

Distributionally Robust LQG control under Distributed Uncertainty

Lucia Falconi, Augusto Ferrante, Mattia Zorzi

Abstract—A new paradigm is proposed for the robustification of the LQG controller against distributional uncertainties on the noise process. Our controller optimizes the closed-loop performances in the worst possible scenario under the constraint that the noise distributional aberrance does not exceed a certain threshold limiting the relative entropy pseudo-distance between the actual noise distribution the nominal one. The main novelty is that the bounds on the distributional aberrance can be arbitrarily distributed along the whole disturbance trajectory. We discuss why this can, in principle, be a substantial advantage and we provide simulation results that substantiate such a principle.

Index Terms—Optimal control, robustness, stochastic systems, Dynamic programming, relative entropy.

I. INTRODUCTION

Linear Quadratic (LQ) optimal control is arguably one of the most fundamental ideas in modern control theory with ramifications in virtually all the fields of the discipline. In particular, this is a natural approach for the control of multiple-input and multiple-output (MIMO) systems. The theory may be easily extended to stochastic systems by considering the Linear Quadratic Gaussian (LQG) control which is the core idea in the development of many advanced control techniques, such as all the MPC and MPC-like methods [1].

The LQG method involves the design of a controller which optimizes performances based on a nominal model of the process which is affected by a Gaussian distributed disturbance with known mean and covariance. Thus, in the nominal situation the LQG controller guarantees optimal performances. However, soon after its introduction, it was recognized [2] that, as for a kind of waterbed effect, optimality makes the LQG controller vulnerable to model uncertainties.

This potential lack of robustness has motivated a formidable stream of research aiming to ensure that the controller provides satisfactory performances even in the presence of model misspecifications and inaccuracies.

The extensive research conducted in this area has resulted in a multitude of available approaches, including H^∞ control methods, based on the minimization of H^∞ performance criteria (see for example [3], [4], [5], [6]), and risk-sensitive LQG control, where the standard quadratic loss function is replaced by an exponential quadratic function [7], [8].

Our work can be placed in the broad area of robustification of LQG control and, more specifically, in the framework

of *distributionally robust control (DRC)*, which takes into account uncertainty in the probability distribution underlying a stochastic system. Instead of assuming a given distribution, DRC methods design a control policy which minimizes the expected value of a given cost under the worst-case distribution in a so-called *ambiguity set*. Several types of ambiguity sets have been employed in DRC, exploiting moment constraints [9], total variational distance [10], Wasserstein distance [11] and relative entropy [12].

In this paper, we express the ambiguity set as a ball defined in the relative-entropy topology and centered at the nominal distribution. This ambiguity set based on relative entropy pseudo-distance has several attractive features. First, relative entropy is a prominent metric in information theory which satisfies important structural properties. In addition, it is the natural “metric” between systems when they are identified from data, [13], [14]. Finally, it turns out that minimax LQG control problem with a relative entropy constraint admits closed-form solutions in the form of a parameterized, risk-sensitive optimal controller. Thus it provides a new interpretation for the risk-sensitive paradigm.

Our work is closely related to the seminal paper [12] by Petersen *et al.* that proposed an entropy-based minimax optimal control problem for stochastic uncertain systems. The main difference between our paper and [12] concerns the distribution of the uncertainty along the time interval. Indeed, [12] assumes a *single* constraint on the overall noise distribution on the entire time interval. Conversely our approach imposes a constraint to each time step, taking a point of view whose nature is similar to the approach used by [15], [16], [17], [18] in the robust filtering setting. Petersen’s approach is the natural way to model the uncertainties when the discrepancy between the nominal and the actual system is due to the action of an adversary who can manage a limited mismatch budget to perturb the nominal system and, when convenient, is allowed to concentrate most (or all) such a budget in a few time points. However, in most practical situations the model mismatch is a consequence of modelling approximations and random fluctuations, and there is no a real adversary. In these cases, since the same effort is usually made to model each time step, it is more realistic to define a specific ambiguity set at each step of the time interval. For this reason, we address the latter problem. The reason for our choice is that, in Petersen’s approach, it may happen that most of the uncertainty is concentrated on few time steps, leading to unrealistic scenarios and to overly conservative conclusions.

We believe that this point may better clarified by two examples. Assume that we want to design a robust LQG

L. Falconi, A. Ferrante, and M. Zorzi are with the Department of Information Engineering, University of Padova, Padova, Italy; Lucia Falconi’s activity is supported by Fondazione CARIPARO, Italy (Borse di Dottorato CARIPARO 2020); e-mail: lucia.falconi@phd.unipd.it (L. Falconi); augusto@dei.unipd.it (A. Ferrante); zorzi@dei.unipd.it (M. Zorzi).

optimal controller for an airplane. The Gaussian noise models the effects of the wind which, in practice, is not Gaussian. Therefore, we need to guarantee robustness against different distributions of the wind disturbance. By adopting the approach in [12], it may happen that the worst-case distribution differs from the nominal one at just one time interval but in that time interval the difference is unreasonably large: the controller must be able to counteract a totally unrealistic wind concentrated at a single time point with potential degradation of the performances. The possibility of distributing the uncertainty along the whole trajectory and to select different uncertainty radii depending on the reliability of the wind forecasts at each point is clearly an interesting feature in this scenario.

A second example, is the case when the difference between the nominal Gaussian noise and the actual one is used to account for errors in the model parameters. Also in this case, the possibility of distributing the uncertainty along the whole trajectory is clearly advantageous with respect to a potential worst-case where the model mismatch is unreasonably concentrated at a single time interval.

The main contributions of the paper can be summarized as follows. We propose a state-feedback a Distributed uncertainty Distributionally robust LQG control problem (D^2 -LQG) for discrete-time linear stochastic uncertain systems subject to a quadratic cost function. The uncertain systems are described in terms of a nominal system, driven by white Gaussian noise, and a perturbed system, in which a general class of stochastic noise processes are allowed. At each time instant, a relative entropy tolerance is used to model a limit on the admissible noise distributions. To address this problem, we adopt a Dynamic Programming technique, where each subproblem consists in an infinite-dimensional minimax optimization problem over a time interval of length one. By exploiting the Lagrange duality theory and the duality between free-energy and relative entropy, we are able to convert this problem into a risk-sensitive optimal control problem with full-state information which can be solved by using existing results in [7]. The overall solution takes the form of a risk-sensitive controller with a time-varying risk-sensitive parameter. Of course the problem, as posed in our setting, is mathematically much more challenging because of the large number of constraints translating into a large number of dual variables. Nevertheless, we propose an effective way to compute the solution for which we prove optimality.

The paper significantly extends [19], where a preliminary problem, that is the worst-case performance analysis problem, is proposed.

The outline of the paper is as follows. In Section II we briefly recall the definition and some important properties of the relative-entropy. Section III introduces the class of stochastic uncertain systems considered in this work and the relative-entropy ambiguity set. Section VI deals with a worst-case performance analysis problem with respect to a quadratic cost. The results of this Section may be viewed as a preliminary step towards the solution of DRC problem faced in Section V. The least-favorable state-space model is derived in Section VI. Illustrative examples are presented in

Section VII which show the advantages of distributing the model uncertainty. Finally, conclusions and future works are discussed in Section VIII. We extensively use some convex optimization results that, for the convenience of the reader, are recalled in the appendix.

Notation

\mathbf{R} is the real line; \mathbf{R}_+ (\mathbf{R}_{++}) is the space of nonnegative (positive) scalars. Given a matrix A , A^\top denotes the transpose. If A is a square matrix, $|A|$ denotes its determinant and, if it is also symmetric, we write $A \succ 0$ to denote that A is positive definite and $A \succeq 0$ to denote that A is positive semi-definite. I is the identity matrix. $x \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu; \Sigma)$ means that x is a Gaussian random variable with mean μ and covariance matrix Σ . The symbol $\mathbf{E}[\cdot]$ denotes the expectation with respect to the probability density function $f(\cdot)$, whereas $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}[\cdot]$ denotes the expectation with respect to the density function $\tilde{f}(\cdot)$.

II. RELATIVE ENTROPY AND OPTIMIZATION

In this section, we briefly recall the definition and some well-known properties of the relative entropy (see, for example, [20]).

Given any two probability measures \tilde{f} and f defined on \mathbf{R}^n , the deviation of \tilde{f} from f is measured by the *relative entropy* (or Kullback-Leibler divergence), which is defined as

$$R(\tilde{f}||f) := \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \ln \frac{\tilde{f}(x)}{f(x)} \tilde{f}(x) dx.$$

$R(\cdot||\cdot)$ is not a distance since it is not symmetric, and, more importantly, it does not satisfy the triangle inequality. However it is a pseudo-distance as it satisfies the following property: $R(\tilde{f}||f) \geq 0$ and $R(\tilde{f}||f) = 0$ if and only if $\tilde{f}(x) = f(x)$ a.e. Moreover, it is well known that, for a given probability density function f , $R(\tilde{f}||f)$ is a strictly convex function of \tilde{f} on the set of probability density functions.

Lemma 2.1: Suppose that \tilde{f} and f are Gaussian density functions on \mathbf{R}^n with the same (non-singular) covariance matrix V : $f \sim \mathcal{N}(v, V)$ and $\tilde{f} \sim \mathcal{N}(\tilde{v}, V)$ Then

$$R(\tilde{f}||f) = \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{v} - v)^\top V^{-1}(\tilde{v} - v).$$

Finally, we recall the duality between free energy and relative entropy which underlies the solution to the proposed stochastic optimization problem:

Lemma 2.2 (Relative Entropy and Free Energy duality): For a given probability density function $f : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}_+$ and a bounded measurable function $J : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$:

$$\sup_{\tilde{f}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{P}} \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} J(x) \tilde{f}(x) dx - R(\tilde{f}||f) = \log \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} e^{J(x)} f(x) dx$$

where the supremum is taken over the set \mathcal{P} of all the probability density functions $\tilde{f}(x)$ on \mathbf{R}^n . Moreover, the supremum is achieved by the probability density function

$$\tilde{f}^o(x) = f(x) \frac{e^{J(x)}}{\int_{\mathbf{R}^n} e^{J(\bar{x})} f(\bar{x}) d\bar{x}}. \quad (1)$$

III. STOCHASTIC UNCERTAIN SYSTEMS

This section introduces the class of uncertain systems considered in this paper. We consider discrete-time linear stochastic uncertain systems defined over a finite time interval, described in terms of a *reference or nominal system* with a specified statistical description, and a *perturbed system* in which a general class of stochastic noise processes are allowed.

1) *Reference system*: The reference system is described by the following state equation:

$$x_{t+1} = Ax_t + Bu_t + v_t \quad t = 0, \dots, N \quad (2)$$

where $x_t \in \mathbf{R}^n$ is the state vector, $u_t \in \mathbf{R}^m$ is the control input and $\{v_t \in \mathbf{R}^n, t = 0, \dots, N\}$ is a zero-mean, white Gaussian noise sequence with covariance matrix $V \succ 0$. Notice that $V \succ 0$ means that v_t affects all components of the dynamics, possibly with a very small variance for relations which are viewed as almost certain. This is a typical assumption when the relative entropy is used to measure the proximity of statistical models (see for example [15]). The matrices A, B and V have appropriate dimensions, and, for the ease of notation, they are assumed time independent. Generalization to time-varying systems only entails heavier notations. The conclusions however are exactly the same and can be reached by the exact same arguments.

2) *Perturbed system*: The corresponding perturbed system is described by the state equation

$$\begin{aligned} x_{t+1} &= Ax_t + Bu_t + \tilde{v}_t, & t = 0, \dots, N \\ z_t &= E_1 x_t + E_2 u_t \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where the noise input sequence $\{\tilde{v}_t, t = 0, \dots, N\}$ is defined by an unknown probability density function. The quantity $z_t \in \mathbf{R}^p$ is a signal which defines the set of allowable uncertain noise probability measures via the relative entropy constraint. One possible interpretation of this signal will be given at the end of the section. The matrices E_1 and E_2 are known matrices used to add more flexibility in modelling the system's uncertainty. To simplify the computations we assume that

$$E_1^\top E_2 = 0.$$

Our results can be easily extended to the case in which we drop this assumption.

3) *Admissible Controller*: We suppose that the whole state is accessible with negligible measure noise and we consider state feedback control policies of the form:

$$u_t = \pi_t(x_t), \quad t = 0, \dots, N \quad (4)$$

where π_t is a measurable map from \mathbf{R}^n to \mathbf{R}^m . As discussed later, if we enlarge the set of feasible control policies by allowing π to depend on the the whole past history of the state, the optimal solution remains the same. In other words, there is no limitations in considering only the control policies (4). This is indeed rather intuitive if we consider the Markovian property of the state.

We suppose that the initial state $x_0 = \bar{x}_0$ is a deterministic quantity. Then, for any given admissible control law of the

form (4), the nominal joint probability density function of the state sequence $X_{0:N+1}$ can be expressed as

$$f(X_{0:N+1}) = \delta(x_0 - \bar{x}_0) \prod_{t=1}^{N+1} f(x_t | x_{t-1}) \quad (5)$$

where

$$f(x_t | x_{t-1}) = \mathcal{N}(Ax_{t-1} + Bu_{t-1}, V). \quad (6)$$

We consider a similar decomposition for the joint probability measure $\tilde{f}(X_{0:N-1})$ of the perturbed system:

$$\tilde{f}(X_{0:N+1}) = \delta(x_0 - \bar{x}_0) \prod_{t=1}^{N+1} \tilde{f}(x_t | x_{t-1}).$$

3) *Relative Entropy Constraints*: We use the relative entropy between the true and the nominal densities to measure modeling errors. Instead of applying a single constraint to the relative entropy of the true and nominal probability densities of the state sequence $X_{0:N+1}$ over the whole time interval as done in the seminal paper [12], we specify separate modeling tolerances for each time step of the transitions density $f(x_t | x_{t-1})$. Specifically, we use the relative entropy between the true and nominal transition densities at time t , namely $\tilde{f}(x_t | x_{t-1})$ and $f(x_t | x_{t-1})$, to measure modeling errors. Given any admissible control law $\pi = \{\pi_t, t = 0, \dots, N\}$, we introduce the quantity

$$\begin{aligned} R_t &:= R_t(\tilde{f}(x_t | x_{t-1}) || f(x_t | x_{t-1})) \\ &= \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \ln \left(\frac{\tilde{f}(x_t | x_{t-1})}{f(x_t | x_{t-1})} \right) \tilde{f}(x_t | x_{t-1}) dx_t. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the model mismatch at time t is expressed by the constraint:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{E}}[R_t] \leq \tilde{\mathbf{E}}\left[\frac{1}{2}\|z_{t-1}\|^2\right] + d_t \quad (7)$$

where the expectation is taken with respect to the true marginal

$$\tilde{f}(x_{t-1}) = \int \tilde{f}(x_{t-1} | x_{t-2}) \dots \tilde{f}(x_1 | \bar{x}_0) dx_1 \dots dx_{t-1}.$$

The ambiguity set is defined by the convex ball of functions \mathcal{B}_t :

$$\mathcal{B}_t := \left\{ \tilde{f}(x_t | x_{t-1}) \in \mathcal{P} : \tilde{\mathbf{E}}[R_t] \leq \tilde{\mathbf{E}}\left[\frac{1}{2}\|z_{t-1}\|^2\right] + d_t \right\}$$

and the parameter $d_t > 0$ is called tolerance and quantifies the constant mismatch budget allowed at time t . Clearly, \mathcal{B}_t is parameterized by the density function $\tilde{f}(x_{t-1})$. It is worth noting that the model uncertainty is spread over the finite interval, unlike [12] where the model uncertainty is characterized using one relative entropy constraint regarding the entire interval. The latter characterization allows to concentrate the uncertainty in one step, which is not a common situation in practice. In contrast, the former promotes an equal distribution of uncertainty along the time interval.

We can motivate the above stochastic uncertainty description by interpreting it in terms of linear fractional transformation (LFT) model [21]. LFT is a very general and powerful tool to represent various sources of uncertainty in dynamical




Fig. 1: Linear fractional transformation (LTF) uncertain model.

models, frequently used in modern control theory. It consists in separating the nominal model from the uncertainty in a feedback interconnection as shown in Figure 1. The uncertainty operator Δ is a quantity which is typically unknown but bounded in magnitude. This is a very general paradigm both conceptually and practically. In fact, in most cases the uncertainty on the system dynamics can be effectively modelled by suitably selecting the admissible structure of Δ and the way in which Δ is bounded in magnitude. This is indeed a very natural way of modelling uncertainty for systems learned from data. We can interpret the signal $z(t)$ in (3) as the input of the uncertain block Δ in the LFT model. Then the uncertain system (2)-(3)-(7) allows for any uncertainty block Δ whose norm is bounded. Notice that Δ can be dynamic and time-varying: in this case the notation Δ_t is adopted.

Lemma 3.1: Consider the stochastic uncertain system (2)-(4). Assume that the perturbed noise signal \tilde{v}_t is generated according to the LFT model of Figure 1 where the uncertainty block is a time-varying matrix $\Delta_t \in \mathbf{R}^{n \times p}$, i.e.

$$\tilde{v}_t = v_t + \bar{v}_t = v_t + \Delta_t z_t, \quad t = 0, \dots, N. \quad (8)$$

If

$$\Delta_t \Delta_t^\top \preceq V, \quad t = 0, \dots, N, \quad (9)$$

then the relative-entropy constraint (7) is satisfied at each time instant for any $d_t > 0$.

Proof.

From the definition of the perturbed signal (8), it follows that $\tilde{f}(x_{t+1}|x_t) = \mathcal{N}(Ax_t + Bu_t + \Delta_t z_t, V)$. Hence, given $x_t \in \mathbf{R}^n$,

$$R_{t+1} = \frac{1}{2} z_t^\top \Delta_t^\top V^{-1} \Delta_t z_t \leq z_t^\top z_t,$$

where the equality follows from Lemma 2.1 and the inequality from the norm bound (9). Now, the thesis is obtained by taking the expectation and by considering the monotonicity of the expected value and the positivity of d_{t+1} . ■

In conclusion, our paradigm appears to be the natural framework to address the robustification of LQG control solutions in all the ubiquitous situations in which the uncertainty may be represented as in Figure 1. The main advantage with respect to existing literature is that our formulation is ideally suited to capture the essence of the problem whenever the uncertainty is distributed along the whole time interval.

IV. WORST PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

In this section, we consider the problem of characterizing the worst-case performances with respect to a quadratic cost function for a stochastic uncertain system of the form (2)-(7) with $u_t \equiv 0$. The solution to this problem is presented in [22] and it puts the basis for the synthesis of the minimax LQG controller under incremental model uncertainty which will be addressed in the next section.

By assuming that the input signal is identically equal to zero, the reference system state equation (2) becomes:

$$x_{t+1} = Ax_t + v_t, \quad t = 0, \dots, N \quad (10)$$

which specifies the nominal conditional density

$$f(x_t|x_{t-1}) \sim \mathcal{N}(Ax_{t-1}, V) \quad t = 1, \dots, N+1. \quad (11)$$

The corresponding perturbed system is described by

$$\begin{aligned} x_{t+1} &= Ax_t + \tilde{v}_t \\ z_t &= E_1 x_t \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where the probability distribution of the perturbed noise sequence \tilde{v}_t is subject to the incremental relative entropy constraint (7).

For the above stochastic uncertain system, we consider the problem of characterizing the worst case performance with respect to the cost functional:

$$J = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=0}^N x_t^\top Q x_t + \frac{1}{2} x_{N+1}^\top Q_{N+1} x_{N+1}, \quad (13)$$

where $Q \succeq 0$, $Q_{N+1} \succ 0$. This is the typical cost function in linear quadratic problems for autonomous systems. In the following it is assumed that the pair (A, Q) is observable.

More precisely, the problem under consideration is to find

$$\max_{\{\tilde{f}(x_t|x_{t-1}) \in \mathcal{B}_t, t=1, \dots, N+1\}} \tilde{\mathbf{E}}[J]. \quad (14)$$

Because of the constraints' and the objective function's special structure, we can obtain the overall solution by optimizing a sequence of $N+1$ single-variable constrained optimization problems by adopting a *backward dynamic programming* technique [1, ch. I]. We start by optimizing the objective function with respect to $\tilde{f}(x_{N+1}|x_N)$, that is we consider the maximization problem

$$\max_{\tilde{f}(x_{N+1}|x_N) \in \mathcal{B}_{N+1}} \tilde{\mathbf{E}}[J]. \quad (15)$$

where $\tilde{f}(X_{0:N})$ appears as a parameter.

Next we show that the constrained stochastic optimization problem (15) can be replaced by a corresponding unconstrained stochastic optimization problem by means of the *duality theory*, and in particular of Theorem A.2. To this end, we first introduce the Lagrange multiplier $\tau_{N+1} \in \mathbf{R}_+$ associated with the constraint (7) for $t = N+1$. Then, we define the augmented cost functional

$$J_{\tau_{N+1}} := J - \tau_{N+1} [R_{N+1} - \frac{1}{2} \|z_N\|^2 - d_{N+1}],$$

and we denote by $W_{\tau_{N+1}}$ the value of the following unconstrained optimization problem:

$$W_{\tau_{N+1}} := \max_{\tilde{f}(x_{N+1}|x_N) \in \mathcal{P}} \tilde{\mathbf{E}}[J_{\tau_{N+1}}]. \quad (16)$$

By applying Theorem A.2 to the current optimization problem (15), we obtain the following theorem:

Theorem 4.1: Consider the stochastic uncertain system (10) - (12) subject to the constraint (7), and the cost functional J given by (13). Then the value of the stochastic optimization problem (15) is finite if and only if $\Gamma_{N+1} := \{\tau_{N+1} > 0 \mid W_{\tau_{N+1}} < \infty\}$ is non empty. In this case,

$$\max_{\tilde{f}(x_{N+1}|x_N) \in \mathcal{B}_{N+1}} \tilde{\mathbf{E}}[J] = \min_{\tau_{N+1} > 0} W_{\tau_{N+1}}. \quad (17)$$

Proof.

The theorem can be obtained by sensibly applying Theorem A.2 to the current optimization problem with X as the linear vector space of functions from \mathbf{R}^n to \mathbf{R} and Ω the set of probability density functions on \mathbf{R}^n . The objective function corresponds to $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}[J]$ which is a linear, thus concave, map of $\tilde{f}(x_{N+1}|x_N)$. The function $g(\cdot)$ corresponding to $\tilde{\mathbf{E}}[R_{N+1} - \frac{1}{2}\|z_N\|^2 - d_{N+1}]$ is a convex function of $\tilde{f}(x_{N+1}|x_N)$ thanks to the properties of the relative entropy. Finally, the transition probability density function $\tilde{f}(x_{N+1}|x_N) = f(x_{N+1}|x_N)$ is strictly feasible since it satisfies

$$\tilde{\mathbf{E}}[R_{N+1} - \frac{1}{2}\|z_N\|^2 - d_{N+1}] = -\frac{1}{2}\|z_N\|^2 - d_{N+1} < 0.$$

Hence, the conditions of Theorem A.2 are satisfied. Now, the main clarification is that we can rule out the case in which the minimum in (27) is achieved at $\tau_{N+1} = 0$. Indeed, if $\tau_{N+1} = 0$ then we have $J_{\tau_{N+1}} = J$. Hence, since Q_{N+1} is strictly positive, it is straightforward to verify that for any $\tilde{f}(X_{0:N})$

$$W_{\tau_{N+1}} = \max_{\tilde{f}(x_{N+1}|x_N) \in \mathcal{P}} \tilde{\mathbf{E}}[J] = \infty. \quad \blacksquare$$

Now, we evaluate the quantity $W_{\tau_{N+1}}$ for $\tau_{N+1} > 0$. To this end, we recall the following well-known result on the integral of a multivariate Gaussian function (see for example [23]):

Lemma 4.1 (Generalized Gaussian integral): If $A = A^\top \in \mathbf{R}^{n \times n}$, $A \succ 0$, then

$$\int_{\mathbf{R}^n} e^{-\frac{1}{2}x^\top Ax + b^\top x + c} dx = \sqrt{\frac{(2\pi)^n}{|A|}} e^{\frac{b^\top A^{-1}b}{2} + c}$$

where $x, b \in \mathbf{R}^n$ and $c \in \mathbf{R}$.

By applying first Lemma 2.2 and then Lemma 4.1, it follows

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\tau_{N+1}} &= \tilde{\mathbf{E}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^N x_t^\top \frac{Q}{2} x_t + \frac{\tau_{N+1} \|z_N\|^2}{2} + \tau_{N+1} \times \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left(\max_{\tilde{f}(x_{N+1}|x_N) \in \mathcal{P}} \tilde{\mathbf{E}} \left[x_{N+1}^\top \frac{Q_{N+1}}{2\tau_{N+1}} x_{N+1} - R_{N+1} | x_N \right] \right) \right] \\ &\quad + \tau_{N+1} d_{N+1} \\ &= \tilde{\mathbf{E}} \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} x_t^\top Q x_t + \frac{1}{2} x_N^\top (Q + \tau_{N+1} E_1^\top E_1) x_N + \tau_{N+1} \times \right. \\ &\quad \left. \ln \left(\int \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2\tau_{N+1}} x_{N+1}^\top Q_{N+1} x_{N+1} \right\} f(x_{N+1}|x_N) dx_{N+1} \right) \right] \\ &\quad + \tau_{N+1} d_{N+1} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\mathbf{E}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{N-1} x_t^\top Q x_t + x_N^\top \Pi_N x_N \right] - \frac{\tau_{N+1}}{2} \ln \left| I - \frac{Q_{N+1} V}{\tau_{N+1}} \right| \\ &\quad + \tau_{N+1} d_{N+1} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Pi_N = Q + \tau_{N+1} E_1^\top E_1 + A^\top \left(Q_{N+1}^{-1} - \frac{V}{\tau_{N+1}} \right)^{-1} A \quad (18)$$

provided that

$$\left(Q_{N+1}^{-1} - \frac{V}{\tau_{N+1}} \right) \succ 0.$$

Notice that the latter condition is necessary for $W_{\tau_{N+1}}$ to be finite. We know from Theorem 4.1 that if Problem (15) is finite, then the set Γ_{N+1} is non-empty, and therefore there exists $\tau_{N+1} > 0$ such that the latter condition is satisfied.

Remark 1: Since $Q_{N+1} \succ 0$ and the pair (A, Q) is observable, Π_N given by (18) is also positive definite. Indeed from (18) it is clear that Π_N is in general positive semidefinite. Actually it is strictly definite. Indeed, assume by contradiction that there exists $y \neq 0$ such that $y^\top \Pi_N y = 0$. This implies that $Qy = 0$ and, since $(\Pi_{N+1}^{-1} - V/\tau_{N+1})$ is non-singular, that $Ay = 0$. But then, $y \neq 0$ belongs to the non observable subspace. This contradicts the hypothesis that the pair (A, Q) is observable.

In view of (17), if Γ_{N+1} is non-empty, Problem (14) can be rewritten as:

$$\max_{\tilde{f}(x_1|x_0) \in \mathcal{B}_1} \dots \max_{\tilde{f}(x_N|x_{N-1}) \in \mathcal{B}_N} \min_{\tau_{N+1} > 0} W_{\tau_{N+1}}$$

where $W_{\tau_{N+1}}$ is evaluated by using the above formula. Notice that $W_{\tau_{N+1}}$ is a dual function, thus it is convex with respect to the Lagrange multiplier τ_{N+1} [24]. Hence, since $W_{\tau_{N+1}}$ is convex in τ_{N+1} and linear, thus concave, in $\tilde{f}(x_N|x_{N-1})$, in view of the *Von Neumann's Minimax Theorem*, see Theorem A.1, we can switch the minimization and maximization operation without affecting the result, and we obtain:

$$\max_{\tilde{f}(x_1|x_0) \in \mathcal{B}_1} \dots \min_{\tau_{N+1} > 0} \max_{\tilde{f}(x_N|x_{N-1}) \in \mathcal{B}_N} W_{\tau_{N+1}}.$$

The knowledge of the structure of $W_{\tau_{N+1}}$ as derived above allows us to move to the next stage of the dynamic programming recursion. In the next stage, if we neglect the constant

terms, we are concerned with the solution of the optimization problem:

$$\max_{\tilde{f}(x_N|x_{N-1}) \in \mathcal{B}_N} \tilde{\mathbf{E}} \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} x_t^\top Q x_t + x_N^\top \Pi_N x_N \right]$$

with $\tilde{f}(X_{0:N-1})$ as a parameter. This problem is identical in structure to the problem (15) that we have just solved, thus we can rearrange Theorem 4.1 and write out the solution by simply renaming variables. By repeating the dynamic programming recursion $N + 1$ times we derive the following result:

Theorem 4.2: Consider the stochastic uncertain system (10)-(12), the model mismatch constraints (7) and the cost functional (13). Introduce the risk-sensitive-like Riccati recursion:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{N+1} &= Q_{N+1} \\ \Pi_t &= Q + \tau_{t+1} E_1^\top E_1 + A^\top \left(\Pi_{t+1}^{-1} - \frac{V}{\tau_{t+1}} \right)^{-1} A, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

which is required to satisfy the following condition:

$$\left(\Pi_{t+1}^{-1} - \frac{V}{\tau_{t+1}} \right)^{-1} \succ 0 \text{ for } t = 0, \dots, N. \quad (20)$$

Then, the minimax optimal control problem (14) is finite if and only if there exists $(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{N+1}) \in \mathbf{R}_{++}^{N+1}$ such that (20) is satisfied at each time step t . In such a case, the worst cost (14) is given by the solution of the following optimization problem:

$$\min_{\tau_1 > 0, \dots, \tau_{N+1} > 0} W_{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{N+1}}, \quad (21)$$

where

$$W_{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{N+1}} := \frac{1}{2} \bar{x}_0^\top \Pi_0 \bar{x}_0 - \sum_{t=1}^{N+1} \left(\frac{\tau_t}{2} \log |I - \Pi_t \frac{V}{\tau_t}| - \tau_t d_t \right).$$

Before proving Theorem 4.2, we state the following preliminary Lemma:

Lemma 4.2: Given any probability density function $\tilde{f}(X_{0:t-1})$, the function $W_{\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1}}$ defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1}} &:= \tilde{\mathbf{E}} \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^t x_k^\top Q x_k + \frac{1}{2} x_{t+1}^\top \Pi_{t+1} x_{t+1} \right] \\ &\quad - \sum_{k=t+1}^{N+1} \left(\frac{\tau_k}{2} \log |I - \frac{\Pi_k V}{\tau_k}| - \tau_k d_k \right), \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

with Π_t computed according to (19), is jointly convex in $(\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1})$ for any $t = 0, \dots, N$.

Proof. The function $W_{\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1}}$ can be equivalently written as

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1}} &= \max_{\tilde{f}(x_{t+1}|x_t), \dots, \tilde{f}(x_{N+1}|x_N) \in \mathcal{P}} \tilde{\mathbf{E}} \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^N x_k^\top Q x_k \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} x_{N+1}^\top Q_{N+1} x_{N+1} \right] - \sum_{k=t+1}^{N+1} \tau_k (R_k - \frac{1}{2} \|z_k\|^2 - d_k). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, since $W_{\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1}}$ is the pointwise maximum of a set of affine functions of $(\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1})$, it is convex by Lemma A.1. \blacksquare

Proof of Theorem (4.2) The theorem derives from the previous arguments. The only necessary clarification is that, at each time step t , with $t = 0, \dots, N$,

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\tilde{f}(x_t|x_{t-1}) \in \mathcal{B}_t} \min_{\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1} > 0} W_{\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1}} &= \\ \min_{\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1} > 0} \max_{\tilde{f}(x_t|x_{t-1}) \in \mathcal{B}_t} W_{\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1}} & \end{aligned}$$

for any given $\tilde{f}(X_{0:t-1})$. This equality follows from the *Minimax theorem* A.1, since $W_{\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1}}$ is linear in $\tilde{f}(x_t|x_{t-1})$, and convex in $(\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1})$ by Lemma 4.2. \blacksquare

Remark 2: We immediately recognize that our solution has the same structure of the solution to the robust performance analysis problem considered in [12, Section IV.B]. However, instead of using a constant Lagrange multiplier τ , here τ_t is time-dependent. Indeed, whereas in the previous work [12] a single relative entropy constrained was imposed, resulting in a unique Lagrange multiplier, here each $\tilde{f}(x_{t+1}|x_t)$ has an associated relative entropy constraint.

Moreover, by writing $\theta_t = \tau_t^{-1}$, we easily see that the solution to our problem takes the form of a risk-sensitive cost (see the state feedback control results given in [7] in the special case where there is no control input). However, while in standard risk-sensitive control problems the risk sensitive parameter θ appearing in the exponential of the quadratic loss function is constant, here θ_t is time-dependent. As a matter of fact, in the present paper we tackle the robust analysis problem by evaluating $N + 1$ risk-sensitive costs with a time-varying risk-sensitive parameter, namely

$$\int \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2\tau_{t+1}} x_t^\top \Pi_t x_t \right\} f(x_t|x_{t-1}) dx_t \quad t = N + 1, \dots, 1.$$

As a result we obtain a risk-sensitive Riccati recursion with a time-dependent sensitivity parameter $1/\tau_t$.

V. MINIMAX OPTIMAL CONTROL

In this section, we consider the problem of constructing a state feedback controller which minimizes the worst case performance for a stochastic uncertain system with incremental relative entropy constraints. The main result of this section is to show that this problem can be converted into an equivalent state-feedback risk-sensitive optimal control problem with a time varying risk-sensitive parameter.

We consider the stochastic uncertain system (2)-(7) introduced in Section III. The performance index is the standard symmetric quadratic function of state and control action:

$$J = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=0}^N (x_t^\top Q x_t + u_t^\top R u_t) + \frac{1}{2} x_{N+1}^\top Q_{N+1} x_{N+1}, \quad (23)$$

where $Q \succeq 0$, $Q_{N+1} \succ 0$ and $R \succ 0$. Matrices Q , Q_{N+1} and R are designed in according to the specific control: the lower the index takes value, the more the control strategy will satisfy the specifics. This index measures the state deviation from the origin at the final time step and during the transient phase, as well as the energy spent for the control.

We assume that the pair (A, Q) is observable.

The minimax control problem under consideration involves

finding an admissible controller to minimize the worst expected value of the cost functional (23). That is, we are concerned with the control problem:

$$\min_{\{u_t = \pi_t(x_t), t=0, \dots, N\}} \max_{\{\tilde{f}(x_t|x_{t-1}) \in \mathcal{B}_t, t=1, \dots, N+1\}} \tilde{\mathbf{E}}[J]. \quad (24)$$

We solve this problem by applying the approach developed in the previous section based on the backward dynamic programming technique and the duality between relative entropy and free energy.

Consider the situation at time N : the state variable x_N has been observed and the control signal $u_N = \pi_N(x_N)$ should be determined by solving the following minimax constrained optimal control problem:

$$\min_{u_N = \pi_N(x_N)} \max_{\tilde{f}(x_{N+1}|x_N) \in \mathcal{B}_{N+1}} \tilde{\mathbf{E}}[J]. \quad (25)$$

Notice that the density function $\tilde{f}(X_{0:N})$ and the input sequence $U_{0:N-1}$ are considered as parameters at this stage.

By exploiting the duality theory, the control problem (25) can be replaced by an equivalent unconstrained stochastic game problem where the maximizing player is the probability measure $\tilde{f}(x_{N+1}|x_N)$ and the minimizing player is the input $u_N = \pi_N(x_N)$.

Theorem 5.1: Consider the stochastic uncertain system (2), (3) and (7) with cost functional J given by (23). Define the augmented cost functional

$$J_{\tau_{N+1}} := J - \tau_{N+1} [R_{N+1} - \frac{1}{2} \|z_N\|^2 - d_{N+1}],$$

where $\tau_{N+1} \in \mathbf{R}_+$, and introduce the unconstrained stochastic game problem:

$$W_{\tau_{N+1}} := \min_{u_N = \pi_N(x_N)} \max_{\tilde{f}(x_{N+1}|x_N) \in \mathcal{P}} \tilde{\mathbf{E}}[J_{\tau_{N+1}}]. \quad (26)$$

For any distribution $\tilde{f}(X_{0:N})$ and any control sequence $U_{0:N-1}$, the constrained stochastic optimization problem (25) is finite if and only if $\Gamma_{N+1} := \{\tau_{N+1} > 0 \mid W_{\tau_{N+1}} < \infty\}$ is non empty. In this case,

$$\min_{u_N = \pi_N(x_N)} \max_{\tilde{f}(x_{N+1}|x_N) \in \mathcal{B}_{N+1}} \tilde{\mathbf{E}}[J] = \min_{\tau_{N+1} > 0} W_{\tau_{N+1}}. \quad (27)$$

Proof. The proof follows similar steps to the proof of Theorem 4.1 of Section (IV) and it is therefore omitted. ■

Now, we evaluate the quantity $W_{\tau_{N+1}}$ for $\tau_{N+1} > 0$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\tau_{N+1}} &= \min_{u_N} \max_{\tilde{f}(x_{N+1}|x_N)} \tilde{\mathbf{E}} \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=0}^N (x_t^\top Q x_t + u_t^\top R u_t) + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \frac{1}{2} x_{N+1}^\top Q_{N+1} x_{N+1} - \tau_{N+1} (R_{N+1} - \frac{1}{2} \|z_N\|^2 - d_{N+1}) \right] \\ &= \min_{u_N} \tilde{\mathbf{E}} \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} (x_t^\top Q x_t + u_t^\top R u_t) + \tau_{N+1} \times \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left(\max_{\tilde{f}(x_{N+1}|x_N)} \tilde{\mathbf{E}} \left[\frac{1}{2\tau_{N+1}} (x_N^\top \bar{Q}_{\tau_{N+1}} x_N + u_N^\top \bar{R}_{\tau_{N+1}} u_N + \right. \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \left. x_{N+1}^\top Q_{N+1} x_{N+1}) - R_{N+1} \mid x_N \right] \right) \right] + \tau_{N+1} d_{N+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{Q}_{\tau_{N+1}} &:= Q + \tau_{N+1} E_1^\top E_1 \\ \bar{R}_{\tau_{N+1}} &:= R + \tau_{N+1} E_2^\top E_2. \end{aligned}$$

By applying Lemma 2.2 it follows that

$$W_{\tau_{N+1}} = \min_{u_N} \tilde{\mathbf{E}} \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} (x_t^\top Q x_t + u_t^\top R u_t) + \tau_{N+1} \times \right. \\ \left. \log \mathbf{E} \left[J_{RS, N+1} \mid x_N \right] \right] + \tau_{N+1} d_{N+1},$$

where

$$J_{RS, N+1} := \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2\tau_{N+1}} (x_N^\top \bar{Q}_{\tau_{N+1}} x_N + u_N^\top \bar{R}_{\tau_{N+1}} u_N + \right. \\ \left. + x_{N+1}^\top Q_{N+1} x_{N+1}) \right\}.$$

Here the subscript RS stands for *risk-sensitive*. Indeed, we can recognize that this is a risk-sensitive criterion with risk-sensitivity parameter $1/\tau_{N+1}$.

From Lemma A.3 we can exchange the minimization with respect to $u_N = \pi_N(x_N)$ and the expectation with respect to x_N so that

$$W_{\tau_{N+1}} = \tilde{\mathbf{E}} \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} (x_t^\top Q x_t + u_t^\top R u_t) + \tau_{N+1} \times \right. \\ \left. \min_{u_N} \log \mathbf{E} \left[J_{RS, N+1} \mid x_N \right] \right] + \tau_{N+1} d_{N+1}. \quad (28)$$

In order to find the optimal control strategy at time N we notice that

$$\min_{u_N} \mathbf{E} \log \left[J_{RS, N+1} \mid x_N \right]$$

is a one-step LQG risk-sensitive control problem with state feedback and initial condition x_N . The solution to this problem is obtained by Jacobson in [7] and involves the Riccati recursion:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{N+1} &= Q_{N+1} \\ \Pi_N &= \bar{Q}_{\tau_{N+1}} + A^\top \left(\Pi_{N+1}^{-1} + B \bar{R}_{\tau_{N+1}}^{-1} B^\top - \frac{V}{\tau_{N+1}} \right)^{-1} A \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

which is required to satisfy the condition

$$\Pi_{N+1}^{-1} - \frac{V}{\tau_{N+1}} \succ 0.$$

The resulting optimal state feedback controller is then given by

$$u_N = -\bar{R}_{\tau_{N+1}}^{-1} B^\top \left(\Pi_{N+1}^{-1} + B \bar{R}_{\tau_{N+1}}^{-1} B^\top - \frac{V}{\tau_{N+1}} \right)^{-1} A x_N$$

and the corresponding optimal risk-sensitive cost is

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{u_N} \log \mathbf{E} \left[J_{RS, N+1} \mid x_N \right] &= \frac{1}{2\tau_{N+1}} x_N^\top \Pi_N x_N \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \log \left| I - \frac{\Pi_{N+1} V}{\tau_{N+1}} \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Remark 3: In a similar fashion to Remark 1, we can show that positivity of Q_{N+1} and observability of the pair (A, Q) imply that the matrix $\Pi_N \succ 0$.

By plugging (30) into (28), we obtain that for $\tau_{N+1} \in \Gamma_{N+1}$,

$$W_{\tau_{N+1}} = \tilde{\mathbf{E}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} (x_t^\top Q x_t + u_t^\top R u_t) + \frac{1}{2} x_N^\top \Pi_N x_N \right\} - \frac{\tau_{N+1}}{2} \log \left| I - \frac{\Pi_{N+1} V}{\tau_{N+1}} \right| + \tau_{N+1} d_{N+1}. \quad (31)$$

In view of (27), if Γ_{N+1} is non-empty, Problem (24) can be rewritten as:

$$\min_{\{u_t, t=0, \dots, N-1\}} \max_{\{\tilde{f}(x_t | x_{t-1}) \in \mathcal{B}_t, t=1, \dots, N\}} \min_{\tau_{N+1} > 0} W_{\tau_{N+1}}$$

where $W_{\tau_{N+1}}$ is evaluated by applying the formula (31). Now, in order to move to the next stage of the dynamical programming recursion, we switch the minimization over τ_{N+1} and the maximization over $\tilde{f}(x_N | x_{N-1})$, so that we can consider the problem

$$\min_{u_{N-1}} \max_{\tilde{f}(x_N | x_{N-1}) \in \mathcal{B}_N} \tilde{\mathbf{E}}[W_{\tau_{N+1}}].$$

By looking at expression (31), we immediately recognize that this problem is identical in structure to the problem (25) (apart from some terms which are constant with respect to $\tilde{f}(x_N | x_{N-1})$ and u_{N-1}). Therefore, we can rearrange Theorem 5.1 and repeat all the previous reasonings to tackle it.

We hasten to remark that the switch between the minimization and the maximization operation may in general affect the result. Sufficient conditions to perform this switch without changing the conclusion are given by the *Von Neumann's minimax theorem* A.1. In order to apply this theorem, we notice that linearity (thus concavity) of the function $W_{\tau_{N+1}}$ with respect to $\tilde{f}(x_N | x_{N-1})$ for any fixed τ_{N+1} immediately follows from (31). As regards convexity with respect to τ_{N+1} given $\tilde{f}(x_N | x_{N-1})$, we have to distinguish two cases: when the matrix E_2 in (3) is equal to zero and when it is different from zero. We first analyze the case $E_2 = 0$.

Theorem 5.2: Consider the stochastic uncertain system (2)-(7) with $E_2 = 0$ and the cost functional (23). Introduce the risk sensitive-like Riccati difference equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{N+1} &= Q_{N+1} \\ \Pi_t &= \bar{Q}_{\tau_{t+1}} + A^\top \left(\Pi_{t+1}^{-1} + B \bar{R}_{\tau_{t+1}}^{-1} B^\top - \frac{V}{\tau_{t+1}} \right)^{-1} A, \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where

$$\bar{Q}_{\tau_{t+1}} := Q + \tau_{t+1} E_1^\top E_1, \quad (33)$$

$$\bar{R}_{\tau_{t+1}} := R. \quad (34)$$

The solution to this difference equation is required to satisfy:

$$\left(\Pi_{t+1}^{-1} - \frac{V}{\tau_{t+1}} \right) \succ 0 \text{ for } t = 0, \dots, N. \quad (35)$$

If there exist $(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{N+1}) \in \mathbf{R}_{++}^{N+1}$ such that (35) is satisfied, then the minimax optimal control problem (24) is

finite. In such a case, the minimax control problem (14) is equivalent to

$$\min_{\tau_1 > 0, \dots, \tau_{N+1} > 0} W_{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{N+1}}, \quad (36)$$

where

$$W_{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{N+1}} := \frac{1}{2} \bar{x}_0^\top \Pi_0 \bar{x}_0 - \sum_{t=1}^{N+1} \left(\frac{\tau_t}{2} \log \left| I - \frac{\Pi_t V}{\tau_t} \right| - \tau_t d_t \right). \quad (37)$$

Moreover, if $(\tau_1^\circ, \dots, \tau_{N+1}^\circ) \in \mathbf{R}_{++}^{N+1}$ solves problem (36) and $(\Pi_0^\circ, \dots, \Pi_{N+1}^\circ)$ are the corresponding matrices obtained by (32), then

$$u_t^\circ = -\bar{R}_{\tau_{t+1}^\circ}^{-1} B^\top \left(\Pi_{t+1}^\circ{}^{-1} + B R_{\tau_{t+1}^\circ}^{-1} B^\top - \frac{V}{\tau_{t+1}^\circ} \right)^{-1} A x_t. \quad (38)$$

with $t = 0, \dots, N$ is the optimal control input of problem (24).

In order to prove the theorem, we need the following preliminary Lemma:

Lemma 5.1: Given any probability density function $\tilde{f}(X_{0:t-1})$ and input sequence $U_{0:t}$, if the matrix $E_2 = 0$ then the function $W_{\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1}}$ defined as

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1}} &:= \tilde{\mathbf{E}} \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^t (x_k^\top Q x_k + u_k^\top R u_k) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} x_{t+1}^\top \Pi_{t+1} x_{t+1} \right] - \sum_{k=t+1}^{N+1} \left(\frac{\tau_k}{2} \log \left| I - \frac{\Pi_k V}{\tau_k} \right| - \tau_k d_k \right), \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

with Π_t computed according to (32), is jointly convex in $(\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1})$ for any $t = 0, \dots, N$.

Proof. The function $W_{\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1}}$ can be equivalently written as

$$W_{\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1}} = \min_{\{u_t, \dots, u_N\}} \max_{\substack{\tilde{f}(x_{t+1} | x_t), \dots, \\ \tilde{f}(x_{N+1} | x_N) \in \mathcal{P}}} \tilde{\mathbf{E}}[J_{\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1}}]$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} J_{\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1}} &:= \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^N (x_k^\top Q x_k + u_k^\top R u_k) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} x_{N+1}^\top Q_{N+1} x_{N+1} - \sum_{k=t+1}^{N+1} \tau_k (R_k - \frac{1}{2} \|z_k\|^2 - d_k) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

It is not difficult to see that $J_{\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1}}$ is jointly convex in $(\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1}, u_t, \dots, u_N)$ for any $(\tilde{f}(x_{t+1} | x_t), \dots, \tilde{f}(x_{N+1} | x_N))$ as soon as $E_2 = 0$. Then, by Lemma A.1, the maximization with respect to $(\tilde{f}(x_{t+1} | x_t), \dots, \tilde{f}(x_{N+1} | x_N))$ returns a convex function of $(\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1}, u_t, \dots, u_N)$. Finally, in view of Lemma A.2, the partial minimization over the control input variables (u_t, \dots, u_N) preserves convexity of $W_{\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1}}$ with respect to $(\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1})$. ■

Proof of Theorem 5.2 The theorem derives from the previous arguments, repeating the dynamic programming recursion $N+1$

1 times. The main clarification is that at each time step t , with $t = 0, \dots, N$,

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\tilde{f}(x_t|x_{t-1}) \in \mathcal{B}_t} \min_{\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1} > 0} W_{\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1}} &= \\ \min_{\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1} > 0} \max_{\tilde{f}(x_t|x_{t-1}) \in \mathcal{B}_t} W_{\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1}}, & \quad (40) \end{aligned}$$

for any probability density function $\tilde{f}(X_{0:t-1})$ and any input sequence $U_{0:t}$. Here $W_{\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1}}$ is defined by (39) and the saddle-point equality (40) derives from the Minimax Theorem (A.1). Indeed the function $W_{\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1}}$ is linear in $\tilde{f}(x_t|x_{t-1})$, and it is jointly convex in $(\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1})$ by Lemma 5.1. This allows us to switch the max and min operator and proceed in the dynamic programming procedure without affecting the result. ■

If $E_2 \neq 0$, we can not use Lemma 5.1 to show convexity of $W_{\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1}}$ for $t = 0, \dots, N$. At each time step t , the switch between the max and the min operator may generate an inequality sign “ \leq ” (see [24, p.238]). In this case, the following weaker version of Theorem 5.2 holds:

Theorem 5.3: Consider the stochastic uncertain system (2)-(7) with $E_2 \neq 0$ and the cost functional (23). Let the matrices $\Pi_t \in \mathbf{R}^{n \times n}$ be computed according to the Riccati difference equation (32) where formula (34) is substituted with

$$\bar{R}_{\tau_{t+1}} := R + \tau_{t+1} E_2^\top E_2.$$

If there exist $(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{N+1}) \in \mathbf{R}_{++}^{N+1}$ such that condition (35) is satisfied for each $t = 0, \dots, N$, then Problem (14) is finite. In such a case, an upper bound to (14) is given by the solution to the optimization problem (36) where $W_{\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1}}$ is defined by (37). The control input corresponding to this upper bound is given by (38) where $(\tau_1^\circ, \dots, \tau_{N+1}^\circ)$ is a solution to (36) and $(\Pi_0^\circ, \dots, \Pi_{N+1}^\circ)$ are the corresponding Riccati recursion matrices.

Proof. The theorem derives by the previous arguments. We only clarify that, differently from Theorem 5.2, at each time step t , with $t = 0, \dots, N$, we can only state that

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\tilde{f}(x_t|x_{t-1}) \in \mathcal{B}_t} \min_{\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1} > 0} W_{\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1}} &\leq \\ \min_{\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1} > 0} \max_{\tilde{f}(x_t|x_{t-1}) \in \mathcal{B}_t} W_{\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1}}, & \quad (41) \end{aligned}$$

for any probability density function $\tilde{f}(X_{0:t-1})$ and any input sequence $U_{0:t}$ (see [24, p.238]). Therefore, when we switch the max and min operators to proceed in the dynamic programming recursion, we may in general generate an upper bound to problem (14). ■

Remark 4: If the matrix $E_2 \neq 0$, we have already remarked that we can not extend the proof of Lemma (5.1) to show convexity of the function $W_{\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1}}$ defined in (39). Our conjecture, supported by numerical simulations, is that this function is quasi-convex [24] in $(\tau_{t+1}, \dots, \tau_{N+1})$ for each $t = 0, \dots, N$. If this conjecture holds true, then by the *Sion's minimax theorem* [25] the inequality sign (41) could be substituted with an equality sign, and the dual problem (36) would actually provide the optimal solution to (14). Thus, if our conjecture holds true then the conclusions of Theorem 5.2 hold also in the case when $E_2 \neq 0$. Numerical simulations

in practical examples show that our paradigm provides good performances even in the case of when $E_2 \neq 0$: Example 1 of Section VII is an example of such simulations.

Remark 5: We propose a coordinate descent algorithm [26] to solve Problem (36). At each iteration of the algorithm, we have to solve a single variable optimization problem in τ_t . In order to do that, we solve the Riccati equations (19) for different values of τ_t , then we evaluate the quantity $W_{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{N+1}}$ as a function of τ_t and we choose the value of the variable for which the minimum is achieved. If $E_2 = 0$, we have theoretical guarantees that Problem (36) is a convex optimization problem, thus the coordinate descent algorithm converges to the optimal point.

Remark 6: We have assumed in Section III that the admissible control policies (38) are function of the state vector only at the current time step t . We hasten to remark that **this hypothesis is not restrictive**. In fact, we can repeat the previous argument under the assumption that the controller has access to the whole past history $X_{0:t}$: the computations are essentially the same and the optimal control policy does not change. In other words, no additional information about the future development of the system is obtained if past measurements are included.

VI. LEAST FAVORABLE MODEL

In this section, we consider for simplicity the stochastic uncertain system (2)-(7) with $E_2 = 0$.

A salient feature of the solution scheme presented in Theorem 5.2 of Section V is that an explicit form of the maximizers players $\tilde{f}^\circ(x_{t+1}|x_t)$ in problem (24) is not required to obtain the optimal control law (38). For simulation and performance evaluation, it is instructive to construct the least favorable model. To this end, we state the following preliminary Lemma:

Lemma 6.1: Let $f(x)$ be the probability density function of a n -dimensional normal random vector $x \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$ with $\Sigma \succ 0$, and let $J(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^\top Gx$ where $G = G^\top \in \mathbf{R}^{n \times n}$ is a positive semidefinite matrix. If $(\Sigma^{-1} - G) = \Sigma^{-1}(I - \Sigma G) \succ 0$, then

$$\tilde{f}(x) = f(x) \frac{e^{J(x)}}{\int_{\mathbf{R}^n} e^{J(\bar{x})} f(\bar{x}) d\bar{x}}$$

is a Gaussian distribution given by

$$\tilde{f}(x) \sim \mathcal{N}((I - \Sigma G)^{-1}\mu, (I - \Sigma G)^{-1}\Sigma).$$

Proof.

By applying Lemma 4.1, it is easy to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} e^{J(\bar{x})} f(\bar{x}) d\bar{x} &= \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^n |\Sigma|}} \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \bar{x}^\top G \bar{x} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{2} (\bar{x} - \mu)^\top \Sigma^{-1} (\bar{x} - \mu) \right\} d\bar{x} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^n |\Sigma|}} \int \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \bar{x}^\top (G - \Sigma^{-1}) \bar{x} + \mu^\top \Sigma^{-1} \bar{x} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{2} \mu^\top \Sigma^{-1} \mu \right\} d\bar{x} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{|I - \Sigma G|}} \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \mu^\top \Sigma^{-1} ((I - \Sigma G)^{-1} - I) \mu \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

where, in the third equality we have used Lemma 4.1. Moreover, by completing the square, we can see that

$$f(x)e^{J(x)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^n |\Sigma|}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} (x - \tilde{\mu})^\top \tilde{\Sigma}^{-1} (x - \tilde{\mu}) \right\} \\ \times \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \mu^\top \Sigma^{-1} ((I - \Sigma G)^{-1} - I) \mu \right\}$$

where $\tilde{\mu} = (I - \Sigma G)^{-1} \mu$ and $\tilde{\Sigma} = (I - \Sigma G)^{-1} \Sigma$.

Now, the thesis follows immediately. \blacksquare

Let $\tau_1^\circ, \dots, \tau_{N+1}^\circ$ be the solution to Problem (36) and denote by $\Pi_0^\circ, \dots, \Pi_{N+1}^\circ$ the corresponding matrices obtained by backward iteration of the Riccati difference equation (32). In the same way, the optimal control input given by (38) is denoted by $u_0^\circ, \dots, u_N^\circ$. In Section V, we leverage on Lemma 2.2 in order to compute the worst scenario. This lemma implies that the least-favorable model at each time step t is described by the conditional distribution:

$$\tilde{f}^\circ(x_t | x_{t-1}) = \frac{f(x_t | x_{t-1}) \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2\tau_t^\circ} x_t^\top \Pi_t^\circ x_t \right\}}{\int \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2\tau_t^\circ} \bar{x}_t^\top \Pi_t^\circ \bar{x}_t \right\} f(\bar{x}_t | x_{t-1}) d\bar{x}_t}$$

where the nominal conditional distribution is given by (6). From Lemma 6.1, we can conclude that $\tilde{f}^\circ(x_t | x_{t-1})$ can be expressed in closed form as:

$$\tilde{f}^\circ(x_t | x_{t-1}) \sim \mathcal{N} \left(\left(I - \frac{V \Pi_t^\circ}{\tau_t^\circ} \right)^{-1} (A x_{t-1} + B u_{t-1}^\circ), \right. \\ \left. \left(I - \frac{V \Pi_t^\circ}{\tau_t^\circ} \right)^{-1} V \right).$$

It is clear that the least-favorable density of the noise \tilde{v}_t involves a perturbation of both the mean and the variance of the nominal noise distribution. Notice also that for the worst-case model the noise random variables \tilde{v}_t and \tilde{v}_s , with $t \neq s$, are not independent.

VII. SIMULATIONS

In this section, we present some numerical example in order to illustrate the theory developed above. We compare the solution obtained by our scheme both to the standard LQG solution and to the solution obtained by employing the state of the art method proposed by Petersen and James [12] to make the LQG solution resilient against model uncertainties.

A. Example 1

Consider a stochastic state-space model (2)-(3) of dimension $n = 3$ over an interval of length $N = 100$ with state and input matrices:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0.5773 & -0.6335 & -0.0457 \\ 0.5477 & 1.7583 & 0.0524 \\ -0.4011 & -0.4754 & 1.0043 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 0.3212 \\ 0.3689 \\ -0.2741 \end{bmatrix},$$

and nominal noise variance $V = I$. The uncertainty input z_t is assumed to be a scalar quantity defined by the matrices $E_1 = 0$ and $E_2 = 0.5$. The initial condition is $x_0 = [0.5 \ 0.1 \ -0.7]^\top$; the quadratic cost functional (23) is defined by the weight matrices

$$Q = 0.0025 \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad Q_{N+1} = 0.1 \cdot I, \quad R = 10^{-3}.$$




Fig. 2: Expected closed loop cost versus the real uncertain parameter Δ . We compare the performances of the standard LQG controller (in black), the minimax LQG controller obtained by considering a single relative-entropy constraint (42) for the whole time interval (in blue) and the proposed D^2 -LQG controller in which an incremental relative entropy constraint (7) is considered (in red).

Also, the constants $d_t > 0$ defining the relative entropy constraints (7) are chosen to be $d_t = 10^{-10}$ for all t .

We apply the D^2 -LQG procedure proposed in Section V to control the system. To test the performances, we compute the expected closed-loop cost when the real unknown noise process $\{\tilde{v}_t\}$ is generated according to the LFT model of Figure 1. In particular, we assume that the Δ is a time-invariant matrix given by

$$\Delta = c \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

with c being a scalar ranging in the interval $[-1/\sqrt{3}, 1/\sqrt{3}]$. This ensures that $\|\Delta\|^2 \leq 1$, and consequently, as already remarked in Section III, that the relative entropy constraint (7) is satisfied at every time t .

It is of interest to compare the results with the ones obtained by applying the standard LQG procedure, as well as the controller proposed by Petersen and James in [12, Section IV.B]. The authors of [12] propose a minimax LQG controller for a stochastic uncertain system where the uncertainty is expressed in terms of a single relative-entropy constraint for the whole time interval. Namely, given the nominal Gaussian system (2), the admissible joint probability density functions $\tilde{f}(X_{0,N+1})$ of the perturbed system (3) are assumed to satisfy the constraint

$$R(\tilde{f}(X_{0,N+1}) || f(X_{0,N+1})) \leq d + \tilde{\mathbf{E}} \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=0}^{N+1} \|z_t\|^2 \right]. \quad (42)$$

The tolerance d is positive scalar, and, for a fair comparison, we set

$$d = \sum_{t=1}^{N+1} d_t. \quad (43)$$

A plot of the expected closed-loop cost (23) versus the uncertainty parameter Δ for the three controllers is given in Figure 2. When $\Delta = 0$ the perturbed system corresponds to the nominal one, for which the standard LQG controller is the optimal one. However, the performances of the standard LQG controller rapidly deteriorate when the magnitude of Δ increases, causing the cost of the system to increase

dramatically. It is also evident that the minimax controller with a single relative entropy constraint [12] does not show a satisfactory behavior. The explanation lies in the fact that the maximizing player is allowed to allocate most of the mismatch modeling budget to the first time intervals; this leads to extremely pessimistic and conservative conclusions. Finally we notice that the proposed procedure is able to trade off optimality and resiliency. Indeed, when the real system coincides with the nominal one, the expected closed-loop cost is slightly larger than the optimal one. This cost remains almost constant when the perturbation matrix Δ is different from zero, giving evidence to the robustness properties of the control system.

B. Example 2

We consider the control of the inverted pendulum on a cart, which is a typical benchmark in control theory. The inverted pendulum system is depicted in Figure 3. It consists of a pendulum which is attached to a cart equipped with a motor driving it. The movement of the cart is constrained to the horizontal direction, whereas the pendulum can rotate in the vertical plane. The model parameters are listed in Table I. The motion of the system can be represented by the following equations [27]:

$$\begin{aligned} m_p l \ddot{\theta} \cos \theta - m_p l \dot{\theta}^2 \sin \theta + (M_c + m_p) \ddot{q} &= u \\ J \ddot{\theta} - m_p l g \sin \theta + m_p l \cos \theta \ddot{q} &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

where θ (in rad) is the angle between the vertical axes and the rod of the pendulum, q (in m) is the horizontal displacement of the pendulum and u (in N) is the input acceleration. The quantity $J = (I + ml^2)$ is the pendulum moment of inertia around the pivot.

When the rod of the pendulum is nearby to the unstable equilibrium point $\theta = 0$, any non-linearities in model (44) can be neglected. Thus, by defining the state variables $x = [\theta \ \dot{\theta} \ q \ \dot{q}]^\top$, the system can be represented by the following linear state-space model [27]:

$$\dot{x} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{3(M_c + m_p)g}{4M_c l + m_p l} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -\frac{3m_p g}{4M_c + m_p} & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -\frac{3}{4M_c l + m_p l} \\ 0 \\ \frac{4}{4M_c + m_p} \end{bmatrix} u. \quad (45)$$

Assuming that the system lies in the linear region, the aim is to stabilize it at the equilibrium $x = [0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0]^\top$. To solve this problem, we first discretize the continuous-time model (45) using zero-order hold on the input and a sample time of $T_s = 0.2$ sec. The resulting state and input matrices are:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1.0996 & 0.2066 & 0 & 0 \\ 1.0123 & 1.0996 & 0 & 0 \\ -0.0664 & -0.0044 & 1 & 0.2 \\ -0.6749 & -0.0664 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} -0.0023 \\ -0.0230 \\ 0.0060 \\ 0.0597 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then, we design a controller by applying the proposed D^2 -LQG control strategy. Specifically, we consider the initial state

$$x_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.1 \\ -0.1 \\ 0.05 \\ 0.02 \end{bmatrix}^\top$$

and the quadratic cost (23) for a time interval of length $N = 75$ with weights $Q = Q_{N+1} = \text{diag}(1, 1, 10, 1)$ and $R = 1$. We set the matrices E_1 and E_2 in (3) as

$$E_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -0.0224 & 0.2295 & -0.1318 & -0.0035 \\ 0.1201 & 0.1169 & 0.0139 & -0.1209 \\ -0.1291 & -0.0602 & 0.2178 & -0.0656 \\ 0.1179 & -0.0579 & -0.09106 & 0.0530 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$E_2 = [0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0]^\top,$$

and the tolerance $d_t = 0.0132$ for any t such that $d = \sum d_t = 1$. Finally, v_t is assumed to be a white Gaussian noise with covariance $V = \text{diag}(0.1, 0.5, 0.1, 0.5)$.

In Figure 4, we show the closed-loop system response x and the control action u , together with the value of the cost J defined in (23), in the nominal (deterministic) case in which the underlying system is governed by the dynamics

$$x_{t+1} = Ax_t + Bu_t. \quad (46)$$

We compare the performances of the linear quadratic regulator, the minimax LQG controller proposed in [12] and the proposed D^2 -LQG strategy. From the figure, it is evident that the proposed procedure exhibits an intermediate behavior between the standard LQG control strategy and the single constraint minimax LQG one.

To evaluate the robustness of the three control schemes to model uncertainties and parameter perturbations, we consider the situation in which model (45) is an inaccurate representation of the underlying system. Specifically, we assume that the real underlying system is governed by the dynamics

$$x_{t+1} = (A + \Delta A)x_t + (B + \Delta B)u_t \quad (47)$$

with

$$\Delta A = \begin{bmatrix} 0.0269 & 0.0316 & -0.0243 & 0.0288 \\ -0.0296 & -0.0290 & -0.0163 & -0.0312 \\ 0.0332 & 0.0046 & 0.0348 & -0.0093 \\ -0.0246 & -0.0042 & -0.0284 & 0.0138 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\Delta B = \begin{bmatrix} -0.0004 \\ 0.0011 \\ 0.0012 \\ -0.0002 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The results are summarized in Figure 5. In this perturbed situation, the system controlled with the LQG technique loses stability. This causes the state vector x and therefore the cost J to diverge. On the other hand, the robustness introduced by the minimax controllers prevents system instability. We can also observe that the proposed technique exhibits better performances than the single constraint one, as it achieves a smaller value of the index J . Moreover, it requires the

Symbol	Parameters Name	Value
M_c	Mass of the Cart	3 kg
m_p	Mass of the Pendulum	1.5 kg
l	Half of Pendulum length	2 m
g	Gravity Acceleration	9.8 m/s

TABLE I: Parameters of the inverted pendulum system.




Fig. 3: Inverted pendulum system.

application of a smoother and lower-energy control signal, which is more suitable and realistic in practice.

The matrices ΔA and ΔB and E_1 defined above are randomly generated. By repeating the simulations for a different E_1 and different perturbation matrices ΔA and ΔB (with approximately the same norms) we obtain similar results.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

We have proposed a new LQG problem which provides a control policy which is distributionally robust under distributed uncertainty. Our simulation experiments suggest the following conclusions:

- 1) The standard LQG solution is quite fragile. In fact, the LQG optimal control policy applied to a system featuring modest perturbations with respect to the nominal model may yield an unstable closed-loop system. Both our method and the method proposed in [12] are, on the other hand, resilient to perturbations.
- 2) Our method to deal with uncertainties appears to be much less conservative than that in [12]. In fact, our performances are not significantly different from the optimal LQG ones for the nominal model while the performance index obtained by using the method in [12] is much larger. Moreover, even when the difference between the nominal and the actual model is significant, robustness against instability is guaranteed by both methods but in our method the value of the performance index is significantly smaller.

APPENDIX

A. Convex Optimization

In this section we collect some relevant properties on optimization and convexity underlying the solution the proposed control problem.

Lemma A.1: [24, p.81] Let X be a normed space. Let $\{f_\alpha(x) | \alpha \in I\}$ be a collection of functions with the same domain K . If K is a convex subset of X and $f_\alpha(x)$ is a convex function for each α , then

$$g(x) := \sup_{\alpha \in I} f_\alpha(x)$$

is also convex.

Lemma A.2: [24, p.87] Let $f(x, y)$ be convex in (x, y) and K be a convex non-empty set. Then the function

$$g(x) = \inf_{y \in K} f(x, y)$$

is convex in x provided that $g(x) > -\infty$ for some x .

Theorem A.1 (Von Neumann's Minmax Theorem [28]): Let X and Y be linear vector spaces, and Ω and Ψ be convex subsets of X and Y , respectively. If $f(x, y)$ is concave in x and convex in y , then

$$\max_{x \in \Omega} \min_{y \in \Psi} f(x, y) = \min_{y \in \Psi} \max_{x \in \Omega} f(x, y).$$

Theorem A.2: [29, pag. 224-225] Let X be a linear vector space and Ω be a convex subset of X . Let f be a real-valued concave function on Ω and $g : X \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ a convex map. Suppose there exists $x_1 \in \Omega$ such that $g(x_1) < 0$. Let

$$\mu_0 = \sup_{\substack{x \in \Omega \\ g(x) \leq 0}} f(x) \quad (48)$$

and assume μ_0 is finite. Then,

$$\sup_{\substack{x \in \Omega \\ g(x) \leq 0}} f(x) = \min_{\tau \geq 0} \sup_{x \in \Omega} [f(x) - \tau g(x)] \quad (49)$$

and the minimum in the right side is achieved for a $\tau^o \geq 0$.

Lemma A.3: [30, Lemma 3.1 pag 260] Assume that the function $f(x, u)$ has a unique minimum with respect to $u \in U$ for all $x \in X$. Then the operations of minimizing with respect to all admissible control strategies $u(x)$ and taking the mathematical expectation with respect to x commute. That is

$$\min_{u(x)} \mathbf{E} f(x, u) = \mathbf{E} \min_u f(x, u).$$

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Rawlings, D. Mayne, and M. Diehl, *Model Predictive Control: Theory, Computation, and Design*. Nob Hill Publishing, 2017.
- [2] J. Doyle, "Guaranteed margins for LQG regulators," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 756–757, 1978.
- [3] K. Zhou and P. Khargonekar, "An algebraic riccati equation approach to H^∞ optimization," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 85–91, 1988.
- [4] B. Francis, *A Course in H^∞ Control Theory*, ser. Lecture notes in control and information sciences. Springer-Verlag, 1987.
- [5] J. Doyle, K. Glover, P. Khargonekar, and B. Francis, "State-space solutions to standard H_2 and H_∞ control problems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 34, no. 8, pp. 831–847, 1989.
- [6] C. Bergeling, K. A. Morris, and A. Rantzer, "Closed-form h-infinity optimal control for a class of infinite-dimensional systems," *Automatica*, vol. 117, p. 108916, 2020. [Online]. Available: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S000510982030114X




Fig. 4: Inverted Pendulum on a cart system: nominal case in which the underlying system is governed by the dynamics (46). Evolution of the closed-loop response x and the control input u over the time interval $[0, 10\text{s}]$, and value of the resulting cost J (23). We compare the performances of the standard LQG controller (in black), the minimax LQG controller obtained by considering a single relative-entropy constraint (42) for the whole time interval (in blue) and the proposed D^2 -LQG controller in which an incremental relative entropy constraint (7) is considered (in red).

- [7] D. Jacobson, “Optimal stochastic linear systems with exponential performance criteria and their relation to deterministic differential games,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 124–131, 1973.
- [8] P. Whittle, “Risk-sensitive linear/quadratic/gaussian control,” *Advances in Applied Probability*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 764–777, 1981.
- [9] B. P. Van Parys, D. Kuhn, P. J. Goulart, and M. Morari, “Distributionally robust control of constrained stochastic systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 61, no. 2, pp. 430–442, 2015.
- [10] I. Tzortzis, C. D. Charalambous, and T. Charalambous, “Dynamic programming subject to total variation distance ambiguity,” *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 53, no. 4, pp. 2040–2075, 2015.
- [11] I. Yang, “Wasserstein distributionally robust stochastic control: A data-driven approach,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 8, pp. 3863–3870, 2020.
- [12] I. Petersen, M. James, and P. Dupuis, “Minimax optimal control of stochastic uncertain systems with relative entropy constraints,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 45, no. 3, pp. 398–412, 2000.
- [13] L. Hansen and T. Sargent, *Robustness*. Princeton University Press, 2008.
- [14] M. Zorzi, “On the robustness of the Bayes and Wiener estimators under model uncertainty,” *Automatica*, vol. 83, pp. 133–140, 2017.
- [15] B. C. Levy and R. Nikoukhah, “Robust state space filtering under incremental model perturbations subject to a relative entropy tolerance,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 682–695, 2013.
- [16] M. Zorzi, “Robust kalman filtering under model perturbations,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, no. 6, pp. 2902–2907, 2017.
- [17] S. Yi and M. Zorzi, “Robust kalman filtering under model uncertainty: The case of degenerate densities,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 67, no. 7, pp. 3458–3471, 2022.
- [18] S. Abadeh, V. Nguyen, D. Kuhn, and P. Esfahani, “Wasserstein distributionally robust kalman filtering,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2018, pp. 8474–8483.
- [19] L. Falconi, A. Ferrante, and M. Zorzi, “A new perspective on robust performance for lqg control problems,” in *2022 IEEE 61st Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2022, pp. 3003–3008.
- [20] P. Dai Pra, L. Meneghini, and W. J. Runggaldier, “Connections between stochastic control and dynamic games,” *Mathematics of Control, Signals and Systems*, vol. 9, pp. 303 – 326, 1996.
- [21] I. R. Petersen and R. Tempo, “Robust control of uncertain systems: Classical results and recent developments,” *Autom.*, vol. 50, pp. 1315–1335, 2014.
- [22] L. Falconi, A. Ferrante, and M. Zorzi, “A new perspective on robust




Fig. 5: Inverted Pendulum on a cart system: perturbed case in which the underlying system is governed by the dynamics (47). Evolution of the closed-loop response x and the control input u over the time interval $[0, 10s]$, and value of the resulting cost J (23). We compare the performances of the minimax LQG controller obtained by considering a single relative-entropy constraint (42) for the whole time interval (in blue) and the proposed D^2 -LQG controller in which an incremental relative entropy constraint (7) is considered (in red). The evolution of the system controlled with the standard LQG technique is not shown as the signals diverge.

performance for lqg control problems,” in *2022 IEEE 61st Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2022, pp. 3003–3008.

- [23] A. Zee, *Quantum Field Theory in a Nutshell. Second Edition*, ser. In a Nutshell. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press, 2010.
- [24] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex optimization*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [25] M. Sion, “On general minimax theorems.” 1958.
- [26] J. C. Spall, “Cyclic seesaw process for optimization and identification,” *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, vol. 154, pp. 187–208, 2012.
- [27] B. A. Sharif and A. Ucar, “State feedback and lqr controllers for an inverted pendulum system,” in *2013 The International Conference on Technological Advances in Electrical, Electronics and Computer Engineering (TAECE)*, 2013, pp. 298–303.
- [28] J. Aubin and I. Ekeland, *Applied Nonlinear Analysis*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1984.
- [29] D. G. Luenberger, *Optimization by Vector Space Methods*, 1st ed. USA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1997.
- [30] K. Åström, *Introduction to Stochastic Control Theory*, ser. Dover Books on Electrical Engineering. Dover Publications, 2006.



Lucia Falconi received the M.S. degree in Automation Engineering (cum laude) from the University of Padova, Padova, Italy, in 2020. She is currently pursuing the Ph.D. degree in Information Engineering from the University of Padova. Her research interests are in the areas of systems identification, robust estimation, stochastic systems and stochastic optimal control.



Augusto Ferrante was born in Piove di Sacco, Italy, on August 5, 1967. He received the “Laurea” degree, *cum laude*, in Electrical Engineering in 1991 and the Ph.D. degree in Control Systems Engineering in 1995, both from the University of Padova.

He has been a faculty member of the Colleges of Engineering of the University of Udine and of the “Politecnico di Milano”. He is presently Professor in the “Department of Information Engineering” of the University of Padova.

His research interests are in the areas of linear systems, spectral estimation, optimal control and optimal filtering, quantum control, and stochastic realization.



Mattia Zorzi received the M.S. degree in Automation Engineering and the Ph.D. degree in Information Engineering from the University of Padova, Padova, Italy, in 2009 and 2013, respectively. He held Postdoctoral appointments with the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of Liege, Liege, Belgium, and with the Human Inspired Technology Research Centre, University of Padova, Padova, Italy. He held visiting positions with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of California, Davis,

USA, and with the Department of Engineering, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, U.K., in 2011 and 2013-2014, respectively. He is currently an Associate Professor with the Department of Information Engineering, University of Padova. His current research interests include machine learning, robust estimation, identification theory.

Dr. Zorzi has been an Associate Editor of IEEE Control Systems Letters since 2019. He serves as an Associate Editor on the IEEE Control System Society Conference Editorial Board since 2017 and on the International Program Committee of IFAC World Congress 2020. He is a member of the IFAC Technical Committee on Modelling, Identification and Signal Processing.