

Tube-Based Zonotopic Data-Driven Predictive Control

Alessio Russo^{*,1} and Alexandre Proutiere¹

Abstract— We present a novel tube-based data-driven predictive control method for linear systems affected by a bounded additive disturbance. Our method leverages recent results in the reachability analysis of unknown linear systems to formulate and solve a robust tube-based predictive control problem. More precisely, our approach consists in deriving, from the collected data, a zonotope that includes the true error set. In addition to that, we show how to guarantee the stability of the resulting error zonotope in a probabilistic sense. Results on a double-integrator affected by strong adversarial noise demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed control approach.

I. INTRODUCTION

A recent trend in the control community is that of controlling unknown dynamical systems solely from their input-output data. This trend, which has sparked from a growing interest in machine learning and reinforcement learning methods, is more commonly known as direct control, or model-free control, and has already been investigated in different ways, see for example Direct Adaptive Control [19], data-driven control methods such as VRFT [13], and other references in [25].

In addition to classical direct control methods, recent research has made use of some results in [31], that allow to characterize an unknown linear system through a finite collection of its input/output data (which is also known as Willem’s et al. lemma, or *fundamental lemma*, [31], [25]). Consequently, thanks to this representation, it is possible to directly analyze the system, or formulate a control law, using only the collected input-output data, without the need of identifying the underlying unknown system. Consequently, it is possible to formulate a data-driven version of the linear quadratic regulator [17], or data-driven model-predictive control (MPC) formulations such as DEEPC [14].

Data-driven MPC formulations based on the fundamental lemma have several advantages compared to traditional MPC: it may require less data compared to classical learning-based approaches, and there is no need to identify the underlying system, which could be a costly process for complex systems. However, data-driven MPC formulations based on the fundamental lemma tend to be brittle, and several studies in the literature thoroughly investigate the robustness of data-driven MPC procedures by analysing the resulting multiplicative model uncertainty in the Hankel matrices of the system. [15], [18], [9], [7].

In contrast, in this work we address the problem of robustness for data-driven predictive control by exploiting the

data-driven zonotopic reachability analysis proposed in [2]. Reachability analysis computes the set of trajectories that a system can reach in a finite amount of time, and it is used for formal verification and set-based estimation due to its robust control guarantees [4], [5]. Following the analysis in [2], our approach is based on providing robustness with respect to all possible system matrices that are consistent with the data collected by the user. Our method is inspired by [3], where they provide a robust data-driven predictive control procedure based on reachability analysis, that, however, tends to be computationally intensive as well as sensitive to potential instabilities.

We propose a tube-based approach to robust data-driven predictive control. We first discuss how min-max robust control tends to be computationally infeasible for uncertainties represented by zonotopes, and then propose our method. The underlying idea is to treat the unknown quantities as external disturbances of the system, while guaranteeing the stability of the reachable error trajectories. We show that for a stabilizing gain K it is possible to bound the resulting error zonotope of the system. However, computing a stabilizing gain K is NP-hard, and we provide probabilistic robustness guarantee on learning and verifying that K is stabilizing. We conclude by showing our method on a double-integrator affected by strong-noise, demonstrating how our procedure can guarantee robustness and constraint satisfaction.

II. RELATED WORK

The problem of robustness for MPC has been well studied in the literature, see also the following standard references [24], [27]. Standard min-max formulations usually assume uncertainty in the process noise, and are usually solved by means of semi-definite relaxations [24].

As an alternative, tube-based approaches [23], [26] tend to be more computationally modest, while being robust to all disturbance sequences. The goal of tube-based MPC is to ensure that the nominal trajectory of the system satisfies tightened constraints, so that all possible trajectories of the true system satisfy the original constraint.

In contrast to classical robust MPC formulations, which only assume additive process noise, herein we assume that also the system matrices (A, B) are uncertain, and that the cost function is a generic convex function. A similar problem has been studied in [16], where the authors consider the classical quadratic criterion on the state-action pair, and assume a linear system not affected by noise with polytopic uncertainty in the system matrices (A, B) . Similarly, in [11], the authors consider Scenario Optimization [12] to handle generic bounded uncertainty sets.

* Corresponding author.

¹Alessio Russo and Alexandre Proutiere are in the Division of Decision and Control Systems of the EECS School at KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden. {alessior, alepro}@kth.se

Recently, the authors in [3] proposed ZPC, a robust data-driven predictive control approach based on data-driven reachability analysis [2] to control an uncertain linear system affected by bounded noise. The input-output data of the system is used to construct a matrix zonotope that contains all the possible matrices (A, B) that are consistent with the data, which is then used to formulate a robust MPC approach based on the reachable states. Their formulation, however, is not a tube-based approach, and does not consider the problem of instability in the set of matrices that are consistent with the data. Other robust formulations of data-driven predictive control approaches analyse the robustness of data-driven MPC from a different perspective, mainly by analysing the resulting multiplicative model uncertainty in the Hankel matrices of the system [18], [7].

III. PROBLEM STATEMENT AND PRELIMINARIES

We provide some preliminary concepts on set representation, and then define the problem statement.

A. Set Representations

We define the following sets:

Definition 1 (Zonotope [22]). A Zonotope \mathcal{Z} of dimension n , with γ generators, is a set defined as

$$\mathcal{Z} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x = c_{\mathcal{Z}} + G_{\mathcal{Z}}\beta, \|\beta\|_{\infty} \leq 1, \beta \in \mathbb{R}^{\gamma}\} \quad (1)$$

where $c_{\mathcal{Z}} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the center, and $G_{\mathcal{Z}} = [g_{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}, \dots, g_{\mathcal{Z}}^{(\gamma)}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \gamma}$, is the generator matrix. Furthermore, we define the shorthand $\mathcal{Z} = \langle c_{\mathcal{Z}}, G_{\mathcal{Z}} \rangle$.

Zonotopes, which are a special case of polytopes, are widely used in reachability analysis [4] due to their compact representation, efficient computation of linear transformations and Minkowski sums. A linear mapping is defined as $T\mathcal{Z} = \{Tz : z \in \mathcal{Z}\}$, and the Minkowski sum between two zonotopes $\mathcal{Z}_1, \mathcal{Z}_2$ is computed as $\mathcal{Z}_1 \oplus \mathcal{Z}_2 = \langle c_{\mathcal{Z}_1} + c_{\mathcal{Z}_2}, [G_{\mathcal{Z}_1}, G_{\mathcal{Z}_2}] \rangle$. For simplicity, we denote the sum between two zonotopes using the $+$ sign instead of \oplus .

Similarly, we can also define the concept of matrix zonotope, which is a set of matrices.

Definition 2 (Matrix Zonotope [4]). A Matrix Zonotope \mathcal{M} of dimension (n, p) , with γ generators, is a set defined as

$$\mathcal{M} = \left\{ X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} : X = C_{\mathcal{M}} + \sum_{i=1}^{\gamma} G_{\mathcal{M}}^{(i)} \beta_i, \|\beta\|_{\infty} \leq 1 \right\} \quad (2)$$

where $C_{\mathcal{M}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ is the center, and $G_{\mathcal{M}} = [G_{\mathcal{M}}^{(1)}, \dots, G_{\mathcal{M}}^{(\gamma)}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p\gamma}$ is the generator matrix and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{\gamma}$ is the generator factor. We define the following shorthand for matrix zonotopes $\mathcal{M} = \langle C_{\mathcal{M}}, G_{\mathcal{M}} \rangle$. As for constrained zonotopes, the factors $A_{\mathcal{M}} = [A_{\mathcal{M}}^{(1)}, \dots, A_{\mathcal{M}}^{(\gamma)}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n_c \times p\gamma}$

We define the concatenation of two zonotopes, which is the horizontal stacking of two matrix zonotopes $\mathcal{M}_{AB} =$

$\{[X_A \ X_B] : X_A \in \mathcal{M}_A, X_B \in \mathcal{M}_B\}$. From this definition, we let \mathcal{M}_{AT} be the concatenation of a matrix zonotope \mathcal{M}_A with itself T times, i.e., $\mathcal{M}_{AT} = \{[X_A^{(1)} \ X_A^{(2)} \ \dots \ X_A^{(T)}] : X_A^{(i)} \in \mathcal{M}_A, i = 1, \dots, T\}$.

B. Problem Definition

Model. We consider an uncertain discrete-time LTI model affected by process noise:

$$x_{t+1} = A_0 x_t + B_0 u_t + w_t, \quad (3)$$

where $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ is the discrete time variable, $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the state of the system, $u_t \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the control signal, $A_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $B_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ are the unknown system matrices, and $w_t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the unmeasured process noise. We make the following assumption of boundedness on the process noise, which does not necessarily need to be i.i.d.

Assumption 1. The process noise $w(t)$ lies in $\mathcal{Z}_w = \langle c_{\mathcal{Z}_w}, G_{\mathcal{Z}_w} \rangle$, i.e., $w(t) \in \mathcal{Z}_w \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ for every t . Furthermore, we assume that $0 \in \mathcal{Z}_w$. We denote by γ_w the number of generators of \mathcal{Z}_w .

The objective is to robustly control the uncertain system in Equation (3) for all possible noise realizations $w_t \in \mathcal{Z}_w$. Since the pair (A, B) is unknown, we use a result on the persistency of excitation of the data [31]. For a sequence of input-state trajectories $\{(u_k, x_k)\}_k$ of length T , define the following matrices:

$$\begin{aligned} X_+ &:= [x_1 \ \dots \ x_T], \\ X_- &:= [x_0 \ \dots \ x_{T-1}], \\ U_- &:= [u_0 \ \dots \ u_{T-1}]. \end{aligned}$$

Assumption 2. The pair (A_0, B_0) is unknown, and the user has available one input-state trajectory $\mathcal{D} = (X_-, X_+, U_-)$

such that $\text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} X_- \\ U_- \end{bmatrix} = n + m$.

The rank condition can be verified directly from data, and can be guaranteed for noise-free systems by choosing a persistently exciting input signal of order $n + 1$ [31], [17]. Since the pair (A_0, B_0) is unknown, as well as the actual realization of the noise, there exist multiple pairs (A, B) that are consistent with the data. We denote this set by $\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}}$:

$$\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}} := \{(A, B) : X_+ = AX_- + BU_- + W_-, W_- \in \mathcal{Z}_w\},$$

which we assume to be stabilizable.

Assumption 3. $\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}}$ is stabilizable, i.e., for any $(A, B) \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{D}}$ there exists K such that $(A + BK)$ is Schur.

Problem statement. Taking inspiration from [24], [8], [11], [3], our objective is to robustly control the unknown system in Equation (3) using a receding horizon approach.

Specifically, the control objective is to minimize a sum of convex loss functions $\{\ell_k(x, u)\}_k$ over an M -steps horizon, while constraining the state of the system x_t to a zonotope \mathcal{Z}_x at each time step, and the control signal u_t to be constrained to a zonotope \mathcal{Z}_u . Furthermore, we also assume that the initial condition x_0 belongs to a zonotope \mathcal{Z}_{x_0} .

Finally, we solve the problem by using a receding horizon algorithm that at each iteration computes the optimal control signal over an horizon of $N \leq M$ steps.

Our approach consists of two phases: (1) an offline data-collection phase, to construct an over-approximation of $\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}}$, a set of possible models consistent with the data collected from the true system; (2) an online control phase that solves a robust tube-based MPC formulation.

IV. METHOD

We begin by describing the offline phase, which consists in collecting data from the true system and build a matrix zonotope $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$ that contains the set $\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}}$. Later, we describe the online control problem and illustrate our proposed control approach.

A. Offline Learning Phase

The offline learning phase consists in collecting a dataset \mathcal{D} (of length T) and construct the uncertain set $\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}}$ using the expressiveness of zonotopes.

Let $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{Z}_w^T}$ be the T -concatenation of the noise zonotope \mathcal{Z}_w , where T is the length of the dataset \mathcal{D} . Then, recalling the following result from [2], we have that $\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}}$ is a subset of the matrix zonotope $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$.

Lemma 1 (Lemma 1 in [2]). *Given an input-state trajectory \mathcal{D} of the system in eq. (3), with the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} X_-^\top & U_-^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top$ having full column rank, then $\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$, where $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$ is a matrix zonotope defined as follows:*

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}} = (X_+ - \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{Z}_w^T}) \begin{bmatrix} X_- \\ U_- \end{bmatrix}^\dagger. \quad (4)$$

Note that in [2] they provide a precise characterization of $\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}}$, i.e., it is possible to derive a constrained matrix zonotope $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{D}}$, which is a convex polytope, that is equal to $\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}}$. However, an over-approximation is still needed to practically use $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{D}}$. For this reason, we simply use $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$, and extend the assumption of stabilizability to $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$.

Assumption 4. *The set $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$ is stabilizable.*

B. Online Control Phase

We begin by briefly considering the min-max robust control problem, and understand in which way this problem can be solved. After that, we present our approach based on tube-based MPC.

1) *Min-max robust control.*: Consider the following min-max optimization problem over an horizon of N steps and the uncertain set $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}^N := \{(A, B, w_1, \dots, w_N) : (A, B) \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}, w_i \in \mathcal{Z}_w, i = 1, \dots, N\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{P}}_N(x_t) : & \min_{u_{1|t}, \dots, u_{N|t}} \max_{(A, B, w_1, \dots, w_N) \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}^N} \sum_{k=1}^N \ell_k(x_{k|t}, u_{k|t}) \\ \text{s.t.} & \quad x_{k+1|t} = Ax_{k|t} + Bu_{k|t} + w_k \quad x_{1|t} = x_t \\ & \quad x_{k+1|t} \in \mathcal{Z}_x, u_{k|t} \in \mathcal{Z}_u, \quad k = 1, \dots, N \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

In general, robustly controlling the system in Equation (3) by solving the problem in Equation (5) tends to be computationally prohibitive. We can show that the overall complexity of the inner maximization problem is $O(2^{\gamma_w(T+N)})$.

Lemma 2. *The inner maximization in eq. (5) amounts to checking at-most $2 \left(\sum_{i=0}^{nT-1} \binom{T\gamma_w-1}{i} + \sum_{i=0}^{nN-1} \binom{N\gamma_w-1}{i} \right)$ points in $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}^N$, which scales as $O(2^{\gamma_w(T+N)})$.*

Proof. Since the uncertainties (A, B, w_k) belong to a polytope, by linearity, for fixed control inputs, these uncertainties generate set of predictions that is a polytope. Therefore, we only need to check the vertices of this polytope to compute the robust problem. The matrix zonotope $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$ consists of $\gamma_w T$ generators, consequently $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$ consist at most of $2 \sum_{i=0}^{nT-1} \binom{T\gamma_w-1}{i} \leq 2^{T\gamma_w}$ vertices [10]. Similarly, the matrix zonotope $\{(w_1, \dots, w_N) : w_i \in \mathcal{Z}_w, i = 1, \dots, N\}$ has at-most $2 \sum_{i=0}^{nN-1} \binom{N\gamma_w-1}{i} \leq 2^{N\gamma_w}$ vertices. \square

We remark that it is possible to simplify this issue by over-approximating a matrix zonotope by an hypercube. By doing so, $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$ can be approximated by an hypercube with 2^{nm} vertices, if $\gamma_w T > nm$. However, the set $\{(w_1, \dots, w_N) : w_i \in \mathcal{Z}_w, i = 1, \dots, N\}$ can hardly be simplified due to its dependency on N . To that aim, we advocate that a tube-based approach may achieve comparable level of robustness and performance, while being computationally more efficient. In fact, by using a tube-based approach we are able to remove the dependency on N .

2) *Tube-based robust control*: In tube-based MPC [26] the problem in (5) is relaxed by not considering the actual worst realization of the noise sequence w_t . The idea is to control some nominal dynamics \bar{x}_t of the system, and to make sure that the error $e_t = x_t - \bar{x}_t$ is bounded. In contrast to classical tube-based MPC formulations, in the problem herein considered (A, B) are unknown matrices.

We now illustrate our approach. It consists in devising an algorithm that can take advantage of the theory of zonotopes to guarantee robustness, while making sure that the resulting error zonotope of e_t is bounded in time. We begin by considering the nominal dynamics of the system.

Nominal and error dynamics. Consider some nominal, user-chosen matrices $(\bar{A}, \bar{B}) \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$, and define the nominal predictive dynamics \bar{x}_t and error signal e_t as:

$$\bar{x}_{t+1} = \bar{A}\bar{x}_t + \bar{B}\bar{u}_t, \quad e_t = x_t - \bar{x}_t. \quad (6)$$

where \bar{u}_t is the nominal control signal, which is computed by the receding horizon algorithm. Note that, as shown later, stability-wise it is important that (\bar{A}, \bar{B}) belong to $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$.

Let the true matrices $(A_0, B_0) \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{D}}$ be given by $A_0 = \bar{A} + \Delta A_0$ and $B_0 = \bar{B} + \Delta B_0$ for some $(\Delta A_0, \Delta B_0)$. Then, we can rewrite the system in Equation (3) as

$$x_{t+1} = \bar{A}x_t + \bar{B}u_t + w_t + \Delta A_0 x_t + \Delta B_0 u_t, \quad (7)$$

where the rewriting comes from the intuition to treat $w_t + \Delta A_0 x_t + \Delta B_0 u_t$ as an additive disturbance of the system. We consider a control signal u_t defined as

$$u_t = K e_t + \bar{u}_t, \quad (8)$$

where the gain matrix $K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ is used to stabilize the error dynamics. Then, we can derive the dynamics of the error e_t :

$$e_{t+1} = (\bar{A} + \bar{B}K)e_t + \Delta A_0(e_t + \bar{x}_t) + \Delta B_0 u_t + w_t. \quad (9)$$

From the expression of e_t , due to the properties of zonotopes, we have the following result.

Lemma 3 (Error zonotope). *At time t the error zonotope is:*

$$\mathcal{Z}_{e,t} = (A_0 + B_0 K)^t \underbrace{\mathcal{Z}_{e,0}}_{=(e_0,0)} + \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} (A_0 + B_0 K)^k \mathcal{Z}_{\bar{w},t-k-1}, \quad (10)$$

with $\mathcal{Z}_{\bar{w},t} := \Delta A_0 \bar{x}_t + \Delta B_0 \bar{u}_t + \mathcal{Z}_w$. Moreover, if $\rho(A_0 + B_0 K) < 1$, and (\bar{x}_t, \bar{u}_t) are ultimately uniformly bounded, then $\mathcal{Z}_{e,t}$ is a bounded set for any $t \geq 0$.

$\mathcal{Z}_{e,t}$ represents the set of reachable errors at time t . The proof stems from the expression of e_{t+1} and the fact that the pair (\bar{x}_t, \bar{u}_t) is bounded. The boundedness of this pair follows from the MPC formulation provided below. The idea is to solve a receding-horizon optimization problem that at each step bounds the nominal dynamics \bar{x}_t , so that $\bar{x}_t + \mathcal{Z}_{e,k} \subseteq \mathcal{Z}_x$, as to guarantee that the true dynamics will belong to \mathcal{Z}_x . Similarly, we also constrain the signal \bar{u}_t .

There are two problems left to solve: (i) the zonotope $\mathcal{Z}_{e,t}$ cannot be used in practice since the true matrices (A_0, B_0) are unknown; (ii) how to guarantee the stability of $A_0 + B_0 K$. Regarding the former problem, the idea is to over-approximate $\mathcal{Z}_{e,t}$ by another zonotope $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{e,t}$, so that $\mathcal{Z}_{e,t} \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{e,t}$. The latter problem, instead, can be solved by finding K that is stabilizing for all (A, B) in $\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}}$.

For the sake of illustrating our method, we begin by first considering problem (i), and then problem (ii).

Over-approximating the error zonotope. As mentioned, since the pair (A_0, B_0) is unknown, we cannot consider directly $\mathcal{Z}_{e,t}$ in the optimization algorithm that we wish to solve. Therefore, we construct an over-approximation $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{e,t}$ of $\mathcal{Z}_{e,t}$. First, observe that from lemma 3 we have the following recursive formula:

$$\mathcal{Z}_{e,t} = (A_0 + B_0 K) \mathcal{Z}_{e,t-1} + \Delta A_0 \bar{x}_t + \Delta B_0 \bar{u}_t + \mathcal{Z}_w. \quad (11)$$

Define $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D},K} := \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}} \begin{bmatrix} I_n \\ K \end{bmatrix}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\Delta} := \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}} - [A_n \ B_n]$. Then, we obtain the following over-approximation.

Lemma 4 (Error zonotope over-approximation). *Let $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{e,t}$ be defined as*

$$\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{e,t} := \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D},K} \bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{e,t-1} + \mathcal{M}_{\Delta} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{x}_t \\ \bar{u}_t \end{bmatrix} + \mathcal{Z}_w, \quad (12)$$

with $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{e,0} = \mathcal{Z}_{e,0}$. Then, $\mathcal{Z}_{e,t} \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{e,t}$ for $t \geq 0$.

Algorithm 1 TZ-DDPC: TUBE-BASED ZONOTOPIC DATA-DRIVEN PREDICTIVE CONTROL

Input: Data \mathcal{D} , zonotopes $(\mathcal{Z}_w, \mathcal{Z}_x, \mathcal{Z}_u)$, horizons (N, M)

- 1: Use \mathcal{D} to compute $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$, choose $(A_n, B_n) \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$ and feedback gain K . Set $\theta \leftarrow (A_n, B_n, K)$.
- 2: Set $t \leftarrow 0, \bar{x}_t \leftarrow x_t, e_t \leftarrow 0$.
- 3: **repeat**
- 4: Solve $\mathcal{P}_N(e_t, \bar{x}_t, \theta)$ in (15) to get $\bar{u}_t^* = \{\bar{u}_{1|t}^*, \dots, \bar{u}_{N|t}^*\}$, $\bar{x}_t^* = \{\bar{x}_{1|t}^*, \dots, \bar{x}_{N|t}^*\}$.
- 5: Set $\bar{x}_{t+1} \leftarrow \bar{x}_{2|t}^*$. Apply control signal $u_t = K e_t + \bar{u}_{1|t}^*$ and observe $e_{t+1} = x_{t+1} - \bar{x}_{t+1}$.
- 6: Set $t \leftarrow t + 1$.
- 7: **until** $t \leq M$

Proof. We prove it by induction. Obviously it holds for $t = 0$. For a fixed $t > 0$ we observe that by construction of \mathcal{M}_{Δ} it holds that $\Delta A_0 \bar{x}_t + \Delta B_0 \bar{u}_t \in \mathcal{M}_{\Delta}(\langle \bar{x}_t, 0 \rangle \times \langle \bar{u}_t, 0 \rangle)$. Therefore $\Delta A_0 \bar{x}_t + \Delta B_0 \bar{u}_t + \mathcal{Z}_w \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\Delta}(\mathcal{Z}_{\bar{x}_t} \times \mathcal{Z}_{\bar{u}_t}) + \mathcal{Z}_w$. Using the induction step, since $\mathcal{Z}_{e,t-1} \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{e,t-1}$, and $A_0 + B_0 K = [A_0 \ B_0] \begin{bmatrix} I_n \\ K \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}} \begin{bmatrix} I_n \\ K \end{bmatrix}$, it follows that $(A_0 + B_0 K) \mathcal{Z}_{e,t-1} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D},K} \bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{e,t-1}$. \square

Assume now that K is stabilizing for all $(A, B) \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$. Then we obtain the following stability result for $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{e,t}$.

Lemma 5 (Stability of the error zonotope). *If K is stabilizing for all $(A, B) \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$, $(\bar{x}_t, \bar{u}_t) \in \mathcal{Z}_x \times \mathcal{Z}_u$, $(\bar{A}, \bar{B}) \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$ and $e_0 = 0$, then there exists a zonotope $\bar{\mathcal{Z}} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ that satisfies: (i) $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{e,t} \subset \bar{\mathcal{Z}}$ for every $t \geq 0$; (ii) $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}$ is an invariant set, i.e., for $e \in \bar{\mathcal{Z}} \Rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D},K} e + \bar{w} \in \bar{\mathcal{Z}}$, for all $\bar{w} \in \mathcal{M}_{\Delta}(\mathcal{Z}_x \times \mathcal{Z}_u) + \mathcal{Z}_w$.*

Proof. The proof draws inspiration from [20, Thm. 4.1]. Define the disturbance set at time t as:

$$V = \{(A' - \bar{A})\bar{x} + (B' - \bar{B})\bar{u} + w : (A', B') \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}, \bar{x} \in \mathcal{Z}_x, \bar{u} \in \mathcal{Z}_u, w \in \mathcal{Z}_w\} \quad (13)$$

and define the set of reachable errors:

$$E_t = \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} (A + BK)^k V : (A, B) \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}} \right\}, \quad (14)$$

with $E_t = \{0\}$. Then $E_{t+1} = E_t + (A + BK)^t V$. We note that V is a zonotope, therefore bounded and compact. Since $(\bar{A}, \bar{B}) \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$, and $0 \in \mathcal{Z}_w$, then $0 \in V$. Consequently, since $\rho(A + BK) < 1$ for all $(A, B) \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$, there exist $\mu > 0$ and $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ such that for all $t > 0$, $\max_{(A,B) \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}} (A + BK)^t V \subset \mu \lambda^t (0, I_n)$. The rest of the proof follows as in [20, Thm. 4.1] by noting that E_t is a Cauchy sequence in the Hausdorff metric. \square

Therefore, with an appropriate choice of K we are able to guarantee the stability of the over-approximated error zonotope. We are now ready to illustrate our algorithm.

Optimization problem. Define $\theta = (\bar{A}, \bar{B}, K)$ to be

the parameter of the problem. Then, the optimization problem is formulated as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}_N(e_t, \bar{x}_t, \theta) : \quad & \min_{\bar{u}_{1|t}, \dots, \bar{u}_{N|t}} \sum_{k=1}^N \ell_k(\bar{x}_{k|t}, \bar{u}_{k|t}) \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \bar{x}_{k+1|t} = \bar{A}\bar{x}_{k|t} + \bar{B}\bar{u}_{k|t}, \quad \bar{x}_{1|t} = \bar{x}_t, \\
& \bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{e, k+1|t} = \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}, K} \bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{e, k|t} + \mathcal{M}_{\Delta} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{x}_{k|t} \\ \bar{u}_{k|t} \end{bmatrix} + \mathcal{Z}_w, \\
& \bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{e, k|t} + \bar{x}_{k|t} \subseteq \mathcal{Z}_x, \quad \bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{e, 1|t} = e_t, \\
& K \bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{e, k|t} + \bar{u}_{k|t} \subseteq \mathcal{Z}_u, \quad k = 1, \dots, N.
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

$\mathcal{P}_N(e_t, \bar{x}_t, \theta)$ is a convex problem, and its solution yields the optimal control sequence $\bar{u}_t^* = \{\bar{u}_{1|t}^*, \dots, \bar{u}_{N|t}^*\}$ and the associated optimal nominal state sequence $\bar{x}_t^* = \{\bar{x}_{1|t}^*, \dots, \bar{x}_{N|t}^*\}$. By repeatedly solving this optimization problem, we obtain the receding-horizon procedure in algorithm 1. Furthermore, it is straightforward to observe that if $\mathcal{P}_N(e_t, \bar{x}_t, \theta)$ is feasible at each time step, then the closed-loop system satisfies $x_t \in \mathcal{Z}_x, u_t \in \mathcal{Z}_u$ at each time step under the process noise $w_t \in \mathcal{Z}_w$.

Note that, depending on the application, additional convex constraints can be imposed on (\bar{x}, \bar{u}) , and other modifications can be added by considering $\bar{x}_{k|t} + c_{\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{e, k+1|t}}$, where $c_{\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{e, k+1|t}}$ is the center of the error zonotope at step $k+1|t$.

Lemma 6 (Feasibility and robust constraint satisfaction). *If algorithm 1 is feasible at time $t=0$ for any initial condition $x_0 \in \mathcal{Z}_{x_0}$, so that $\mathcal{Z}_{x_0} \supseteq \mathcal{Z}_x$, then it is feasible at every iteration $0 \leq t \leq M$, and the system satisfies $x_t \in \mathcal{Z}_x, u_t \in \mathcal{Z}_u$ at each time step under the process noise $w_t \in \mathcal{Z}_w$.*

Proof. This is a standard argument and can be easily verified. By the feasibility of \mathcal{P}_N in (15) at time $t=0$ we are guaranteed that $x_1 \in x_0 + \bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{e, 2|0} \subseteq \mathcal{Z}_x$. Recursively, for any t we see that $x_{t+1} \in \bar{x}_{t+1} + \bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{e, 2|t} \subseteq \mathcal{Z}_x$, etc. \square

Simplification. We propose a simple change that can be used to improve the computational efficiency of the algorithm. Taking advantage of the stability induced by K , define the operator $T_{\mathcal{D}, K} \mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}, K} \mathcal{Z}$, so that $T_{\mathcal{D}, K}^n \mathcal{Z} = T_{\mathcal{D}, K} (T_{\mathcal{D}, K}^{n-1} \mathcal{Z})$. Then, we can rewrite $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{e, t}$ recursively as

$$\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{e, t} = T_{\mathcal{D}, K}^t \mathcal{Z}_{e, 0} + \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} T_{\mathcal{D}, K}^k \left[\mathcal{M}_{\Delta} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{x}_{t-k-1} \\ \bar{u}_{t-k-1} \end{bmatrix} + \mathcal{Z}_w \right]. \tag{16}$$

Then, for negligible errors, the user may consider approximating $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{e, t}$ as follows for $t > k_0$:

$$\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{e, t} \approx \sum_{k=0}^{k_0-1} T_{\mathcal{D}, K}^k \left[\mathcal{M}_{\Delta} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{x}_{t-k-1} \\ \bar{u}_{t-k-1} \end{bmatrix} + \mathcal{Z}_w \right]. \tag{17}$$

where k_0 is a user-chosen parameter that can be tuned to only account the last k_0 disturbance terms.

3) *Selection of a feedback gain K :* Finally, we consider the problem of computing K . To guarantee the stability of $A_0 + B_0 K$ we may a worst-case approach, which essentially

comes down to compute K such that the following LMI is satisfied

$$(A + BK)^\top P(A + BK) - P < 0, \quad \forall (A, B) \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}, \tag{18}$$

for some $P > 0$. This is well known to be an NP-hard problem [6], [29], since it amounts to checking the vertices of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$, which scales as $O(2^{nm})$ if we approximate $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$ by an hypercube. The problem we face here is, in nature, similar to the one that we discussed regarding the min-max robust optimization problem in the previous section.

In the following we consider two problems: (1) that of verifying that a given K is stabilizing; (2) the problem of computing a stabilizing K . For both problems, we make use of randomized algorithms to provide probabilistic guarantees.

Verification of K through random sampling. Assume to compute K through some procedure. For example, the user may use concave-programming techniques to compute the bi-level optimization problem $\{K : \rho(A + BK) < 1, (A, B) \in \arg \max_{(A, B) \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}} \|A + BK\|_2\}$, where the 2-norm is used as a proxy of the spectral radius. Since the solution to the inner maximization problem is usually difficult to compute, we need to verify that the resulting gain K is stabilizing. In that sense, it is possible to assess the robustness of K in a probabilistic sense. The idea is to provide a high-confidence guarantee by sampling a batch $\omega_N = \{(A^{(1)}, B^{(1)}), \dots, (A^{(N)}, B^{(N)})\} \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}^N$ of N i.i.d. samples drawn according to some measure \mathbb{P} over $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$. For a pair (A, B) , define $g_K(A, B) := \mathbf{1}_{\rho(A+BK) \geq 1}$ to be a binary function that returns 1 if $\rho(A + BK) \geq 1$. Similarly, for a sample ω_N define $g_K(\omega_N) := \max_{i=1, \dots, N} g_K(A^{(i)}, B^{(i)})$. Then, define the risk of violation over $\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}}$ as:

$$R_K(\omega_N) = \mathbb{P}((A, B) \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{D}} : g_K(A, B) > g_K(\omega_N)). \tag{19}$$

We have the following result.

Lemma 7 (Robustness guarantee for a given K). *For a given accuracy $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and confidence $\delta \in (0, 1)$, if $N \geq \ln(\frac{1}{\delta}) / \ln(\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon})$, then with probability $1 - \delta$ we have $R_K(\omega_N) \leq \varepsilon$, that is*

$$\mathbb{P}(\omega_N \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}^N : R_K(\omega_N) \leq \varepsilon) > 1 - \delta. \tag{20}$$

Proof. Let $\tilde{R}_K(\omega_N) = \mathbb{P}((A, B) \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}} : g_K(A, B) > g_K(\omega_N))$. Using [30, Lemma 11.1], we can straightforwardly obtain $\mathbb{P}(\omega_N \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}^N : \tilde{R}_K(\omega_N) > \varepsilon) \leq (1 - \varepsilon)^N$. Since $\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}} \subset \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$ it follows that for a given ω_N the inequality $\tilde{R}_K(\omega_N) \geq R_K(\omega_N)$ holds, thus $\mathbb{P}(\omega_N : R_K(\omega_N) > \varepsilon) \leq \mathbb{P}(\omega_N : \tilde{R}_K(\omega_N) > \varepsilon) \leq (1 - \varepsilon)^N$. The proof follows by considering the complement and setting $\delta \geq (1 - \varepsilon)^N$. \square

Hence, if K is stabilizing for a given batch ω_N , i.e. $g_K(\omega_N) = 0$, then with confidence $1 - \delta$ we can state that the probability that there exists $(A, B) \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{D}}$ for which $\rho(A + BK) \geq 1$ is lower than, or equal, to ε . Finally, note that the probability measure \mathbb{P} is chosen by the user, and, in general, should represent the uncertainty that the user assigns to the various regions of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$.

Computation of K through random sampling. Similarly, we can learn K by using a random sample ω_N sampled according to \mathbb{P} . For example, K can be computed by solving

$$\begin{bmatrix} X & AX + BZ \\ (AX + BZ)^\top & X \end{bmatrix} \succ 0, \quad \forall (A, B) \in \omega_N$$

for some $X > 0, Z$. Then we obtain K by $K = ZX^{-1}$. Alternatively, the user can compute K through any other method. However, note that K is now a random variable, since it is function of ω_N , i.e. $K = K(\omega_N)$. Therefore, the bound used in the previous section does not hold. We provide the following robustness guarantee if N is sufficiently large.

Lemma 8 (Robustness guarantee for a learnt $K(\omega_N)$). *For a given accuracy $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and confidence $\delta \in (0, 1)$, let $N \geq \frac{5}{\varepsilon} (\ln \frac{4}{\delta} + d \ln \frac{40}{\varepsilon})$ with $d = 2nm \log_2(2en^2(n+1))$. Consider an i.i.d. sample ω_N from $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$ sampled according to \mathbb{P} . Assume that $K = K(\omega_N)$ is computed according to ω_N , and that $\rho(A + BK(\omega_N)) < 1$ for every $(A, B) \in \omega_N$. Then, with probability at-least $1 - \delta$ we have*

$$\mathbb{P}((A, B) \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{D}} : \rho(A + BK(\omega_N))) \leq \varepsilon. \quad (21)$$

Proof. The problem can be framed as a statistical learning problem [29]. The sample complexity then can be found by computing the VC-dimension of $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{S}(K), K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}\}$, where $\mathcal{S}(K) = \{(A, B) \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}} : \rho(A + BK) < 1\}$. The stability test of $A + BK$ can be formulated using the Routh-Hurwitz criterion in the s -domain through a bilinear transform. Then, the Routh-Hurwitz test consists of n polynomial inequality, each with maximum degree $n(n+1)$ in the elements of K . Following the argument in [29, Thm. 3] we apply [30, Corollary 10.12] with $l = nm, d = n(n+1)/2, s = n$, which yields $\text{VC}(\mathcal{C}) \leq 2nm \log_2(2en^2(n+1))$. The result follows by applying standard statistical learning arguments, for example by applying [1, Corollary 4]. \square

V. NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS

Similarly to [26, Sec. 4.1], we illustrate our method on a double integrator affected by strong adversarial noise. To handle the mathematical operations with zonotopes, we created a python library `PYZONOTOPE`¹. The code for `TZ-DDPC`² was written in Python, and can be found on GitHub. To implement the problem in (15), the zonotope inclusion constraints are approximated by considering their right and left interval limits as in [3]. Finally, to reduce the complexity of the problem, the order of all the matrix zonotopes is reduced to 1 using the box reduction method presented in [21].

Simulations. The sampled double integrator is defined by the equation:

$$x_{t+1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} x_t + \begin{bmatrix} 0.5 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} u_t + w_t, \quad x_0 = \begin{bmatrix} -5 \\ -2 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (22)$$

¹PYZONOTOPE: <https://github.com/rssalessio/pyzonotope>

²TZ-DDPC: <https://github.com/rssalessio/TZDDPC>




Fig. 1. Double integrator: comparison of TZ-DDPC and ZPC. The gray area depicts the complement of \mathcal{Z}_x . As seen from the image, ZPC is not feasible for the original constraint zonotope \mathcal{Z}_x , which was then enlarged by 25% to make the problem feasible for ZPC.

We chose a strong adversarial noise w_t that is uniformly sampled from the vertices of $\mathcal{Z}_w = \left\langle 0, \begin{bmatrix} 0.1 & 0.05 \\ 0.05 & 0.1 \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle$.

The state zonotope is $\mathcal{Z}_x = \langle [-4, 0]^\top, \text{diag}(4, 2) \rangle$, while the control signal zonotope is $\mathcal{Z}_u = \langle 0, 1 \rangle$. The cost function at any step k is defined by $\ell(x, u) = \|x\|_2^2 + 10^{-2}|u|$. The matrix zonotope $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{D}}$ was built using $T = 100$ samples, collected using a $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ distribution for u_t . The matrix $K = [-0.561 \quad -1.385]$ was computed by approximately solving the bi-level optimization problem illustrated in §IV-B.3 through the use of concave programming [28]. Finally, the solution was verified using lemma 7 with $\varepsilon = 10^{-2}, \delta = 10^{-5}$. In fig. 1 we compare results for TZ-DDPC and ZPC with $M = 12$. Due to ZPC being slightly more computationally complex, we simulated ZPC with $N = 2$, and for fair comparison we used the same value of N also for TZ-DDPC. With the same data, and constraints, ZPC could not solve the problem without enlarging the size of \mathcal{Z}_x by approximately 25%. This constraint violation is also seen in fig. 1. We conclude that using a stabilizing matrix K can help improve stability, and reduce the complexity of using zonotope-based methods.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this work we proposed a tube-based MPC formulation based on zonotopes to deal with generic convex loss functions, bounded process noise and uncertainties in the system matrices. Our method builds on [2], [3], and consists of two phases: (i) an offline data-collection phase that builds a set of possible system matrices that are consistent with the data; (ii) an online control phase that uses a tube-based MPC paradigm to robustly control the unknown linear system. We show how to guarantee stability of the resulting error zonotope, and provide probabilistic robustness guarantees for the stabilizing gain matrix K . Future venues of research include: how to better approximate the uncertainty set over the system matrices (for example when the noise is bounded and i.i.d.), and the study of specific convex functions as well as extending the analysis to non-linear systems.

REFERENCES

- [1] Teodoro Alamo, Roberto Tempo, and Eduardo F Camacho. Randomized strategies for probabilistic solutions of uncertain feasibility and optimization problems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 54(11):2545–2559, 2009.
- [2] Amr Alanwar, Anne Koch, Frank Allgöwer, and Karl Henrik Johansson. Data-driven reachability analysis using matrix zonotopes. In *Learning for Dynamics and Control*, pages 163–175. PMLR, 2021.
- [3] Amr Alanwar, Yvonne Stürz, and Karl Henrik Johansson. Robust data-driven predictive control using reachability analysis. *European Journal of Control*, page 100666, 2022.
- [4] Matthias Althoff. *Reachability analysis and its application to the safety assessment of autonomous cars*. PhD thesis, Technische Universität München, 2010.
- [5] Matthias Althoff, Goran Frehse, and Antoine Girard. Set propagation techniques for reachability analysis. *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, 4(1), 2021.
- [6] Aharon Ben-Tal and Arkadi Nemirovski. *Lectures on modern convex optimization: analysis, algorithms, and engineering applications*. SIAM, 2001.
- [7] Julian Berberich, Johannes Köhler, Matthias A Müller, and Frank Allgöwer. Data-driven model predictive control with stability and robustness guarantees. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 66(4):1702–1717, 2020.
- [8] José Manuel Bravo, Teodoro Alamo, and Eduardo F Camacho. Robust mpc of constrained discrete-time nonlinear systems based on approximated reachable sets. *Automatica*, 42(10):1745–1751, 2006.
- [9] Valentina Breschi, Alessandro Chiuso, and Simone Formentin. The role of regularization in data-driven predictive control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.10846*, 2022.
- [10] Robert Creighton Buck. Partition of space. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 50(9):541–544, 1943.
- [11] Giuseppe C Calafiore and Lorenzo Fagiano. Robust model predictive control via scenario optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 58(1):219–224, 2012.
- [12] Marco C Campi and Simone Garatti. The exact feasibility of randomized solutions of uncertain convex programs. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 19(3):1211–1230, 2008.
- [13] Marco C Campi, Andrea Lecchini, and Sergio M Savaresi. Virtual reference feedback tuning: a direct method for the design of feedback controllers. *Automatica*, 38(8):1337–1346, 2002.
- [14] Jeremy Coulson, John Lygeros, and Florian Dörfler. Data-enabled predictive control: In the shallows of the deepc. In *2019 18th European Control Conference (ECC)*, pages 307–312. IEEE, 2019.
- [15] Jeremy Coulson, John Lygeros, and Florian Dörfler. Regularized and distributionally robust data-enabled predictive control. In *2019 IEEE 58th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 2696–2701. IEEE, 2019.
- [16] Munoz de la Pena, Alberto Bemporad, and Carlo Filippi. Robust explicit mpc based on approximate multi-parametric convex programming. In *2004 43rd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)(IEEE Cat. No. 04CH37601)*, volume 3, pages 2491–2496. IEEE, 2004.
- [17] Claudio De Persis and Pietro Tesi. Formulas for data-driven control: Stabilization, optimality, and robustness. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 65(3):909–924, 2019.
- [18] Linbin Huang, Jianzhe Zhen, John Lygeros, and Florian Dörfler. Robust data-enabled predictive control: Tractable formulations and performance guarantees. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.07199*, 2021.
- [19] P Ioannou and Konstantinos Tsakalis. A robust direct adaptive controller. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic control*, 31(11):1033–1043, 1986.
- [20] Ilya Kolmanovskiy and Elmer G Gilbert. Theory and computation of disturbance invariant sets for discrete-time linear systems. *Mathematical problems in engineering*, 4(4):317–367, 1998.
- [21] Anna-Kathrin Kopetzki, Bastian Schürmann, and Matthias Althoff. Methods for order reduction of zonotopes. In *2017 IEEE 56th Annual Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 5626–5633. IEEE, 2017.
- [22] Wolfgang Kühn. Rigorously computed orbits of dynamical systems without the wrapping effect. *Computing*, 61(1):47–67, 1998.
- [23] Wilbur Langson, Ioannis Chrysochoos, SV Raković, and David Q Mayne. Robust model predictive control using tubes. *Automatica*, 40(1):125–133, 2004.
- [24] Johan Löfberg. *Minimax approaches to robust model predictive control*, volume 812. Linköping University Electronic Press, 2003.
- [25] Ivan Markovskiy and Paolo Rapisarda. Data-driven simulation and control. *International Journal of Control*, 81(12):1946–1959, 2008.
- [26] David Q Mayne, María M Seron, and SV Raković. Robust model predictive control of constrained linear systems with bounded disturbances. *Automatica*, 41(2):219–224, 2005.
- [27] James Blake Rawlings, David Q Mayne, and Moritz Diehl. *Model predictive control: theory, computation, and design*, volume 2. Nob Hill Publishing Madison, WI, 2017.
- [28] Xinyue Shen, Steven Diamond, Yuntao Gu, and Stephen Boyd. Disciplined convex-concave programming. In *2016 IEEE 55th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 1009–1014. IEEE, 2016.
- [29] M Vidyasagar and Vincent D Blondel. Probabilistic solutions to some np-hard matrix problems. *Automatica*, 37(9):1397–1405, 2001.
- [30] Mathukumalli Vidyasagar. *Learning and generalisation: with applications to neural networks*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [31] Jan C Willems, Paolo Rapisarda, Ivan Markovskiy, and Bart LM De Moor. A note on persistency of excitation. *Systems & Control Letters*, 54(4):325–329, 2005.