

On Building Myopic MPC Policies using Supervised Learning

Christopher A. Orrico, Bokan Yang, Dinesh Krishnamoorthy*

*Department of Mechanical Engineering, Eindhoven University of Technology, 5600 MB, Eindhoven, The Netherlands.
(email: d.krishnamoorthy@tue.nl)*

Abstract: Supervised learning, combined with model predictive control (MPC), has garnered recent attention, especially in approximate explicit MPC. Here, deep neural networks learn the MPC policy from optimal state-action pairs offline. However, while approximate explicit MPC aims to replicate the MPC policy, it often sacrifices performance guarantees inherent in online optimization. This paper proposes an alternative approach: offline supervised learning to derive the optimal value function instead of the policy. This function serves as the cost-to-go in a myopic MPC with a short prediction horizon, significantly reducing online computation without compromising controller performance. Additionally, we augment the offline supervised learning with a descent property constraint, that steers the learning process such that the successor states have lower cost-to-go than current states. Unlike existing approaches, our method learns the cost-to-go function from offline state-action-value tuples, as opposed to closed-loop performance data.

Keywords: model predictive control, value function approximation, parametric sensitivity

1. INTRODUCTION AND MOTIVATION

Model Predictive Control (MPC) is a widely-used approach where an optimization problem is solved iteratively online at each sampling instant, considering the current system state. However, the computational demand for online computation can be restrictive for embedded systems due to limited resources and the necessity for fast sampling times. One common method to mitigate this issue is through pre-computing a parameterized policy using supervised learning, known as expert-assisted supervised learning, imitation learning, or behavioral cloning (Bertsekas, 2019, Section 5.7.2). The core concept is to solve the MPC problem offline for various state realizations to obtain corresponding optimal actions, then train a supervised learning model with this data to approximate the policy. This approximated policy can then replace online optimization, providing actions based on the current state (Mesbah et al., 2022).

Despite the potential of deep learning techniques and the demand for computationally efficient MPC policies in embedded applications, challenges remain regarding the performance guarantees of the closed-loop system. More importantly, any changes in the controller parameters during online implementation can lead to performance losses and violations of safety-critical constraints, undermining the advantages of standard MPC.

One approach to address this involves myopic controllers with very short prediction horizons, which can reduce online computation costs. However, naively reducing the length of the prediction horizon can lead to severe performance degradation. Bellman’s principle of optimality suggests that if a representation of the “cost-to-go” from

any state within the state-space is available, even a greedy approach with a prediction horizon as small as one step can maintain control performance. However, getting an exact representation of the optimal cost-to-go function (using backward induction) is an intractable problem. To address this, the cost-to-go function can be approximated using a suitable parametric function $\mathcal{V}(x; \theta)$.

Learning the optimal cost-to-go function has been predominantly studied under the context of approximate dynamic programming (ADP) and reinforcement learning (RL) (Bertsekas, 2019), using closed-loop performance data. That is, the parameters θ in $\mathcal{V}(x; \theta)$ are updated using systematic methods such as Q-learning or temporal difference using closed-loop data obtained from different episodes (Mesbah et al., 2022, Section V). On the other hand, the use of supervised learning to learn the cost-to-go function offline (akin to approximate explicit MPC) has received very little attention, which is the main focus of this paper. Recently, Abdufattokhov et al. (2021) presented the idea of learning the cost-to-go function offline using supervised learning. However, this was restricted to quadratic cost-to-go functions of the form $\mathcal{V}(x) = x^T P x$, as opposed to generic parametric function approximators $\mathcal{V}(x; \theta)$.

Main Contribution This paper focuses on supervised learning-based value function approximation guided by the descent property constraint, using optimal state-action-value tuples as the training dataset. By solving long-horizon MPC problems offline for various state realizations, labeled training data can be generated. Using a benchmark CSTR example, this paper demonstrates that a good fit only in the sense of mean squared loss can give

poorer asymptotic performance, whereas approximating the value function with the descent property constraint can lead to a more meaningful cost-to-go function, despite having a poorer mean squared loss.

2. PROPOSED METHOD

2.1 Myopic MPC policy

Consider the following MPC problem $\Pi_N(x(t))$ with a long prediction horizon N ,

$$V^*(x(t)) = \min_{x_k, u_k} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \ell(x_k, u_k) + \ell_N(x_N) \quad (1a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } x_{k+1} = f(x_k, u_k) \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{I}_{0:N-1} \quad (1b)$$

$$x_k \in \mathcal{X}, \quad u_k \in \mathcal{U} \quad (1c)$$

$$x_0 = x(t), \quad x_N \in \mathcal{X}_f \quad (1d)$$

where $x \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ are the states, $u \in \mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ denotes the inputs, $x(t)$ is the current state, $\ell: \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denotes the stage cost, $f: \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ denotes the system model, and N is the length of the prediction horizon.

Assumption 1. Functions $f: \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\ell: \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are continuous, and without loss of generality $\ell(x, u) \geq 0$, $f(0, 0) = 0$ and $\ell(0, 0) = 0$, and the origin is contained within $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{U}$.

Leverage Bellman’s principle of optimality, our objective is to build a myopic MPC policy that can be used online.

$$\min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \ell(x(t), u) + V_f(x^+) \quad (2a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } x^+ = f(x(t), u) \in \mathcal{X} \quad (2b)$$

where $V_f(x^+): \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the optimal cost-to-go from any point $x^+ \in \mathcal{X}$. However, since the optimal cost-to-go $V_f(x)$ is not known, we aim to replace it with some suitable function approximator $\mathcal{V}(x; \theta)$ trained using optimal state-value pairs generated offline. This closely resembles approximate dynamic programming (ADP) (Bertsekas, 2019), with the key difference that the cost-to-go function is learned offline using supervised learning, without the need for a simulator or the actual system in-the-loop.

2.2 Learning optimal cost-to-go using supervised learning

Much like approximate explicit MPC schemes, the training dataset is collected by solving offline the original MPC problem with long prediction horizon (1) for several state realizations $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$ using any suitable sampling strategy. The data set consisting of n_{tr} optimal state-action-value tuples is denoted by $\mathcal{D} := \{(x_i, u_i^*, V^*(x_i))\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{tr}}}$.

When approximating the value function, an important question that arises is: what constitutes an effective approximation? If we can precisely learn the optimal cost-to-go V^* , according to Bellman’s principle of optimality, the myopic policy (2) becomes equivalent to the expert MPC problem (1). This underscores the conventional approach of minimizing empirical loss, where we train a function approximator $\mathcal{V}(x; \theta)$ parameterized by θ , to minimize the mean squared error (MSE) loss:

$$\hat{\theta}_1 = \arg \min_{\theta} \frac{1}{n_{\text{tr}}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{tr}}} \|\mathcal{V}(x_i; \theta) - V^*(x_i)\|^2 \quad (3)$$

using \mathcal{D} as the labeled training data set.

However, this alone may not be sufficient, and more intriguingly, this is not even necessary. For example, if $\mathcal{V}(x; \theta)$ exhibits a constant bias compared to $V^*(x)$, the myopic policy using $\mathcal{V}(x; \theta)$ would still yield the optimal policy. This suggests that the relative differences between $\mathcal{V}(x; \theta)$ and $V^*(x)$ should be minimized. In other words, one would want $\mathcal{V}(x; \theta) - \mathcal{V}(x'; \theta) \approx V^*(x) - V^*(x')$, indicating the need for Sobolev-like training. This implies that we need to generate the training data to evaluate the slope along n different directions around x_i , since $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Yet, this still neglects the role of the stage cost. As such, Sobolev training may not be best suited for value function approximation.

One of the desirable properties that we would like to have in the approximate value function $\mathcal{V}(x; \theta)$ is the descent property, whereby, upon applying the optimal input u_i^* at state x_i , the cost-to-go from the successor state $f(x_i, u_i^*)$ must be lesser than the cost-to-go from the current state x_i . To this end, we would like to steer the supervised learning problem such that the learned parameter θ satisfies the descent property for all the training data points. To achieve this property, Abdufattokhov et al. (2021) considered the restricted case of learning a quadratic cost-to-go function of the form $x^T P x$ with $P = L^T L$, and essentially learning L that minimizes the MSE loss. In order to consider a broader class of function approximators, we propose the following training problem

$$\hat{\theta}_2 = \arg \min_{\theta} \frac{1}{n_{\text{tr}}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{tr}}} \|\mathcal{V}(x_i; \theta) - V^*(x_i)\|^2 \quad (4a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \mathcal{V}(f(x_i, u_i^*); \theta) - \mathcal{V}(x_i; \theta) \leq \ell(x_i, u_i^*), \quad (4b)$$

$$i = 1, 2, \dots, n_{\text{tr}}$$

with the descent property constraint (4b). This steers the learning problem such that we only learn θ that satisfies the descent property condition for all the training data points x_i . If this constraint is enforced for a large number of training data set covering the entire feasible state space then the learned value function $\mathcal{V}(x; \theta)$ would exhibit a control Lyapunov function (CLF)-like behavior.

Remark 1. A policy function $\pi_{\text{approx}}(x; \vartheta)$ can also be trained simultaneously using the same dataset \mathcal{D} , which can be used to warm start the myopic controller (2).

The training problem (4) with the constraint (4b) necessitates both the optimal action u_i^* and the value function V_i^* at each data point x_i , unlike the MSE loss function (3) which only requires the value function. However, the need for optimal action and value doesn’t increase computational cost of generating the training data points, since solving (1) at x_i provides both V_i^* and u_i^* . Successful implementation however necessitates generating a large number of state-action-value data points covering the entire feasible state-space, just as in direct policy approximation.

To address the challenge of efficiently generating a large amount of training data samples for direct policy approximation, we recently proposed a sensitivity-based data augmentation scheme, which can be easily extended to the case with generating the optimal value V_i^* in addition to the optimal action u_i^* . Noting that the MPC problem is parametric in the initial state x_i , the key idea behind the data augmentation scheme is as follows: Once the optimization problem (1) is solved for a given initial state

x_i , the parametric sensitivities tells us how the primal-dual solution changes when the initial state changes. The augmented optimal value is obtained by evaluating the cost function using the approximated primal-dual solution. See Krishnamoorthy (2022, 2023) for detailed description of the data augmentation scheme.

3. ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE

This section, applies the proposed approach to a benchmark CSTR example that was previously used to demonstrate direct policy approximation (cf. Hertneck et al. (2018); Krishnamoorthy (2022)). This system consists of two states, namely, the scaled concentration x_1 , and the reactor temperature x_2 . The coolant flow rate u is used to control the CSTR to a desired state of $x^{sp} = [0.2623, 6519]^T$.

Expert MPC: We design a reference tracking model predictive control problem with a prediction horizon of $N = 140$ samples, and a sampling time of $T_s = 3s$. The MPC problem is designed with $\mathcal{X} = [0.0632, 0.4632] \times [0.4519, 0.8519]$ and $\mathcal{U} = [0, 2]$ and the stage cost is given by $\ell(x, u) = \|x - x^{sp}\|^2 + 10^{-4}u^2$. We generated a total of $n_{tr} = 1719$ state-action-value tuples using a grid-based sampling strategy covering the entire feasible state space. This is denoted by \mathcal{D} .

Value function approximation (VfA): We use a radial basis function network with 100 neurons, where each neuron uses the basis function $e^{\beta\|x - \mu_i\|^2}$ centered around μ_i with $\beta = 5$ to represent the approximate value function. The center for each neuron μ_i determined using a k-means clustering algorithm. Using the same parametric function architecture and the training data set \mathcal{D} , we first learn $\hat{\theta}_1$ by minimizing only the mean squared error loss function (3). For the 1719 training data points, this resulted in a MSE of 0.0515 (cf. Fig. 1(a)). We then learn $\hat{\theta}_2$ by minimizing the MSE loss function with additional descent property constraint as shown in (4), which resulted in a MSE of 0.8199 (cf. Fig. 2(a)).

Performance of the Myopic MPC We design a one-step lookahead MPC (2) with the approximate value function $\mathcal{V}(x, \theta)$ as the cost-to go function, implemented with the same sampling time of $T_s = 3s$ as the expert MPC. The myopic MPC with the approximate value function $\mathcal{V}(x, \hat{\theta}_1)$ trained using only the mean squared error loss function is tested in closed-loop simulations starting from several initial states, whose closed-loop trajectories are shown in Fig. 1(b) in blue, benchmarked against the full horizon MPC (in dashed black). From this it can be clearly seen that despite having a reasonably good fit to the training data set (cf. Fig. 1(a)), none of the closed-loop trajectories reach the desired setpoint, but rather exhibits a cyclic performance around the reference point, leading to performances losses. We then test the myopic MPC with the approximate value function $\mathcal{V}(x, \hat{\theta}_2)$ trained with the additional descent property constraint, whose closed loop trajectories are shown in Fig. 2(b) (in red) benchmarked against the full horizon MPC (in dashed black). This example clearly demonstrates that, despite using the exact same function approximator and the training data set, the closed-loop response of a myopic




Fig. 1. (a) Training data V_i^* and predicted data $\mathcal{V}(x_i, \theta_1)$ trained using only the MSE loss function. (b) Closed-loop simulations comparing the myopic MPC with $\mathcal{V}(x_i, \theta_1)$ and the full horizon MPC ($N = 140$).

policy with the approximate value function trained with the descent property constraint performs better.

Myopic policy with updated controller parameters Generating the training dataset for learning the value function approximation incurs similar computational costs as generating the dataset for direct policy approximation. This prompts the question of whether learning the value function offers advantages over direct policy learning. In essence, solving the optimization problem (2) online enables the controller to adapt to real-time changes in parameters such as constraints, prices, and model parameters. This adaptability allows for continuous optimization of system performance based on the latest information available, a capability not present in pre-trained control policies.

To illustrate this, we implement two changes: adjusting the myopic policy to a faster sampling time of $T_s = 0.1s$ and increasing the lower bound on x_2 from 0.4519 to 0.64. Despite these alterations, the myopic MPC still utilizes the same cost-to-go function $\mathcal{V}(x, \hat{\theta}_2)$ trained from expert MPC data, where $x_2 \in [0.4519, 0.8519]$ and $T_s = 3s$. Comparing the closed-loop trajectories of the myopic MPC with $\mathcal{V}(x, \hat{\theta}_2)$ against the full horizon MPC using tightened state constraints (as shown in Fig. 3), demonstrates the myopic MPC's ability to handle changes in controller




Fig. 2. (a) Training data V_i^* and predicted data $\mathcal{V}(x_i, \theta_2)$ trained using the MSE loss function and the descent property constraint. (b) Closed-loop simulations comparing the myopic MPC with $\mathcal{V}(x_i, \theta_2)$ and the full horizon MPC ($N = 140$).




Fig. 3. Closed-loop simulations with the tightened state constraints comparing the myopic MPC with $\mathcal{V}(x_i, \theta_2)$ and the full horizon MPC ($N = 140$).

parameters such as state constraints and sampling time—a feat not achievable with direct policy approximation.

4. CONCLUSION

This paper presented a supervised learning approach to building a myopic MPC with approximate cost-to-go function trained from expert demonstrations in the form of optimal state-action-value tuple collected offline. The novelty lies in encoding the descent property in the learned cost-to-go function, such that we only learn the parameters of a suitable function approximator that satisfies the descent

property for all the training data samples. Using a benchmark CSTR example, we demonstrated that a good fit only in the sense of MSE loss may not always lead to good closed-loop performance, and showed how learning the cost-to-go function using the descent property constraint in addition to the MSE loss function improves the closed-loop performance of the myopic MPC. We further demonstrated the ability of the myopic MPC to handle online variations in the controller parameters, by tightening the constraint set \mathcal{X} , and changing the sample time.

REFERENCES

- Abdulfattokhov, S., Zanon, M., and Bemporad, A. (2021). Learning convex terminal costs for complexity reduction in mpc. In *2021 60th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2163–2168. IEEE.
- Bertsekas, D.P. (2019). *Reinforcement learning and optimal control*. Athena Scientific Belmont, MA.
- Chen, S., Saulnier, K., Atanasov, N., Lee, D.D., Kumar, V., Pappas, G.J., and Morari, M. (2018). Approximating explicit model predictive control using constrained neural networks. In *2018 Annual American control conference (ACC)*, 1520–1527. IEEE.
- Chen, S.W., Wang, T., Atanasov, N., Kumar, V., and Morari, M. (2022). Large scale model predictive control with neural networks and primal active sets. *Automatica*, 135, 109947.
- Fiacco, A.V. (1976). Sensitivity analysis for nonlinear programming using penalty methods. *Mathematical programming*, 10(1), 287–311.
- Hertneck, M., Köhler, J., Trimpe, S., and Allgöwer, F. (2018). Learning an approximate model predictive controller with guarantees. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 2(3), 543–548.
- Keshavarz, A., Wang, Y., and Boyd, S. (2011). Imputing a convex objective function. In *2011 IEEE international symposium on intelligent control*, 613–619. IEEE.
- Krishnamoorthy, D. (2022). A sensitivity-based data augmentation framework for model predictive control policy approximation. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 67, 6090 – 6097.
- Krishnamoorthy, D. (2023). An improved data augmentation scheme for model predictive control policy approximation. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 7, 1867 – 1872.
- Krishnamoorthy, D., Mesbah, A., and Paulson, J.A. (2021). An adaptive correction scheme for offset-free asymptotic performance in deep learning-based economic MPC. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 54(3), 584–589.
- Maciejowski, J.M. (2002). *Predictive control: with constraints*. Pearson education.
- Mesbah, A., Wabersich, K.P., Schoellig, A.P., Zeilinger, M.N., Lucia, S., Badgwell, T.A., and Paulson, J.A. (2022). Fusion of machine learning and mpc under uncertainty: What advances are on the horizon? In *2022 American Control Conference (ACC)*, 342–357. IEEE.
- Paulson, J.A. and Mesbah, A. (2020). Approximate closed-loop robust model predictive control with guaranteed stability and constraint satisfaction. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*.
- Wabersich, K.P. and Zeilinger, M.N. (2021). A predictive safety filter for learning-based control of constrained nonlinear dynamical systems. *Automatica*, 129, 109597.