

Stability for Receding-horizon Stochastic Model Predictive Control with Chance Constraints

Ali Mesbah¹ and Stefan Streif²

Abstract—A stochastic model predictive control (SMPC) approach is presented for discrete-time linear systems with arbitrary time-invariant probabilistic uncertainties and additive Gaussian process noise. Closed-loop stability of the SMPC approach is established by design through appropriate selection of the cost function. Polynomial chaos is used for efficient uncertainty propagation through system dynamics. The performance of the SMPC approach is demonstrated using the Van de Vusse reactions.

I. INTRODUCTION

Robust model predictive control (MPC) approaches have been extensively investigated over the last two decades with the goal to address control of uncertain systems with bounded uncertainties (e.g., see [1] and the references therein). Robust MPC approaches rely on a deterministic setting and set-based uncertainty descriptions to synthesize controllers such that a worst-case objective is minimized or constraints are robustly satisfied [2]. These deterministic approaches may however lead to overly conservative control performance [1] if the worst-case realizations have a small probability of occurrence. An approach that can alleviate the intrinsic limitation of a deterministic robust control setting is to use stochastic descriptions of system uncertainties, which are available in many applications. This notion has led to the emerging field of stochastic MPC (SMPC) (e.g., [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9], [10], [11], [12]), in which probabilistic descriptions of uncertainties and chance constraints are used to allow for pre-specified levels of risk in optimal control.

This paper investigates stability of receding-horizon SMPC. There is extensive literature that deals with tractability and stability of MPC in the deterministic setting (e.g., see [1], [13] and the references therein). However, the technical nature of arguments involved in stability of stochastic systems is significantly different in the case of unbounded uncertainties such as Gaussian process noise. In addition, there exist diverse notions of stability in the stochastic setting that are non-existent in the deterministic case [10].

The work on stability of uncertain systems under receding-horizon stochastic optimal control can be broadly categorized into two research directions: first, studies that consider multiplicative process and measurement noise [5], [6], [14] and second, studies that treat process and measurement noise as additive terms in the system model [15], [16], [9], [17]. The latter approaches mainly rely on the notion of affine

parameterization of control inputs for finite-horizon linear quadratic problems, which allows converting the stochastic programming problem into a deterministic one. Other approaches to SMPC based on randomized algorithms [7], [8], [11] and SMPC formulations with chance constraints [18] have also been reported.

In this paper, stability of receding-horizon SMPC with chance constraints is established for discrete-time linear systems with arbitrary probabilistic time-invariant uncertainties, and additive Gaussian process noise (see Section II for the problem formulation). The generalized polynomial chaos (PC) framework is used for propagation of probabilistic uncertainties through the system dynamics [19], [20], [21] (Section III-A). The PC framework replaces the implicit mappings (i.e., system dynamics) between the uncertain variables and the states with explicit functions in the form of a finite series of orthogonal polynomial basis functions. The Galerkin-projection method [20] is used for analytic computation of the coefficients of the series, based on which the variable statistics can be computed in a computationally efficient manner.

Chance constraints are incorporated into the presented SMPC formulation to trade off between robustness and control performance. To obtain a deterministic surrogate for the SMPC formulation, individual chance constraints are converted into convex second-order cone constraints for a general class of probability distributions with known mean and covariance [22] (Section III-B). Stability results for Markov processes (e.g., [23]) are then used to establish the closed-loop stability of the stochastic system through appropriate selection of the SMPC cost function. It is proven that the SMPC approach ensures stability of the closed-loop system by design under the corresponding receding-horizon control policy (Section IV). The presented receding-horizon SMPC approach is used for stochastic optimal control of the Van de Vusse reactions [24] in the presence of probabilistic uncertainties in initial conditions and model parameters as well as additive Gaussian process noise (Section V).

II. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Consider a stochastic, discrete-time linear system

$$x_{t+1} = A(\theta)x_t + B(\theta)u_t + Fw_t, \quad (1)$$

where $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$ denotes the discrete time; $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ denotes the system states; $u_t \in \mathbb{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ denotes the system inputs, with \mathbb{U} being a nonempty set that is assumed to be measurable and to contain the element $0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$; $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\theta}$ denotes the time-invariant uncertain system parameters

¹ Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA {mesbah@berkeley.edu}.

² Department of Computer Science and Automation, Ilmenau University of Technology, 98684 Ilmenau, Germany {stefan.streif@ovgu.de}.

with known probability distribution functions (PDFs) P_θ ; $w_t \in \mathbb{W} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_w}$ denotes the Gaussian process noise, where $\{w_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ have PDFs P_w on a measurable set \mathbb{W} with $\mathbf{E}[w_t] = 0$ and $\mathbf{E}[w_t w_t^\top] = \Sigma$ for a known positive semi-definite matrix $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w \times n_w}$; $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_x}$ denotes the state transition matrix; and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_u}$ and $F \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_w}$ denote the input and noise matrices, respectively. The initial states x_0 in (1) are considered to be uncertain with known Gaussian PDFs P_{x_0} . It is assumed that the pair (A, B) is stabilizable for all uncertainty realizations.

Let $\Theta := [x_0^\top \theta^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\xi}$ (with $n_\xi \leq n_\theta + n_x$) be the vector of all time-invariant system uncertainties (i.e., uncertain initial conditions and uncertain parameters). The uncertainty associated with the states x_t can be characterized in terms of the multivariate state PDF $P_{x_t} := P(x_t | \Theta)$ that evolves in time. Denote a probability triple by (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) , which defines a probability space on the basis of the sample space Ω , σ -algebra \mathcal{F} , and the probability measure P on Ω . It is assumed that the uncertainties Θ are functions of random variables $\xi := [\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n_\xi}]^\top$ with known independent PDFs $P(\xi_i)$ over the common support Ω . The random variables ξ_i lie in $\mathcal{L}^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$, where $\mathcal{L}^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ is the Hilbert space of all random variables with finite variance $\mathbf{E}[\xi_i^2] < \infty$.

This paper aims to design an SMPC approach for the system (1) such that the stability of the closed-loop system is guaranteed. An SMPC approach with chance constraints enables controlling the predicted PDF of states in an optimal manner over a finite prediction horizon, while ensuring the satisfaction of constraints with a desired probability level. The SMPC approach incorporates the statistical descriptions of system uncertainties into the control framework. Such a probabilistic control approach allows the shaping of the state PDFs, which is essential to trade off the performance and robustness of the closed-loop system.

In this work a full state feedback control scheme is considered in which the initial states at sampling time k are uncertain. The receding-horizon SMPC problem for the stochastic, linear system (1) is formulated as follows.

Problem 1 (Receding-horizon SMPC): Let $\pi := [\pi_0, \pi_1, \dots, \pi_{k-1}]$ be a k -stage receding-horizon control policy, where $k \in \mathbb{N}$ denotes the sampling time instant, and each $\pi_k(x_k) : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \rightarrow \mathbb{U}$ is a measurable function. At every time instant k , the optimal stochastic control problem is stated as

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\bar{\pi}_{0:N_c|k}} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \|\mathbf{E}[\bar{x}_i]\|_Q^2 + \text{tr}\{Q\mathbf{Var}[\bar{x}_i]\} + \\ & \|\mathbf{E}[\bar{x}_N]\|_S^2 + \text{tr}\{S\mathbf{Var}[\bar{x}_N]\} \\ \text{s.t.: } & \bar{x}_{t+1} = A(\theta)\bar{x}_t + B(\theta)u_t + Fw_t, \quad \forall t = 0, \dots, N \\ & \Pr[c_i \bar{x}_t + d_i \leq 0] \geq \beta_i, \quad \forall t = 0, \dots, N \\ & \quad \quad \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I} \\ & u_t = \bar{\pi}_{0:N_c|k}(x_k) \quad \forall t = 0, \dots, N_c \\ & \bar{\pi}_{0:N_c|k} \in \mathbb{U} \quad \forall t = 0, \dots, N \\ & \bar{x}_0 \sim P_{x_0} \\ & \theta \sim P_\theta, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $\bar{\pi}_{0:N_c|k}(x_k) := [\bar{\pi}_{0|k}, \bar{\pi}_{1|k}, \dots, \bar{\pi}_{N_c-1|k}]$ denotes the *feedback control law* over the control horizon $N_c \in \mathbb{N}$; $N \in \mathbb{N}$ denotes the prediction horizon; \bar{x}_t denotes the states predicted by the system model; x_k denotes the measured system states at time instant k ; $\mathbf{E}[\bar{x}_i]$ and $\mathbf{Var}[\bar{x}_i] = \mathbf{E}[\bar{x}_i^2]$ denote the vector of expected values and the diagonal matrix of variances of predicted states \bar{x}_i , respectively; tr denotes the trace of a square matrix; $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_x}$ and $S \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_x}$ denote symmetric and positive definite weight functions; \Pr denotes probability; the scalar values $c_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and $d_i \in \mathbb{R}$ define the state constraints; $\beta_i \in (0, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}$ denotes the lower bound of the desired probability that the individual state constraints should be satisfied in the presence of system uncertainties; $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \{1, \dots, n_x\}$ denotes a subset of states for which the chance constraints are defined; and \mathbb{U} is a compact set of admissible feedback control policies. The *feedback control inputs* to be applied to system (1) at sampling time instant k are then defined as $\pi_k(x_k) = \bar{\pi}_{0|k}^*$, where $\bar{\pi}_{0|k}^*$ denotes the optimal values of $\bar{\pi}_{0|k}$.

The cost function in (2) is defined in terms of the first and second moments of the PDFs of the predicted states \bar{x}_t . The cost function consists of two terms- a running-cost term defined over the prediction horizon $[0, N)$ and a terminal cost term that enables enforcing the cost function at the end point N of the prediction horizon. As will be shown in Section IV, appropriate selection of the weight function S (corresponding to the terminal-cost term) will ensure that the closed-loop system is stable under the control policy π .

In this work, the feedback control law takes the form

$$\bar{\pi}_{t|k} = \bar{u}_t + K_t(x_k - \mathbf{E}[\bar{x}_t]), \quad (3)$$

where $\{\bar{u}_t\}_{t=0}^N$ and $\{K_t\}_{t=0}^N$ comprise the decision variables in the stochastic optimal control problem (2). The stochastic system (1) under the receding-horizon control policy π leads to closed-loop state trajectories $\{x_t^{cl}\}_{t \in \mathbb{N}_0}$, where

$$x_{t+1}^{cl} = A(\theta)x_t^{cl} + B(\theta)\bar{\pi}_{0|k}^*(x_k^{cl}) + Fw_t.$$

The closed-loop states are Markov processes, as the probability distribution of the future states x_{t+1}^{cl} at time $t+1$ are conditionally independent of the past states $\{x_s^{cl}\}_{s=0}^{t-1}$ given the present states x_t^{cl} . This implies that

$$P(x_{t+1}^{cl} | \{x_s^{cl}\}_{s=0}^t) = P(x_{t+1}^{cl} | x_t^{cl}).$$

The standard stability results for Markov processes will be used in Section IV to establish the stability of the receding-horizon SMPC approach stated in Problem 1.

The key challenges to solve the stochastic optimal control problem (2) are efficient propagation of probabilistic uncertainties through the system dynamics, and the reformulation of chance constraints to computationally tractable expressions. Next, the generalized polynomial chaos framework for uncertainty propagation and a deterministic surrogate for the chance constraints are introduced.

III. STOCHASTIC MODEL PREDICTIVE CONTROL

A. Polynomial Chaos for Uncertainty Propagation

The time evolution of the multivariate state PDF P_{x_t} describes the propagation of uncertainties arisen from parametric uncertainties, uncertain initial conditions, and additive process noise through the system dynamics (1). For any fixed value of the time-invariant uncertainties in (1), the multivariate state PDF P_{x_t} possesses a multivariate Normal distribution due to the Gaussian nature of the additive process noise and the initial states. The multivariate PDF P_{x_t} can be obtained through evaluating the conditional probability $P(x_t|\Theta)$ for all possible uncertainties Θ (which are characterized by the standard random variables ξ)

$$\begin{aligned} P_{x_t} &= \int_{\Omega} P(x_t|\Theta(\xi))P(\xi)d\xi \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \mathcal{N}(\mu_t(\Theta), \nu_t(\Theta))P(\xi)d\xi, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $\mu_t(\Theta) := [\mu_1(t, \xi), \dots, \mu_{n_x}(t, \xi)]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ and $\nu_t(\Theta) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_x}$ denote the the mean and the covariance matrix of the multivariate Normal distribution of states (denoted by \mathcal{N}), respectively. For a particular realization of time-invariant uncertainties Θ , the multivariate Normal distribution is described by its mean and covariance (i.e., the first two moments of the PDF) defined as

$$\mu_{t+1} = A(\theta)\mu_t + B(\theta)u_t \quad (5a)$$

$$\nu_{t+1} = A(\theta)\nu_t + \nu_t A(\theta)^\top + F\Sigma F^\top, \quad (5b)$$

respectively.

Evaluation of the mean and covariance matrix of the PDF P_{x_t} for different realizations of uncertainties Θ can be computationally prohibitive using the commonly used Monte Carlo simulation methods. In this work, the generalized polynomial chaos framework [19], [21] is used for efficient propagation of time-invariant uncertainties through (5a) and (5b). The PC framework enables approximation of a stochastic variable $\psi(\xi)$ in terms of a finite series expansion of orthogonal polynomial basis functions

$$\hat{\psi}(\xi) := \sum_{k=0}^L a_k \Phi_k(\xi) = a^\top \Lambda(\xi), \quad (6)$$

where $a := [a_0, \dots, a_L]^\top$ denotes the vector of expansion coefficients a_k ; $\Lambda(\xi) := [\Phi_0(\xi), \dots, \Phi_L(\xi)]^\top$ denotes the vector of basis functions Φ_k of maximum degree m with respect to the random variables ξ ; and $L + 1 = \frac{(n_\xi + m)!}{n_\xi! m!}$ denotes the total number of terms in the expansion. The basis functions belong to the Askey scheme of polynomials, which encompasses a set of orthogonal basis functions in the Hilbert space defined on the support of the random variables [21]. This implies that $\langle \Phi_i(\xi), \Phi_j(\xi) \rangle = \langle \Phi_i^2(\xi) \rangle \delta_{ij}$, where $\langle h(\xi), g(\xi) \rangle = \int_{\Omega} h(\xi)g(\xi)P_\xi d\xi$ denotes the inner product induced by P_ξ , and δ_{ij} denotes the Kronecker delta function. Hence, the coefficients a_k in (6) are defined by

$$a_k = \frac{\langle \hat{\psi}(\xi), \Phi_k(\xi) \rangle}{\langle \Phi_k(\xi), \Phi_k(\xi) \rangle}.$$

For the linear system (1) the integrals in the inner products can be straightforwardly computed analytically [20]. Note that the basis functions Φ_k are chosen in accordance with the PDFs of the uncertain variables ξ .

To use the PC framework for uncertainty propagation through (5a) and (5b), the vector of mean values μ_t and the entries of the covariance matrix ν_t are augmented into a single vector $\eta_t := [\eta_1(t, \xi), \dots, \eta_{n_\eta}(t, \xi)]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\eta}$ with $n_\eta = n_x(n_x + 3)/2$. The evolution of η_t is described by [25]

$$\eta_{t+1} = L(\Theta)\eta_t + M(\Theta)\gamma_t, \quad (7)$$

where $\gamma_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\gamma}$ denotes the input vector of the augmented system; $L(\Theta) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\eta \times n_\eta}$ denotes the augmented system matrix; and $M(\Theta) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\eta \times n_\gamma}$ denotes the augmented input matrix. The PC approximation of each of the stochastic variables in (7) can be written as

$$\hat{\eta}_i(t, \xi) := \sum_{k=0}^L \bar{\eta}_{i_k}(t) \Phi_k(\xi) = \bar{\eta}_i^\top(t) \Lambda(\xi) \quad (8a)$$

$$\hat{L}_{ij}(\xi) := \sum_{k=0}^L \bar{L}_{ij_k} \Phi_k(\xi) = \bar{L}_{ij}^\top \Lambda(\xi) \quad (8b)$$

$$\hat{M}_{ij}(\xi) := \sum_{k=0}^L \bar{M}_{ij_k} \Phi_k(\xi) = \bar{m}_{ij}^\top \Lambda(\xi). \quad (8c)$$

The Galerkin-projection method [20] is used to determine the $n_\eta(L + 1)$ unknown time-varying coefficients $\bar{\eta}_{i_k}$ in the polynomial chaos approximation of the augmented system dynamics (7). The PC coefficients are obtained by substituting (8) in (7)

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\eta}_i^\top(t + 1) \Lambda(\xi) &= \sum_{j=1}^{n_\eta} \bar{L}_{ij}^\top \Lambda(\xi) \bar{\eta}_j^\top(t) \Lambda(\xi) \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^{n_\gamma} \bar{m}_{ij}^\top \Lambda(\xi) \gamma_j(t), \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n_\eta, \end{aligned}$$

and projecting the above expression onto the space of orthogonal basis functions $\{\Phi_k\}_{k=0}^L$. This results in a set of $n_\eta(L + 1)$ analytic, deterministic equations for the coefficients η_{i_k} .

The PC expansion coefficients of $\{\hat{\eta}_i(t, \xi)\}_{i=1}^{n_\eta}$ enable efficient computation of the statistical moments of distributions of the mean μ_t and the covariance matrix ν_t with respect to all uncertainty realizations Θ as defined by

$$\mathbf{E}[(\hat{\eta}_i(t, \xi))^o] = \mathbf{E}\left[\left(\sum_{k=0}^L \eta_{i_k}(t) \Phi_k(\xi)\right)^o\right], \quad i = 1, \dots, n_\eta, \quad (9)$$

where o denotes the order of the moment.

B. Chance Constraints

The individual chance constraints in the stochastic optimal control problem (2) should be converted into deterministic expressions in order to obtain a computationally tractable control formulation. Eq. (4) indicates that the states $\bar{x}_i(t)$ in the chance constraints

$$\Pr[c_i \bar{x}_t + d_i \leq 0] \geq \beta_i, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I} \quad (10)$$

have a Normal distribution described by (5a) and (5b) for any fixed realization of the time-invariant uncertainties Θ . The polynomial chaos framework is used to recast (10) into a computationally tractable expression in terms of $\hat{\eta}_t$, which entails the PC approximations of the mean and variance of the states.

Theorem 1 (Convex second-order cone constraints ([22, Theorem 3.1]): Consider an individual chance constraint of the form

$$\Pr[l^\top v \leq 0] \geq 1 - \epsilon, \quad \epsilon \in (0, 1), \quad (11)$$

where $l \in \mathbb{R}^{n_l}$ denotes some random quantities with a known multivariate PDF and $v \in \mathbb{R}^{n_v}$ denotes some variables. Denote with \mathcal{L} the family of all distributions with known mean \bar{l} and covariance Γ . For any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, the chance constraint

$$\inf_{l \sim \mathcal{L}} \Pr[l^\top v \leq 0] \geq 1 - \epsilon$$

(where $l \sim \mathcal{L}$ denotes that the distribution of l belongs to the family \mathcal{L}) is equivalent to the convex second-order cone constraint

$$\kappa_\epsilon \mathbf{Var}[l^\top v] + \mathbf{E}[l^\top v] \leq 0, \quad \kappa_\epsilon = \sqrt{(1 - \epsilon)/\epsilon}, \quad (12)$$

where $\mathbf{E}[l^\top v] = \bar{l}^\top v$ and $\mathbf{Var}[l^\top v] = v^\top \Gamma v$. \blacksquare

Theorem 1 provides an explicit expression for the chance constraint (11) that is enforced with respect to the PDF of the random quantities l . Eq. (12) implies that the individual chance constraints in (10) can be converted into convex, deterministic constraints

$$c_i \left(\kappa_{1-\beta_i} \mathbf{Var}[\hat{\nu}_{ii}(t)] + \mathbf{E}[\hat{\mu}_i(t)] \right) + d_i \leq 0, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I}, \quad (13)$$

where $\mu_i(t)$ and $\nu_{ii}(t)$ denote the mean and variance of the i^{th} state, respectively. Note that $\nu_{ii}(t)$ corresponds to the i^{th} diagonal entry of the covariance matrix ν_t . $\mathbf{E}[\mu_i(t)]$ and $\mathbf{Var}[\nu_{ii}(t)]$, $\forall i \in \mathcal{I}$ (\mathbf{Var} denoting the second statistical moment of a PDF) can be computed using the PC coefficients $\bar{\eta}_{i_k}$ for the respective entries of $\hat{\eta}_t$ (i.e., (9)).

C. Reformulation of the Stochastic Optimal Control Problem

Using the polynomial chaos framework for probabilistic uncertainty propagation through the moments of the multivariate state PDF (4) and the explicit expressions (13) to replace the chance constraints, a deterministic surrogate for the receding-horizon stochastic optimal control problem (2) is presented below.

Problem 2 (Deterministic formulation for SMPC): The deterministic optimal control problem at each time instant k is stated as

$$\min_{\bar{\pi}_{0:N_c|k}} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \|\mathbf{E}[\hat{\mu}_i(\Theta)]\|_Q^2 + \text{tr}\{Q \mathbf{Var}[\hat{\nu}_i(\Theta)]\} + \|\mathbf{E}[\hat{\mu}_N(\Theta)]\|_S^2 + \text{tr}\{S \mathbf{Var}[\hat{\nu}_N(\Theta)]\}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{s.t.: } \quad & \hat{\eta}_{t+1} = \hat{L}(\Theta) \hat{\eta}_t + \hat{M}(\Theta) \gamma_t, & \forall t = 0, \dots, N \\ & c_i \left(\kappa_{1-\beta_i} \mathbf{Var}[\hat{\nu}_{ii}(t)] + \mathbf{E}[\hat{\mu}_i(t)] \right) & \forall t = 0, \dots, N \\ & + d_i \leq 0, & \forall i \in \mathcal{I} \\ & u_t = \bar{\pi}_{0:N_c|k}(\mu_k) & \forall t = 0, \dots, N_c \\ & \bar{\pi}_{0:N_c|k} \in \mathbb{U} & \forall t = 0, \dots, N \\ & \hat{\mu}_N \in \mathcal{M} \\ & \hat{\nu}_N \leq \mathcal{V} \\ & \hat{\mu}_0 = \mu_k \\ & \hat{\nu}_0 = \nu_k, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where $\hat{\cdot}$ denotes the PC approximation of the stochastic variable; μ_k and ν_k denote the mean and variance of the true (measured or estimated) system states at sampling time instant k ; and \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{V} denote positively invariant sets corresponding to terminal constraints on the mean and covariance matrix of the multivariate state PDF P_{x_N} . The feedback control law $\bar{\pi}_{t|k}$ directly affects the dynamics of the PDF mean (see (5a)), and is defined using (3)

$$\bar{\pi}_{t|k} = \bar{u}_t + K_t(\mu_k - \mathbf{E}[\hat{\mu}_t]). \quad (15)$$

As in standard MPC [13], terminal constraints are incorporated into the optimal control problem (14) to guarantee stability with respect to the state constraints. Next, the stability of the presented SMPC formulation is established.

IV. STABILITY ANALYSIS OF STOCHASTIC MODEL PREDICTIVE CONTROL

Two approaches generally exist to guarantee stability for receding-horizon predictive control of discrete-time systems [13]: (i) appropriate selection of the cost function, and (ii) incorporating appropriate constraint(s) into the finite-horizon control problem. This work adopts the former approach for the stochastic system (1) to arrive at a Lyapunov-like inequality in terms of the cost function in order to ensure stability under receding-horizon control.

The states of the system (1) under receding-horizon SMPC (2) consist in Markov processes (see Section II). The general strategy to examine the stability of \mathbb{R}^{n_x} -valued Markov processes x_t is to investigate the behavior of sequences $\mathbf{E}[g(x_t)]$, where g denotes a norm-like function [10]. The theory of stability for discrete-time Markov processes entails the notion of *negative drift condition* [23].

Definition 1 (Negative drift condition): For measurable functions $\Xi : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ and $\Upsilon : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ and a bounded and measurable set $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$, there exists

$$\mathbf{E}[\Xi(x')] - \Xi(x) \leq -\Upsilon(x) \quad \forall x, x' \notin \mathcal{X}.$$

Note that the negative drift condition resembles Lyapunov stability conditions for deterministic discrete-time systems. A widely used variant of the negative drift condition is the geometric drift condition, which is defined below.

Lemma 1 (Geometric drift condition [23]): Suppose there exist a measurable function $V : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ and a compact set $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ such that $\mathbf{E}[V(x')] \leq \lambda_0 V(x)$, $\forall x \notin \mathcal{X}$ and $\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{E}[V(x')] = \gamma$, where $\gamma > 0$ and $\lambda_0 \in [0, 1)$.

Then $\mathbf{E}[V(x_t)] \leq \lambda_0^t V(x) + \gamma(1 - \lambda_0)^{-1}$, $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$. This implies

$$\mathbf{E}[V(x')] - V(x) \leq -(1 - \lambda_0)V(x), \quad \forall x, x' \notin \mathcal{X}, \quad (16)$$

which is known as the geometric drift condition. ■

The geometric drift condition is now used to establish the stability of the stochastic optimal control problem (14).

Theorem 2 (Stability of receding-horizon SMPC): The k -stage receding-horizon control policy π with the feedback control law (15) guarantees the stability of the stochastic optimal control problem (14) if there exists a gain matrix $K_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u \times n_x}$ such that

$$(A + BK_t)^\top S(A + BK_t) - S = -Q. \quad (17)$$

Proof. It should be shown that for all stabilizing control actions the cost function of the SMPC problem satisfies the negative drift condition. It follows from the discussion in Section III-A that the cost function in (14) is equivalent to

$$J(x, \pi) = \mathbf{E} \left[\underbrace{\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \|\hat{\mu}_i\|_Q^2}_{J_r(x_t, \pi_t)} + \underbrace{\|\hat{\mu}_N\|_S^2}_{J_f(x_N)} \right], \quad (18)$$

which consists of the *running-cost function* J_r and the *terminal-cost function* J_f . According to the LQ theory, (17) implies that the feedback control law (15) and, as a result, the receding-horizon control action π_k is stabilizing. By defining the measurable function $V(x) := x^\top Sx$, it follows from Lemma 1 that $\mathbf{E}[V(x_t)] \leq \lambda_0^t V(x) + \gamma(1 - \lambda_0)^{-1}$, when λ_0 , \mathcal{X} , and γ are given by

$$\lambda_0 = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\sigma_{\min}(Q)}{\sigma_{\max}(S)} \right),$$

$$\mathcal{X} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x} | x^\top Sx \leq \frac{2}{\lambda_0} \text{tr}(S\Sigma)\},$$

and

$$\gamma = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} (x^\top (A + BK_t)^\top S(A + BK_t)x + \text{tr}(S\Sigma))$$

with $\sigma_{\min}(\cdot)$ and $\sigma_{\max}(\cdot)$ denoting the minimum and maximum singular values, respectively. It can now be straightforwardly verified that the cost function $J(x, \pi)$ fulfills:

- 1) the boundedness condition

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} (\mathbf{E}[J_f(x')] - J_f(x) + J_r(x, \pi(x))) \leq \gamma,$$

- 2) and the negative drift condition


$$\mathbf{E}[J_f(x')] - J_f(x) \leq -J_r(x, \pi(x)), \quad \forall x, x' \notin \mathcal{X}$$

under the receding-horizon control policy π . This result indicates the closed-loop stability of Problem 2, as the negative drift condition (see Definition 1) is satisfied. ■

Note that terminal state constraints are included in the optimal control problem (14) to ensure stability with respect to the state constraints [13]. When a control input term is included into the cost function in (14) to penalize excessive control inputs, the stability of the optimal control problem can still be guaranteed by accounting for the control input weight function in (17).

V. CASE STUDY: VAN DE VUSSE REACTOR

The Van de Vusse series of reactions [24]



in an isothermal continuous stirred-tank reactor is considered to evaluate the performance of the SMPC approach. The dynamical evolution of the concentration of A and B (denoted by C_A and C_B , respectively) is described by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{C}_A &= -k_1 C_A - k_3 C_A^2 - C_A u \\ \dot{C}_B &= k_1 C_A - k_2 C_B - C_B u, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where u is the dilution rate (i.e., manipulated variable). Linearizing the system (19) around a desired steady state and discretizing the linearized model with a sampling time of 0.002 (see [26]) results in a linear system of the form (1) with

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \theta_1 & 0 \\ 0.088 & 0.819 \end{pmatrix} \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} -0.005 \\ -0.002 \end{pmatrix},$$

where θ_1 has the four-parameter β distribution $\beta(0.923, 0.963, 2, 5)$. The noise matrix in (1) is assumed to be identity, and $\Sigma = 10^{-4}I$ with I being a 2×2 identity matrix. The states of the linearized model are defined in terms of the deviation variables x_1 and x_2 . The initial states possess distributions $x_1(0) \sim \mathcal{N}(0.5, 0.01)$ and $x_2(0) \sim \mathcal{N}(0.1, 0.01)$, respectively. The control objective is to retain both states at the desired steady state (hence $x_{1_{sp}} = 0$ and $x_{2_{sp}} = 0$) in the presence of time-invariant probabilistic uncertainties and process noise. In addition, x_2 should remain below the limit 0.17.

The receding-horizon stochastic optimal control problem is formulated for the linearized system of the Van de Vusse reactions. A fifth-order expansion of Jacobi polynomials is used to propagate the time-invariant parametric uncertainty through (7). The weight matrix Q in the optimal control problem (14) is defined as identity, implying that there is equal importance for both states to have minimum variance around their respective steady state values. The probability β_i in the chance constraint imposed on x_2 is 0.95, which indicates that at least in 95% of occurrences the constraint $x_2 < 0.17$ should be satisfied.

The performance of the receding-horizon SMPC approach is evaluated based on 100 closed-loop simulations in the presence of probabilistic uncertainties and process noise, and is compared with that of a nominal MPC approach with terminal constraints. Figure 1 shows the histograms of x_1 for both MPC approaches at three different times. The SMPC approach clearly leads to smaller mean (i.e., deviation with respect to the steady state value) and smaller variance. This indicates that the SMPC approach can effectively deal with the system uncertainties and process noise. Figure 1 shows that the state approaches its steady state value (x_1 approaches zero). To assess the satisfaction of the state constraint, the time profiles of x_2 for the 100 runs are shown in Figure 2. The state constraint is fulfilled in over 95% of simulations, whereas it is violated in nearly 46% of closed-loop simulations of the nominal MPC approach. Hence, the




Fig. 1. Histograms of x_1 at different times obtained from 100 closed-loop simulations of the receding-horizon SMPC (blue) and MPC (red). Receding-horizon SMPC leads to smaller mean and variance of x_1 in the presence of probabilistic uncertainties and process noise.


inclusion of the chance constraint into the SMPC approach leads to effective state constraints satisfaction.

VI. CONCLUSIONS


The paper presents a SMPC approach for linear systems with arbitrary time-invariant probabilistic uncertainties and additive Gaussian process noise. The closed-loop simulation results for the Van de Vusse reactions indicate the capability of SMPC to control the multivariate PDF of states, while guaranteeing the fulfillment of state constraints in the presence of probabilistic uncertainties and process noise.

REFERENCES

[1] A. Bemporad and M. Morari, "Robust model predictive control: A survey," in *Robustness in Identification and Control* (A. Garulli and A. Tesi, eds.), pp. 207–226, Springer Berlin, 1999.
 [2] F. Blanchini, "Set invariance in control," *Automatica*, vol. 35, pp. 1747–1767, 1999.



(a) SMPC



(b) MPC

Fig. 2. Time profiles of x_2 obtained from 100 closed-loop simulations of the receding-horizon SMPC and MPC. The red-dashed line represents the state constraint. Receding-horizon MPC results in violation of the constraint in 46% of the cases.

[3] A. Schwarm and M. Nikolaou, "Chance-constrained model predictive control," *AIChE Journal*, vol. 45, pp. 1743–1752, 1999.
 [4] D. H. V. Hessem and O. H. Bosgra, "A full solution to the constrained stochastic closed-loop MPC problem via state and innovations feedback and its receding horizon implementation," in *Proceedings of the 42nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, (Maui, Hawaii), pp. 929–934, 2003.
 [5] P. D. Couchman, M. Cannon, and B. Kouvaritakis, "Stochastic MPC with inequality stability constraints," *Automatica*, vol. 42, pp. 2169–2174, 2006.
 [6] M. Cannon, B. Kouvaritakis, and X. Wu, "Probabilistic constrained MPC for systems with multiplicative and additive stochastic uncertainty," in *Proceedings of the IFAC World Congress*, (Seoul, South Korea), pp. 15297–15302, 2008.
 [7] D. Bernardini and A. Bemporad, "Scenario-based model predictive control of stochastic constrained linear systems," in *Proceedings of the 48th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, (Shanghai, China), pp. 6333–6338, 2009.
 [8] L. Blackmore, M. Ono, A. Bektassov, and B. C. Williams, "A probabilistic particle-control approximation of chance-constrained stochastic predictive control," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 26, pp. 502–517, 2010.
 [9] F. Oldewurtel, A. Parisio, C. N. Jones, M. Morari, D. Gyalistras, M. Gwerder, V. Stauch, B. Lehmann, and K. Wirth, "Energy efficient building climate control using stochastic model predictive control and weather predictions," in *Proceedings of the American Control Conference*, (Baltimore, Maryland), pp. 2100–2105, 2010.
 [10] D. Chatterjee and J. Lygeros, "Stability and performance of stochastic predictive control," *arXiv:1304.2581v2*, 2013.
 [11] G. C. Calafiore and L. Fagiano, "Robust model predictive control via scenario optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 58, pp. 219–224, 2013.
 [12] A. Mesbah, S. Streif, R. Findeisen, and R. D. Braatz, "Stochastic nonlinear model predictive control with probabilistic constraints," in *Proceedings of the American Control Conference*, (Portland, Oregon), pp. 2413–2419, 2014.
 [13] D. Q. Mayne, J. B. Rawlings, C. V. Rao, and P. O. M. Scokaert, "Constrained model predictive control: Stability and optimality," *Automatica*, vol. 36, pp. 789–814, 2000.
 [14] J. Primbs and C. Sung, "Stochastic receding horizon control of constrained linear systems with state and control multiplicative noise," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 54, pp. 221–230, 2009.
 [15] A. Ben-Tal, S. Boyd, and A. Nemirovski, "Extending scope of robust optimization: Comprehensive robust counterparts of uncertain problems," *Journal of Mathematical Programming*, vol. 107, pp. 63–89, 2006.
 [16] D. Bertsimas and D. B. Brown, "Constrained stochastic LQC: A tractable approach," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 52, pp. 1826–1841, 2007.
 [17] P. Hokayem, E. Cinquemani, D. Chatterjee, F. Ramponi, and J. Lygeros, "Stochastic receding horizon control with output feedback and bounded controls," *Automatica*, vol. 48, pp. 77–88, 2012.
 [18] M. Farina, L. Giulioni, L. Magni, and R. Scattolini, "A probabilistic approach to model predictive control," in *Proceedings of the 52nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, (Florence, Italy), pp. 7734–7739, 2013.
 [19] N. Wiener, "The homogeneous chaos," *American Journal of Mathematics*, vol. 60, pp. 897–936, 1938.
 [20] R. Ghanem and P. Spanos, *Stochastic Finite Elements - A Spectral Approach*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991.
 [21] D. Xiu and G. E. Karniadakis, "The wiener-asky polynomial chaos for stochastic differential equations," *SIAM Journal of Scientific Computation*, vol. 24, pp. 619–644, 2002.
 [22] G. C. Calafiore and L. E. Ghaoui, "On distributionally robust chance-constrained linear programs," *Journal of Optimization Theory and Application*, vol. 130, pp. 1–22, 2006.
 [23] S. P. Meyn and R. L. Tweedie, *Markov Chains and Stochastic Stability*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2009.
 [24] J. G. V. de Vusse, "Plug-flow type reactor versus tank reactor," *Chemical Engineering Science*, vol. 19, pp. 994–997, 1964.
 [25] U. Konda, P. Singla, T. Singh, and P. Scott, "State uncertainty propagation in the presence of parametric uncertainty and additive white noise," in *Proceedings of the American Control Conference*, (Baltimore, Maryland), pp. 3118–3123, 2010.

- [26] P. O. M. Scokaert and J. B. Rawlings, "Constrained linear quadratic regulation," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 43, pp. 1163–1169, 1998.