

Adaptive Output Feedback Model Predictive Control

Anchita Dey, Abhishek Dhar and Shubhendu Bhasin

Abstract—Model predictive control (MPC) for uncertain systems in the presence of hard constraints on state and input is a non-trivial problem, and the challenge is increased manifold in the absence of state measurements. In this paper, we propose an adaptive output feedback MPC technique, based on a novel combination of an adaptive observer and robust MPC, for single-input single-output discrete-time linear time-invariant systems. At each time instant, the adaptive observer provides estimates of the states and the system parameters that are then leveraged in the MPC optimization routine while robustly accounting for the estimation errors. The solution to the optimization problem results in a homothetic tube where the state estimate trajectory lies. The true state evolves inside a larger outer tube obtained by augmenting a set, invariant to the state estimation error, around the homothetic tube sections. The proof for recursive feasibility for the proposed ‘homothetic and invariant’ two-tube approach is provided, along with simulation results on an academic system.

I. INTRODUCTION

Model predictive control (MPC) [1] is a well-known technique for making optimal control decisions in the presence of hard constraints on states and control inputs. The classical MPC relies on exact system model knowledge without consideration for any uncertainty or noise. Unfortunately, it is practically challenging to obtain an approximate, let alone an accurate model of the system. Thus, there are efforts to relax the need for ‘M’ in MPC. Several questions, however, arise. Can state predictions, which are at the heart of MPC, be reliably made without an accurate model? How to account for errors in those state predictions? Is recursive feasibility guaranteed? These questions become harder to answer when the state measurements are also unavailable.

There has already been a lot of progress on how to deal with uncertainties in the system model, mostly using a robust tube-based approach [2], [3]. However, robust approaches typically handle additive disturbances. To account for parametric uncertainties in the model, adaptive MPC methods were proposed, where the goal was to learn the unknown parameters for better transient performance [4]-[7]. Another learning-based approach is the iterative learning-based MPC [8], [9] where learning is done to increase the accessible safe region for the states to evolve. This method is particularly useful for applications involving repetitive tasks.

A restrictive assumption made in most robust and adaptive MPC literature is the availability of state measurements. To

obviate this requirement, [10] and [11] use a Luenberger observer to estimate the states, and then design robust tubes for a system with known model parameters but additive disturbances. In [12], a tube-based approach independent of the state estimation method is presented. The application-based paper [13] uses MPC with an observer for state estimation; the adaptation done is in terms of switching from one known system to another. Authors of [14] extend the work in [10] to learning of the safe region for iterative tasks, as in [8], while assuming the system parameters to be known. Recently, some data-driven approaches using Hankel matrix have been proposed in [15] and [16] which include an initial data-driven system identification step before the MPC optimization routine is run. A drastically different method is adopted in [17], where input-output data is used to estimate future outputs with an estimated ARX model, whose parameters, along with the control input to be applied, are obtained by solving recursive least square (RLS) problems.

Yet, a common assumption in [10]-[14] is that the system parameters are known, whereas the techniques in [15] and [16] need an offline phase for data collection and may not give satisfactory performance if the parameters change during operation of the optimization routine. The approach in [17] uses RLS with saturated control inputs, which may cause violation of any hard constraints on the outputs.

In this paper, we strategically combine an online state and parameter estimator with MPC leading to an adaptive output feedback MPC (AOFMPC) design for discrete-time single-input single-output (SISO) linear time-invariant (LTI) systems. The estimator deployed is an adaptive observer [18], which uses input-output data to simultaneously estimate the states and the system parameters *online*. The state estimation error is accounted for by constructing an invariant set [19] that is used to get a tightened constraint for the state estimates. The constrained optimal control problem (COCP) for MPC is reformulated in terms of the state and parameter estimates, i.e., the cost function along with the constraints are now defined in terms of the state and parameter estimates obtained from the observer. Another challenge is to generate future state estimate predictions required in the COCP by somehow exploiting the adaptive observer dynamics; this is non-trivial since it requires knowledge of the future parameter estimates and outputs. To get around this issue, the observer dynamics is rewritten in terms of the quantities known at the current time instant, and an additive uncertainty is considered to account for the mismatched dynamics. This uncertainty in predicted state estimates is dealt with using a homothetic tube framework [2, sec 3.3] that ensures that the state estimate trajectory stays inside the homothetic tube.

Anchita Dey (*corresponding author*) and Shubhendu Bhasin are with the Department of Electrical Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Delhi, Hauz Khas, New Delhi, Delhi 110016, India {anchita.dey, sbhasin}@ee.iitd.ac.in.

Abhishek Dhar is with the Department of Electrical Engineering, Linköping University, Linköping 58183, Sweden abhishek.dharr@gmail.com.

The set invariant to the state estimation errors is added to the homothetic tube sections to obtain a larger outer tube, inside which the true state evolves. This leads to a unique two-tube architecture: an inner homothetic tube and an outer invariant-added-to-homothetic tube.

The proposed AOFMPC relaxes the assumption on availability of state measurements as well as system parameters. There is no offline pre-MPC system identification phase. Additionally, this novel framework of an invariant annular portion around a homothetic tube enables us to impose constraints on all the states and inputs, and not only on the outputs and inputs [15]-[17], [20], [21].

Notations: $\|\cdot\|_q$ represents q -norm of a vector (or induced q -norm of a matrix) where $q \in \{2, \infty\}$. For a vector (scalar) g , $\|g\|_V^2 = g^T V g$ where V is a matrix (scalar). For sets \mathbb{A} and \mathbb{B} , $\mathbb{A} \oplus \mathbb{B}$ denotes Minkowski sum and $\mathbb{A} \ominus \mathbb{B}$ denotes Pontryagin difference. $I_g \in \mathbb{R}^{g \times g}$ is the Identity matrix. $0_{g \times h} \in \mathbb{R}^{g \times h}$ is the zero matrix. $\mathbb{I}_g^h = \{g, g+1, \dots, h-1, h\}$ with integers g and $h > g$. The value of g at time $t+i$ predicted at time t is denoted by $g_{i|t}$. The estimate of g is \hat{g} and $g \in \mathcal{L}_\infty$ implies g is bounded. $\text{conv}\{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_q\}$ represents convex hull of g_1, g_2, \dots, g_q where q is some finite integer.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

Consider the constrained discrete-time SISO LTI system

$$x_{t+1} = Ax_t + bu_t, \quad y_t = cx_t \quad (1)$$

$$x_t \in \mathcal{X}, \quad u_t \in \mathcal{U} \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{I}_0^\infty \quad (2)$$

where $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $u_t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $y_t \in \mathbb{R}$ denote the state, input and output, respectively at time t . The parameters $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $b, c^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are unknown constants. The goal is to stabilize the system while satisfying hard state and input constraints (2). Provided the state measurements and system parameters are available, this is achievable with classical MPC [1] by solving the following optimization problem (OP).

$$\text{OP1: } \min_{\mu_t} J(x_t, \mu_t) \triangleq \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \left(\|x_{i|t}\|_{\bar{Q}}^2 + \|u_{i|t}\|_{\bar{R}}^2 \right) + \|x_{N|t}\|_{\bar{P}}^2$$

subject to $x_{0|t} = x_t$, $x_{i|t} \in \mathcal{X} \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{I}_0^N$, $u_{i|t} \in \mathcal{U} \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{I}_0^{N-1}$,

$$x_{N|t} \in \mathcal{X}_T \subseteq \mathcal{X} \quad \text{and} \quad x_{i+1|t} = Ax_{i|t} + bu_{i|t} \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{I}_0^{N-1}$$

where $\bar{P}, \bar{Q} > 0_{n \times n}$, $\bar{R} > 0$, $\mu_t \triangleq \{u_{0|t}, u_{1|t}, \dots, u_{N-1|t}\}$, N is the prediction horizon length (for states as well as control) and \mathcal{X}_T is the terminal set containing the origin [1, ch 2].

In the absence of state measurements and accurate knowledge of A and b , OP1 is not solvable. In this work, an adaptive observer is used to simultaneously estimate the state and system parameters. The estimates are used to solve a reformulated COCP in a robust framework with a receding horizon approach [1]. In developing the theory, we consider the following standard assumptions [4], [6], [10] throughout.

Assumption 1: The state space realization given in (1) is observable.

Assumption 2: The unknown parameter $\psi \triangleq [A \quad b] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n+1)}$ belongs to a set $\Psi \triangleq \text{conv}\{\psi^{v1}, \psi^{v2}, \dots, \psi^{vL}\}$ where the vertices $\psi^{v1}, \psi^{v2}, \dots, \psi^{vL} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n+1)}$ are known, and L

is some finite positive integer. Each element in Ψ forms a stabilizable system.

Assumption 1 is necessary for an observer-based approach while Assumption 2 is considered to allow constraint tightening as well as to find a terminal set in the MPC design.

III. ADAPTIVE OBSERVER FOR STATE AND PARAMETER ESTIMATION

Following Assumption 1, there is no loss of generality if (1) is considered to be in the observable canonical form with the parameters as

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} a & & & \\ & I_{n-1} & & \\ & & 0_{1 \times (n-1)} & \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{with } a = [a_1 \quad a_2 \quad \dots \quad a_n]^T \quad (3)$$

$$b = [b_1 \quad b_2 \quad \dots \quad b_n]^T \quad \text{and } c = [1 \quad 0_{1 \times (n-1)}]. \quad (4)$$

The structures in (3) and (4) are used to construct the observer. Let $F \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be any user-defined stable matrix of the form

$$F = \begin{bmatrix} f & & & \\ & I_{n-1} & & \\ & & 0_{1 \times (n-1)} & \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{with } f = [f_1 \quad f_2 \quad \dots \quad f_n]^T. \quad (5)$$

Using (3)-(5), the plant dynamics in (1) can be re-written as

$$x_{t+1} = Fx_t + (A - F)x_t + bu_t = Fx_t + (a - f)y_t + bu_t. \quad (6)$$

The adaptive observer dynamics is given by

$$\hat{x}_{t+1} = F\hat{x}_t + (\hat{a}_t - f)y_t + \hat{b}_t u_t \quad (7)$$

where $\hat{a}_t \triangleq [\hat{a}_{1t} \quad \hat{a}_{2t} \quad \dots \quad \hat{a}_{nt}]^T$, $\hat{b}_t \triangleq [\hat{b}_{1t} \quad \hat{b}_{2t} \quad \dots \quad \hat{b}_{nt}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are the estimates of a and b respectively, obtained at time t . Introducing $p \triangleq [(a - f)^T \quad b^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ and its estimate $\hat{p}_t \triangleq [(\hat{a}_t - f)^T \quad \hat{b}_t^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$, the solution of (7) is given by [18]

$$\hat{x}_t = [M_{1t} \quad M_{2t}] \hat{p}_t + F^t \hat{x}_0 \quad (8)$$

$$\Rightarrow \hat{y}_t = \phi_t^T \hat{p}_t + cF^t \hat{x}_0 \quad (9)$$

where \hat{y}_t is the observer output, $\phi_t \triangleq [M_{1t} \quad M_{2t}]^T c^T \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ with $M_{1t}, M_{2t} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ satisfying

$$M_{1_{t+1}} = FM_{1t} + I_n y_t, \quad M_{1_0} = 0_{n \times n} \quad (10)$$

$$M_{2_{t+1}} = FM_{2t} + I_n u_t, \quad M_{2_0} = 0_{n \times n}.$$

Let $\tilde{x}_t \triangleq x_t - \hat{x}_t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the state estimation error and $\tilde{p}_t \triangleq p - \hat{p}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ be the parameter estimation error. It follows from (6), (8) and (10) that

$$\tilde{x}_t = [M_{1t} \quad M_{2t}] \tilde{p}_t + F^t \tilde{x}_0. \quad (11)$$

Since $\tilde{x}_0 \in \mathcal{L}_\infty$ and F is Hurwitz, $F^t \tilde{x}_0$ exponentially converges to zero. Thus, the convergence of \tilde{x}_t to zero is dictated by the convergence of \tilde{p}_t to zero. The following adaptive law is considered for updating \hat{p}_t using an exponentially weighted least squares method [22, ch 3]

$$\hat{p}_t = \hat{p}_{t-1} + \Gamma_t \phi_t (y_t - cF^t \hat{x}_0 - \phi_t^T \hat{p}_{t-1}) \quad (12)$$

$$\Gamma_t = \frac{1}{\zeta^2} \left[\Gamma_{t-1} - \frac{\Gamma_{t-1} \phi_t \phi_t^T \Gamma_{t-1}}{\zeta^2 + \phi_t^T \Gamma_{t-1} \phi_t} \right] \quad (13)$$

where $\zeta \in (0, 1)$ and $\Gamma_0 = \gamma^2 I_{2n}$ where $\gamma \gg 1$ [18]. The estimate $\hat{y}_t \triangleq [\hat{A}_t \quad \hat{b}_t]$ (where \hat{A}_t is structurally similar to

A , except for a being replaced by \hat{a}_t), is constructed using \hat{p}_t given by (12).

Lemma 1: If the regressor ϕ_t is persistently exciting, then the parameter estimation error \tilde{p}_t and consequently the state estimation error \tilde{x}_t exponentially converges to zero as $t \rightarrow \infty$. (*Proof:* In [18, Appendix] and from (11)).

Remark 1: For an LTI system, the persistent excitation condition is guaranteed by choosing the input u_t to be sufficiently rich [23].

The parameter estimates $\hat{\psi}_t$ obtained using (12) and (13) may lie outside Ψ . Since it is desirable that $\hat{\psi}_t \in \Psi$ (Assumption 2), the adaptation law in (12) is replaced by the following two equations

$$\bar{p}_t \triangleq \hat{p}_{t-1} + \Gamma_t \phi_t (y_t - cF^t \hat{x}_0 - \phi_t^T \hat{p}_{t-1}) \quad (14)$$

$$\hat{p}_t = \begin{cases} \bar{p}_t, & \text{if } \hat{\psi}_t \in \Psi \\ \text{Proj}_{\Pi}(\bar{p}_t), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

where $\text{Proj}_{\Pi}(\bar{p}_t)$ is an operator that projects \bar{p}_t orthogonally [24, ch 4] onto the set $\Pi \triangleq \{[(\hat{a} - f)^T \ \hat{b}^T]^T \mid \hat{a}, \hat{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \begin{bmatrix} \hat{a} \\ 0_{1 \times (n-1)} \\ \hat{b} \end{bmatrix} \in \Psi\}$.

Remark 2: Lemma 1 is applicable to the projection modified recursive updates of \hat{p}_t given by (13)-(15) [24, ch 4].

IV. ADAPTIVE OUTPUT FEEDBACK MPC

In absence of state measurements, the COCP OP1 is reformulated in terms of the state estimates. This implies that we need to find a constraint set for \hat{x}_t , so that $x_t \in \mathcal{X}$. Since $\hat{x}_t = x_t - \tilde{x}_t$, it is possible to obtain a constraint set $\widehat{\mathcal{X}}$ for \hat{x}_t by tightening \mathcal{X} using an invariant set for \tilde{x}_t [19].

A. An invariant set for the state estimation errors

From (7), we can write the adaptive observer dynamics as

$$\hat{x}_{t+1} = F\hat{x}_t + (\hat{A}_t - F)x_t + \hat{b}_t u_t. \quad (16)$$

Subtracting (16) from (6), we get

$$\tilde{x}_{t+1} = F\tilde{x}_t + \tilde{\psi}_t Z_t \quad (17)$$

where $\tilde{\psi}_t \triangleq \Psi - \hat{\psi}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n+1)}$ and $Z_t \triangleq [x_t^T \ u_t]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Next, we make a standard assumption regarding the uncertainty in initial state estimate [10], [11].

Assumption 3: There exists a known, convex, compact set \mathbb{W}_0 containing \tilde{x}_0 and the origin, and $\mathbb{W}_0 \subset \mathcal{X}$.

Assumption 3 is required to characterize a bounded set for $\tilde{x}_t \forall t \in \mathbb{I}_0^\infty$. Using it and (17), we can write

$$\tilde{x}_0 \in \mathbb{W}_0 \text{ and } \tilde{x}_i \in \mathbb{W}_i \triangleq F^i \mathbb{W}_0 \oplus \bigoplus_{k=0}^{i-1} F^k \Omega_1 \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{I}_1^\infty \quad (18)$$

where $\Omega_1 \triangleq \{\tilde{\psi}Z \mid \|\tilde{\psi}\|_2 \in \mathbb{B}_0^\Psi, Z = [x^T \ u]^T \text{ with } x \in \mathcal{X}, u \in \mathcal{U}\}$ and \mathbb{B}_0^Ψ is a ball centred at the origin with radius equal to $\max\{\|\psi_{(1)} - \psi_{(2)}\| \mid \psi_{(1)}, \psi_{(2)} \in \Psi\}$.

Let $\Omega_\infty \triangleq \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \bigoplus_{k=0}^{i-1} F^k \Omega_1$. Since Ω_1 is a compact, convex polytopic set containing the origin, we can find a minimal robust positively invariant set Ω_∞ that satisfies [11]

$$\Omega_\infty = F\Omega_\infty \oplus \Omega_1. \quad (19)$$

Computing an outer approximation [19] of Ω_∞ is more tractable; let Ω_{oa} be that outer approximation. Using Ω_{oa} and the fact that $\mathbb{W}_0 \supseteq F\mathbb{W}_0 \supseteq F^2\mathbb{W}_0 \supseteq \dots$, we get

$$\tilde{x}_t \in \mathbb{W}_{oa} \triangleq \mathbb{W}_0 \oplus \Omega_{oa} \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{I}_0^\infty. \quad (20)$$

Finally, using \mathbb{W}_{oa} in which the state estimation error \tilde{x}_t evolves, the tightened constraint set for the state estimate \hat{x}_t is obtained as

$$x_t - \tilde{x}_t = \hat{x}_t \in \widehat{\mathcal{X}} \triangleq \mathcal{X} \ominus \mathbb{W}_{oa} \quad (21)$$

which implies that the smaller the size of \mathbb{W}_{oa} , the larger the feasible region for the COCP.

The initial constraint tightening in (21) allows us to reformulate the COCP in terms of the state estimate. Adding back \mathbb{W}_{oa} to the state estimate trajectory, obtained from the subsequently reformulated COCP, results in a tube [2] for the true state trajectory.

The observer dynamics in (7), in addition to generating state estimates, is exploited for computing state estimate predictions that are used in the MPC optimization routine. To that end, the dynamics in (16), which is an equivalent form of (7), is rewritten as

$$\hat{x}_{t+i+1} = F\hat{x}_{t+i} + (\hat{A}_{t+i} - F)x_{t+i} + \hat{b}_{t+i}u_{t+i} \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{I}_0^\infty. \quad (22)$$

However, in its current form, (22) is not usable for computing state estimate predictions due to the presence of \hat{A}_{t+i} , $\hat{b}_{t+i} \forall i \in \mathbb{I}_1^\infty$ and $x_{t+i} \forall i \in \mathbb{I}_0^\infty$, which are unavailable at current time t . Hence, (22) is rewritten as

$$\hat{x}_{t+i+1} = \hat{A}_t \hat{x}_{t+i} + \hat{b}_t u_{t+i} + \varepsilon_{t+i} \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{I}_0^\infty \quad (23)$$

where $\varepsilon_{t+i} \triangleq (\hat{A}_{t+i} - F)\tilde{x}_{t+i} + (\hat{\psi}_{t+i} - \hat{\psi}_t)\hat{Z}_{t+i} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, with $\hat{Z}_{t+i} \triangleq [\hat{x}_{t+i}^T \ u_{t+i}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, is coined as the prediction uncertainty. All the terms involving the unavailable quantities at time t in (22) are lumped together in ε_{t+i} . This prediction uncertainty is handled using a homothetic tube [2], as detailed in the subsequent subsections.

B. Sets for the prediction uncertainties

By definition, $\varepsilon_{t+i} = (\hat{A}_{t+i} - F)\tilde{x}_{t+i} + (\hat{\psi}_{t+i} - \hat{\psi}_t)\hat{Z}_{t+i} = (\hat{A}_{t+i} - F)\tilde{x}_{t+i} + \sum_{k=t}^{t+i-1} (\hat{\psi}_{k+1} - \hat{\psi}_k)\hat{Z}_{t+i} \forall i \in \mathbb{I}_0^\infty$. Thus,

$$\varepsilon_{t+i} \in \Omega_2 \oplus i\Omega_3 \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{I}_0^\infty \quad (24)$$

where $\Omega_2 \triangleq \{(\hat{A} - F)\tilde{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \hat{A} \in \Psi_A, \tilde{x} \in \mathbb{W}_{oa}\}$, $\Psi_A \triangleq \{\hat{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \mid [\hat{A} \ \hat{b}] \in \Psi \text{ with } \hat{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$ and $\Omega_3 \triangleq \{(\hat{\psi}_{(1)} - \hat{\psi}_{(2)})\hat{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \|\hat{\psi}_{(1)} - \hat{\psi}_{(2)}\|_2 \in \mathbb{B}_0^\Psi, \hat{Z} = [\hat{x}^T \ u]^T \text{ with } \hat{\psi}_{(1)}, \hat{\psi}_{(2)} \in \Psi, \hat{x} \in \widehat{\mathcal{X}}, u \in \mathcal{U}\}$.

C. Tubes for state estimate and control input

The optimization routine provides a state estimate tube $\mathbf{S}_t \triangleq \{S_{0|t}, S_{1|t}, \dots, S_{N|t}\}$ and a control tube $\mathbf{U}_t \triangleq \{U_{0|t}, U_{1|t}, \dots, U_{N-1|t}\}$ at each t . The state estimate tube sections are designed as [2]

$$S_{i|t} = \beta_{i|t} + \alpha_{i|t} D \subseteq \widehat{\mathcal{X}} \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{I}_0^N. \quad (25)$$

where $D = \text{conv}\{d^{v^1}, d^{v^2}, \dots, d^{v^j}\}$ [$(\cdot)^{v^k}$ denotes k^{th} vertex] is a convex polytope containing the origin, and $\{\beta_{i|t}\}$ and $\{\alpha_{i|t}\}$ are the sequences of centers and scaling factors, respectively, for the tube sections in \mathbf{S}_t . From (25), we express,

$S_{i|t} = \text{conv}\{s_{i|t}^{v_1}, s_{i|t}^{v_2}, \dots, s_{i|t}^{v_j}\}$ where $s_{i|t}^{v_k} = \beta_{i|t} + \alpha_{i|t} d^{v_k} \forall (i, k) \in \mathbb{I}_0^N \times \mathbb{I}_1^j$. And the control tube sections are given by [2]

$$U_{i|t} = \{u_{i|t}^{v_1}, u_{i|t}^{v_2}, \dots, u_{i|t}^{v_j}\} \subseteq \mathcal{U} \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{I}_0^{N-1} \quad (26)$$

where each $u_{i|t}^{v_k}$ is linked to $s_{i|t}^{v_k} \forall (i, k) \in \mathbb{I}_0^{N-1} \times \mathbb{I}_1^j$, and is required to satisfy the inclusion given later in (28d).

D. Characterization of the Terminal Set

For the AOFMPC, we make the following assumption.

Assumption 4: There exists a pair (P, K) corresponding to a matrix $Z > 0_{n \times n}$, where $P, Z \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $K^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $P > 0_{n \times n}$ and $-(\hat{A} + \hat{b}K)^T P (\hat{A} + \hat{b}K) + P - Z > 0_{n \times n} \forall [\hat{A} \ \hat{b}] \in \Psi$. In addition, \exists a λ -contractive set $\widehat{\mathcal{X}}_T \triangleq \xi D \subseteq \widehat{\mathcal{X}}$ where $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\|(\hat{A} + \hat{b}K)\hat{x}\|_P \leq \lambda \|\hat{x}\|_P \forall (\hat{x}, K\hat{x}) \in \widehat{\mathcal{X}}_T \times \mathcal{U}$ with $\lambda \in (0, 1)$.

The terminal set for AOFMPC is $\widehat{\mathcal{X}}_T$, inside which control input $u_t = K\hat{x}_t \forall \hat{x}_t \in \widehat{\mathcal{X}}_T$. The constant λ is chosen such that

$$\lambda \widehat{\mathcal{X}}_T \subseteq \widehat{\mathcal{X}}_T \ominus \{\Omega_2 \oplus (N-1)\Omega_3\} \quad (\text{from (24)}). \quad (27)$$

Assumption 4 is standard in the context of adaptive MPC [6]. A set $\widehat{\mathcal{X}}_T$ satisfying (27) is computable following [25].

E. Reformulated COCP for AOFMPC

Let $\theta_t \triangleq \{\{\alpha_{i|t}\}, \{\beta_{i|t}\}, \mathbf{U}_t\} \forall i \in \mathbb{I}_0^N$. The reformulated COCP for AOFMPC is given by

$\text{OP2: } \min_{\theta_t} J(\hat{x}_t, \theta_t)$ where

$$J(\hat{x}_t, \theta_t) \triangleq \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \sum_{k=1}^j \left(\|s_{i|t}^{v_k}\|_Q^2 + \|u_{i|t}^{v_k}\|_R^2 \right) + \sum_{k=1}^j \|s_{N|t}^{v_k}\|_P^2 \quad (28)$$

$$\text{subject to } \beta_{0|t} = \hat{x}_t, \alpha_{0|t} = 0 \text{ and } \alpha_{i|t} \geq 0 \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{I}_1^N \quad (28a)$$

$$S_{i|t} \subseteq \widehat{\mathcal{X}}, U_{i|t} \subseteq \mathcal{U} \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{I}_0^{N-1} \quad (28b)$$

$$S_{N|t} \subseteq \widehat{\mathcal{X}}_T \subset \widehat{\mathcal{X}} \quad (28c)$$

$$\hat{A}_t s_{i|t}^{v_k} + \hat{b}_t u_{i|t}^{v_k} \in S_{i+1|t} \ominus \{\Omega_2 \oplus i\Omega_3\} \forall (i, k) \in \mathbb{I}_0^{N-1} \times \mathbb{I}_1^j \quad (28d)$$

where $Q > 0_{n \times n}$, $R > 0$, and P and $\widehat{\mathcal{X}}_T$ are defined following Assumption 4 and (27). From (28a), $S_{0|t}$ and $U_{0|t}$ are singleton sets with respective elements \hat{x}_t and $u_{0|t} \triangleq u_{0|t}^v = u_{0|t}^{v_1} = \dots = u_{0|t}^{v_j}$. The control input applied to (1) and (16) at time t is $u_t = u_{0|t}$. The inclusion (28d) obtained from (22)-(24) ensures that $\hat{x}_{t+i} \in S_{i|t} \forall (t, i) \in \mathbb{I}_0^\infty \times \mathbb{I}_0^N$.

The complete homothetic tube containing the state estimate trajectory is constructed using $S_{0|0} \ni \hat{x}_0$ and $S_{1|t} \ni \hat{x}_{t+1} \forall t \in \mathbb{I}_0^\infty$. Its pictorial representation is given in Fig.1 as the yellow inner tube, with the state estimate trajectory in red. Adding the invariant set \mathbb{W}_{oa} to the tube sections of the homothetic tube results in a larger outer tube (Fig.1). Since the state estimation errors belong to \mathbb{W}_{oa} , the actual state trajectory is guaranteed to lie inside the outer tube. Algorithm 1 provides the steps to implement AOFMPC in a receding horizon fashion [1].

Remark 3: The proposed method allows the imposition of a user-defined bound on the internal states and not only on the system output (unlike [15]-[17], [20] and [21]).




Fig. 1. Pictorial representation of the tubes' structure along with the true and estimated states of a 2nd-order SISO LTI system. Superscripts on x_t and \hat{x}_t denote the respective components.

Algorithm 1 AOFMPC

Offline: Compute \mathbb{W}_{oa} from (20), $\widehat{\mathcal{X}}$ from (21), Ω_2, Ω_3 from (24) and, (P, K) for Ψ and $\widehat{\mathcal{X}}_T$ from Assumption 4 and (27).

Online:

for $t \geq 0$ **do**

- Measure y_t from the plant (1).
- Run OP2 with \hat{x}_t, \hat{A}_t and \hat{b}_t to get u_t .
- Apply u_t and y_t to the observer (16) to get $\hat{x}_{t+1}, \hat{A}_{t+1}$ and \hat{b}_{t+1} . Simultaneously, apply u_t to the plant (1).
- Update $t \leftarrow t + 1$.

end for

F. Recursive Feasibility and Boundedness

We make the following claims for OP2 .

Lemma 2: Suppose $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$, $\hat{x}_0 \in \widehat{\mathcal{X}}$ and OP2 is initially feasible (i.e., solution of OP2 exists at $t = 0$) resulting in control μ_0 . Then, $\varepsilon_i \in \Omega_2 \oplus i\Omega_3 \forall i \in \mathbb{I}_0^{N-1}$, and $\tilde{x}_i \in \mathbb{W}_{oa}$ guaranteeing $x_i \in \mathcal{X} \forall i \in \mathbb{I}_1^N$.

Proof: From (20), $\tilde{x}_0 = x_0 - \hat{x}_0 \in \mathcal{X} - \widehat{\mathcal{X}} \Rightarrow \tilde{x}_0 \in \mathbb{W}_{oa}$. $\therefore \varepsilon_0 = (\hat{A}_0 - F)\tilde{x}_0 \in \Omega_2$ (by definition of Ω_2). Further, (20) and (28d) guarantee that $\tilde{x}_1 \in \mathbb{W}_{oa}$ and $\hat{x}_1 \in S_{1|0} \subseteq \widehat{\mathcal{X}}$, respectively. $\therefore x_1 = \hat{x}_1 + \tilde{x}_1 \in \widehat{\mathcal{X}} \oplus \mathbb{W}_{oa} \Rightarrow x_1 \in \mathcal{X}$ (from (21)).

Using similar steps as done for $\varepsilon_0, \tilde{x}_1$ and x_1 , it can be proved that $\varepsilon_i \in \Omega_2 \oplus i\Omega_3 \forall i \in \mathbb{I}_1^{N-1}$ and $\tilde{x}_i \in \mathbb{W}_{oa}$ guaranteeing $x_i \in \mathcal{X} \forall i \in \mathbb{I}_1^N$. ■

Corollary 1: If $\forall t \in \mathbb{I}_0^\infty, x_t \in \mathcal{X}, \hat{x}_t \in \widehat{\mathcal{X}}$ and OP2 is feasible at time t resulting in control μ_t , then, $\varepsilon_{t+i} \in \Omega_2 \oplus i\Omega_3 \forall i \in \mathbb{I}_0^{N-1}$, and $\tilde{x}_{t+i} \in \mathbb{W}_{oa} \forall i \in \mathbb{I}_1^N$ guaranteeing $x_{t+i} \in \mathcal{X} \forall i \in \mathbb{I}_1^N$.

Theorem 1: If OP2 is feasible at any time t , then it will be recursively feasible at all time $t + i \forall i \in \mathbb{I}_1^\infty$.

Proof: Given that OP2 is feasible at time t , (28a)-(28d) are satisfied. For time $t + 1$, let a solution be proposed in terms of state and input tubes as

$$\begin{aligned} S_{t+1} &= \{S_{0|t+1}, S_{1|t+1}, \dots, S_{N|t+1}\} \\ U_{t+1} &= \{U_{0|t+1}, U_{1|t+1}, \dots, U_{N-1|t+1}\} \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where $S_{i|t+1} = S_{i+1|t} \forall i \in \mathbb{I}_1^{N-1}$, $S_{N|t+1} = \widehat{\mathcal{X}}_T$

$$U_{i|t+1} = U_{i+1|t} \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{I}_1^{N-2}, U_{N-1|t+1} = K\widehat{\mathcal{X}}_T.$$

The convex combination of the vertices of $S_{1|t}$ that results in \hat{x}_{t+1} , is used to get u_{t+1} from $U_{1|t}$. Thus, $\beta_{0|t+1} = \hat{x}_{t+1}$ and

$\alpha_{0|t+1} = 0$ implying $S_{0|t+1} = \{\hat{x}_{t+1}\}$ and $U_{0|t+1} = \{u_{t+1}\}$, i.e., $u_{0|t+1}^1 = u_{0|t+1}^2 \dots = u_{0|t+1}^j = u_{t+1}$.

Adding and subtracting $\hat{A}_t s_{i|t+1}^{vk} + \hat{b}_t u_{i|t+1}^{vk}$ to the LHS of (28d) at time $t+1$, instead of t , $\forall (i,k) \in \mathbb{I}_0^{N-2} \times \mathbb{I}_1^j$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{A}_{t+1} s_{i|t+1}^{vk} + \hat{b}_{t+1} u_{i|t+1}^{vk} \\ &= (\hat{\Psi}_{t+1} - \hat{\Psi}_t) \begin{bmatrix} s_{i|t+1}^{vk} & u_{i|t+1}^{vk} \end{bmatrix}^T + \hat{A}_t s_{i+1|t}^{vk} + \hat{b}_t u_{i+1|t}^{vk} \\ &\in \Omega_3 \oplus [S_{i+2|t} \ominus \{\Omega_2 \oplus (i+1)\Omega_3\}] = S_{i+1|t+1} \ominus (\Omega_2 \oplus i\Omega_3). \end{aligned}$$

From (28c) and (29), $S_{N-1|t+1} = S_{N|t} \subseteq \widehat{\mathcal{X}}_T$ and $U_{N-1|t+1} = K \widehat{\mathcal{X}}_T$. Using Assumption 4 and (27), $\forall k \in \mathbb{I}_1^j$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{A}_{t+1} s_{N-1|t+1}^{vk} + \hat{b}_{t+1} u_{N-1|t+1}^{vk} = (\hat{A}_{t+1} + \hat{b}_{t+1} K) s_{N-1|t+1}^{vk} \\ &\in \lambda S_{N-1|t+1} = \lambda S_{N|t} \subseteq \lambda \widehat{\mathcal{X}}_T \subseteq S_{N|t+1} \ominus \{\Omega_2 \oplus (N-1)\Omega_3\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\mathbb{OP}2$ is feasible at $t+1$ with the proposed solution. Similarly, it can be proved that $\mathbb{OP}2$ will be feasible at $t+2$ using the solution for $t+1$, and one can recursively continue to prove recursive feasibility at all time $t+i \forall i \in \mathbb{I}_1^\infty$. ■

Corollary 2: The application of control $u_t = u_{0|t}$ ensures $x_t \in \mathcal{X}$ and $u_t \in U_{0|t} \subseteq \mathcal{U} \forall t \in \mathbb{I}_0^\infty$. (*Proof:* Follows from Lemma 2, Corollary 1, and Theorem 1. Note: the control input constraint has not been modified in this paper).

The recursive feasibility of $\mathbb{OP}2$ implies \hat{x}_t enters $\widehat{\mathcal{X}}_T$ in at most N steps. From (29), the control inputs being implemented are $u_t = u_{0|t} \forall t \in \mathbb{I}_0^{N-1}$ and $u_t = K \hat{x}_t \forall t \in \mathbb{I}_N^\infty$. Using Assumption 4, it follows that \hat{x}_t exponentially converges to the origin if (22) is used for prediction. Since (23) replaced (22), we arrive at two possible scenarios.

- ε_{t+i} converges to zero: This requires \bar{p}_t , and consequently, \hat{x}_t converging to zero following (11). By Remarks 1 and 2, ε_{t+i} converges to zero if the input is sufficiently rich. This can be achieved using a constraint on u_t to be sufficiently rich, following [4, inequality (29)]. With such u_t , $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \hat{x}_t = x_t$. However, the excitation constraint prevents \hat{x}_t and x_t from settling at zero even as $t \rightarrow \infty$.
- ε_{t+i} does not converge to zero: In absence of any excitation, there is no guarantee that \bar{p}_t and hence, \hat{x}_t will converge to zero. At best, it can be guaranteed that $x_t \in \hat{x}_t \oplus \mathbb{W}_{oa}$.

In either case, recursive feasibility of $\mathbb{OP}2$ guarantees that $\hat{x}_t, u_t \in \mathcal{L}_\infty \forall t \in \mathbb{I}_0^\infty$. By definition of $\widehat{\mathcal{X}}_T$, $\hat{x}_t \in \mathcal{L}_\infty \Rightarrow x_t \in \mathcal{L}_\infty \forall t \in \mathbb{I}_0^\infty$. Additionally, (15) ensures $\hat{A}_t, \hat{b}_t \in \mathcal{L}_\infty \forall t \in \mathbb{I}_0^\infty$.

V. NUMERICAL EXAMPLE

We consider a 2nd order LTI system¹

$$x_{t+1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1.56 & 1 \\ -0.32 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x_t + \begin{bmatrix} 0.12 \\ 0.16 \end{bmatrix} u_t ; y_t = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x_t.$$

The set $\Psi = \text{conv}\{\psi^{v1}, \psi^{v2}, \psi^{v3}\}$ where $\psi^{v1} = [3 \ 1 \ 0.3 ; 0.5 \ 0 \ 0.4]$, $\psi^{v2} = [-0.2 \ 1 \ 0 ; -0.8 \ 0 \ 0]$ and $\psi^{v3} =$

¹A 2nd order example is chosen for ease of visualization of the tubes, although implementation on higher order systems can also be achieved, albeit at a higher computational cost.




Fig. 2. Normalized parameter estimates obtained from adaptive observer. The normalized estimates do not converge to 1 in the absence of sufficient excitation.




Fig. 3. True states and their estimates. Superscripts on x_t and \hat{x}_t denote the respective components. The zoomed figure shows that \hat{x}_t does not converge to x_t .




Fig. 4. State tubes for $N=5$. The inner (yellow) and the outer (combined yellow and white) tubes are obtained using the estimates in Figs. 2 and 3. Superscripts on x_t and \hat{x}_t denote the respective components.




Fig. 5. Control input without any imposed excitation condition.

$[1 \ 1 \ 0 ; -0.9 \ 0 \ 0]$. The initial conditions are chosen to be $x_0 = [-10 \ ; \ 8.9]$, $\hat{x}_0 = [-10 \ ; \ 8.3]$, $\hat{\Psi}_0 = [1.02 \ 1 \ 0.003 \ ; \ -0.886 \ 0 \ 0.004]$ and $\mathbb{W}_0 = \{w \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \|w\|_\infty \leq 1.8\}$. State and input constraints are $\|x_t\|_\infty \leq 38$ and $\|u_t\|_\infty \leq 45.5$. The other parameters for AOFMPC are: $N=5$, $Q=I_2$, $R=0.1$, $K = [-6.8959 \ -2.1518]$, $\Gamma_0 = 100I_4$, $\zeta = 0.25$, $P = [38.342 \ -81.5595 \ ; \ -81.5595 \ 213.5527]$ and $F = [0.4 \ 1 \ ; \ -0.05 \ 0]$. The simulations have been carried out using [26] and [27].

Figs. 2 and 3 demonstrate that, in the absence of sufficient excitation, \hat{x}_t , \hat{a}_t and \hat{b}_t reach the vicinity of their respective true values without actually converging to them. The two tubes are shown in Fig. 4 where the inner tube (in yellow) is for \hat{x}_t (in red line). The blue line is for x_t that evolves inside the outer tube. Fig. 5 shows the implemented control input.

Figs. 6 and 7 highlight the case when u_t is additionally constrained to be sufficiently rich. Fig. 6 shows that \hat{a}_t and \hat{b}_t converge to a and b respectively within $t=30$. This results




Fig. 6. Normalized parameter estimates with sufficiently rich u_t . Here, the estimates converge to their true values.




Fig. 7. True states and their estimates with sufficiently rich u_t . Superscripts on x_t and \hat{x}_t denote the respective components. The zoomed figure shows that \hat{x}_t converges to x_t .

in the convergence of \hat{x}_t to x_t (Fig. 7).

VI. CONCLUSION

The paper proposes a technique to solve the COCP for uncertain discrete-time SISO LTI systems using only output measurements. The solution approach involves an MPC using estimates of the states and system parameters, which are obtained simultaneously from an adaptive observer at each time instant. Reformulating the COCP using the online available estimates leads to the introduction of uncertainties in the state estimate predictions, and is tackled using a homothetic tube. Additionally, an invariant set for the state estimation error is characterized. The optimization routine ensures that the state estimates are in a constraint set tightened by the invariant set. Adding the invariant set to the homothetic tube sections creates a larger tube that contains the actual state trajectory. The two-tube architecture ensures that the hard constraint on the actual state is never violated for any possible value of the state estimation error. Simulation results show the performance of the proposed AOFMPC with and without a sufficiently rich input. A detailed stability analysis of the proposed theory will be done as a part of future work. An immediate extension of this work would be to design AOFMPC for multiple-input multiple-output systems, and to show how the persistent excitation condition in Lemma 1 and Remark 2 can be relaxed (possibly by leveraging initial excitation condition [28]). The proposed method also serves as a stepping stone to construct adaptive tubes for increasing the feasible space and thus, reducing conservatism.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Kouvaritakis and M. Cannon, "Model predictive control," *Switzerland: Springer International Publishing*, vol. 38, 2016.
- [2] W. Langson, I. Chrysochoos, S. Raković, and D. Q. Mayne, "Robust model predictive control using tubes," *Automatica*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 125–133, 2004.
- [3] S. V. Raković, B. Kouvaritakis, R. Findeisen, and M. Cannon, "Homothetic tube model predictive control," *Automatica*, vol. 48, no. 8, pp. 1631–1638, 2012.

- [4] M. Lorenzen, M. Cannon, and F. Allgöwer, "Robust MPC with recursive model update," *Automatica*, vol. 103, pp. 461–471, 2019.
- [5] B. Hernandez and P. Trodden, "Persistently exciting tube MPC," in *2016 American Control Conference*, 2016, pp. 948–953.
- [6] A. Dhar and S. Bhasin, "Indirect adaptive MPC for discrete-time LTI systems with parametric uncertainties," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 66, no. 11, pp. 5498–5505, 2021.
- [7] B. Zhu, Z. Zheng, and X. Xia, "Constrained adaptive model-predictive control for a class of discrete-time linear systems with parametric uncertainties," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 65, no. 5, pp. 2223–2229, 2019.
- [8] U. Rosolia and F. Borrelli, "Learning model predictive control for iterative tasks. A Data-Driven Control Framework," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 63, no. 7, pp. 1883–1896, 2017.
- [9] M. Bujarbaruah, X. Zhang, U. Rosolia, and F. Borrelli, "Adaptive MPC for iterative tasks," in *2018 IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, 2018, pp. 6322–6327.
- [10] D. Q. Mayne, S. V. Raković, R. Findeisen, and F. Allgöwer, "Robust output feedback model predictive control of constrained linear systems," *Automatica*, vol. 42, no. 7, pp. 1217–1222, 2006.
- [11] M. Kögel and R. Findeisen, "Robust output feedback MPC for uncertain linear systems with reduced conservatism," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 10 685–10 690, 2017.
- [12] S. Subramanian, S. Lucia, and S. Engell, "A novel tube-based output feedback MPC for constrained linear systems," in *2017 American Control Conference*, 2017, pp. 3060–3065.
- [13] M. Ghanes, M. Trabelsi, H. Abu-Rub, and L. Ben-Brahim, "Robust adaptive observer-based model predictive control for multilevel flying capacitors inverter," *IEEE Trans. Ind. Electron.*, vol. 63, no. 12, pp. 7876–7886, 2016.
- [14] L. Brunke, S. Zhou, and A. P. Schoellig, "RLO-MPC: Robust learning-based output feedback mpc for improving the performance of uncertain systems in iterative tasks," in *2021 60th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, 2021, pp. 2183–2190.
- [15] J. Coulson, J. Lygeros, and F. Dörfler, "Data-enabled predictive control: In the shallows of the DeepPC," in *2019 18th European Control Conference*, 2019, pp. 307–312.
- [16] J. Berberich, J. Köhler, M. A. Müller, and F. Allgöwer, "Data-driven model predictive control with stability and robustness guarantees," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 66, no. 4, pp. 1702–1717, 2020.
- [17] T. W. Nguyen, S. A. U. Islam, A. L. Bruce, A. Goel, D. S. Bernstein, and I. V. Kolmanovsky, "Output-feedback RLS-based model predictive control," in *2020 American Control Conference*, 2020, pp. 2395–2400.
- [18] T. Suzuki, T. Nakamura, and M. Koga, "Discrete adaptive observer with fast convergence," *International Journal of Control*, vol. 31, no. 6, pp. 1107–1119, 1980.
- [19] S. V. Rakovic, E. C. Kerrigan, K. I. Kouramas, and D. Q. Mayne, "Invariant approximations of the minimal robust positively invariant set," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 406–410, 2005.
- [20] T. W. Nguyen, S. A. U. Islam, D. S. Bernstein, and I. V. Kolmanovsky, "Predictive cost adaptive control: A numerical investigation of persistency, consistency, and exigency," *IEEE Control Syst. Mag.*, vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 64–96, 2021.
- [21] T. A. N. Heirung, B. E. Ydstie, and B. Foss, "Dual adaptive model predictive control," *Automatica*, vol. 80, pp. 340–348, 2017.
- [22] G. C. Goodwin and K. S. Sin, *Adaptive filtering prediction and control*. Courier Corporation, 2014.
- [23] S. Boyd and S. S. Sastry, "Necessary and sufficient conditions for parameter convergence in adaptive control," *Automatica*, vol. 22, no. 6, pp. 629–639, 1986.
- [24] P. Ioannou and B. Fidan, *Adaptive control tutorial*. SIAM, 2006.
- [25] M. S. Darup and M. Cannon, "On the computation of λ -contractive sets for linear constrained systems," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 62, no. 3, pp. 1498–1504, 2016.
- [26] M. Herceg, M. Kvasnica, C. Jones, and M. Morari, "Multi-Parametric Toolbox 3.0," in *Proc. of the European Control Conference*, Zürich, Switzerland, July 17–19 2013, pp. 502–510.
- [27] J. Löfberg, "YALMIP : A toolbox for modeling and optimization in MATLAB," in *In Proceedings of the CACSD Conference*, Taipei, Taiwan, 2004.
- [28] A. Dhar, S. Basu Roy, and S. Bhasin, "Initial excitation based discrete-time multi-model adaptive online identification," *European Journal of Control*, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejcon.2022.100672>.