-driven method by identifying the unknown H_1, H_2 in (11) and then computing a stabilizing gain K^θ .

3.3 Identifier

As discussed above, due to the unknown nature of S , the exact value of θ cannot be determined at the initial stage of the system. A natural idea is to generate a regression model of the unknown parameter θ^\star in the form

$$\beta(t) = \phi(\theta^\star, \alpha(t)),$$

and then identify the parameter online. Unfortunately, we cannot obtain a *linear* regressor in our context, but it can be represented as a linear regressor with some perturbation terms. Here, we adopt the discrete-time identifier in Bin et al. (2019).

The identifier state is defined as $\xi = (R, v) \in \mathcal{Z} := \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, which evolves at jumps according to

$$\begin{aligned} R^+ &= \mu R + \gamma(\alpha) \gamma(\alpha)^\top \\ v^+ &= \mu v + \gamma(\alpha) \beta \\ \theta^+ &\in p_{\mathcal{E}}(R^\dagger v), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mu \in (0, 1)$ is a forgetting factor, $p_{\mathcal{E}}(\cdot)$ projects onto a compact admissible set \mathcal{E} , and the reshape operator $\gamma(\cdot)$ has been defined in Section 1 (Notation). Here, we select the variables (α, β) as

$$\alpha = \eta_e, \quad \beta = \theta^\top \eta_e + e. \quad (22)$$

The identifier yields the prediction $\hat{\beta}(\theta, \alpha) = \theta^\top \alpha$ with prediction error $\varepsilon(\theta, \alpha, \beta) = \beta - \hat{\beta}(\theta, \alpha)$ and cost

$$J_{\alpha, \beta}(t, j)(\theta) = \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \mu^{j-i-1} \|\varepsilon(\theta, \alpha(t^i, i), \beta(t^i, i))\|^2.$$

For $(t, j) \in \mathcal{T}$, t denotes the continuous time and j represents the jump iteration index of the discrete identifier. We define $t^j = \sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}}(t, j) \in \mathcal{T}$, and the construction based on errors ε and J is intended to identify the optimal linear model that characterizes the relationship between the inputs α and β . The finite data summaries

$$\begin{aligned} R^\star(t, j) &= \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \mu^{j-i-1} \gamma(\alpha(t^i, i)) \gamma(\alpha(t^i, i))^\top \\ v^\star(t, j) &= \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \mu^{j-i-1} \gamma(\alpha(t^i, i)) \beta(t^i, i), \end{aligned}$$

characterize minimizers of $J_{\alpha, \beta}$ via $R^\star \theta = v^\star$ when R^\star is nonsingular. We provide the necessary clarification of the following property established in Bin et al. (2019).

- (i) the recursion for $\xi = (R, v)$ is (robustly) asymptotically stable, under a standard (J, ϵ) -persistence-of-excitation condition on η_e , i.e., for $\mu \in (0, 1)$ and some $\epsilon > 0$

$$\min \sigma \left(\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \mu^{j-i-1} \gamma(\eta_e(t^i, i)) \gamma(\eta_e(t^i, i))^\top \right) \geq \epsilon.$$

By selecting (22), the identifier is interconnected with the proposed internal model such that the identifier updates θ using the measurable signal η_e and the regulation error e . According to (Bin et al., 2019, Prop. 1), the convergence of the identification algorithm can be guaranteed.

Algorithm 1 Adaptive Data-Driven Output Regulation

Require: Initial parameter θ_0, δ , dataset \mathcal{S}_\star for $t \in [0, \tau]$, sample number $N \geq 1$, sampling interval $\tau_s = \tau/N$.

% θ_i : updated parameter after the i -th jump;
% $\{\mathcal{S}_{b_i}^{a_i}\}_{i=0}^N := \{(a_i, b_i) \mid \text{for } i = 0, 1, \dots, N\}$;

- 1: Use \mathcal{S}_\star , (6), and (14) to generate $\tilde{\zeta}(t), \tilde{\chi}$:

$$\tilde{\chi}(t) = \exp(-\Lambda_F t) \mathbf{1}_n,$$

$$\tilde{\zeta}_y(t) = \int_0^t \exp[F(t-\tau)] L \tilde{y}(\tau) d\tau,$$

$$\tilde{\zeta}_u(t) = \int_0^t \exp[F(t-\tau)] L \tilde{u}(\tau) d\tau, \quad t \in [0, t_\star].$$

Ensure: Boundedness and tracking error $e \rightarrow 0$.

- 2: **for** $i = 0$ to N_I **do**

- 3: **Initialization:** $\tilde{\eta}_e^{\theta_i}(0) = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^d, \tilde{\zeta}^{\theta_i}(0) = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}, \tilde{\chi}^{\theta_i}(0) = \mathbf{1}_n, \Lambda_F = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$.

- 4: **Initial offline data of θ_i :** Run the internal model (10), i.e.

$$\tilde{\eta}_y^{\theta_i}(t) = \int_0^t \exp[\Phi(\theta_i)(t-\tau)] G \tilde{y}(\tau) d\tau, \quad t \in [0, t_\star].$$

Sampling to compute the post-processed data $\mathcal{S}_p^{\theta_i}$.

- 5: **Compute Stabilizing Gain K^{θ_i} :** Solve the LMI

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{\mathcal{A}}^{\theta_i \top} P + P \hat{\mathcal{A}}^{\theta_i} + Q & P \mathcal{B}_c \\ \mathcal{B}_c^\top P & R \end{bmatrix} \preceq 0, \quad P = P^\top \succ 0, R \succ 0,$$

$$\text{then } K^{\theta_i} = \begin{bmatrix} K_{\zeta_y}^{\theta_i} & K_{\zeta_u}^{\theta_i} & K_{\eta_e}^{\theta_i} \end{bmatrix} = R^{-1} \mathcal{B}_c^\top P.$$

- 6: **Adaptive Iteration:**

- 7: Apply (K^{θ_i}, θ_i) to (19);

- 8: Execute (19) for duration T_2 to obtain (η_e, e) ; update θ_{i+1} using the discrete identifier.

- 9: **if** $|\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i| < \delta$ **then**

- 10: Set $N_{\text{end}} := i$; **break**

- 11: **end if**

- 12: **end for**

- 13: **return** $\{\mathcal{S}_{e_i}^{\theta_i}\}_{i=0}^{N_{\text{end}}}$ to generate the image.
-

4. MAIN RESULTS

In this section, we present our main results on the data-driven state-feedback controller for output regulation. By integrating the datasets \mathcal{S}_\star and \mathcal{S}_p^θ , the post-processed internal model, the system tracking filter, and the discrete parameter identifier, we construct the output regulator as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\tau} = 1 \\ (\dot{R}, \dot{v}) = (0_{d \times d}, 0_d) \\ \dot{\theta} = 0 \\ \text{Eqs. (19), (6), } \tau \in [0, T_1 + \underline{T}_2] \\ \tau^+ = 0 \\ \eta_e^+ = \eta_e \\ \zeta^+ = \zeta \quad (\zeta := \text{col}(\zeta_y - \zeta_r, \zeta_u)) \\ \theta^+ \in p_{\mathcal{E}}(R^\dagger v) \\ R^+ = \mu R + \gamma(\eta_e) \gamma(\eta_e)^\top \\ v^+ = \mu v + \gamma(\eta_e) (\theta^\top \eta_e + e), \quad \tau \in \max[\underline{T}_2, \bar{T}_2], \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

with the regulator output

$$u = K^\theta \begin{bmatrix} \eta_e \\ \zeta \end{bmatrix},$$

where T_1 denotes the data sampling period of the nominal system, \underline{T}_2 represents the lower bound of the steady state convergence time of the actual system, meaning that when $T_2 \geq \underline{T}_2$ the actual system can be guaranteed to have reached steady state, and \bar{T}_2 is chosen as the upper bound of the convergence time, with the system output given by (18). After each jump, the updated parameter θ and the recorded dataset \mathcal{S}_\star are used to compute the new post-processed dataset \mathcal{S}_p^θ and the corresponding K^θ .

For the above proposed regulator, we have the following convergence result.

Theorem 12. Let Assumptions 1–3 and 7 hold for the given plant, the exogenous system, and the sampling times t_0, \dots, t_k . Then, there exists $T_1^\star > 0$ such that for $\underline{T}_2 \geq T_1^\star$, all states in the closed-loop that are interconnected by (1), (2) and (23) are bounded. Moreover, suppose that η_e is (J, ϵ) -PE for some $J \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\epsilon > 0$, and then there exists $T_2^\star \geq T_1^\star$ such that for any $\underline{T}_2 \geq T_2^\star$ the convergence property in (3) holds.

Proof. The stability problem of equations (6) and (19) in system (23) can be addressed by Theorem 8. Considering the existence of the discrete-time identifier, it is necessary to perform a preliminary analysis using Lyapunov inequalities for both continuous-time intervals (i.e., flow processes) and discrete jumps. By analyzing the identification error and the dynamics described by (21), stability can be determined in the jump instants and the minimum iteration time. Additionally, key inequality equations for the boundedness of the identifier states can be derived. Through the (J, ϵ) -persistence of excitation condition and the Cayley-Hamilton theorem under the true value condition in equation (21), we can extract key information regarding the steady-state regulation error being zero in Problem 1. The guarantee of asymptotic stability is obtained by integrating the Lyapunov inequalities, both continuous and discrete, that hold for the states of the internal model, identifier, and filter. By combining (Bin et al., 2019, Lemma 5) under the noise-free analysis, we can conclude that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e(t) = 0$. The detailed proof can be found in (Bin et al., 2019, Proof of Theorem 1). Since this paper considers the simplified case without noise, the specific proof details are not repeated here.

Remark 13. The overall algorithm is given in Algorithm 1, whose cascaded structure is illustrated in Fig. 1. Note

that if the adaptation parameter θ is equal to their values in θ^* and a stabilizing feedback gain K^θ is known, the proposed approach becomes the standard one for model-based output regulation. From this point onward, the convergence is exponential.




Fig. 1. Block diagram of the closed-loop system structure.

5. NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS

In this section, we present numerical simulations to validate the effectiveness of the proposed approach.

We consider a linear system (1) with the matrices

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}, C = [-1 \ 1 \ 0].$$

The reference is generated by the exosystem with $S = [0, -2; 2, 0]$ and $w(0) = \mathbf{1}_2$. and the regulated output coefficient is set as the column vector $C_r = -[2, 50/\pi^2]$. The simulation runs for $t_* = 10$ s with a sampling period $\tau_s = 0.1$ s. The initial state $x(0)$ is randomly sampled component-wise from the interval $[-1, 1]$; the initial conditions $\epsilon(0)$, $\eta_e(0)$ and $\zeta(0)$ are set to zero. The excitation input used for data collection in \mathcal{S}_* is $\tilde{u}(t) = \sum_{k=1}^4 k \sin(k\omega_1 t)$, $\omega_1 = 5$ rad/s. The filter parameters are chosen as $\Lambda_F = -\text{diag}(1, 2, 3)$, $L = \text{col}(1, 2, 3)$. The internal model is implemented according to (6) with initial parameter estimate $\theta_0 = \text{col}(1, -1)$ and $G = \text{col}(0, 1)$.

For the identifier, we set $\mu = 0.9$. At each iteration, $\Phi(\theta)$ is reconstructed and a new stabilizing gain K^θ is obtained. This process is repeated for $N_I = 70$ iterations. The collected data satisfy Assumption 7. After a number of iteration, the parameter θ stopped at $\text{col}(-4, 0)$ and $K^{\theta_{70}} = [-1.561 \ 1.012 \ 0.348 \ 1.175 \ -1.826 \ 0.714 \ 0.336 \ 1.167]$. We show the simulation results in Fig. 2 for this configuration.

6. CONCLUSION

In this work, we have developed a data-driven regulator that achieves asymptotic regulation with unknown linear plant and exosystem dynamics. The nominal system constructed from offline data has been shown to overcome the infeasibility issues caused by the unmeasurable exosystem states, enabling the data-driven computation of stabilizing feedback gain. Moreover, the discrete-time parameter identifier effectively handles the iterative adaptation of the internal-model parameters associated with the unknown

exosystem matrix, and the overall scheme has been proven to guarantee stability and asymptotic convergence of the regulation error. Future work will extend this framework to leader–follower multi-agent networks to achieve output synchronization when only a subset of agents has access to the exosystem output. It is also interest to extend the proposed approach to MIMO systems using Kreisselmeier’s adaptive filter Gao et al. (2025); Kreisselmeier (1979), as well as to nonlinear systems through the Kazantzis–Kravaris–Luenberger (KKL) observer Andrieu and Praly (2006).

Appendix A. THE PROOF OF LEMMA 8

Proof. For the data-based system equation (16), we separate the known part from the unknown part, leading to

$$Z_+^\theta = \begin{bmatrix} \Phi(\theta) & 0 \\ 0 & I_2 \otimes F \end{bmatrix} Z^\theta + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ B \end{bmatrix} U + \mathcal{D} [C \ M_\rho] \begin{bmatrix} Z_{\zeta_{oi}} \\ X \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then, the unknown matrix \mathcal{C} can be estimated using measurable data and known matrices. From Assumption 7, the following holds,

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{D}\mathcal{C} = (Z_+^\theta - \mathcal{A}_n^\theta Z^\theta - \mathcal{B}_c U) \begin{bmatrix} Z_{\zeta_{oi}} \\ X \end{bmatrix}^\dagger \begin{bmatrix} I_{2n} \\ 0_{d \times 2n} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Hence, we define $\hat{\mathcal{A}}^\theta = \mathcal{A}_n^\theta + \mathcal{H} [0_{2d} \ 1]$, so that the matrix \mathcal{A}_c^θ can be expressed as $\hat{\mathcal{A}}^\theta$, and is now treated as a known matrix. From Lemma 6, it follows that the pair $(\mathcal{A}_c^\theta, \mathcal{B}_c)$ is stabilizable for any fixed θ .

We now establish closed-loop stability. It is ensured if there exist matrices $P \succ 0$ and $Q \succ 0$ of proper dimensions and a scalar $R > 0$ such that $\hat{\mathcal{A}}^{\theta^\top} P + P \hat{\mathcal{A}}^\theta - P \mathcal{B}_c R^{-1} \mathcal{B}_c^\top P + Q \preceq 0$, with a stabilizing feedback gain $K^\theta = R^{-1} \mathcal{B}_c^\top P$. Applying the Schur complement directly leads to (17) and $\hat{\mathcal{A}}^\theta - \mathcal{B}_c K^\theta$ is Hurwitz.

Appendix B. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 9

Proof. To facilitate the proof, we define

$$\zeta_e := \zeta_y - \zeta_r.$$

Its dynamics is given by $\dot{\zeta}_e = F \zeta_e + L e$. Define the transverse coordinate

$$\rho_e := x - \Pi_1 \zeta_e - \Pi_2 \zeta_u,$$

whose dynamics is $\dot{\rho}_e = (A - \Pi_1 L C) \rho_e + \Pi_1 L C_r w$. Now, the overall dynamics is

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{w} \\ \dot{\rho}_e \\ \dot{\eta}_e \\ \dot{\zeta}_e \\ \dot{\zeta}_u \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} S & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \Pi_1 L C_r & A - \Pi_1 L C & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -G C_r & G C & \Phi(\theta) & G H_1 & G H_2 \\ -L C_r & L C & 0 & F + L H_1 & L H_2 \\ 0 & 0 & L K_{\eta_e}^\theta & L K_{\zeta_e}^\theta & F + L K_{\zeta_u}^\theta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w \\ \rho_e \\ \eta_e \\ \zeta_e \\ \zeta_u \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note that all the sequel analysis is conduct for a fixed θ . Given the Poisson stability of system S and the Hurwitz property of the $(2, 2)$ -block above, the steady state of the overall system can be represented as a linear combination of w , i.e.

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left| \begin{bmatrix} \rho_e(t) \\ \eta_e(t) \\ \zeta_e(t) \\ \zeta_u(t) \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_{\rho_e} \\ \Psi_{\eta_e} \\ \Psi_{\zeta_e} \\ \Psi_{\zeta_u} \end{bmatrix} w(t) \right| = 0 \quad (\text{exp.}), \quad (\text{B.1})$$




Fig. 2. The first figure shows the the regulation error e ; the second illustrates the convergence of the parameter θ .

in which $\Psi_{\rho_e}, \Psi_{\eta_e}, \Psi_{\zeta_e}$ and Ψ_{ζ_u} are solutions of the Sylvester equation

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_{\rho_e} S &= (A - \Pi_1 LC) \Psi_{\rho_e} + \Pi_1 LC r, \\ \Psi_{\eta_e} S &= \Phi(\theta) \Psi_{\eta_e} + GH_1 \Psi_{\zeta_e} + GH_2 \Psi_{\zeta_u} + GC \Psi_{\rho_e} - GC r, \\ \Psi_{\zeta_e} S &= (F + LH_1) \Psi_{\zeta_e} + LH_2 \Psi_{\zeta_u} + LC \Psi_{\rho_e} - LC r, \\ \Psi_{\zeta_u} S &= LK_{\eta_e}^\theta \Psi_{\eta_e} + LK_{\zeta_e}^\theta \Psi_{\zeta_e} + (F + LK_{\zeta_u}^\theta) \Psi_{\zeta_u}.\end{aligned}\quad (\text{B.2})$$

We perform the change of coordinate $(\rho_e, \eta_e, \zeta_e, \zeta_u) \mapsto \mathbf{x} := (\rho_e - \Psi_{\rho_e} w, \eta_e - \Psi_{\eta_e} w, \zeta_e - \Psi_{\zeta_e} w, \zeta_u - \Psi_{\zeta_u} w)$, and we have

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \begin{bmatrix} A - \Pi_1 LC & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ GC & \Phi(\theta) & GH_1 & GH_2 \\ LC & 0 & F + LH_1 & LH_2 \\ 0 & LK_{\eta_e}^\theta & LK_{\zeta_e}^\theta & F + LK_{\zeta_u}^\theta \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Considering that (B.3) satisfies the stabilizability condition in Lemma 6 and that Lemma 8 guarantees the solvability of K^θ , a system matrix in (B.3) can be made Hurwitz. Consequently, the exponential convergence property of (B.1) follows. If we partition conformally $\Psi_{\eta_e} := \text{col}(\Psi_{\eta_{e1}}, \dots, \Psi_{\eta_{ed}})$, then (B.2) becomes (21), where $C\Psi_x - C_r = H_1 \Psi_{\zeta_e} + H_2 \Psi_{\zeta_u} + C\Psi_{\rho_e} - C_r$. By substituting the first $d-1$ equations into the last equation and noting the transformation relation $\Psi_x = \Psi_{\rho_e} + \Pi_1 \zeta_e + \Pi_2 \zeta_u$, we obtain $\Psi_{\eta_{ed}} S = -\theta_1 \Psi_{\eta_{e1}} - \theta_2 \Psi_{\eta_{e2}} \dots - \theta_d \Psi_{\eta_{ed}} + C\Psi_x - C_r$, which yields the desired identity and completes the proof.

REFERENCES

- Andrieu, V. and Praly, L. (2006). On the existence of a Kazantzis-Kravaris/Luenberger observer. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 45(2), 432–456.
- Berberich, J., Wildhagen, S., Hertneck, M., and Allgöwer, F. (2021). Data-driven analysis and control of continuous-time systems under aperiodic sampling. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 54(7), 210–215.
- Bin, M., Marconi, L., and Teel, A.R. (2019). Adaptive output regulation for linear systems via discrete-time identifiers. *Automatica*, 105, 422–432.
- Bosso, A., Borghesi, M., Iannelli, A., Notarstefano, G., and Teel, A.R. (2025a). Data-driven control of continuous-time lti systems via non-minimal realizations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.22505*.
- Bosso, A., Borghesi, M., Iannelli, A., Notarstefano, G., and Teel, A.R. (2025b). Derivative-free data-driven control of continuous-time linear time-invariant systems. *Eur. J. Control*, 101309.
- Francis, B.A. and Wonham, W.M. (1976). The internal model principle of control theory. *Automatica*, 12(5), 457–465.
- Francis, B.A. and Wonham, W.M. (1975). The internal model principle for linear multivariable regulators. *Appl. Math. Optim.*, 2(2), 170–194.
- Gao, H., Bosso, A., Wang, L., Saussié, D., and Yi, B. (2025). Input-output data-driven stabilization of continuous-time linear MIMO systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.06524*.
- Hu, Z., De Persis, C., Simpson-Porco, J.W., and Tesi, P. (2025). Data-driven harmonic output regulation of a class of nonlinear systems. *Syst. Control Lett.*, 200. Art. no. 106079.
- Huang, J. and Rugh, J. (1990). On a nonlinear multivariable servomechanism problem. *Automatica*, 26(6), 963–972.
- Huang, J. (2004). *Nonlinear output regulation: theory and applications*. SIAM.
- Isidori, A. (2017). *Lectures in Feedback Design for Multivariable Systems*. Springer.
- Isidori, A. and Byrnes, C.I. (1990). Output regulation of nonlinear systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 35(2), 131–140.
- Kreisselmeier, G. (1979). The generation of adaptive law structures for globally convergent adaptive observers. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 24(3), 510–513.

- Lin, Y., Sontag, E.D., and Wang, Y. (1996). A smooth converse lyapunov theorem for robust stability. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 34(1), 124–160.
- Mao, J., Williams, E., Mylvaganam, T., and Scarcioiti, G. (2025a). One equation to rule them all—part i: Direct data-driven cascade stabilisation. *Online*.
- Mao, J., Williams, E., Mylvaganam, T., and Scarcioiti, G. (2025b). One equation to rule them all—part ii: Direct data-driven reduction and regulation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.17251*.
- Marconi, L. and Praly, L. (2008). Uniform practical nonlinear output regulation. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 53(5), 1184–1202.
- Marconi, L., Praly, L., and Isidori, A. (2007). Output stabilization via nonlinear luenberger observers. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 45(6), 2277–2298.
- Priscoli, F.D., Marconi, L., and Isidori, A. (2006). Adaptive observers as nonlinear internal models. *Systems & Control Letters*, 55(8), 640–649.
- Serrani, A., Isidori, A., and Marconi, L. (2002). Semiglobal nonlinear output regulation with adaptive internal model. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 46(8), 1178–1194.
- Su, Y. and Huang, J. (2011). Cooperative output regulation of linear multi-agent systems. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, 57(4), 1062–1066.
- Wang, L., Isidori, A., Su, H., and Marconi, L. (2016). Nonlinear output regulation for invertible nonlinear mimo systems. *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, 26(11), 2401–2417.
- Wang, L. and Kellett, C.M. (2019). Adaptive semiglobal nonlinear output regulation: An extended-state observer approach. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 65(6), 2670–2677.
- Wang, L., Marconi, L., Wen, C., and Su, H. (2020a). Pre-processing nonlinear output regulation with non-vanishing measurements. *Automatica*, 111, 108616.
- Wang, L., Marconi, L., Wen, C., and Su, H. (2020b). Robust output regulation for a class of nonlinear systems not detectable by the regulated output. *European Journal of Control*, 52, 26–33.