

# Cooperative Optimal Output Tracking for Discrete-Time Multiagent Systems: Stabilizing Policy Iteration Frameworks and Analysis

Dongdong Li, Jiuxiang Dong

**Abstract**—In this paper, two model-free optimal output tracking frameworks based on policy iteration for discrete-time multi-agent systems are proposed. First, we establish a framework of stabilizing policy iteration that can start from any initial feedback control policy, relaxing the dependence of traditional policy iteration on the initial stabilizing control policy. Then, another efficient and equivalent  $Q$ -learning policy iteration framework is developed, which is shown to require only less system data to get the same results as the stabilizing policy iteration. Both frameworks obtain stabilizing control policy by iterating the stabilizing virtual closed-loop system step-by-step to the actual closed-loop system. Multiple explicit schemes for the iteration step-size/coefficient are designed and their stability during the above iterations is analyzed. By using the generated closed-loop stabilizing control policy and two frameworks, the optimal feedback control gain is obtained. The approximate solution of the regulator equations is found by model-free iteration, which leads to the optimal feedforward gain. Finally, the cooperative optimal output tracking is realized by a distributed feedforward-feedback controller. The proposed algorithms are validated by simulation.

**Index Terms**—optimal output tracking, multi-agent systems, policy iteration,  $Q$ -learning, stabilizing control policy, reinforcement learning.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The cooperative control of multi-agent systems (MASs) has been widely studied in the past two decades [1]–[4] and applied to mechanical and electrical. The cooperative output tracking problem is one of the most important problems for MASs and is usually solved by designing a distributed output controller for each follower to track the leader’s output. In recent years, many classical cooperative output tracking methods such as [5]–[7] have been proposed for the problems. However, in these works, it is assumed that the dynamics of each follower is known and optimal control is not considered. The cooperative optimal output tracking (COOT) problem is the introduction of optimal control in such problems to optimize certain predefined performance metrics while achieving cooperative tracking.

Reinforcement learning (RL) [8], [9] or adaptive dynamic programming [10], [11], which makes decisions through the

interaction of the agent with the environment, can combine features of optimal control and intelligent computation. Different from model-based approaches [12], it can achieve optimal control when the model is unknown or inaccurate. By stepwise learning and feedback, RL can obtain the near-optimal solutions for optimal control instead of giving an analytical solution directly. Most RL results for discrete-time (DT) systems or continuous-time (CT) systems are designed based on two main frameworks: policy iteration (PI) [10], [13]–[19] and value iteration (VI) [10], [16]. PI starts with the stabilizing/admissible control policy that gradually nears the optimal control policy by solving a series of Lyapunov functions, and it has a fast convergence rate [16], [19], [20]. In contrast, VI can start with an arbitrary control policy and update the control policy in each iteration only after the value function has converged, so the approximate solution converges more slowly [19], [20]. In [13], the model-based PI for DT linear systems is presented, which is the basis for the subsequent PI results. In [17], [18], PI-based model-free output regulation methods are developed for CT and DT linear systems, respectively. For the state-unmeasurable case, in both [10], [16], the output feedback PI and VI methods are proposed for the DT system. In [14], the optimal output tracking problem for DT linear systems with unknown dynamics is investigated and the effect of reconstruction errors is considered.

The limitations of the initial stabilizing/admissible control policy remain in the above PI methods [10], [13]–[19]. Recently, many effective methods have been investigated to address the limitations of initial stabilizing control policy for DT [20]–[22] and CT [23]–[26] linear systems. In [21], [25], [26], the advantages of VI are utilized to address the initial stabilizing control limitations of the PI. In [21], the coefficients are used to balance VI and PI, while in [25], [26], the stabilizing control gain is computed from VI and then used for PI to get the optimal control quickly, which is called hybrid iteration. However, in these methods, the computing stabilizing control policy phase still contains the main characteristics of VI, such as slower convergence. Recently, some methods for calculating stabilizing control policy obtained by directly improving the PI have been proposed for DT [20], [22] and CT [23], [24] linear systems. In [22], the iteration step size is not explicit, whereas in [20], the algorithm must start with the zero-initial policy. Therefore, it is important to develop a more comprehensive algorithm for solving initial stabilizing policy with faster convergence.

Dongdong Li and Jiuxiang Dong are with the College of Information Science and Engineering, Northeastern University, Shenyang 110819, China, the State Key Laboratory of Synthetical Automation of Process Industries, Northeastern University, Shenyang 110819, China, and the Key Laboratory of Vibration and Control of Aero-Propulsion Systems Ministry of Education, Northeastern University, Shenyang 110819, China. Email: lidongdongyq@163.com, dongjiuxiang@ise.neu.edu.cn.

The  $Q$ -learning algorithm is one of the classical techniques in RL and is usually designed by means of an action-valued function, which is defined by the Bellman equation and is often referred to as the  $Q$ -function [19], [20].  $Q$ -learning algorithms, same as other RL algorithms, are mainly categorized into two types: PI-based [15], [19], [27], [28] and VI-based [29], [30]. In [19], [30], PI-based and VI-based  $Q$ -learning methods are proposed for the zero-sum game optimal control problem for DT linear systems, respectively. In [15], a PI-based  $Q$ -learning optimal tracking method is proposed, which is directly handled by considering a reference trajectory and designing an augmented system. In [28], the similar approach is used to propose a PI-based  $Q$ -learning method to deal with the optimal tracking problem of networked systems with dropouts. In [29], different optimal tracking method is proposed, where the optimal feed-forward and feedback matrices are obtained by direct training through VI-based  $Q$ -learning. However, the method is difficult to extend to the PI framework and to COOT problem for complex MASs. Moreover, in the PI-based  $Q$ -learning algorithm, there is still a limitation of the initial stabilizing control policy.

Recently, model-free PI and VI algorithms have been applied to the COOT or cooperative optimal output regulation problem for MASs and many classical results have been obtained such as [2], [3], [31]–[34]. Among these methods, COOT or cooperative optimal output regulation is mainly realized via the combination of output regulation theory [35] and RL. Considering the communication topology, the output regulation/tracking part is mainly solved by solving the regulator equations [32], [33] and internal model methods [2], [3], [31], [34], while the optimal control is mainly realized by PI [2], [3], [31], [33] and VI [32], [34]. In the above PI-based methods, the computational problem of stabilizing control policy with unknown model needs to be addressed urgently, and it is also meaningful to develop a method to implement COOT based on  $Q$ -learning and solving the regulator equations to obtain the optimal feed-forward feedback control.

Inspired by existing results, the model-free distributed feed-forward feedback optimal control algorithms for DT MASs are proposed to realize COOT. The main contributions are as follows:

- 1) A model-free iteration method for solving the optimal feedforward and feedback gains is proposed, and the effect of observation error is analyzed. Two model-free stabilizing PI frameworks (including PI-based  $Q$ -learning) for solving the optimal feedback gain are proposed, and they are mainly divided into two phases, which yield the closed-loop stabilizing feedback control policy and the optimal feedback control policy, respectively.
- 2) Compared with the method [20] that starts with a zero-initial policy and the traditional PI [13]–[16], [18], we develop a novel PI that can start with an arbitrary initial control policy, and obtain the closed-loop stabilizing control policy by building the stabilizing virtual closed-loop system and iterating it to the actual closed-loop system, where the upper bound on the spectral radius of the actual closed-loop system can be set by the user.

Two schemes are designed to solve the sufficient and necessary problem corresponding to iteration stability, thus giving explicit iteration step-size/coefficient. The stability of the framework and the advantages of different schemes are analyzed.

- 3) An equivalent and efficient stabilizing PI-based  $Q$ -learning framework is designed, and three schemes are proposed to solve sufficient and necessary problem corresponding to stability, thus explicit iteration step-size/coefficient is obtained. The method relaxes the stabilizing initial control policy restriction in existing PI-based  $Q$ -learning methods [15], [19], [27], [28]. In its model-free version, the process of solving the  $Q$ -function and regulator equations is separated, and the obtained overall algorithm requires less system data and is more efficient compared to the first framework.
- 4) The stability, optimality and equivalence of the two frameworks are analyzed and verified. We also analyze and validate the equivalence between all schemes, the inclusion relationship and the impact of the selection of the iteration step-size/coefficient on the two algorithms.

*Notations:*  $\rho(*)$  denotes the spectral radius of the matrix “\*”.  $\otimes$  denotes the Kronecker product. For any matrix  $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{a \times b}$  and constants  $a, b$ , we define  $\text{vec}(Y) = [Y_1^T, Y_2^T, \dots, Y_b^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{ab}$ , where  $Y_j \in \mathbb{R}^a$  is  $i$ th column of matrix  $Y$  for  $j = 1, \dots, b$ . If matrix  $Y = Y^T \in \mathbb{R}^{a \times a}$ ,  $\text{vecs}(Y) = [Y_{1,1}, 2Y_{1,2}, \dots, 2Y_{1,a}, Y_{2,2}, 2Y_{2,3}, \dots, 2Y_{a-1,a}, Y_{a,a}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{\frac{a(a+1)}{2}}$ , where  $Y_{i,j}$  is the  $i$ th row and  $j$ th column element of matrix  $Y$ . For vector  $v \in \mathbb{R}^a$ ,  $\text{vecv}(v) = [v_1^2, v_1 v_2, \dots, v_1 v_n, v_2^2, v_2 v_3, \dots, v_{a-1} v_a, v_a^2]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{\frac{a(a+1)}{2}}$ .  $\sigma_{\max}(*)$  and  $\sigma_{\min}(*)$  denote the maximum and minimum singular values of the matrix “\*”.

## II. PROBLEM FORMULATION AND PRELIMINARIES

### A. Problem formulation

A class of linear heterogeneous DT MASs is as follows

$$x_i(t+1) = A_i x_i(t) + B_i u_i(t), \quad (1a)$$

$$y_i(t) = C_i x_i(t) + S_i u_i(t), \quad (1b)$$

$$e_i(t) = C_i x_i(t) + S_i u_i(t) + Fv(t), \quad (1c)$$

where  $x_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ ,  $u_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$  and  $y_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y}$  are the state, input and output of agent  $i$ , and  $e_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y}$  is the output tracking error between agent  $i$  and the leader with  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ , and  $v(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_v}$  is the state of the leader as

$$v(t+1) = Ev(t), \quad (2a)$$

$$y_d(t) = -Fv(t), \quad (2b)$$

where  $y_{di} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y}$  is its output.  $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}$ ,  $B_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times m_i}$ ,  $C_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y \times n_i}$ ,  $S_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y \times m_i}$ ,  $E \in \mathbb{R}^{n_v \times n_v}$  and  $F \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y \times n_v}$  are constant matrices with appropriate dimensions.

A directed graph topology is defined as  $\mathcal{G} = (\bar{\mathcal{V}}, \bar{\mathcal{E}})$  with  $\bar{\mathcal{E}} \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{V}} \times \bar{\mathcal{V}}$  and  $\bar{\mathcal{V}} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, N\}$ . Node 0 denotes the leader system (2),  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$  nodes denote followers (1), and  $N_i$  denotes the set of neighbors connected to agent  $i$ . Define  $d_i = \sum_{j=1}^{N_i} a_{ij}$  and  $a_{ij} > 0$  if  $(j, i) \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}$ , otherwise

$a_{ij} = 0$ . Define matrix  $\mathcal{H} = [h_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^N \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ , where  $h_{ii} = \sum_{j=0}^N a_{ij}$  and  $h_{ij} = -a_{ij}$  with  $a_{ij} > 0$  if  $(j, i) \in \bar{\mathcal{E}}$ , otherwise  $a_{ij} = 0$ .

*Assumption 1:* [5] The  $(A_i, B_i)$  is stabilizable for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ .

*Assumption 2:* [5]  $\text{rank}\left(\begin{bmatrix} A_i - \lambda I & B_i \\ C_i & S_i \end{bmatrix}\right) = n_i + n_y$  for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , where  $\forall \lambda \in \sigma(E)$ .

*Assumption 3:* [5] The graph  $\bar{\mathcal{G}}$  contains a directed spanning tree.

*Assumption 4:* [5] All eigenvalue modulus of matrix  $E$  are less than or equal to 1.

The COOT is to design the distributed controllers for all agents such that the output tracking error  $e_i(t)$  converges asymptotically to 0 and the predefined performances are optimized. Inspired by [6], [7], we design the following distributed observer to estimate matrices  $E$ ,  $F$  and the leader state  $v(t)$  and as

$$E_i(t+1) = E_i(t) + \mu_i \sum_{j=0}^N a_{ij}(E_j(t) - E_i(t)), \quad (3a)$$

$$F_i(t+1) = F_i(t) + \mu_i \sum_{j=0}^N a_{ij}(F_j(t) - F_i(t)), \quad (3b)$$

$$\zeta_i(t+1) = E_i(t)\zeta_i(t) + \mu_i E_i(t) \sum_{j=0}^N a_{ij}(\zeta_j(t) - \zeta_i(t)), \quad (3c)$$

where  $E_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_v \times n_v}$  and  $\zeta_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_v}$  are the estimated values of  $E$ ,  $F$  and  $v(t)$  with  $E_0 = E$ ,  $F_0 = F$  and  $\zeta_0 = v$ ,  $\mu_i = (1 + d_i + a_{i0})^{-1}$ . Define the estimated errors as  $\tilde{E}_i = E_i - E$ ,  $\tilde{F}_i = F_i - F$  and  $\tilde{\zeta}_i = \zeta_i - v$ . The stability analysis of the observer is given by the following lemma.

*Lemma 1:* [7] Given the system (1), (2) and observer (3), under Assumption 1, for any initial  $E_i(0)$ ,  $F_i(0)$  and  $\zeta_i(0)$  with  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ , there are  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{E}_i(t) = 0$ ,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{F}_i(t) = 0$  and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\zeta}_i(t) = 0$  exponentially.

To achieve the control objective, we design the following feedforward-feedback controller as

$$u_i(t) = -K_i x_i(t) + T_i \zeta_i(t), \quad (4)$$

where  $K_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times n_i}$  is the feedback control gain and  $T_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times n_v}$  is the feedforward control gain. According to output regulation theory [5], [35],  $T_i$  can be obtained by

$$T_i = U_i + K_i X_i, \quad (5)$$

where pair  $(X_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_v}, U_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times n_v})$  is the solution to the following regulator equations

$$0 = A_i X + B_i U_i - X_i E, \quad (6a)$$

$$0 = C_i X_i + S_i U_i + F. \quad (6b)$$

The equations are guaranteed to be solvable by Assumption 2. Before analyzing the stability of the observer-based output tracking framework, the following lemma is given.

*Lemma 2:* Consider system  $x(t+1) = f_1 x(t) + f_2(t)$ , where  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $f_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is Schur,  $f_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is bounded for  $t > 0$ . Then, for any  $x(0)$ ,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x(t) = 0$  if  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} f_2(t) = 0$ .

*Proof.* The proof is similar to [5, Lemma 1] and can be obtained by input-to-state stability [36, Lemma 3.8].  $\square$

*Theorem 1:* Consider the system (1) and (2). Under Assumptions 1-4,  $T_i$  is designed by (5)-(6) and  $K_i$  is designed such that  $A_i - B_i K_i$  is Schur for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . The cooperative output tracking is realized by the controller (4).

*Proof.* Define  $\bar{x}_i(t) = x_i(t) - X_i v(t)$ . By using (1), (2), (4)-(6) and  $\tilde{\zeta}_i(t) = \zeta_i(t) - v(t)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{x}_i(t+1) &= A_i x_i(t) + B_i u_i(t) - X_i E v(t) \\ &= (A_i - B_i K_i) \bar{x}_i(t) + B_i T_i \tilde{\zeta}_i(t), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\zeta}_i(t) = 0$  exponentially by Lemma 1. According to Lemma 2, there is  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \bar{x}_i(t) = 0$  due to  $A_i - B_i K_i$  is Schur. Since  $e_i(t) = (C_i - S_i K_i) \bar{x}_i(t) + S_i T_i \tilde{\zeta}_i(t)$ , one has  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e_i(t) = 0$ .  $\square$

Letting  $\bar{u}_i(t) = u_i - U_i v(t)$  and considering system (1), we can obtain the error system as

$$\bar{x}_i(t+1) = A_i \bar{x}_i(t) + B_i \bar{u}_i(t), \quad (8a)$$

$$e_i(t) = C_i \bar{x}_i(t) + S_i \bar{u}_i(t). \quad (8b)$$

For  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , the optimal feedback controller is designed as

$$\bar{u}_i(t) = -K_i^* \bar{x}_i(t), \quad (9)$$

where  $K_i^*$  is the optimal feedback gain such that the following optimization problem is solved,

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\bar{u}_i} \{V_i(t) &= \sum_{\tau=t}^{\infty} (\bar{x}_i^T(\tau) Q_i \bar{x}_i(\tau) + \bar{u}_i^T(\tau) R_i \bar{u}_i(\tau))\}, \\ \text{s.t. } &(8a) \ \& \ (9) \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

with  $Q_i = Q_i^T > 0$  and  $R_i = R_i^T > 0$ . In the subsequent design, we solve problem (10) to obtain  $K_i^*$  and solve the output regulator equations (6a)-(6b) to obtain  $(X_i, U_i)$ , respectively, then the COOT problem is solved.

## B. Preliminaries

The optimization problem in (10) can be solved by designing the optimal feedback gain as

$$K_i^* = (R_i + B_i^T P_i B_i)^{-1} B_i^T P_i A_i \quad (11)$$

where  $P_i = P_i^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}$  is the unique positive definite solution to the algebraic Riccati equation (ARE),

$$P_i = A_i^T P_i A_i - A_i^T P_i B_i (R_i + B_i^T P_i B_i)^{-1} B_i^T P_i A_i + Q_i. \quad (12)$$

*Lemma 3:* [13], [14], [20] Given initial stabilizing control gain  $K_i^0$  such that  $\rho(A_i - B_i K_i^0) < 1$ . Find  $P_i^j = (P_i^j)^T$  by the Lyapunov equation as

$$P_i^j = (A_i - B_i K_i^j)^T P_i^j (A_i - B_i K_i^j) + Q_i + (K_i^j)^T R_i K_i^j \quad (13)$$

and update the policy by

$$K_i^{j+1} = (R_i + B_i^T P_i B_i)^{-1} B_i^T P_i^j A_i \quad (14)$$

for  $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  and  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . Then, there are: 1).  $\rho(A_i - B_i K_i^{j+1}) < 1$ ; 2).  $P_i^* \leq P_i^{j+1} \leq P_i^j$ ; 3).  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} P_i^j = P_i^*$  and  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} K_i^j = K_i^*$ .

*Remark 1:* Lemma 3 is the classical model-based PI algorithm, which can be designed as some model-free versions [14], [16], [18] to obtain the optimal solution of ARE when  $A_i$  and  $B_i$  are unknown. Lemma 3 requires that the initial stabilizing policy be known, however, it is not effectively addressed in these results.

### III. MODEL-BASED SOLUTION TO THE COOT PROBLEM

In this section, we assume that the system dynamics are all known, establish a model-based approach to solve the above problems, and compute closed-loop stabilizing control policy of MASs in Lemma 3.

#### A. Model-based solution to regulator equations

Inspired by [17], [32], [33], [37], we define two Sylvester maps  $\Upsilon_i : \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_v} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_v}$  and  $\tilde{\Upsilon}_i : \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_v} \times \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times n_v} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_v}$  as

$$\Upsilon_i(X_i) := X_i E - A_i X_i, \quad (15a)$$

$$\tilde{\Upsilon}_i(X_i, U_i) := X_i E - A_i X_i - B_i U_i. \quad (15b)$$

Then, the solutions to (6) can be established by the Sylvester maps. Set sequences  $X_{il} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_v}$  and  $U_{il} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times n_v}$  for  $l = 0, 1, \dots, h_i$  and  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , where  $(h_i - 1)$  is the dimension of the null space of  $I_{n_v} \otimes \bar{C}_i$  with  $\bar{C}_i = [C_i, S_i]$ . We select  $X_{i0} = 0_{n_i \times n_v}$ ,  $U_{i0} = 0_{m_i \times n_v}$ , all the vectors  $\text{vec}([X_{il}^T, U_{il}^T])$  to form a basis for  $\ker(I_{n_v} \otimes \bar{C}_i)$  for  $l = 2, \dots, h_i$ , and  $C_i X_{i1} + S_i U_{i1} = -F$ . Note that  $F$  is not available for all agents. Therefore, we design

$$[\hat{X}_{i1}^T, \hat{U}_{i1}^T]^T = -\bar{C}_i^T (\bar{C}_i \bar{C}_i^T)^{-1} F_i(t_0), \quad (16)$$

where  $t_0 > 0$  is a sufficiently large constant,  $\hat{X}_{i1}$  and  $\hat{U}_{i1}$  are the estimations of  $X_{i1}$  and  $U_{i1}$  with  $\tilde{X}_{i1} = \hat{X}_{i1} - X_{i1}$  and  $\tilde{U}_{i1} = \hat{U}_{i1} - U_{i1}$  being the estimated errors. Assumption 2 guarantees that  $\bar{C}_i$  is row-full rank and hence  $\bar{C}_i \bar{C}_i^T$  is invertible. Since  $[\tilde{X}_{i1}^T, \tilde{U}_{i1}^T]^T = -\bar{C}_i^T (\bar{C}_i \bar{C}_i^T)^{-1} \tilde{F}_i(t_0)$  and  $t_0$  is sufficiently large, there is  $\lim_{t_0 \rightarrow \infty} (\tilde{X}_{i1}, \tilde{U}_{i1}) = 0$ .

Clearly, the solution to (6) can be approximated as

$$(X_i, U_i) = (\hat{X}_{i1}, \hat{U}_{i1}) + \sum_{l=2}^{h_i} \delta_{il} (X_{il}, U_{il}), \quad (17)$$

where  $\delta_{il}$  is the unknown coefficients. Unlike the CT systems [17], [32], [33], introducing an arbitrary bounded matrix  $M_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}$ , we have

$$M_i \tilde{\Upsilon}_i(X_i, U_i) = M_i \tilde{\Upsilon}_i(\hat{X}_{i1}, \hat{U}_{i1}) + \sum_{l=2}^{h_i} \delta_{il} M_i \tilde{\Upsilon}_i(X_{il}, U_{il}). \quad (18)$$

Then, the regulator equations (6) and its approximate version can be expressed as

$$\Omega_i \chi_i = \eta_i, \quad (19a)$$

$$\Omega_i \chi_i = \hat{\eta}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad (19b)$$

where

$$\Omega_i = \begin{bmatrix} \text{vec}(M_i \tilde{\Upsilon}_i(X_{i2}, U_{i2})) & \dots & \text{vec}(M_i \tilde{\Upsilon}_i(X_{ih_i}, U_{ih_i})) & 0 \\ \text{vec}([X_{i2}^T, U_{i2}^T]^T) & \dots & \text{vec}([X_{ih_i}^T, U_{ih_i}^T]^T) & -I \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\chi_i = \begin{bmatrix} \delta_{i2} & \dots & \delta_{ih_i} & \text{vec}([X_i^T, U_i^T])^T \end{bmatrix}^T, \\ \hat{\eta}_i = \begin{bmatrix} \text{vec}(-M_i \tilde{\Upsilon}_i(\hat{X}_{i1}, \hat{U}_{i1})) \\ -\text{vec}([\hat{X}_{i1}^T, \hat{U}_{i1}^T]^T) \end{bmatrix}, \\ \eta_i = \begin{bmatrix} \text{vec}(-M_i \tilde{\Upsilon}_i(X_{i1}, U_{i1})) \\ -\text{vec}([X_{i1}^T, U_{i1}^T]^T) \end{bmatrix}$$

with  $\hat{\eta}_i$  being the approximation of  $\eta_i$ .

Inspired by [5], [37], we design the following iteration method to update the approximate solution to the regulator equations (6) as

$$\chi_i^{n+1} = \chi_i^n - \kappa_i \Omega_i^T (\Omega_i \chi_i^n - \hat{\eta}_i), \quad (20)$$

where  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ . Give the following theorem to determine the parameter  $\kappa_i$  and analyze the optimality of the final iteration solution of (20).

*Theorem 2:* Consider the distributed observer (6) and iteration equation (20). Under Assumption 2,  $i = 1, \dots, N$  and  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots \rightarrow \infty$ , setting  $0 < \kappa_i < 2/\rho(\Omega_i^T \Omega_i)$  and  $t_0$  sufficiently large, the solution  $\chi_i^n$  from (20) can be viewed as the approximate solution of (19a) and the solution error being sufficiently small.

*Proof.* Under Assumption 2, there is a vector  $\chi_i^*$  satisfying  $\Omega_i \chi_i^* = \eta_i$ , where  $\Omega_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i^* \times n_i^*}$  with  $n_i^1 = (2n_i + m_i)n_v$  and  $n_i^2 = (2n_i + 2m_i - n_y)n_v$ . It can be inferred from Assumption 2 that  $m_i \geq n_y$ , thus  $n_i^2 \geq n_i^1$ . From Assumption 2, we have  $0 < \text{rank}(\Omega_i) := n_i^3 \leq n_i^1$ . By singular value decomposition, there is an orthogonal matrix  $W_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i^2 \times n_i^2}$  and a full-column rank matrix  $\bar{\Omega}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i^1 \times n_i^3}$  with  $W_i^T W_i = W_i W_i^T = I$  so that  $\Omega_i W_i = [\bar{\Omega}_i, 0]$ ,

$$W_i^T \Omega_i^T \Omega_i W_i = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\Omega}_i^T \bar{\Omega}_i & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, W_i^T \Omega_i^T \eta_i = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\Omega}_i^T \eta_i \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Define  $\bar{\chi}_i^* = W_i^T \chi_i^* = [\bar{\chi}_{i1}^*, \bar{\chi}_{i2}^*]^T$  and  $\bar{\chi}_i = [\bar{\chi}_{i1}^T, \bar{\chi}_{i2}^T]^T$ , where  $\bar{\chi}_{i1}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i^3}$  and  $\bar{\chi}_{i2}^* \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i^2 - n_i^3}$ . Then,  $\bar{\Omega}_i^T \bar{\chi}_{i1}^* = \eta_i$  has unique solution. Defining  $\tilde{\eta}_i = \hat{\eta}_i - \eta_i$ ,  $\tilde{\chi}_{i1}^* = \bar{\chi}_{i1}^* - \bar{\chi}_{i1}^*$  and  $\tilde{\chi}_{i2}^* = \bar{\chi}_{i2}^* - \bar{\chi}_{i2}^*$ , we have

$$\tilde{\chi}_{i1}^{n+1} = (I - \kappa_i \bar{\Omega}_i^T \bar{\Omega}_i) \tilde{\chi}_{i1}^n + \kappa_i \bar{\Omega}_i^T \tilde{\eta}_i, \quad (21a)$$

$$\tilde{\chi}_{i2}^{n+1} = \tilde{\chi}_{i2}^n, \quad (21b)$$

where  $\tilde{\eta}_i = [\text{vec}(-M_i \tilde{\Upsilon}_i(\tilde{X}_{i1}, \tilde{U}_{i1}))^T, -\text{vec}([\tilde{X}_{i1}^T, \tilde{U}_{i1}^T]^T)]^T$ . Let  $\vartheta_{i,0}$  and  $\vartheta_{i,1}$  be certain positive constants. Since  $\mathcal{H}^\mu := I_N - \text{diag}\{\mu_i\} \mathcal{H}$  of graph  $\bar{\mathcal{G}}$  is Schur, there is  $0 < |\lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{H}^\mu)| < 1$ . From (3b) and  $\tilde{F}_i(t+1) = (\mathcal{H}^\mu \otimes I_{n_v}) \tilde{F}_i(t)$  in [7], we have

$$\|\kappa_i \bar{\Omega}_i^T \tilde{\eta}_i\| \leq \vartheta_{i,1} |\lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{H}^\mu)|^{t_0}. \quad (22)$$

Then, according to (21a), one has

$$\|\tilde{\chi}_{i1}^n\| \leq (\vartheta_{i,0})^n \|\tilde{\chi}_{i1}^0\| + ((\vartheta_{i,0})^{n-1} + 1) \vartheta_{i,1} |\lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{H}^\mu)|^{t_0}, \quad (23)$$

where  $\vartheta_{i,0} = \rho(I - \kappa_i \bar{\Omega}_i^T \bar{\Omega}_i)$  with  $0 < \kappa_i < 2/\rho(\Omega_i^T \Omega_i)$ . Then, according to (21) and (23), we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\tilde{\chi}_i^n\| \leq \vartheta_{i,1} |\lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{H}^\mu)|^{t_0}. \quad (24)$$

Since  $\vartheta_{i,1}$  is positive constant and  $\vartheta_{i,1} |\lambda_{\max}(\mathcal{H}^\mu)|^{t_0}$  is sufficiently small if  $t_0$  is sufficiently large, the solution  $\tilde{\chi}_i^n$  converges to the solution of (19a), where the error is

sufficiently small by increasing  $t_0$ . The proof is completed.  $\square$

*Remark 2:* Theorem 2 proves that if  $t_0$  is large enough, a model-based approximate solution to the regulator equations (6) can be obtained by iteration equation (20). Different from CT systems [17], [32], [33], the Sylvester maps for complex DT system (1) are more difficult to be re-represented as model-free versions. Note that we introduce the matrix  $M_i$ , which is replaced with  $A_i^T P_i$  in the model-free design phase to reconstruct the model-free  $\Omega_i$  and  $\hat{\eta}_i$ .

### B. Model-based solution to the optimization problem by a stabilizing PI

Currently, the model-free PI method developed based on Lemma 3 can well solve the optimization problem in (10) if the stabilizing control policy of system (8a) is known. However, designing stabilizing control policies usually relies on known system models. In this section, we present a method for computing the stabilizing control policy for system (8a), which is subsequently replaced with a model-free version.

First, for any system (8a), there must exist a positive definite unknown constant  $\beta_i$  satisfying

$$0 < \beta_i < \tilde{\rho}_i := \frac{1}{\rho(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^0)} \quad (25)$$

such that  $\rho((\tilde{\rho}_i - \beta_i)(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^0)) < 1$ , where  $\tilde{K}_i^0$  is the arbitrarily bounded feedback control gain. The stabilizing PI is given by the following lemma.

*Lemma 4:* For  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , given arbitrarily bounded policy  $\tilde{K}_i^0$ , constants  $\tilde{\beta}_i$  and  $\alpha_i^0$  satisfying  $\tilde{\beta}_i = \tilde{\rho}_i - \beta_i$  and  $\tilde{\rho}_i > \beta_i > \alpha_i^0 > 0$ . For  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , solve  $\tilde{P}_i^k$  by

$$\begin{aligned} & [(\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^k \alpha_i^m)(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^k)]^T \tilde{P}_i^k [(\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^k \alpha_i^m)(A_i \\ & - B_i \tilde{K}_i^k)] - \tilde{P}_i^k = -Q_i - (\tilde{K}_i^k)^T R_i \tilde{K}_i^k, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

update control policy  $\tilde{K}_i^{k+1}$  and iteration step-size  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{K}_i^{k+1} = & (\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^k \alpha_i^m)^2 (R_i + (\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^k \alpha_i^m)^2 B_i^T \tilde{P}_i^k B_i)^{-1} \\ & \times B_i^T \tilde{P}_i^k A_i, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

$$0 < \alpha_i^{k+1} < \frac{1}{\rho(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^{k+1})} - (\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^k \alpha_i^m). \quad (28)$$

Then, there are: 1).  $\rho(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^{k+1}) < 1/(\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^{k+1} \alpha_i^m)$ ; 2). if  $\alpha_i^k$  is bounded,  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  also is bounded.

*Proof.* Prove 1) by induction and Lemma 3. For  $i = 1, \dots, N$  and  $k = 0$ , one has  $\rho((\tilde{\beta}_i + \alpha_i^0)(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^0)) < \tilde{\rho}_i \rho(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^0) = 1$ . Clearly,  $\tilde{K}_i^0$  is the stabilizing control gain of system  $((\tilde{\beta}_i + \alpha_i^0)A_i, (\tilde{\beta}_i + \alpha_i^0)B_i)$ . It follows from Lemma 3 that  $\rho((\tilde{\beta}_i + \alpha_i^0)(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^1)) < 1$ . Then, there exists  $\alpha_i^1$  satisfying (28) due to  $1/\rho(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^1) - (\tilde{\beta}_i + \alpha_i^0) > 0$ . Hence, one has  $\rho(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^1) < 1/(\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^1 \alpha_i^m)$ . For  $i = 1, \dots, N$  and  $k = 0, 1$ , conclusion 1) holds.

Suppose that conclusion 1) holds for  $k = z$  and  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , where  $z \in \mathbb{N}$ . There is  $\rho((\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^z \alpha_i^m)(A_i -$

$B_i \tilde{K}_i^z)) < 1$ . This implies  $\tilde{K}_i^z$  is a stabilizing gain of system  $((\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^z \alpha_i^m)A_i, (\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^z \alpha_i^m)B_i)$ . By Lemma 3, one has  $\rho((\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^z \alpha_i^m)(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^{z+1})) < 1$ . Similarly, there must exist  $\alpha_i^{z+1}$  satisfying  $0 < \alpha_i^{z+1} < 1/\rho(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^{z+1}) - (\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^{z+1} \alpha_i^m)$ . Thus, we have  $\rho((\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^{z+1} \alpha_i^m)(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^{z+1})) < 1$ . Conclusion 1) holds for  $k = z + 1$  and  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . Therefore, conclusion 1) is true.

Proof of conclusion 2). For  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , since  $\alpha_i^0$  and  $\tilde{K}_i^0$  are bounded,  $\tilde{P}_i^0$  is bounded from (26). Hence,  $\tilde{K}_i^1$  also is bounded from (27). Recursively, we have that  $\tilde{K}_i^{k+1}$  is bounded if  $\alpha_i^k$  is bounded. Therefore, there is  $0 < 1/\rho(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^{k+1}) - (\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^{k+1} \alpha_i^m) < \infty$ . Obviously, it follows from (28) that  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  is bounded.  $\square$

*Remark 3:* If  $\alpha_i^k$  satisfies (28),  $\beta_i + \sum_{m=0}^{k+1} \alpha_i^m$  is monotonically increasing. Setting the termination criterion of the algorithm in Lemma 4 to  $\beta_i + \sum_{m=0}^{k+1} \alpha_i^m \geq 1$ , a stabilizing control gain  $\tilde{K}_i^k$  of system (8a) can be obtained by conclusion 1) in Lemma 4. Let  $\tilde{K}_i^0 = \tilde{K}_i^{k+1}$  in Lemma 3, the near-optimal control gain can be obtained by iterations. Different from Lemma 3 or [20], Lemma 4 can start with arbitrary initial control policy and is not limited to stabilizing gain or  $\tilde{K}_i^0 = 0$ . The algorithm is equivalent to iterating the stabilizing virtual closed-loop system  $(\beta_i + \alpha_i^0)(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^0)$  step-by-step to the actual closed-loop system  $(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^{k+1})$  until  $\beta_i + \sum_{m=0}^{k+1} \alpha_i^m \geq 1$ . In the next section, we will design a model-free version of Lemma 4.

## IV. DATA-DRIVEN SOLUTION TO THE COOT BY OFF-POLICY

In this section, the online RL algorithm is proposed by off-policy approach to learn the optimal control gain and the solution of the regulator equations.

### A. Data collection and stabilizing policy computation

For  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , by defining  $\tilde{x}_{i1}(t) = x_i(t) - \hat{X}_{i1} \zeta_i(t)$  and  $\tilde{x}_{il}(t) = x_i(t) - X_{il} \zeta_i(t)$  for  $l = 0, 2, 3, \dots, h_i$  and using (1), (6) and (15), we have

$$\tilde{x}_{il}(t+1) = A_i \tilde{x}_{il}(t) + B_i u_i(t) + \pi_{il} \zeta_i(t) + \varrho_{il}(t), \quad (29)$$

where  $\pi_{il} = -\Upsilon_i(X_{il})$ ,  $\varrho_{il}(t) = -X_{il} \tilde{E}_i \zeta_i(t) - \mu_i X_{il} E_i \sum_{j=0}^N a_{ij} (\zeta_j(t) - \zeta_j(t))$ ,  $\pi_{i1}$  and  $\varrho_{i1}(t)$  are obtained by replacing  $X_{i1}$  as  $\hat{X}_{i1}$ , respectively. By defining

$$\tilde{A}_i^k = (\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^k \alpha_i^m)(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^k), \quad (30)$$

we rewrite system (29) as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{x}_{il}(t+1) = & (\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^k \alpha_i^m)^{-1} \tilde{A}_i^k \tilde{x}_{il}(t) \\ & + B_i (\tilde{K}_i^k \tilde{x}_{il}(t) + u_i(t)) + \pi_{il} \zeta_i(t) + \varrho_{il}(t). \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Using (26), (27) and (31), there is

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{x}_{il}^T(t+1) \tilde{P}_i^k \tilde{x}_{il}(t+1) - \tilde{x}_{il}^T(t) \tilde{P}_i^k \tilde{x}_{il}(t) \\ & = (\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^k \alpha_i^m)^{-2} \tilde{x}_{il}^T(t) (-Q_i - (\tilde{K}_i^k)^T R_i \tilde{K}_i^k) \tilde{x}_{il}(t) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + ((\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^k \alpha_i^m)^{-2} - 1) \tilde{x}_{il}^T(t) \tilde{P}_i^k \tilde{x}_{il}(t) \\
& + u_i^T(t) B_i^T \tilde{P}_i^k B_i u_i(t) - \tilde{x}_{il}^T(t) \tilde{K}_i^k B_i^T \tilde{P}_i^k B_i \tilde{K}_i^k \tilde{x}_{il}(t) \\
& + 2 \tilde{x}_{il}^T(t) A_i^T \tilde{P}_i^k B_i (u_i(t) + \tilde{K}_i^k \tilde{x}_{il}(t)) + \zeta_i^T(t) \pi_{il}^T \tilde{P}_i^k \pi_{il} \zeta_i(t) \\
& + 2 u_i^T(t) B_i \tilde{P}_i^k \pi_{il} \zeta_i(t) + 2 \tilde{x}_{il}^T(t) A_i^T \tilde{P}_i^k \pi_{il} \zeta_i(t) + \omega_{il}(t), \tag{32}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\omega_{il}(t)$  is caused by  $\varrho_{il}(t)$  as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \omega_{il}(t) \\
& = 2 \tilde{x}_{il}^T(t) (A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^k)^T \tilde{P}_i^k \varrho_{il}(t) + 2 \zeta_i^T(t) \pi_{il}^T \tilde{P}_i^k \varrho_{il}(t) \\
& + 2 (u_i(t) + \tilde{K}_i^k \tilde{x}_{il}(t))^T B_i^T \tilde{P}_i^k \varrho_{il}(t) + \varrho_{il}^T(t) \tilde{P}_i^k \varrho_{il}(t). \tag{33}
\end{aligned}$$

The error  $\omega_{il}(t)$  arises from the combination of the observer errors and the constant matrices. We can obtain the following matrices by collecting data at time interval  $[t_0, t_f]$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta_{\tilde{x}_{il}} &= [\text{vecv}(\tilde{x}_{il}(t_1)) - \text{vecv}(\tilde{x}_{il}(t_0)), \dots, \\
& \quad \text{vecv}(\tilde{x}_{il}(t_{f+1})) - \text{vecv}(\tilde{x}_{il}(t_f))]^T, \\
\Gamma_{\tilde{x}_{il}} &= [\text{vecv}(\tilde{x}_{il}(t_0)), \dots, \text{vecv}(\tilde{x}_{il}(t_f))]^T, \\
\Gamma_{\zeta_i} &= [\text{vecv}(\zeta_i(t_0)), \dots, \text{vecv}(\zeta_i(t_f))]^T, \\
\Gamma_{u_i} &= [\text{vecv}(u_i(t_0)), \dots, \text{vecv}(u_i(t_f))]^T, \\
\Gamma_{k\tilde{x}_{il}} &= [\text{vecv}(\tilde{K}_i^k \tilde{x}_{il}(t_0)), \dots, \text{vecv}(\tilde{K}_i^k \tilde{x}_{il}(t_f))]^T, \\
\Gamma_{\tilde{x}\tilde{x}_{il}} &= [\tilde{x}_{il}(t_0) \otimes \tilde{x}_{il}(t_0), \dots, \tilde{x}_{il}(t_f) \otimes \tilde{x}_{il}(t_f)]^T, \\
\Gamma_{u_i\tilde{x}_{il}} &= [u_i(t_0) \otimes \tilde{x}_{il}(t_0), \dots, u_i(t_f) \otimes \tilde{x}_{il}(t_f)]^T, \\
\Gamma_{\zeta_i\tilde{x}_{il}} &= [\zeta_i(t_0) \otimes \tilde{x}_{il}(t_0), \dots, \zeta_i(t_f) \otimes \tilde{x}_{il}(t_f)]^T, \\
\Gamma_{\zeta_i u_i} &= [\zeta_i(t_0) \otimes u_i(t_0), \dots, \zeta_i(t_f) \otimes u_i(t_f)]^T, \\
\Gamma_{\omega_{il}} &= [\omega_{il}(t_0), \dots, \omega_{il}(t_f)]^T.
\end{aligned}$$

By using these data matrices, (32) is written as

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\phi}_{il}^k [\text{vecs}(\tilde{P}_i^k)^T, \text{vec}(\tilde{L}_{1,i}^k)^T, \text{vecs}(\tilde{L}_{2,i}^k)^T, \text{vec}(\tilde{L}_{3,il}^k)^T, \\
\text{vec}(\tilde{L}_{4,il}^k)^T, \text{vecs}(\tilde{L}_{5,il}^k)^T]^T = \tilde{\psi}_{il}^k + \Gamma_{\omega_{il}}, \tag{34}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\phi}_{il}^k &= [\theta_{\tilde{x}_{il}} - ((\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^k \alpha_i^m)^{-2} - 1) \Gamma_{\tilde{x}_{il}}, \\
& \quad - 2 \Gamma_{\tilde{x}\tilde{x}_{il}} (I_{n_i} \otimes \tilde{K}_i^{kT}) - 2 \Gamma_{u_i\tilde{x}_{il}}, \Gamma_{k\tilde{x}_{il}} - \Gamma_{u_i}, \\
& \quad - 2 \Gamma_{\zeta_i\tilde{x}_{il}}, -2 \Gamma_{\zeta_i u_i}, -\Gamma_{\zeta_i}] \\
\tilde{L}_{1,i}^k &= A_i^T \tilde{P}_i^k B_i, \quad \tilde{L}_{2,i}^k = B_i^T \tilde{P}_i^k B_i, \quad \tilde{L}_{3,il}^k = A_i^T \tilde{P}_i^k \pi_{il}, \\
\tilde{L}_{4,il}^k &= B_i^T \tilde{P}_i^k \pi_{il}, \quad \tilde{L}_{5,il}^k = \pi_{il}^T \tilde{P}_i^k \pi_{il}, \\
\tilde{\psi}_{il}^k &= (\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^k \alpha_i^m)^{-2} \Gamma_{\tilde{x}_{il}} \text{vecs}(-\tilde{Q}_i^k), \\
\tilde{Q}_i^k &= Q_i + (\tilde{K}_i^k)^T R_i \tilde{K}_i^k. \tag{35}
\end{aligned}$$

Similar to Theorem 2, the data error  $\Gamma_{\omega_{il}}$  is also affected by the observation errors and the time  $t_0$ . Let  $\vartheta_{i,b}$  be certain positive constants, where  $b = 2, 3, 4$ . From Lemma 1, one has that  $\|\sum_{j=0}^N a_{ij}(\zeta_j(t_0) - \zeta_i(t_0))\| < \vartheta_{i,2}$  and  $\|\sum_{j=0}^N a_{ij}(E_j(t_0) - E_i(t_0))\| < \vartheta_{i,3}$ , hence, there exists a small constant  $\vartheta_{i,4}$  satisfying  $\|\varrho_{il}(t_0)\| < \vartheta_{i,4}$ . For  $\forall t > t_0$ ,  $\vartheta_{i,2}$ ,  $\vartheta_{i,3}$  and  $\vartheta_{i,4}$  will be sufficiently small as  $t_0$  is chosen to be sufficiently large. Similar to [14, Theorem 2], [32], if

the starting time for the data collection  $t_0$  is sufficiently large, (34) can be approximately replaced by

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\phi}_{il}^k [\text{vecs}(\tilde{P}_i^k)^T, \text{vec}(\tilde{L}_{1,i}^k)^T, \text{vecs}(\tilde{L}_{2,i}^k)^T, \text{vec}(\tilde{L}_{3,il}^k)^T, \\
\text{vec}(\tilde{L}_{4,il}^k)^T, \text{vecs}(\tilde{L}_{5,il}^k)^T]^T = \tilde{\psi}_{il}^k, \tag{36}
\end{aligned}$$

for  $k = 0, 1, \dots, l = 0, 1, \dots, h_i$  and  $i = 1, \dots, N$ .

**Lemma 5:** For  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , if the condition

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{rank}([\Gamma_{\tilde{x}\tilde{x}_{il}}, \Gamma_{u_i}, \Gamma_{\zeta_i}, \Gamma_{u_i\tilde{x}_{il}}, \Gamma_{\zeta_i\tilde{x}_{il}}, \Gamma_{\zeta_i u_i}]) \\
= (n_i + m_i + n_v)(n_i + m_i + n_v + 1)/2 \tag{37}
\end{aligned}$$

is satisfied,  $\tilde{\phi}_{il}^k$  has full column-rank.

The full column-rank condition similar to Lemma 5 is commonly found in data-driven RL methods such as [14], [17], [20], [33], [37], which contain the detailed analysis process. By Lemma 5, (36) can be solved as

$$\begin{aligned}
[\text{vecs}(\tilde{P}_i^k)^T, \text{vec}(\tilde{L}_{1,i}^k)^T, \text{vecs}(\tilde{L}_{2,i}^k)^T, \text{vec}(\tilde{L}_{3,il}^k)^T, \\
\text{vec}(\tilde{L}_{4,il}^k)^T, \text{vecs}(\tilde{L}_{5,il}^k)^T]^T = (\tilde{\phi}_{il}^{kT} \tilde{\phi}_{il}^k)^{-1} \tilde{\phi}_{il}^{kT} \tilde{\psi}_{il}^k, \tag{38}
\end{aligned}$$

for  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ . According to (27), update the control gain by

$$\tilde{K}_i^{k+1} = (\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^k \alpha_i^m)^2 (R_i + (\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^k \alpha_i^m)^2 \tilde{L}_{2,i}^k)^{-1} \tilde{L}_{1,i}^k. \tag{39}$$

## B. Determine initial coefficient $\tilde{\beta}_i + \alpha_i^0$

**Initialize** a sufficiently small constant  $\alpha_i^0 > 0$  and a monotonic sequence  $\{\tilde{\beta}_i^z\}$  satisfying  $0 < \tilde{\beta}_i^{z+1} < \tilde{\beta}_i^z$  and  $\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\beta}_i^z = 0$  for  $\forall z \in \mathbb{N}$ . Set  $z \leftarrow 0$  and  $\tilde{\beta}_i \leftarrow \tilde{\beta}_i^0$ , **repeat**: 1). **if**  $\tilde{P}_i^0 \leq 0$  from (38), **then**  $z \leftarrow z + 1$ ,  $\tilde{\beta}_i \leftarrow \tilde{\beta}_i^z$  and calculate  $\tilde{P}_i^0$  by (38); **else end**; 2). **output**  $\tilde{\beta}_i \leftarrow \tilde{\beta}_i^z$  and  $\alpha_i^0$ .

**Remark 4:** If  $t_0$  is sufficiently large and (37) is satisfied, solving  $\tilde{P}_i^k$  by (38) is equivalent to solving  $\tilde{P}_i^k$  by (26). For  $k = 0$ , if  $\tilde{P}_i^0 > 0$ , it can be deduced from Lyapunov theory that  $(\tilde{\beta}_i + \alpha_i^0)(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^0)$  is Schur. Therefore, we can use the above iterations to find the coefficient  $\tilde{\beta}_i + \alpha_i^0$  such that the system  $((\tilde{\beta}_i + \alpha_i^0)A_i, (\tilde{\beta}_i + \alpha_i^0)B_i)$  is stabilized by any bounded initial control gain  $\tilde{K}_i^0$ . It is clear that neither (38)-(39) nor the above iterations use a priori knowledge.

## C. Choose iteration step-size $\alpha_i^{k+1}$ by model-free methods

Updating  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  by (28) is equivalent to solving the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{solve } \alpha_i^{k+1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \\
& \text{s.t. } \begin{cases} \alpha_i^{k+1} > 0 \\ (\tilde{A}_i^{k+1})^T \Theta_i^{k+1} \tilde{A}_i^{k+1} - \Theta_i^{k+1} < 0, \end{cases} \tag{40}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{A}_i^{k+1}$  is defined in (30),  $\Theta_i^{k+1}$  is an unknown positive definite matrix and exists. We provide two schemes for solving the problem in (40) to obtain the model-free version of (28).

**Scheme 1.** (*Pseudo-solution based method.*) Solve  $\hat{\tilde{P}}_i^{k+1}$  by

$$[(\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^k \alpha_i^m)(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^{k+1})]^T \hat{\tilde{P}}_i^{k+1} [(\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^k \alpha_i^m)(A_i$$

$$-B_i \tilde{K}_i^{k+1})] - \hat{P}_i^{k+1} = -Q_i - (\tilde{K}_i^{k+1})^T R_i \tilde{K}_i^{k+1}. \quad (41)$$

Then, (41) can be solved by the model-free form as

$$[\text{vecs}(\hat{P}_i^{k+1})^T, *, *, *, *, *]^T = (\hat{\phi}_{il}^{k+1T} \hat{\phi}_{il}^{k+1})^{-1} \hat{\phi}_{il}^{k+1T} \hat{\psi}_{il}^{k+1}, \quad (42)$$

where “\*” denotes the other vectors that are not used,  $\hat{\phi}_{il}^{k+1}$  and  $\hat{\psi}_{il}^{k+1}$  are obtained by replacing  $\tilde{K}_i^k$  with  $\tilde{K}_i^{k+1}$  in  $\phi_{il}^k$  and  $\psi_{il}^k$ , respectively. We name  $\hat{P}_i^{k+1}$  as *pseudo-solution*, thus distinguishing it from the positive definite unique solution  $\tilde{P}_i^{k+1}$  to (26). Finally, (28) is replaced by

$$0 < \alpha_i^{k+1} < (\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^k \alpha_i^m) \left( \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{\min}(\bar{Q}_i^{k+1})}{\sigma_{\max}(\hat{P}_i^{k+1} - \bar{Q}_i^{k+1})} + 1} - 1 \right). \quad (43)$$

**Scheme 2. (Monotonicity-based method.)** By using the monotonicity  $0 < \hat{P}_i^{k+1} \leq \tilde{P}_i^k$ , we obtain the following selection criteria for  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  as

$$0 < \alpha_i^{k+1} < (\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^k \alpha_i^m) \left( \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{\min}(\bar{Q}_i^{k+1})}{\sigma_{\max}(\tilde{P}_i^k - \bar{Q}_i^{k+1})} + 1} - 1 \right), \quad (44)$$

where  $\tilde{P}_i^k$  and  $\bar{Q}_i^{k+1}$  are obtained by (38)-(39).

**Theorem 3:** For  $i = 1, \dots, N$  and a sufficiently large  $t_0$ , given the control gain  $\tilde{K}_i^{k+1}$  by (27). Then, one has that: 1). updating  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  by (28) is equivalent to solving the problem in (40); 2). if the  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  is updated by scheme 1, the  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  satisfies (40); 3). if the  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  is updated by scheme 2, the  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  satisfies (40).

*Proof.* Proof of conclusion 1). (*Sufficiency:*) Satisfying (28) implies that  $\rho(\tilde{A}_i^{k+1}) < 1$  and  $\alpha_i^{k+1} > 0$ . Then, there must exist a positive definite matrix  $\Theta_i^{k+1}$  such that  $(\tilde{A}_i^{k+1})^T \Theta_i^{k+1} \tilde{A}_i^{k+1} - \Theta_i^{k+1} < 0$ .

(*Necessity:*) The  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  obtained by solving the problem in (40) satisfies its constraints. This implies that  $\alpha_i^{k+1} > 0$  and  $\rho((\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^{k+1} \alpha_i^m)(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^{k+1})) < 1$ . Then, (28) can be obtained. Conclusion 1) is proved.

Proof of conclusion 2). For  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , since  $\tilde{K}_i^{k+1}$  from (27) is the stabilizing control gain of  $(\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^k \alpha_i^m)(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^{k+1})$ . This implies that there exists a unique positive definite solution  $\hat{P}_i^{k+1}$  to (41). If  $t_0$  is sufficiently large, solving (42) is equivalent to solving (41). One has

$$\begin{aligned} & (\tilde{A}_i^{k+1})^T \hat{P}_i^{k+1} \tilde{A}_i^{k+1} - \hat{P}_i^{k+1} \\ & \stackrel{(a)}{=} \left( \left( \frac{\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^{k+1} \alpha_i^m}{\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^k \alpha_i^m} \right)^2 - 1 \right) (\hat{P}_i^{k+1} - \bar{Q}_i^{k+1}) - \bar{Q}_i^{k+1} \\ & \stackrel{(b_0)}{<} \sigma_{\min}(\bar{Q}_i^{k+1}) I_{n_i} - \bar{Q}_i^{k+1} < 0, \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

where (a) is obtained by (41) and the definition of  $\tilde{A}_i^{k+1}$ , (b<sub>0</sub>) is obtained by (43). Since the right hand side of Eq. (a) in (45) is a monotonically increasing function on the interval (43) with respect to  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$ , we have  $(\tilde{A}_i^{k+1})^T \hat{P}_i^{k+1} \tilde{A}_i^{k+1} - \hat{P}_i^{k+1} < 0$  when  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  satisfies (43). Clearly, (40) is satisfied, where  $\Theta_i^{k+1} = \hat{P}_i^{k+1}$ .

Proof of conclusion 3). For sufficiently large  $t_0$  and  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , since  $\tilde{K}_i^{k+1}$  from (27) is the stabilizing control

gain of  $(\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^k \alpha_i^m)(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^{k+1})$ . Viewing  $(\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^k \alpha_i^m)A_i$  and  $(\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^k \alpha_i^m)B_i$  as  $A_i$  and  $B_i$  respectively in Lemma 3, we get  $0 < \hat{P}_i^{k+1} \leq \tilde{P}_i^k$  by conclusion 2) in Lemma 3. Then, one has

$$\begin{aligned} & (\tilde{A}_i^{k+1})^T \hat{P}_i^{k+1} \tilde{A}_i^{k+1} - \hat{P}_i^{k+1} \\ & \stackrel{(a)}{=} \left( \left( \frac{\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^{k+1} \alpha_i^m}{\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^k \alpha_i^m} \right)^2 - 1 \right) (\hat{P}_i^{k+1} - \bar{Q}_i^{k+1}) - \bar{Q}_i^{k+1} \\ & \stackrel{(b_1)}{\leq} \left( \left( 1 + \frac{\alpha_i^{k+1}}{\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^k \alpha_i^m} \right)^2 - 1 \right) (\tilde{P}_i^k - \bar{Q}_i^{k+1}) - \bar{Q}_i^{k+1} \\ & \stackrel{(c)}{<} \sigma_{\min}(\bar{Q}_i^{k+1}) I_{n_i} - \bar{Q}_i^{k+1} < 0, \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

where (b<sub>1</sub>) is obtained by  $0 < \hat{P}_i^{k+1} \leq \tilde{P}_i^k$  and (c) is obtained by (44). Similarly, any choice of  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  on interval (44) ensures the stability of system  $\tilde{A}_i^{k+1}$  for step  $k+1$ . Clearly, (40) is satisfied.  $\square$

**Remark 5:** Theorem 3 guarantees the stability of the stabilizing PI from the  $k$ th step iteration to the  $(k+1)$ st step iteration. Both Schemes 1 and 2 are feasible. In Scheme 1, the selection interval (43) for  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  is obtained by solving the *pseudo-solution*  $\hat{P}_i^{k+1}$ , which is the solution of the Lyapunov equation (41) for the system  $(\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^k \alpha_i^m)(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^{k+1})$ , not the solution  $\tilde{P}_i^{k+1}$  of the system  $\tilde{A}_i^{k+1}$  in step  $k+1$ . In Scheme 2, iteration (42) is avoided by using the monotonicity  $0 < \hat{P}_i^{k+1} \leq \tilde{P}_i^k$  and the selection interval (44) for  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  is computed directly.

**Remark 6:** Although Scheme 2 has less computation in each iteration, the resulting interval (44) is contained in the interval (43), noting that solving (42) in Scheme 1 does not require the data to be re-collected. Since the right-hand side of (a) is a monotonically increasing function on the interval  $\alpha_i^{k+1} > 0$  with respect to  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  and (b<sub>1</sub>) is obtained by further relaxation of (a), it follows from (45) and (46) that (44)  $\subseteq$  (43). According to Lemma 4, the actual closed-loop system satisfies  $\rho(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^k) < 1/(\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^k \alpha_i^m)$  for  $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Obviously, a larger  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  can either find the stabilizing control gain faster or make the closed-loop system spectral radius smaller. Since (44)  $\subseteq$  (43), the  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  obtained by using Scheme 1 in each iteration is greater.

#### D. Stabilizing PI-based data-driven COOT Algorithm 1

After closed-loop stabilizing control gain  $\tilde{K}_i^{k+1}$  is obtained by model-free modified PI and  $\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^{k+1} \alpha_i^m \geq 1$ , if let  $K_i^j = \tilde{K}_i^{k+1}$  be the stabilizing control gain with  $j = 0$  and always set  $\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^{k+1} \alpha_i^m = 1$ , then Lemma 4 degenerates into Lemma 3. According to (36), for sufficiently large  $t_0$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$  and  $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \phi_{il}^j [\text{vecs}(P_i^j)^T, \text{vec}(L_{1,i}^j)^T, \text{vecs}(L_{2,i}^j)^T, \text{vec}(L_{3,il}^j)^T, \\ & \text{vec}(L_{4,il}^j)^T, \text{vecs}(L_{5,il}^j)^T]^T = \psi_{il}^j, \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{il}^j &= [\theta_{\tilde{x}_{il}}, -2\Gamma_{\tilde{x}\tilde{x}_{il}}(I_{n_i} \otimes K_i^{jT}) - 2\Gamma_{u_i \tilde{x}_{il}}, \Gamma_{j\tilde{x}_{il}} \\ & \quad - \Gamma_{u_i}, -2\Gamma_{\zeta_i \tilde{x}_{il}}, -2\Gamma_{\zeta_i u_i}, -\Gamma_{\zeta_i}] \\ L_{1,i}^j &= A_i^T P_i^j B_i, \quad L_{2,i}^j = B_i^T P_i^j B_i, \quad L_{3,il}^j = A_i^T P_i^j \pi_{il}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
L_{4,il}^j &= B_i^T P_i^j \pi_{il}, & L_{5,il}^j &= \pi_{il}^T P_i^j \pi_{il}, \\
\psi_{il}^j &= \Gamma \tilde{x}_{il} \text{vecs}(-Q_i - K_i^{jT} R_i K_i^j), \\
\Gamma_{j\tilde{x}_{il}} &= [\text{vecv}(K_i^j \tilde{x}_{il}(t_0)), \dots, \text{vecv}(K_i^j \tilde{x}_{il}(t_f))]^T.
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

If (37) is satisfied, (48) can be uniquely solved by

$$\begin{aligned}
&[\text{vecs}(P_i^j)^T, \text{vec}(L_{1,i}^j)^T, \text{vecs}(L_{2,i}^j)^T, \text{vec}(L_{3,il}^j)^T, \\
&\text{vec}(L_{4,il}^j)^T, \text{vecs}(L_{5,il}^j)^T]^T = (\phi_{il}^{jT} \phi_{il}^j)^{-1} \phi_{il}^{jT} \psi_{il}^j,
\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

Then, the control gain can be updated by

$$K_i^{j+1} = (R_i + L_{2,i}^j)^{-1} L_{1,i}^j. \tag{50}$$

Based on (49), let  $M_i = A_i^T P_i^j$  in (18). Note that  $\pi_{il} = -\Upsilon_i(X_{il})$ . Since  $\Upsilon_i(X_{il}) = X_{il}E - A_i X_{il} = -\pi_{il}$ , there is  $\tilde{\Upsilon}_i(X_{il}, U_{il}) = -\pi_{il} - B_i U_{il}$ . Therefore, we have  $M_i \tilde{\Upsilon}_i(X_{il}, U_{il}) = -A_i^T P_i^j \pi_{il} - A_i^T P_i^j B_i U_{il} = -L_{3,il}^j - L_{1,i}^j U_{il}$ . The  $\Omega_i$  and  $\hat{\eta}_i$  in (19b) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega_i &= \\
&\begin{bmatrix} \text{vec}(-L_{3,il}^j - L_{1,i}^j U_{il}) & \dots & \text{vec}(-L_{3,ih_i}^j - L_{1,i}^j U_{ih_i}) & 0 \\ \text{vec}([X_{i2}^T, U_{i2}^T]^T) & \dots & \text{vec}([X_{ih_i}^T, U_{ih_i}^T]^T) & -I \end{bmatrix}, \\
\hat{\eta}_i &= \begin{bmatrix} \text{vec}(L_{3,il}^j + L_{1,i}^j \hat{U}_{il}) \\ -\text{vec}([\hat{X}_{il}^T, \hat{U}_{il}^T]^T) \end{bmatrix}.
\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

Finally, the overall stabilizing off-policy data-driven online COOT algorithm can be summarized as in Algorithm 1.

---

#### Algorithm 1 Stabilizing Off-Policy Iteration Algorithm

---

- 1: **Initialize:** Select arbitrary control policy  $\tilde{K}_i^0$ , sufficiently small positive constants  $\varepsilon_{i,1}$ ,  $\varepsilon_{i,2}$  and  $\alpha_i^0$ , a monotonic sequence  $\{\tilde{\beta}_i^z\}$  satisfying  $\tilde{\beta}_i^z < \tilde{\beta}_i^{z+1}$  and  $\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\beta}_i^z = 0$  for  $\forall z \in \mathbb{N}$ . Design  $u_i(t) = -\tilde{K}_i^0 x_i(t) + n_i(t)$  as the input signal on  $[0, t_f]$ , where  $n_i(t)$  is the exploration noise. Set  $k \leftarrow 0$ ,  $z \leftarrow 0$ ,  $l \leftarrow 0$ ,  $j \leftarrow 0$ ,  $\tilde{\beta}_i \leftarrow \tilde{\beta}_i^0$ .
  - 2: **Pre-collection:** Set a larger  $t_0$ . By using (3), (16) and  $F_i(t_0)$ ,  $\tilde{X}_{i1}$  and  $\tilde{U}_{i1}$  are obtained.
  - 3: **Data-collection:** Collect data on the time interval  $[t_0, t_f]$  until (37) is satisfied.
  - 4: **Online iteration:** (Steps 5-12)
  - 5: If  $\tilde{P}_i^0 \leq 0$  from (38), then  $z \leftarrow z + 1$ ,  $\tilde{\beta}_i \leftarrow \tilde{\beta}_i^z$  and calculate  $\tilde{P}_i^0$  by (38), otherwise output  $\tilde{\beta}_i \leftarrow \tilde{\beta}_i^z$  and go to the next step;
  - 6: Solve  $\tilde{P}_i^k$ ,  $\tilde{L}_{1,i}^k$  and  $\tilde{L}_{2,i}^k$  by (38), update  $\tilde{K}_i^{k+1}$  by (39);
  - 7: Choose  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  by Scheme 1 or Scheme 2. If  $\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^{k+1} \alpha_i^m \geq 1$ , let  $K_i^0 \leftarrow \tilde{K}_i^{k+1}$  and go to the next step; Otherwise  $k \leftarrow k + 1$  and go to step 6;
  - 8: Solve  $P_i^j$ ,  $L_{1,i}^j$  and  $L_{2,i}^j$  by (47), then update control policy  $K_i^{j+1}$  by (49);
  - 9: If  $\|P_i^j - P_i^{j-1}\| \leq \varepsilon_{i,1}$ , go to the next step; Otherwise  $j \leftarrow j + 1$  and go to step 8;
  - 10: Solve (47) to obtain  $\Omega_i$  and  $\hat{\eta}_i$  by (51);
  - 11: Determine parameter  $0 < \kappa_i < 2/\rho(\Omega_i^T \Omega_i)$ ;
  - 12: Calculate  $\chi_i^n$  by (20) until  $\|\chi_i^{n+1} - \chi_i^n\| \leq \varepsilon_{i,2}$ .
  - 13: **Optimal control phase:** The learned optimal feedback gain  $\hat{K}_i^*$  and feedforward gain  $\hat{T}_i^*$  are given as  $\hat{K}_i^* = K_i^{j+1}$  and  $\hat{T}_i^* = U_i + \hat{K}_i^* X_i$ , respectively.
- 

*Theorem 4:* Under Assumptions 1-4, consider the distributed observer (3) and DT system (1)-(2). For  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , let the adaptive feedforward-feedback controller as  $u_i(t) = -\hat{K}_i^* x_i(t) + \hat{T}_i^* \zeta_i(t)$ , where  $\hat{K}_i^*$  and  $\hat{T}_i^*$  are the learned optimal gains by Algorithm 1. Then, the COOT problem is solved.

*Proof.* We first show that  $K_i^{j+1}$  and  $\chi_i^n$  converge to ideal values. Based on Lemma 1 and Theorem 2, if  $t_0$  in Algorithm 1 is sufficiently large,  $\chi_i^n$  converges to the solution of (19a), thus the solution  $(X_i, U_i)$  to (6) is obtained. Similar to [14, Theorem 2], [32], if  $t_0$  in Algorithm 1 is sufficiently large, the solution of (36) converges to the solution of (34). If (37) is satisfied, then (36) can be uniquely solved by (38). Then, (38) is equivalent to (26). This implies that (39) is equivalent to (27). By Theorem 3, updating  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  by using Scheme 1 and Scheme 2 must satisfy (28). Thus, steps 5-7 of Algorithm 1 are equivalent to Lemma 4 and  $\tilde{K}_i^{k+1}$  is a stabilizing control gain. Letting  $K_i^0 = \tilde{K}_i^{k+1}$  clearly satisfies the initial condition of Lemma 3. If  $t_0$  in Algorithm 1 is sufficiently large and (37) is satisfied, (49) is equivalent to (13), then  $K_i^{j+1}$  from (50) converges to the optimal control gain  $K_i^*$  and  $P_i^j$  converges to the optimal solution  $P_i^*$ . Therefore, the learned optimal gains  $\hat{K}_i^*$  and  $\hat{T}_i^*$  by Algorithm 1 converge to the optimum, respectively. Since  $A_i - B_i \hat{K}_i^*$  is Schur and  $\hat{T}_i^*$  satisfies (5)-(6), by Theorem 1 one gets  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e_i(t) = 0$ . Thus, the COOT problem is solved. The proof is completed.  $\square$

## V. Q-LEARNING ALGORITHM BASED ON STABILIZING PI

In this section, we extend Lemma 3 and Lemma 4 to design another model-free algorithm based on Q-learning.

### A. Q-learning establishment and stabilizing policy computation

For  $i = 1, \dots, N$  and  $l = 0, 2, 3, \dots, h_i$ , define  $\tilde{u}_{il}(t) = u_i(t) - U_{il} \zeta_i(t)$  and  $\tilde{u}_{i1}(t) = u_i(t) - \tilde{U}_{i1} \zeta_i(t)$ . We construct a virtual system as

$$\tilde{\xi}_{il}(t+1) = (\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^k \alpha_i^m) \tilde{x}_{il}(t+1), \tag{52}$$

where  $\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^k \alpha_i^m$  is defined as  $\gamma_i^k$ . The value functions associated with system (52) are

$$\tilde{V}_{il}(\tilde{x}_{il}(t)) = \tilde{x}_{il}^T(t) \tilde{P}_i \tilde{x}_{il}(t), \tag{53a}$$

$$\tilde{V}_{il}(\tilde{\xi}_{il}(t+1)) = \tilde{\xi}_{il}^T(t+1) \tilde{P}_i \tilde{\xi}_{il}(t+1), \tag{53b}$$

where  $\tilde{P}_i = \tilde{P}_i^T > 0$ . Then, the following Bellman equation can be obtained as

$$\tilde{V}_{il}(\tilde{x}_{il}(t)) = \tilde{x}_{il}^T(t) Q_i \tilde{x}_{il}(t) + \tilde{u}_{il}^T(t) R_i \tilde{u}_{il}(t) + \tilde{V}_{il}(\tilde{\xi}_{il}(t+1)). \tag{54}$$

Define the DT Q-function as  $\tilde{Q}_{il}(\tilde{x}_{il}(t), \tilde{u}_{il}(t)) = \tilde{V}_{il}(\tilde{x}_{il}(t))$ . According to (54), one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{Q}_{il}(\tilde{x}_{il}(t), \tilde{u}_{il}(t)) &= \tilde{x}_{il}^T(t) Q_i \tilde{x}_{il}(t) + \tilde{u}_{il}^T(t) R_i \tilde{u}_{il}(t) \\
&\quad + \tilde{V}_{il}(\tilde{\xi}_{il}(t+1)).
\end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

By defining  $Z_{il}(t) = [\tilde{x}_{il}^T(t), \tilde{u}_{il}^T(t)]^T$  and using (52)-(55), one has

$$\tilde{Q}_{il}(\tilde{x}_{il}(t), \tilde{u}_{il}(t)) = \tilde{x}_{il}^T(t) Q_i \tilde{x}_{il}(t) + \tilde{u}_{il}^T(t) R_i \tilde{u}_{il}(t)$$



$$\begin{aligned}
& + (\gamma_i^k)^2 \tilde{x}_{il}^T(t+1) \tilde{P}_i \tilde{x}_{il}(t+1) \\
& = Z_{il}^T(t) \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{H}_{i,11} & \tilde{H}_{i,12} \\ \tilde{H}_{i,21} & \tilde{H}_{i,22} \end{bmatrix}}_{:=\tilde{H}_i} Z_{il}(t), \quad (56)
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{H}_i^T = \tilde{H}_i$ ,  $\tilde{H}_{i,11} = (\gamma_i^k)^2 A_i^T \tilde{P}_i A_i + Q_i$ ,  $\tilde{H}_{i,12} = (\gamma_i^k)^2 A_i^T \tilde{P}_i B_i$ ,  $\tilde{H}_{i,22} = (\gamma_i^k)^2 B_i^T \tilde{P}_i B_i + R_i$ . The Bellman equation (54) is rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_{il}^T(t) \tilde{H}_i Z_{il}(t) & = \tilde{x}_{il}^T(t) Q_i \tilde{x}_{il}(t) + \tilde{u}_{il}^T(t) R_i \tilde{u}_{il}(t) \\
& + Z_{il}^T(t+1) \tilde{H}_i Z_{il}(t+1). \quad (57)
\end{aligned}$$

According to [20], [27], the optimal control under  $(X_{il}, U_{il})$  is derived by  $\partial \tilde{Q}_{il}(\tilde{x}_{il}(t), \tilde{u}_{il}(t)) / \partial \tilde{u}_{il} = 0$ . Then, there is

$$\tilde{u}_{il}(t) = -(\tilde{H}_{i,22})^{-1} \tilde{H}_{i,21} \tilde{x}_{il}(t) = -\tilde{K}_i \tilde{x}_{il}(t), \quad (58)$$

where  $\tilde{H}_{i,21} = \tilde{H}_{i,12}^T$ . Clearly, solving  $\tilde{K}_i$  and  $\tilde{P}_i$  is independent of the  $l$ . That is, we can obtain  $\tilde{K}_i$  and  $\tilde{P}_i$  by being in the case  $(X_{i0}, U_{i0})$ . For  $l = 0$ , using  $\tilde{u}_{i0}(t+1) = -\tilde{K}_i \tilde{x}_{i0}(t+1)$  in (58), we establish the following simplified Lyapunov equation for  $Q$ -learning as

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_{i0}^T(t) \tilde{H}_i Z_{i0}(t) & = Z_{i0}^T(t) Q_{Ri} Z_{i0}(t) \\
& + (\gamma_i^k)^2 \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x}_{i0}(t+1) \\ \tilde{K}_i \tilde{x}_{i0}(t+1) \end{bmatrix}^T \tilde{H}_i \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x}_{i0}(t+1) \\ \tilde{K}_i \tilde{x}_{i0}(t+1) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (59)
\end{aligned}$$

where  $Q_{Ri} = \begin{bmatrix} Q_i & 0 \\ 0 & R_i \end{bmatrix}$ . By defining  $\Pi_i = \gamma_i^k \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_i} \\ -\tilde{K}_i \end{bmatrix} [A_i \ B_i]$  and using  $\tilde{x}_{i0}(t+1) = A_i \tilde{x}_{i0}(t) + B_i \tilde{u}_{i0}(t)$ , one has that (59) is equivalent to the Lyapunov equation as

$$\tilde{H}_i = Q_{Ri} + \Pi_i^T \tilde{H}_i \Pi_i, \quad (60)$$

and  $\tilde{P}_i = [I_{n_i}, -\tilde{K}_i^T] \tilde{H}_i [I_{n_i}, -\tilde{K}_i^T]^T$ .

**Lemma 6:** For  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , system  $\gamma_i^k (A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i)$  is stable if and only if there exists a unique positive definite solution  $\tilde{H}_i$  to Lyapunov equation (60).

*Proof.* This proof can be obtained by expanding [20, Lemma 4] to system  $\gamma_i^k (A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ .  $\square$

According to (58), (59) and Lemma 6, the following stabilizing  $Q$ -learning iteration is established.

---

### Iteration 1. Stabilizing PI-based $Q$ -learning

---

1. **Policy evaluation:** Given arbitrary  $\tilde{K}_i^0$ , the appropriate positive constants  $\alpha_i^0$  and  $\tilde{\beta}_i$ . For  $k = 0, 1, \dots$  and  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , solve  $\tilde{H}_i^k$  by

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_{i0}^T(t) \tilde{H}_i^k Z_{i0}(t) & = Z_{i0}^T(t) Q_{Ri} Z_{i0}(t) + (\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^k \alpha_i^m)^2 \\
& \times \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x}_{i0}(t+1) \\ -\tilde{K}_i^k \tilde{x}_{i0}(t+1) \end{bmatrix}^T \tilde{H}_i^k \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x}_{i0}(t+1) \\ -\tilde{K}_i^k \tilde{x}_{i0}(t+1) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (61)
\end{aligned}$$

2. **Policy improvement:** Update control policy by

$$\tilde{K}_i^{k+1} = (\tilde{H}_{i,22}^k)^{-1} \tilde{H}_{i,21}^k. \quad (62)$$

3. **Update  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  and  $\tilde{P}_i^k$ :** Update  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  by (28) and update

$\tilde{P}_i^k$  by

$$\tilde{P}_i^k = [I_{n_i}, (-\tilde{K}_i^k)^T] \tilde{H}_i^k [I_{n_i}, (-\tilde{K}_i^k)^T]^T. \quad (63)$$

Then, there are: 1).  $\rho(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^{k+1}) < 1 / (\beta_i + \sum_{m=0}^{k+1} \alpha_i^m)$ ; 2). if  $\alpha_i^k$  is bounded,  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  is also bounded.

Define  $z_{i0}^k(t+1) = [\tilde{x}_{i0}(t+1)^T, (\tilde{K}_i^k \tilde{x}_{i0}(t+1))^T]^T$  and collect data on  $[t_0, t_f]$  to obtain the following matrices as

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_{Z_{i0}} & = [\text{vecv}(Z_{i0}(t_0)), \text{vecv}(Z_{i0}(t_1)), \dots, \text{vecv}(Z_{i0}(t_f))]^T, \\
\Gamma_{z_{i0}^k} & = [\text{vecv}(z_{i0}^k(t_0+1)), \dots, \text{vecv}(z_{i0}^k(t_f+1))]^T.
\end{aligned}$$

According to (61), we have

$$\tilde{\Xi}_i^k \text{vecs}(\tilde{H}_i^k) = \tilde{\varphi}_i^k, \quad (64)$$

where  $\tilde{\Xi}_i^k = \Gamma_{Z_{i0}} - (\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^k \alpha_i^m)^2 \Gamma_{z_{i0}^k}$  and  $\tilde{\varphi}_i^k = \Gamma_{Z_{i0}} \text{vecs}(Q_{Ri})$ . Similar to Lemma 5, if the collected data satisfy

$$\text{rank}(\Gamma_{Z_{i0}}) = (n_i + m_i)(n_i + m_i + 1)/2, \quad (65)$$

the matrix  $\tilde{\Xi}_i^k$  has full column-rank. Then, for  $k = 0, 1, \dots$ , (64) can be solved by

$$\text{vecs}(\tilde{H}_i^k) = (\tilde{\Xi}_i^{kT} \tilde{\Xi}_i^k)^{-1} \tilde{\Xi}_i^{kT} \tilde{\varphi}_i^k. \quad (66)$$

### B. Determine $\tilde{\beta}_i$ and $\alpha_i^{k+1}$ by $Q$ -learning.

It follows from Lemma 6 that if the solution  $\tilde{H}_i^k$  to (61) is positive definite, then the system  $(\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^k \alpha_i^m)(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^k)$  is stable. Based on this conclusion, the coefficient  $\tilde{\beta}_i + \alpha_i^0$  can be determined by the following iteration.

**Initialize** a sufficiently small constant  $\alpha_i^0 > 0$  and a monotonic sequence  $\{\tilde{\beta}_i^z\}$  satisfying  $0 < \tilde{\beta}_i^{z+1} < \tilde{\beta}_i^z$  and  $\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\beta}_i^z = 0$  for  $\forall z \in \mathbb{N}$ . Set  $z \leftarrow 0$  and  $\tilde{\beta}_i \leftarrow \tilde{\beta}_i^0$ , **repeat**: 1). **if**  $\tilde{H}_i^0 \leq 0$  from (66), **then**  $z \leftarrow z + 1$ ,  $\tilde{\beta}_i \leftarrow \tilde{\beta}_i^z$  and calculate  $\tilde{H}_i^0$  by (66); **else end**; 2). **output**  $\tilde{\beta}_i \leftarrow \tilde{\beta}_i^z$  and  $\alpha_i^0$ .

We design three schemes for choosing  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$ , all of which ensure stability at each iteration step. It is first necessary to prove the equivalence of Stabilizing PI-based  $Q$ -learning and Lemma 4. Similar to Iteration 1, the following PI-based  $Q$ -learning iteration 2 is designed.

---

### Iteration 2. PI-based $Q$ -learning

---

1. **Policy evaluation:** Given a initial stabilizing policy  $K_i^0$  such that  $\rho(A_i - B_i K_i^0) < 1$ . For  $j = 0, 1, \dots$  and  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , solve  $H_i^j$  by

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_{i0}^T(t) H_i^j Z_{i0}(t) & = Z_{i0}^T(t) Q_{Ri} Z_{i0}(t) + \\
& \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x}_{i0}(t+1) \\ -K_i^j \tilde{x}_{i0}(t+1) \end{bmatrix}^T H_i^j \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x}_{i0}(t+1) \\ -K_i^j \tilde{x}_{i0}(t+1) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (67)
\end{aligned}$$

2. **Policy improvement:** Update control policy by

$$K_i^{j+1} = (H_{i,22}^j)^{-1} H_{i,21}^j. \quad (68)$$

Then, there are: 1).  $P_i^j = [I_{n_i}, (-K_i^j)^T] H_i^j [I_{n_i}, (-K_i^j)^T]^T$ ; 2).  $\rho(A_i - B_i K_i^{j+1}) < 1$ ; 3).  $H_i^* \leq H_i^j \leq H_i^{j+1}$ ,  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} H_i^j = H_i^*$  and  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} K_i^j = K_i^*$ .

**Lemma 7:** Stabilizing PI-based  $Q$ -learning iteration 1 is equivalent to the stabilizing PI algorithm in Lemma 4, and

PI-based  $Q$ -learning iteration 2 is equivalent to the traditional PI algorithm in Lemma 3.

*Proof.* Solving (61) is equivalent to solving  $\tilde{H}_i^k = Q_{Ri} + \Pi_i^{kT} \tilde{H}_i^k \Pi_i^k$ , where  $\Pi_i^k = \gamma_i^k [I_{n_i}, (-\tilde{K}_i^k)^T]^T [A_i, B_i]$ . They are further equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}_i^k &= Q_{Ri} + \\ (\gamma_i^k)^2 &\begin{bmatrix} A_i & B_i \\ -\tilde{K}_i^k A_i & -\tilde{K}_i^k B_i \end{bmatrix}^T \tilde{H}_i^k \begin{bmatrix} A_i & B_i \\ -\tilde{K}_i^k A_i & -\tilde{K}_i^k B_i \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

Recalling the form of  $\tilde{H}_i^k$  and substituting (62) and (69) into (63) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{P}_i^k &= (\gamma_i^k)^2 (A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^k)^T \tilde{P}_i^k (A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^k) \\ &+ Q_i + (\tilde{K}_i^k)^T R_i \tilde{K}_i^k \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

which is (26). Since (62) is equivalent to (27), Iteration 1 is equivalent to the algorithm in Lemma 4. The proof that Iteration 2 is equivalent to Lemma 3 is analogous and therefore is omitted here. Then, we have  $\rho(A_i - B_i K_i^{j+1}) < 1$  and  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} K_i^j = K_i^*$ . Moreover, by using Lemma 6 under  $\gamma_i^k = 1$ , (67) and (68), we have  $H_i^* \leq H_i^j \leq H_i^{j+1}$  and  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} H_i^j = H_i^*$ .  $\square$

Based on Lemma 7 and Section IV-C, we propose the following three schemes for choosing  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$ .

**Scheme A.** (*Solution  $\tilde{P}_i^k$ -based method.*) Since Iteration 1 is equivalent to Lemma 4 and the solution  $\tilde{P}_i^k$  can be obtained by Iteration 1, we can update  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  by (44).

According to Lemma 6, updating  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  by (28) and the problem in (40) is equivalent to solving the problem as

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{solve } \alpha_i^{k+1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \\ &\text{s.t. } \begin{cases} \alpha_i^{k+1} > 0 \\ (\Pi_i^{k+1})^T \tilde{\Theta}_i^{k+1} \Pi_i^{k+1} - \tilde{\Theta}_i^{k+1} < 0, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

where  $\Pi_i^{k+1}$  is defined in Lemma 7,  $\tilde{\Theta}_i^{k+1}$  is an unknown positive definite matrix and exists. The problem in (71) can be solved by the following two schemes.

**Scheme B.** (*Pseudo-solution based method.*) Solve  $\hat{H}_i^{k+1}$  by

$$\hat{H}_i^{k+1} = Q_{Ri} + (\Pi_{\tilde{K}_i^{k+1}}^k)^T \hat{H}_i^{k+1} \Pi_{\tilde{K}_i^{k+1}}^k, \quad (72)$$

where  $\hat{H}_i^{k+1}$  is named as the *pseudo-solution* and  $\Pi_{\tilde{K}_i^{k+1}}^k = \gamma_i^k [I_{n_i}, (-\tilde{K}_i^{k+1})^T]^T [A_i, B_i]$ . If (65) is satisfied, (72) can be uniquely solved by

$$\text{vecs}(\hat{H}_i^{k+1}) = (\hat{\Xi}_i^k)^{-1} \hat{\Xi}_i^k \hat{\varphi}_i^k, \quad (73)$$

where  $\hat{\Xi}_i^k = \Gamma_{Z_{i0}} - (\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^k \alpha_i^m)^2 \Gamma_{z_{i0}^{k+1}}$  and  $\hat{\varphi}_i^k = \Gamma_{Z_{i0}} \text{vecs}(Q_{Ri})$ . Finally, we update  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  by

$$0 < \alpha_i^{k+1} < \gamma_i^k \left( \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{\min}(Q_{Ri})}{\sigma_{\max}(\hat{H}_i^{k+1} - Q_{Ri})}} + 1 - 1 \right). \quad (74)$$

**Scheme C.** (*Monotonicity-based method.*) By using the monotonicity  $0 < \hat{H}_i^{k+1} \leq \tilde{H}_i^k$ , we update  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  by

$$0 < \alpha_i^{k+1} < \gamma_i^k \left( \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{\min}(Q_{Ri})}{\sigma_{\max}(\tilde{H}_i^k - Q_{Ri})}} + 1 - 1 \right). \quad (75)$$

**Theorem 5:** For  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , given the control gain  $\tilde{K}_i^{k+1}$  by (27). Then, one has that: 1). updating  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  by (28) is equivalent to solving the problem in (71); 2). the  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  satisfies (40) if update  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  by Scheme A, Scheme B and Scheme C.

*Proof.* Proof of conclusion 1). (*Sufficiency.*) According to Lemma 6, satisfying (71) implies that  $\rho(\tilde{A}_i^{k+1}) < 1$  and  $\alpha_i^{k+1} > 0$ . Thus, there must exist the positive definite unique matrix  $\tilde{\Theta}_i^{k+1}$  satisfying  $(\Pi_i^{k+1})^T \tilde{\Theta}_i^{k+1} \Pi_i^{k+1} - \tilde{\Theta}_i^{k+1} < 0$ .

(*Necessity.*) The  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  obtained by solving the problem in (71) satisfies its constraints. It follows from (71) and Lemma 6 that  $\alpha_i^{k+1} > 0$  and  $\rho((\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^{k+1} \alpha_i^m)(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^{k+1})) < 1$ . Then, (28) can be derived.

2). Proof of Scheme A. It follows from Lemma 7 that Iteration 1 is equivalent to Lemma 4. It follows from conclusion 1) in Theorem 3 and Theorem 5 that the problem in (71) is equivalent to the problem in (40). Therefore, Scheme A is equivalent to Scheme 1.

Proof of Scheme B. According to Lemmas 3, 6 and 7, the  $\tilde{K}_i^{k+1}$  obtained from (27) is the stabilizing control gain of system  $\gamma_i^k (A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^{k+1})$ . There must exist the positive definite unique solution  $\hat{H}_i^{k+1}$  to (72). Then, one has

$$\begin{aligned} &(\Pi_i^{k+1})^T \hat{H}_i^{k+1} \Pi_i^{k+1} - \hat{H}_i^{k+1} \\ &\stackrel{(B1)}{=} ((\gamma_i^{k+1}/\gamma_i^k)^2 - 1)(\hat{H}_i^{k+1} - Q_{Ri}) - Q_{Ri} \quad (76) \\ &\stackrel{(B2)}{<} \sigma_{\min}(Q_{Ri}) I_{n_i} - Q_{Ri} < 0, \end{aligned}$$

where (B1) is obtained by (72) and (B2) is obtained by (74). Since the right-hand side of Eq. (B1) is a monotonically increasing function on the interval (74) with respect to  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$ , the choice of  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  within the interval (74) ensures that  $(\Pi_i^{k+1})^T \hat{H}_i^{k+1} \Pi_i^{k+1} - \hat{H}_i^{k+1} < 0$  holds. Clearly, (71) is satisfied, where  $\tilde{\Theta}_i^{k+1} = \hat{H}_i^{k+1}$ .

Proof of Scheme C. According to Lemmas 3 and 7, by viewing  $\gamma_i^k [A_i, B_i]$  as  $[A_i, B_i]$  in Iteration 2 and Lemma 3, we have  $0 < \hat{H}_i^{k+1} \leq \tilde{H}_i^k$ . Then, there is

$$\begin{aligned} &(\Pi_i^{k+1})^T \hat{H}_i^{k+1} \Pi_i^{k+1} - \hat{H}_i^{k+1} \\ &\stackrel{(B1)}{=} ((\gamma_i^{k+1}/\gamma_i^k)^2 - 1)(\hat{H}_i^{k+1} - Q_{Ri}) - Q_{Ri} \\ &\stackrel{(C1)}{\leq} ((\gamma_i^{k+1}/\gamma_i^k)^2 - 1)(\tilde{H}_i^k - Q_{Ri}) - Q_{Ri} \quad (77) \\ &\stackrel{(C2)}{<} \sigma_{\min}(Q_{Ri}) I_{n_i} - Q_{Ri} < 0, \end{aligned}$$

where (C1) is obtained by  $0 < \hat{H}_i^{k+1} \leq \tilde{H}_i^k$  and (C2) is obtained by (75). Similarly, any choice of  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  on interval (75) ensures the stability of system  $\tilde{A}_i^{k+1}$  for step  $k+1$ . Thus, (71) is satisfied.  $\square$

**Remark 7:** Lemma 6 is the basis for the design of Iteration 1 and Iteration 2, and a fundamental stability condition for the choice of  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$ . According to Lemma 6, the Lemma 7 can also be further obtained. Thus, a novel  $Q$ -learning framework (Iteration 1 and Iteration 2) different from [15], [16], [28], [30] is composed. Moreover, instead of re-collecting data and calculating  $\tilde{u}_{i0}(t) = -\tilde{K}_i^k \tilde{x}_{i0}(t)$  using the estimated  $\tilde{K}_i^k$  (or  $K_i^j$ ), the collected data are directly utilized in Iteration 1 (or 2) to quickly iterate  $\tilde{H}_i^k$  (or  $H_i^j$ ) and update  $\tilde{K}_i^{k+1}$  (or  $K_i^{j+1}$ ).

*Remark 8:* Note that since stabilizing PI-based  $Q$ -learning is equivalent to Lemma 4, the process of obtaining stabilizing control gains by using Iteration 1 with Scheme A should be the same as the results by using Algorithm 1 with Scheme 2. If the results are the same, it also verifies their equivalence. Similarly, Scheme C is obtained by further contracting from Scheme B. Thus, it is easy to obtain (75)  $\subseteq$  (74). However, it is unable to compare the relationship between Scheme A and Schemes B (or C), as the relationship is influenced by  $[I_{n_i}, (-\tilde{K}_i^k)^T]$ , see (44), (63), (74) and (75).

### C. Stabilizing PI-based $Q$ -learning COOT Algorithm 2

By using (64), (66) and Scheme A (or Scheme B or Scheme C), we obtain the stabilizing control gain  $\tilde{K}_i^{k+1}$ . Let  $K_i^0 = \tilde{K}_i^{k+1}$  be the initial stabilizing gain for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . If (65) is satisfied, for  $j = 0, 1, \dots$ , (67) can be solved by

$$\text{vecs}(H_i^j) = (\Xi_i^{jT} \Xi_i^j)^{-1} \Xi_i^{jT} \varphi_i^j, \quad (78)$$

where  $\Xi_i^j = \Gamma_{Z_{i0}} - \Gamma_{z_{i0}^j}$  and  $\varphi_i^j = \Gamma_{Z_{i0}} \text{vecs}(Q_{Ri})$  with  $z_{i0}^j(t+1) = [\tilde{x}_{i0}(t+1)^T, (K_i^j \tilde{x}_{i0}(t+1))^T]^T$ .

Based on  $H_i^j$  and  $K_i^{j+1}$  obtained from (78) and (68), we further solve (19b) for  $l = 1, \dots, h_i$ . According to Iteration 2 and  $P_i^j = [I_{n_i}, (-K_i^j)^T] H_i^j [I_{n_i}, (-K_i^j)^T]^T$ , we can get

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x}_{il}(t+1) \\ -K_i^j \tilde{x}_{il}(t+1) \end{bmatrix}^T H_i^j \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x}_{il}(t+1) \\ -K_i^j \tilde{x}_{il}(t+1) \end{bmatrix} \\ & - \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x}_{il}(t) \\ -K_i^j \tilde{x}_{il}(t) \end{bmatrix}^T H_i^j \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x}_{il}(t) \\ -K_i^j \tilde{x}_{il}(t) \end{bmatrix} \\ & = \tilde{x}_{il}^T(t+1) P_i^j \tilde{x}_{il}(t+1) - \tilde{x}_{il}^T(t) P_i^j \tilde{x}_{il}(t). \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

And (29) can be rewritten as

$$\tilde{x}_{il}(t+1) = A_i^j \tilde{x}_{il}(t) + B_i(K_i^j \tilde{x}_{il}(t) + u_i(t)) + \pi_{il} \zeta_i(t) + \varrho_{il}(t), \quad (80)$$

where  $A_i^j = A_i - B_i K_i^j$  and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \varrho_{il}(t) = 0$ . Then, if  $t_0$  is sufficiently large, by substituting (80) to  $\tilde{x}_{il}^T(t+1) P_i^j \tilde{x}_{il}(t+1) - \tilde{x}_{il}^T(t) P_i^j \tilde{x}_{il}(t)$  and using the data matrices in Section IV-A, we have

$$\Phi_{il} [\text{vec}^T(L_{3,il}^j), \text{vec}^T(L_{4,il}^j), \text{vecs}^T(L_{5,il}^j)]^T = \tilde{h}_{il}, \quad (81)$$

where  $\tilde{h}_{il} = \theta_{\tilde{x}_{il}} \text{vecs}(P_i^j) - (2\Gamma_{\tilde{x}_{il}}(I_{n_i} \otimes K_i^{jT}) + 2\Gamma_{u_i \tilde{x}_{il}}) \text{vec}(H_{i,12}^j) + (\Gamma_{\tilde{x}_{il}} - \Gamma_{u_i}) \text{vecs}(H_{i,22}^j - R_i) + \Gamma_{\tilde{x}_{il}} \text{vecs}(Q_i + K_i^{jT} R_i K_i^j)$  and  $\Phi_{il} = [2\Gamma_{\tilde{x}_{il}} \zeta_{i,il}, 2\Gamma_{\zeta_i u_i}, \Gamma_{\zeta_i}]$ . If the condition

$$\text{rank}([\Gamma_{\zeta_i \tilde{x}_{il}}, \Gamma_{\zeta_i u_i}, \Gamma_{\zeta_i}]) = (n_i + m_i) n_v + n_v (n_v + 1) / 2 \quad (82)$$

is satisfied for  $l = 1, 2, \dots, h_i$ , then (81) can be solved by

$$[\text{vec}^T(L_{3,il}^j), \text{vec}^T(L_{4,il}^j), \text{vecs}^T(L_{5,il}^j)]^T = (\Phi_{il}^T \Phi_{il})^{-1} \Phi_{il}^T \tilde{h}_{il}. \quad (83)$$

Based on (83), let  $M_i = A_i^T P_i^j$  in (18). We have  $M_i \tilde{Y}_i(X_{il}, U_{il}) = -A_i^T P_i^j \pi_{il} - A_i^T P_i^j B_i U_{il} = -L_{3,il}^j - H_{i,12}^j U_{il}$ . The  $\Omega_i$  and  $\hat{\eta}_i$  in (19b) can be rewritten as (51), where  $L_{1,i}^j$  is replaced by  $H_{i,12}^j$ .

Finally, the overall Algorithm 2 is given as follows.

*Theorem 6:* Under Assumptions 1-4, consider the distributed observer (3) and DT system (1)-(2). For  $i = 1, \dots, N$ ,

### Algorithm 2 Stabilizing $Q$ -learning COOT Algorithm 2

- 1: **Initiation:** Select arbitrary control policy  $\tilde{K}_i^0$ , sufficiently small positive constants  $\varepsilon_{i,1}$ ,  $\varepsilon_{i,2}$  and  $\alpha_i^0$ , a monotonic sequence  $\{\tilde{\beta}_i^z\}$  satisfying  $\tilde{\beta}_i^z < \tilde{\beta}_i^{z+1}$  and  $\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\beta}_i^z = 0$  for  $\forall z \in \mathbb{N}$ . Design  $u_i(t) = -\tilde{K}_i^0 x_i(t) + n_i(t)$  as the input signal on  $[0, t_f]$ , where  $n_i(t)$  is the exploration noise. Set  $k \leftarrow 0$ ,  $z \leftarrow 0$ ,  $l \leftarrow 0$ ,  $j \leftarrow 0$ ,  $\tilde{\beta}_i \leftarrow \tilde{\beta}_i^0$ .
- 2: **Pre-collection:** Set a larger  $t_0$ . By using (3), (16) and  $F_i(t_0)$ ,  $\hat{X}_{i1}$  and  $\hat{U}_{i1}$  are obtained.
- 3: **Data-collection:** Collect data on the time interval  $[t_0, t_f]$  until (65) and (82) are satisfied.
- 4: **Online iteration:** (Steps 5-12)
- 5: If  $\tilde{H}_i^0 \leq 0$  from (66), then  $z \leftarrow z + 1$ ,  $\tilde{\beta}_i \leftarrow \tilde{\beta}_i^z$  and calculate  $\tilde{H}_i^0 \leq 0$  by (66), otherwise output  $\tilde{\beta}_i \leftarrow \tilde{\beta}_i^z$  and go to the next step;
- 6: Solve  $\tilde{H}_i^k$  by (66), update  $\tilde{K}_i^{k+1}$  by (62);
- 7: Choose  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  by Scheme A (or Scheme B or Scheme C). If  $\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^{k+1} \alpha_i^m \geq 1$ , let  $K_i^0 \leftarrow \tilde{K}_i^{k+1}$  and go to the next step; Otherwise  $k \leftarrow k + 1$  and go to step 6;
- 8: Solve  $H_i^j$  by (78), update control policy  $K_i^{j+1}$  by (68);
- 9: If  $\|H_i^j - H_i^{j-1}\| \leq \varepsilon_{i,1}$ , go to the next step; Otherwise  $j \leftarrow j + 1$  and go to step 8;
- 10: Solve (83) for  $l = 1, 2, \dots, h_i$  to obtain  $\Omega_i$  and  $\hat{\eta}_i$ ;
- 11: Determine parameter  $0 < \kappa_i < 2/\rho(\Omega_i^T \Omega_i)$ ;
- 12: Calculate  $\chi_i^n$  by (20) until  $\|\chi_i^{n+1} - \chi_i^n\| \leq \varepsilon_{i,2}$ .
- 13: **Optimal control phase:** The learned optimal feedback gain  $\hat{K}_i^*$  and feedforward gain  $\hat{T}_i^*$  are given as  $\hat{K}_i^* = K_i^{j+1}$  and  $\hat{T}_i^* = U_i + \hat{K}_i^* X_i$ , respectively.

let the adaptive feedforward-feedback controller as  $u_i(t) = -\hat{K}_i^* x_i(t) + \hat{T}_i^* \zeta_i(t)$ , where  $\hat{K}_i^*$  and  $\hat{T}_i^*$  are the learned optimal gains by Algorithm 2. Then, the COOT problem is solved.

*Proof.* For  $i = 1, \dots, N$  and  $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , if (65) is satisfied, (64) can be solved by (66). It follows from Lemma 7 that the stabilizing  $Q$ -learning Iteration 1 is equivalent to Lemma 4. Therefore, choosing  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  by Scheme A satisfies (28). It follows from Theorem 5 that (28) is satisfied if and only if  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  satisfies (71). The  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  obtained from Schemes B and C are both satisfying (71), so they satisfy (28). Since (64) is equivalent to (61), the steps 5-7 in Algorithm 2 satisfy the stabilizing  $Q$ -learning Iteration 1. Then  $\tilde{K}_i^{k+1}$  is the stabilizing control gain of the system  $A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^{k+1}$ . Let  $K_i^0 = \tilde{K}_i^{k+1}$  be the stabilizing control gain, which satisfies the initial condition of Iteration 2. For  $j = 0, 1, \dots$ , if (65) is satisfied, (67) can be solved by (78). Then, the steps 8-9 in Algorithm 2 are equivalent to  $Q$ -learning Iteration 2. Therefore, we can obtain  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} H_i^j = H_i^*$  and  $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} K_i^j = K_i^*$  by Algorithm 2. If  $t_0$  is large enough and (82) is satisfied, (81) can be solved by (83). The  $\Omega_i$  and  $\hat{\eta}_i$  in (19b) can be obtained. By Theorem 2,  $\chi_i^n$  can converge to the solution of (19a) and thus  $(X_i, U_i)$  is obtained. Since  $\hat{K}_i^*$  converges to  $K_i^*$  and  $\hat{T}_i^*$  satisfies (5)-(6), by Theorem 1 then we have  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e_i(t) = 0$ . Thus, the COOT problem is solved. The proof is completed.  $\square$

*Theorem 7:* For the same system, the initial collection time  $t_0$  and exploration noise  $n_i(t)$ , the Algorithm 2 has less data that must be collected to satisfy the full column-rank condition

compared to the Algorithm 1.

*Proof.* Collecting data such that (37) is satisfied is the full column-rank condition for solving the COOT problem by Algorithm 1, and for convenience we define  $\mathcal{R}_{i,1} = \text{rank}([\Gamma_{\bar{x}\bar{x}_{ii}}, \Gamma_{u_i}, \Gamma_{\zeta_i}, \Gamma_{u_i\bar{x}_{ii}}, \Gamma_{\zeta_i\bar{x}_{ii}}, \Gamma_{\zeta_i u_i}]) = (n_i + m_i + n_v)(n_i + m_i + n_v + 1)/2$ . Collecting data such that (65) and (82) are satisfied is the full column-rank condition for solving the COOT problem by Algorithm 2. We define  $r_{i,1} = \text{rank}(\Gamma_{Z_{i0}}) = (n_i + m_i)(n_i + m_i + 1)/2$  and  $r_{i,2} = \text{rank}([\Gamma_{\zeta_i\bar{x}_{ii}}, \Gamma_{\zeta_i u_i}, \Gamma_{\zeta_i}]) = (n_i + m_i)n_v + n_v(n_v + 1)/2$ . Then, the rank that satisfies Algorithm 2 is  $\mathcal{R}_{i,2} = \max\{r_{i,1}, r_{i,2}\}$ . Since  $\mathcal{R}_{i,1} = r_{i,1} + r_{i,2}$ , it follows that  $\mathcal{R}_{i,1} > \mathcal{R}_{i,2}$ . If  $t_{f1}$  is defined as the time when condition (37) is satisfied and  $t_{f2}$  as the time when (65) and (82) are satisfied, then there is  $t_{f1} > t_{f2}$ .  $\square$

*Remark 9:* Theorem 7 shows that the  $Q$ -learning algorithm 2 requires less system data and has higher efficiency for the COOT problem of the same MASs. In addition, since  $\mathcal{R}_{i,1} = r_{i,1} + r_{i,2}$ , this advantage becomes more significant as the system size becomes larger. However, it is clear from Lemma 7 that Algorithm 1 is important for the building process of Algorithm 2, and together they form two novel frameworks for model-free stabilizing PI.

*Remark 10:* Note that Iterations 1 and 2 are different from the forms of traditional methods [15], [19], [28]. This novel form of policy evaluation corresponds to Lemma 6, which is the basis for establishing the equivalence relations in Lemma 7 and calculating  $\tilde{P}_i^k$  (or  $P_i^j$ ). Moreover, Iterations 1 and 2 and COOT Algorithm 2 are established by separating the process of solving the feedback solution from the solution to the regulator equations. By the above method, not only the  $Q$ -learning Algorithm 2 can be built, which is equivalent to Algorithm 1, but also the amount of necessary data is reduced.

*Remark 11:* It should be emphasized that Algorithms 1 and 2 can be further simplified if optimality is not pursued, i.e., steps 8-9 in Algorithms 1 and 2 can be omitted. Moreover, since  $\rho(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^{k+1}) < 1/(\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^{k+1} \alpha_i^m)$ , the spectral radius of the closed-loop system (8a) can be guaranteed to be less than  $1/\bar{\lambda}$  if  $\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^{k+1} \alpha_i^m \geq \bar{\lambda}$ , where  $\bar{\lambda} \geq 1$ . This ensures that the system is stabilized and the error converges at a specified rate. Based on Lemma 4, some stabilizing data-driven algorithms with prescribed convergence rate for systems of the form  $x(k+1) = Ax(k) + Bu(k)$  can be designed without requiring the initial stabilizing control policy. Due to space constraints, this is not analyzed further here.

## VI. SIMULATION

In this section, the proposed Algorithms 1 and 2 will be verified and analyzed. Consider the following DT MASs, where the leader system is

$$v(t+1) = \begin{bmatrix} \cos(0.3) & \sin(0.3) \\ -\sin(0.3) & \cos(0.3) \end{bmatrix} v(t), \quad y_a(t) = [1 \quad 0]v(t), \quad (84)$$

and the follower systems are represented as (1a) and (1b) with  $A_i = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & -0.2i \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $C_i = [1, 0]$  and  $S_i = I_{m_i}$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ ,  $B_{1,2} = [0, 1]^T$  and  $B_{3,4} = [1, 0]^T$ . Since

$\rho(A_i) \geq 1$ , all 4 followers are open-loop unstable. The MASs are 4 followers and 1 leader connected by the communication graph in Fig. 1. Set  $Q_i = I_2$  and  $R_i = 1$ . The initial states




Fig. 1. The communication graph.

are set to  $v(0) = [3, 3]^T$ ,  $x_i(0) = [5, -5]^T$ ,  $\zeta_i(0) = [0, 0]^T$ ,  $E_i(0) = \mathbf{0}_{2 \times 2}$  and  $F_i(0) = [0, 0]$ . For convenience, define  $\bar{\alpha}_{i1}^{k+1}$ ,  $\bar{\alpha}_{i2}^{k+1}$ ,  $\bar{\alpha}_{iA}^{k+1}$ ,  $\bar{\alpha}_{iB}^{k+1}$  and  $\bar{\alpha}_{iC}^{k+1}$  to be the upper bounds of  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  in Schemes 1, 2, A, B and C, respectively. Then, these selection schemes of  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  can be denoted as  $\alpha_i^{k+1} = a_i \bar{\alpha}_{i1}^{k+1}$ ,  $\alpha_i^{k+1} = a_i \bar{\alpha}_{i2}^{k+1}$ ,  $\alpha_i^{k+1} = a_i \bar{\alpha}_{iA}^{k+1}$ ,  $\alpha_i^{k+1} = a_i \bar{\alpha}_{iB}^{k+1}$  and  $\alpha_i^{k+1} = a_i \bar{\alpha}_{iC}^{k+1}$ , where  $a_i \in (0, 1)$  is the user-defined coefficient. In this section, we adjust  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  by setting  $a_i$ . When  $A_i$  and  $B_i$  are unknown, set  $\alpha_i^0 = 10^{-4}$  and the monotonically decreasing sequence  $\tilde{\beta}_i^z$  as  $\{0.5, 0.49, 0.48, \dots, 0.01\}$ . For both algorithms, the high-frequency exploration noises are set to  $n_i(t) = 0.1 \sin(16t) + 0.1 \cos(11t)$ , and the initial times for collecting data is set to  $t_0 = 85$ . We select  $\kappa_i = 1/\rho(\Omega_i^T \Omega_i)$ ,  $\varepsilon_{i,1} = 10^{-4}$  and  $\varepsilon_{i,2} = 10^{-4}$  in Algorithms 1 and 2.

### A. Verification and analysis of Algorithm 1

System data is collected from time  $t_0$  until condition (37) is satisfied. Based on the system dimensions, it is known that  $t_f = 100$ . Then, the iterative results of steps 5-7 in Algorithm 1 with Scheme 2 and  $a_i = 0.5$  are shown in Fig. 3(a), and when  $\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^{k+1} \alpha_i^m \geq 1$  is satisfied, the stabilizing control gains are obtained as  $\tilde{K}_1^5 = [-0.8246, -0.1326]$ ,  $\tilde{K}_2^5 = [-0.8186, -0.2630]$ ,  $\tilde{K}_3^5 = [-0.2456, 0.6164]$ ,  $\tilde{K}_4^5 = [-0.3115, 0.4778]$ , and the spectral radius are  $\rho(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^5) = 0.4188, 0.4260, 0.4861, 0.5225$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ . Lemma 4 is verified. Taking  $\tilde{K}_i^5$  as the stabilizing control gain  $K_i^0$ , the optimal control gain  $K_i^3$  and the optimal solution  $P_i^2$  are obtained by steps 8-9 of Algorithm 1, and the optimal error is shown in Fig. 4, where the average optimality error  $\sum_{i=1}^4 \|P_i^2 - P_i^*\|/4 = 1.9642 \times 10^{-6}$ . The two phases of Algorithm 1 undergo 5 + 2 step iterations. The convergence process of the approximate solution to the regulator equation (6) obtained by steps 10-12 of Algorithm 1 is shown in Fig. 5(a). Theorem 2 is verified. It is clear that both the feedforward gain  $\hat{T}_i^*$  and the feedback gain  $\hat{K}_i^*$  of the distributed controller  $u_i$  converge to the optimum. Finally, the controller is updated and we get the result as in Fig. 2(a). Algorithm 1 is verified.

### B. Verification and analysis of Algorithm 2

System data is collected from time  $t_0$  until conditions (65) and (82) are satisfied. It follows that  $t_f = 94$ . By using 5-7 steps of Algorithm 2 with Scheme A and  $a_i = 0.5$  until  $\tilde{\beta}_i + \sum_{m=0}^{k+1} \alpha_i^m \geq 1$ , the iterative result can be obtained as in Fig. 3(b). The stabilizing control gains are obtained as  $\tilde{K}_1^5 = [-0.8246, -0.1326]$ ,  $\tilde{K}_2^5 = [-0.8186, -0.2630]$ ,  $\tilde{K}_3^5 =$




Fig. 2. (a). The outputs of MASs obtained by using Algorithm 1; (b). The outputs of MASs obtained by using Algorithm 2.




Fig. 3. Verification of Lemmas 4 and 7: (a). The closed-loop system spectral radius  $\rho(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^k)$  obtained by using Algorithm 1 with Scheme 2, where  $a_i = 0.5$ ; (b).  $\rho(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^k)$  obtained by using Algorithm 2 with Scheme A, where  $a_i = 0.5$ .




Fig. 4. (a). Optimality error  $\|P_i^j - P_i^*\|$  obtained by using Algorithm 1; (b). optimal feedback policy error  $\|K_i^j - K_i^*\|$  obtained by using Algorithm 1.




Fig. 5. (a). The error  $\|\tilde{x}_i^n - \tilde{x}_i^*\|$  obtained by using Algorithm 1; (b). The error  $\|\tilde{x}_i^n - \tilde{x}_i^*\|$  obtained by using Algorithm 2, where  $\tilde{x}_i^n = \text{vec}([(X_i^n)^T, (U_i^n)^T]^T)$  and  $\tilde{x}_i^* = \text{vec}([(X_i^*)^T, (U_i^*)^T]^T)$ .




Fig. 6. (a). Optimality error  $\|H_i^j - H_i^*\|$  obtained by using Algorithm 2; (b). optimal feedback policy error  $\|K_i^j - K_i^*\|$  obtained by using Algorithm 2.




Fig. 7. (a).  $\rho(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^k)$  by Algorithm 1 with Scheme 1, where  $a_i = 0.9999$ ; (b). the upper bound difference  $\bar{\alpha}_{i1}^{k+1} - \bar{\alpha}_{i2}^{k+1}$  between Scheme 2 and Scheme 1 under  $a_i = 0.5$ .

$[-0.2456, 0.6164]$ ,  $\tilde{K}_4^5 = [-0.3115, 0.4778]$ , and the spectral radius are  $\rho(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^5) = 0.4188, 0.4260, 0.4861, 0.5225$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ . Note that the result is exactly the same as the result of Algorithm 1, see previous subsection. This also verifies the equivalence of  $Q$ -learning iteration 1 and Lemma 4, i.e., Lemma 7 is verified. Similarly, the optimal control gain  $K_i^3$  and the optimal solution  $H_i^2$  are obtained by steps 8-9 of Algorithm 2, and the optimal error is shown in Fig. 6, where the average optimality error  $\sum_{i=1}^4 \|H_i^2 - H_i^*\|/4 = 6.0560 \times 10^{-8}$ . Note that the iterations of  $H_i^j$  and  $P_i^j$  have the same trend but different results. The approximate solution to the regulator equation (6) obtained by steps 10-12 of Algorithm 2 is shown in Fig. 5(b). This is the same result as Algorithm 1. Finally, the output tracking result is obtained as in Fig. 2 (b). Comparing Fig. 2(b) and Fig. 2(a), it can be seen that Algorithm 2 collects data in less time and requires less data. Theorem 7 is verified.

### C. Verification of other schemes

Use other schemes in steps 5-7 of Algorithms 1 and 2 for validation. By using Algorithm 1 with Scheme 1 and  $a_i = 0.9999$ , the results were obtained as in Fig. 7(a). As can be seen in Fig. 7(a), Scheme 1 is also feasible. Note that Fig. 7(b), the relationship of Schemes 1 and 2 depicted in Remark 6 is determined by  $\bar{\alpha}_{i1}^{k+1} - \bar{\alpha}_{i2}^{k+1}$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$  under  $a_i = 0.5$ . Since  $\bar{\alpha}_{i1}^{k+1} - \bar{\alpha}_{i2}^{k+1}$  is always positive, it verifies that (44)  $\subseteq$  (43) (See Remark 6).

Similarly, by using Algorithm 2 with Scheme B and  $a_i = 0.9999$ , the results were obtained as in Fig. 8(a). As shown in




Fig. 8. (a).  $\rho(A_i - B_i \tilde{K}_i^k)$  by Algorithm 2 with Scheme B, where  $a_i = 0.9999$ ; (b). the upper bound difference  $\bar{\alpha}_{iB}^{k+1} - \bar{\alpha}_{iC}^{k+1}$  between Scheme B and Scheme C under  $a_i = 0.5$ .

the figure, Scheme B is also feasible. And in Fig. 8(b),  $\bar{\alpha}_{iB}^{k+1} - \bar{\alpha}_{iC}^{k+1}$  is always positive under  $a_i$ , which implies that (44)  $\subseteq$  (43) (See Remark 8). Therefore, Scheme C must be feasible and is not further verified due to space constraints.

*Remark 12:* In Sections VI-A and VI-B, the equivalence of Algorithm 1 with Scheme 2 and Algorithm 2 with Scheme A is verified. In Section VI-C, the other schemes and the inclusion relationships between them are verified. Note that because of the monotonicity of Eq.(a) in (45) and Eq.(B1) in (76) with respect to  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$ , (44)  $\subseteq$  (43) and (75)  $\subseteq$  (74), if Scheme 1 is feasible then Scheme 2 must be feasible, and if Scheme B is feasible then Scheme C must be feasible. Setting  $a_i = 0.9999$  is to verify that  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  is feasible in the entire intervals (43) and (74). Since a smaller  $\alpha_i^{k+1}$  results in more iterations, when verifying the inclusion relationship (the positivity and negativity of  $\bar{\alpha}_{i1}^{k+1} - \bar{\alpha}_{i2}^{k+1}$  and  $\bar{\alpha}_{iB}^{k+1} - \bar{\alpha}_{iC}^{k+1}$ ), setting  $a_i = 0.5$  is to show more iteration results.

## VII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we propose two model-free stabilizing COOT algorithms. First, a model-based modified PI algorithm was proposed for solving the stabilizing control gain of the closed-loop system with a prescribed spectral radius upper bound. Then, the model-based approach was expanded into two model-free versions, i.e., the off-policy iteration and the off-policy  $Q$ -learning. Moreover, we give a variety of iteration step size selection schemes that can guarantee iteration stability. Finally, the proposed algorithms and their corresponding theories are validated by simulation.

## REFERENCES

- [1] W. Ren and R. W. Beard, *Distributed consensus in multi-vehicle cooperative control*. Springer, 2008, vol. 27, no. 2.
- [2] C. Chen, L. Xie, K. Xie, F. L. Lewis, and S. Xie, "Adaptive optimal output tracking of continuous-time systems via output-feedback-based reinforcement learning," *Automatica*, vol. 146, p. 110581, 2022.
- [3] W. Gao, Z.-P. Jiang, F. L. Lewis, and Y. Wang, "Leader-to-formation stability of multiagent systems: An adaptive optimal control approach," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 63, no. 10, pp. 3581–3587, 2018.
- [4] R. Gao and G.-H. Yang, "Resilient cluster consensus for discrete-time high-order multi-agent systems against malicious adversaries," *Automatica*, vol. 159, p. 111382, 2024.
- [5] J. Huang, "The cooperative output regulation problem of discrete-time linear multi-agent systems by the adaptive distributed observer," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, no. 4, pp. 1979–1984, 2016.

- [6] T. Liu and J. Huang, "Adaptive cooperative output regulation of discrete-time linear multi-agent systems by a distributed feedback control law," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 63, no. 12, pp. 4383–4390, 2018.
- [7] Z. Feng, G. Hu, X. Dong, and J. Lü, "Discrete-time adaptive distributed output observer for time-varying formation tracking of heterogeneous multi-agent systems," *Automatica*, vol. 160, p. 111400, 2024.
- [8] F. L. Lewis, D. Vrabie, and V. L. Syrmos, *Optimal control*. John Wiley & Sons, 2012.
- [9] D. Vrabie, K. G. Vamvoudakis, and F. L. Lewis, "Optimal adaptive control and differential games by reinforcement learning principles," (*No Title*), 2012.
- [10] F. L. Lewis and K. G. Vamvoudakis, "Reinforcement learning for partially observable dynamic processes: Adaptive dynamic programming using measured output data," *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part B (Cybernetics)*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 14–25, 2010.
- [11] W. B. Powell, *Approximate Dynamic Programming: Solving the curses of dimensionality*. John Wiley & Sons, 2007, vol. 703.
- [12] P. A. Ioannou and J. Sun, *Robust adaptive control*. Courier Corporation, 2012.
- [13] G. Hewer, "An iterative technique for the computation of the steady state gains for the discrete optimal regulator," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 382–384, 1971.
- [14] C. Chen, L. Xie, Y. Jiang, K. Xie, and S. Xie, "Robust output regulation and reinforcement learning-based output tracking design for unknown linear discrete-time systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 4, pp. 2391–2398, 2022.
- [15] B. Kiumarsi, F. L. Lewis, H. Modares, A. Karimpour, and M.-B. Naghibi-Sistani, "Reinforcement  $q$ -learning for optimal tracking control of linear discrete-time systems with unknown dynamics," *Automatica*, vol. 50, no. 4, pp. 1167–1175, 2014.
- [16] B. Kiumarsi, F. L. Lewis, M.-B. Naghibi-Sistani, and A. Karimpour, "Optimal tracking control of unknown discrete-time linear systems using input-output measured data," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 45, no. 12, pp. 2770–2779, 2015.
- [17] W. Gao and Z.-P. Jiang, "Adaptive dynamic programming and adaptive optimal output regulation of linear systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 61, no. 12, pp. 4164–4169, 2016.
- [18] Y. Jiang, B. Kiumarsi, J. Fan, T. Chai, J. Li, and F. L. Lewis, "Optimal output regulation of linear discrete-time systems with unknown dynamics using reinforcement learning," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 50, no. 7, pp. 3147–3156, 2019.
- [19] B. Luo, Y. Yang, and D. Liu, "Policy iteration  $q$ -learning for data-based two-player zero-sum game of linear discrete-time systems," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 51, no. 7, pp. 3630–3640, 2020.
- [20] D. Li and J. Dong, "Data-based efficient off-policy stabilizing optimal control algorithms for discrete-time linear systems via damping coefficients," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.20845*, 2024.
- [21] B. Luo, Y. Yang, H.-N. Wu, and T. Huang, "Balancing value iteration and policy iteration for discrete-time control," *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, vol. 50, no. 11, pp. 3948–3958, 2019.
- [22] A. Lamperski, "Computing stabilizing linear controllers via policy iteration," in *2020 59th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1902–1907.
- [23] C. Chen, F. L. Lewis, and B. Li, "Homotopic policy iteration-based learning design for unknown linear continuous-time systems," *Automatica*, vol. 138, p. 110153, 2022.
- [24] H. Jiang and B. Zhou, "Bias-policy iteration based adaptive dynamic programming for unknown continuous-time linear systems," *Automatica*, vol. 136, p. 110058, 2022.
- [25] W. Gao, C. Deng, Y. Jiang, and Z.-P. Jiang, "Resilient reinforcement learning and robust output regulation under denial-of-service attacks," *Automatica*, vol. 142, p. 110366, 2022.
- [26] H. Shen, C. Peng, H. Yan, and S. Xu, "Data-driven near optimization for fast sampling singularly perturbed systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2024.
- [27] V. G. Lopez, M. Alsalti, and M. A. Müller, "Efficient off-policy  $q$ -learning for data-based discrete-time lqr problems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 5, pp. 2922–2933, 2023.
- [28] Y. Jiang, J. Fan, T. Chai, F. L. Lewis, and J. Li, "Tracking control for linear discrete-time networked control systems with unknown dynamics and dropout," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, vol. 29, no. 10, pp. 4607–4620, 2018.
- [29] C. Li, J. Ding, F. L. Lewis, and T. Chai, "Model-free  $q$ -learning for the tracking problem of linear discrete-time systems," *IEEE Transactions on*

*Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 3191–3201, 2022.

- [30] A. Al-Tamimi, F. L. Lewis, and M. Abu-Khalaf, “Model-free  $q$ -learning designs for linear discrete-time zero-sum games with application to  $h$ -infinity control,” *Automatica*, vol. 43, no. 3, pp. 473–481, 2007.
- [31] C. Chen, F. L. Lewis, K. Xie, S. Xie, and Y. Liu, “Off-policy learning for adaptive optimal output synchronization of heterogeneous multi-agent systems,” *Automatica*, vol. 119, p. 109081, 2020.
- [32] Y. Jiang, W. Gao, J. Wu, T. Chai, and F. L. Lewis, “Reinforcement learning and cooperative  $h_\infty$  output regulation of linear continuous-time multi-agent systems,” *Automatica*, vol. 148, p. 110768, 2023.
- [33] D. Li and J. Dong, “Off-policy learning  $h_\infty$  cooperative optimal output regulation for unknown multiagent systems without initial stabilizing gains,” *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, 2024.
- [34] K. Xie, Y. Jiang, X. Yu, and W. Lan, “Data-driven cooperative optimal output regulation for linear discrete-time multi-agent systems by online distributed adaptive internal model approach,” *Science China Information Sciences*, vol. 66, no. 7, p. 170202, 2023.
- [35] J. Huang, *Nonlinear output regulation: theory and applications*. SIAM, 2004.
- [36] Z.-P. Jiang and Y. Wang, “Input-to-state stability for discrete-time nonlinear systems,” *Automatica*, vol. 37, no. 6, pp. 857–869, 2001.
- [37] Y. Jiang, L. Liu, and G. Feng, “Adaptive optimal tracking control of networked linear systems under two-channel stochastic dropouts,” *Automatica*, vol. 165, p. 111690, 2024.



**Dongdong Li** received the B.S. degree in Automation from Anhui University of Science and Technology, Huainan, China, in 2020 and the M.S. degree in Control science and engineering with the College of Information Science and Engineering, Northeastern University, Shenyang, China, in 2023.

He is currently working toward the Ph.D. degree in control science and engineering from Northeastern University, Shenyang, China. His research interests include adaptive control, reinforcement learning and optimal control.



**Jiuxiang Dong** received the B.S. degree in mathematics and applied mathematics, the M.S. degree in applied mathematics from Liaoning Normal University, Dalian, China, in 2001 and 2004, respectively, and the Ph.D. degree in navigation guidance and control from Northeastern University, Shenyang, China, in 2009.

He is currently a Professor with the College of Information Science and Engineering, Northeastern University. His research interests include fuzzy control, robust control and optimal control. Prof. Dong

is an Associate Editor for *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems II: Express Briefs* and *International Journal of Control, Automation, and Systems*.