

Approximate solution of stochastic infinite horizon optimal control problems for constrained linear uncertain systems

Eunhyek Joa, *Student Member, IEEE* and Francesco Borrelli, *Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract—We propose a Model Predictive Control (MPC) with a single-step prediction horizon to solve infinite horizon optimal control problems with the expected sum of convex stage costs for constrained linear uncertain systems. The proposed method relies on two techniques. First, we estimate the expected values of the convex costs using a computationally tractable approximation, achieved by sampling across the space of disturbances. Second, we implement a data-driven approach to approximate the optimal value function and its corresponding domain, through systematic exploration of the system’s state space. These estimates are subsequently used as the terminal cost and terminal set within the proposed MPC. We prove recursive feasibility, robust constraint satisfaction, and convergence in probability to the target set. Furthermore, we prove that the estimated value function converges to the optimal value function in a local region. The effectiveness of the proposed MPC is illustrated with detailed numerical simulations and comparisons with a value iteration method and a Learning MPC that minimizes a certainty equivalent cost.

Index Terms—Data-driven, Learning, Optimal control, Predictive control.

I. INTRODUCTION

This paper proposes a computationally tractable approach to compute a solution to the following problem

$$\begin{aligned} Q^*(x_0) = \min_{\pi(\cdot)} \mathbb{E}_{w_{0:\infty}} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \ell(x_k, \pi(x_k)) \right] \\ \text{s.t., } x_{k+1} = Ax_k + B\pi(x_k) + w_k, \\ x_k \in \mathcal{X}, \pi(x_k) \in \mathcal{U}, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

in a region x_0 of the state space. In (1), w_k is a random variable with bounded support and a known probability distribution function. We assume the existence of a zero-cost terminal set \mathcal{O} ; once the system reaches \mathcal{O} it remains in there at no further cost. This infinite horizon optimal control problem (OCP) is similar to the *Stochastic Shortest Path* problem in [3, Chap. 3] in having a cost-free terminal set, but differs because we deal with discrete-time linear uncertain systems with state and input constraints.

A classical way to solve this problem (1) is Dynamic programming (DP), through value iteration [2, Chap. 5.3.1], [3, Chap. 3.4],[22, Chap. 4.4] or policy iteration [2, Chap. 5.3.2], [3, Chap. 3.5], [22, Chap. 4.3]. These methods involve

gridding the state and input spaces to obtain the optimal value function and the associated DP policy globally, i.e., covering all possible states and inputs.

Gridding is associated with well-known issue of control smoothness and *curse of dimensionality* [12]. Approximate DP addresses this issue by approximating the value function and the policy [2, Chap. 6]. However, manually crafting basis functions/features can often be challenging. Neural Networks(NN), which can automatically extract features from data, provide an alternative for approximating the value function [2, Chap. 6.4.2] and the policy [2, Chap. 6.7]. However, when solving the state/input-constrained OCPs (1) of safety-critical systems, training NNs are difficult [13] and the resulting NNs require additional safety measures like safety filter [23] or constraint-admissible set [13] which can result in conservative closed-loop performances.

Model Predictive Control (MPC) can be seen as a variation of approximate DP when the terminal cost of the MPC is chosen as an approximated value function [4]. In [8, 10, 11, 14], researchers solve problem (1) by using MPC. They assume that the stage cost in (1) takes the form of a linear or quadratic function and the associated probability distribution exhibits a finite first and second moment. In this case, they can reformulate the expected value of each stage cost as a certainty equivalent cost and exactly calculate the value function of (1) by solving the Riccati equation. However, without such assumptions for the stage costs, it is generally difficult to explicitly calculate the value function of (1). For deterministic systems, a data-driven approach to calculating a value function and its domain, called a Learning MPC (LMPC), is presented in [18]. In [18], from historical data, the value function and its domain are updated after each episode is completed and are utilized as the terminal cost and terminal set of the MPC. [18] proves that this LMPC converges to the optimal control policy of the given infinite horizon OCPs for deterministic linear time-invariant (LTI) systems under some assumptions.

In this paper, we propose a novel data-driven MPC approach that provides an approximate solution to (1) within a local region in the state space explored by the proposed algorithm. In contrast to [8, 10, 11, 14], we consider a convex cost that is not necessarily reformulated as a certainty equivalent cost. Compared to [18, 19, 20], we consider the expected sum of stage costs.

Our data-driven approach uses a forward iterative strategy, unlike DP, which works backward from a target set \mathcal{O} to

The authors are with the Model Predictive Control Lab, Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of California at Berkeley (e-mail: e.joa@berkeley.edu; fborrelli@berkeley.edu).

the initial state. Our method moves forward from the initial state to \mathcal{O} and iteratively updates the value function and its domain. In particular, we collect data from each *episode*, a task starting from an initial state and ending when it reaches a predefined target set \mathcal{O} . After each *episode*, we explore areas in the state space which the system has not visited before, a process denoted as *Exploration*. Using data from completed episodes and the *Exploration*, we update the estimated value function and its domain. These updated values serve as the terminal cost and terminal set in the MPC for the next *episode*. Our contributions are summarized as:

- We formulate a one-step MPC which approximates problem (1).
- We prove that the closed-loop system controlled by the proposed one-step MPC has the following properties: (i) *convergence in probability*: the probability that the closed-loop system converges to the target set \mathcal{O} approaches one as the time step goes to infinity, and (ii) robustly satisfies state and input constraints.
- We prove that as the number of episodes increases an upper bound of the closed loop optimal cost decreases. Moreover, we prove that this upper bound converges to a neighborhood of the optimal value function of (1).
- We propose a novel exploration method. Compared to the [7, Algorithm 2] where the farthest reachable states along certain predetermined or random directions are found, we calculate the direction of improving the performance and find the farthest reachable states along that direction.
- With numerical simulations, we compare our proposed approach with the LMPC with certainty equivalent cost [19] and the value iteration method in [26]. In terms of the expected total cost, our proposed approach outperforms the LMPC [19] by 16%. Additionally, the terminal cost of our proposed MPC closely approximates the value function of the value iteration method in a local region while the proposed method is fifteen times faster than the value iteration method.

Notation: Throughout the paper, we use the following notation. The Minkowski sum of two sets is denoted as $\mathcal{X} \oplus \mathcal{Y} = \{x+y : x \in \mathcal{X}, y \in \mathcal{Y}\}$. The Pontryagin difference between two sets is defined as $\mathcal{X} \ominus \mathcal{Y} = \{x \in \mathcal{X} : x+y \in \mathcal{X}, \forall y \in \mathcal{Y}\}$. The m -th column vector of a matrix H is denoted as $[H]_m$. The m -th component of a vector h is $[h]_m$. $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{A})$ is the probability of the event \mathcal{A} , and $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ is the expectation of its argument. The notation $x_{l:m}$ means the sequence of the variable x from time step l to time step m . $\dim(v)$ denotes the dimension of the vector v . $\text{int}(\mathcal{S})$ denotes the interior of the set \mathcal{S} . $\text{conv}\{\mathcal{S}\}$ denotes the convex hull of the set \mathcal{S} .

II. PROBLEM SETUP

A. System Dynamics

We consider an uncertain LTI system perturbed by a state additive, stochastic disturbance. The system dynamics is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} x_{k+1}^j &= Ax_k^j + Bu_k^j + w_k^j, \quad w_k^j \sim p(w), \\ x_0^j &\sim p(x_0), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $x_k^j \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ is the state, and $u_k^j \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ is the input at time step k of the episode j . System matrices A and B are known. The initial state of the system x_0^j is a random vector with distribution $p(x_0)$. At each time step k of the episode j , the system is affected by a random disturbance $w_k^j \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ with known distribution $p(w)$. We use the following assumptions on the system (2).

Assumption 1: (Bounded Random Disturbance) We assume that the random disturbance w_k^j is an independently and identically distributed (i.i.d.), zero-mean random variable with known distribution $p(w)$ and known support \mathcal{W} . The set $\mathcal{W} = \{w \mid H_w w \leq h_w\}$ is a nonempty polytope that contains the origin in its interior. Furthermore, l_w is the number of vertices of \mathcal{W} , and $v_i^{\mathcal{W}}$ is the i -th vertex of the \mathcal{W} .

Assumption 2: (Bounded Random Initial State) We assume that the initial state x_0^j is an independently and identically distributed (i.i.d.) with distribution $p(x_0)$ and known support \mathcal{S} . Moreover, the set \mathcal{S} is compact.

B. Constraints

System (2) is subject to the following constraints:

$$\begin{aligned} x_k^j &\in \mathcal{X}, \quad u_k^j \in \mathcal{U}, \quad \forall w_k^j \in \mathcal{W}, \\ \forall k \geq 0, \quad \forall j \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $\mathcal{X} = \{x \mid H_x x \leq h_x\}$ is a polyhedron, and $\mathcal{U} = \{u \mid H_u u \leq h_u\}$ is a nonempty polytope. For the feasibility of the problem setup, we use the following assumption.

Assumption 3: $\forall x_0^j \sim p(x_0), x_0^j \in \mathcal{X}$.

C. Optimal Control Problem (OCP)

We consider a control task where we would like to steer the system (2) towards the target set $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ while minimizing the expected sum of the stage cost $\ell(\cdot, \cdot) : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and robustly satisfying the constraints (3) for every realization of additive disturbances. We use the following assumptions on the target set \mathcal{O} and the stage cost $\ell(\cdot, \cdot)$.

Assumption 4: (Robust Positive Invariant Set \mathcal{O}) A set $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ is a robust positive invariant set for the autonomous system $x_{k+1} = (A + BK)x_k + w_k$ where $w_k \in \mathcal{W}$ and K is a given state feedback gain, i.e., if $x_k \in \mathcal{O} \Rightarrow x_{k+1} \in \mathcal{O}, \forall w_k \in \mathcal{W}$. Furthermore, the set \mathcal{O} is a polytope with a nonempty relative interior [1] where its vertices are $\{v_1^{\mathcal{O}}, v_2^{\mathcal{O}}, \dots, v_{l_{\mathcal{O}}}^{\mathcal{O}}\}$. We define $\mathcal{KO} = \{u \mid u = Kx, x \in \mathcal{O}\}$. By Assumption 4, $\forall x \in \mathcal{O}, \exists u \in \mathcal{KO}$ such that $Ax + Bu + w \in \mathcal{O}, \forall w \in \mathcal{W}$.

Assumption 5: (Differentiable, Convex, and Positive Definite Stage Cost) The stage cost $\ell(\cdot, \cdot)$ is differentiable and jointly convex in its arguments. Furthermore, we assume that $\ell(x, u) = 0, \forall x \in \mathcal{O}$ and $\forall u \in \mathcal{KO}$. Also, $\ell(x, u) > 0, \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \setminus \mathcal{O}, \forall u \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \setminus \mathcal{KO}$.

We want to compute a solution to the following infinite horizon OCP under the Assumptions 1-5 for $x \sim p(x_0)$:

$$\begin{aligned} Q^*(x) &= \min_{\pi(\cdot)} \mathbb{E}_{w_{0:\infty}} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \ell(x_k, \pi(x_k)) \right] \\ \text{s.t.}, \quad x_{k+1} &= Ax_k + B\pi(x_k) + w_k, \\ x_0 &= x, \quad w_k \sim p(w), \\ x_k &\in \mathcal{X}, \quad \pi(x_k) \in \mathcal{U}, \quad \forall w_k \in \mathcal{W}, \\ \forall k &\geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Note that system (2) is uncertain and that the OCP (4) involves an optimization over state feedback policies $\pi(\cdot)$ [2, Chap.1.2]

Remark 1: Once the state x_k^j of (2) reaches the target set \mathcal{O} , it will remain within it. This is because remaining in the target set \mathcal{O} is optimal according to Assumption 5. Moreover, remaining in the target set \mathcal{O} is feasible by Assumption 4.

III. APPROACH

A. Solution Approach

There are three main challenges in solving (4), namely:

- (C1) Solving the problem (4) for $T \rightarrow \infty$ is computationally demanding.
- (C2) Minimizing the expected cost in (4) involves infinitely nested multivariate integrals.
- (C3) Optimizing over control policies $\pi(\cdot)$ is an infinite dimensional optimization problem.

We address (C1)-(C3) by solving a simpler constrained OCP with prediction horizon $N = 1$ in a receding horizon fashion and updating its parameters over multiple episodes. Specifically, we design an MPC controller of the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} V^j(x) &= \min_{u_k} \ell(x_k, u_k) + \mathbb{E}_{w_k} [Q^{j-1}(x_{k+1})] \\ \text{s.t.}, \quad x_{k+1} &= Ax_k + Bu_k + w_k, \\ x_k &= x, \quad w_k \sim p(w) \\ x_k &\in \mathcal{X}, \quad u_k \in \mathcal{U}, \\ x_{k+1} &\in \mathcal{SS}^{j-1}, \quad \forall w_k \in \mathcal{W}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where x_{k+i} is the state and u_{k+i} is the input at predicted time step $k+i$. \mathcal{SS}^{j-1} is the terminal set and $Q^{j-1}(\cdot)$ is the terminal cost, which is the estimated value function defined on the terminal set \mathcal{SS}^{j-1} . The upper index is used to denote the episode. Let T^j denote the end time of the j -th episode, i.e., $x_{T^j}^j \in \mathcal{O}$.

For time step k of episode j , we store a state x_k^j and the associated optimal input $u_k^* = \pi^{j*}(x_k^j)$ to learn the terminal set \mathcal{SS}^j and the terminal cost $Q^j(\cdot)$ for the next episode $j+1$ after the episode j is completed, which will be detailed in Sec. IV. \mathcal{SS}^{j-1} is also called a safe set [18] since if properly computed, it is robust positive invariant, i.e., $\forall x \in \mathcal{SS}^{j-1}, \exists u \in \mathcal{U}$, s.t., $Ax + Bu + w \in \mathcal{SS}^{j-1}, \forall w \in \mathcal{W}$. The block diagram of the proposed approach is illustrated in Fig. 1.




Fig. 1. Overall block diagram of the proposed approach.

B. Tractable reformulation of (5)

Although the infinitely nested expected cost in (4) reduces to a single expected terminal cost in (5), it is still computationally intractable for real-time applications, in general. This is because evaluating the expected terminal cost in (5) involves a multivariate integral. We present the tractable reformulation of (5) in this section.

1) *Tractable reformulation of the expected terminal cost in (5):* We reformulate the expected terminal cost in (5) by approximating the multivariate integral with a discrete sum by discretizing the disturbance set \mathcal{W} . Our discretization approach involves sampling disturbances randomly within the disturbance set \mathcal{W} and including the vertices of \mathcal{W} . The discretized disturbances consist of all sampled points and the vertices of \mathcal{W} as shown in Fig. 2.




Fig. 2. A two-dimensional example of the discretization method. The dark gray polytope is the disturbance set \mathcal{W} . All dots are the discretized disturbances. The blue dots denote randomly sampled points while the red dots denote vertices of the disturbance set \mathcal{W} .

Let M denote the number of discretized disturbances and w^m denote m -th discretized disturbance. As the sampled disturbance set $\{w^m\}_{m=1}^M$ includes vertices of \mathcal{W} , any disturbance $w \in \mathcal{W}$ can be parameterized as a convex combination of the discretized disturbances as follows:

$$w = \sum_{m=1}^M \mu_m(w) w^m, \quad (6)$$

where $\mu_m(w)$ is the parameterized convex coefficient. We will use (6) to replace a generic disturbance w with the convex combination of the sampled disturbance set $\{w^m\}_{m=1}^M$. This replacement is needed to numerically compute the expected cost. To compute the optimality gap in Section V-C, the parameterized coefficients need to satisfy the property introduced next.

Assumption 6: $\forall w \in \mathcal{W}$, let m be in the set $\{m | m \in \{1, \dots, M\} \text{ and } \mu_m(w) \neq 0\}$, the following conditions hold:

$$\exists \delta(w, M) > 0, \quad \|w - w^m\| \leq \delta(w, M). \quad (7)$$

6.2 Decreasing bound as increasing M

Consider $M = M_1$, and we continuously sample the disturbance within \mathcal{W} while maintaining the previous M_1 samples. Then, we have the following:

$$\exists N > M_1, \quad \forall M_2 \geq N, \quad \delta(w, M_1) > \delta(w, M_2). \quad (8)$$

Remark 2: Assumption 6 implies that for any disturbance $w \in \mathcal{W}$, the discretized disturbance w^m with non-zero coefficient $\mu_m(w)$ is located close to w . Furthermore, as the number of the discretized disturbances M increases sufficiently, the bound $\delta(w, M)$ decreases. Appendix A describes different ways to calculate $\mu_m(w)$ and its expected value for $p(w)$, which is p_m described next.

Once the function $\mu_m(w)$ is calculated, we take the expectation of it with respect to $p(w)$, which is a coefficient of the discrete sum to approximate the expected terminal cost in (5):

$$p_m = \mathbb{E}_w[\mu_m(w)]. \quad (9)$$

Using the coefficients p_m , we approximate the expected terminal cost in the (5) with a discrete sum as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{w_k^j} \left[Q^{j-1}(Ax_{0|k}^j + Bu_{0|k}^j + w_k^j) \right] \\ & \simeq \sum_{m=1}^M p_m Q^{j-1}(Ax_{0|k}^j + Bu_{0|k}^j + w^m) \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

2) Tractable MPC problem: The tractable reformulation of the MPC problem (5) can be achieved by replacing the terminal cost of (5) with its approximation in (10) and robustifying the terminal constraint $x_{1|k}^j \in \mathcal{SS}^{j-1}$, $\forall w_k^j \in \mathcal{W}$. In summary, the tractable reformulation of (5) is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{V}^j(x) = \min_{u_k} & \ell(x_k, u_k) + \sum_{m=1}^M p_m Q^{j-1}(\bar{x}_{k+1} + w^m) \\ \text{s.t.}, & \bar{x}_{k+1} = Ax_k + Bu_k, \\ & x_k = x, \\ & x_k \in \mathcal{X}, u_k \in \mathcal{U}, \\ & \bar{x}_{k+1} \in \mathcal{SS}^{j-1} \ominus \mathcal{W}, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where \bar{x}_{k+1} is a nominal state at predicted time step $k+1$.

After solving (11), we apply the optimal MPC policy $\pi^j(\cdot)$:

$$u_k^j = \pi^{j*}(x_k^j) = u_k^* \quad (12)$$

to system (2) at time k of the episode j in closed-loop.

3) Convergence to the target set in probability: In this section, we prove that the approximation in (10) is an upper bound of the expected terminal cost in (5), and describe how this property is used to ensure the convergence in probability to the target set \mathcal{O} when the system (2) is controlled by the MPC policy (12).

First, we prove that the approximation in (10) is an upper bound of the expected terminal cost in (5) similarly as proved in [16, Thm.1].

Proposition 1: Suppose the value function $Q^j(\cdot)$ is a convex function. Let Assumptions 1-5 hold. Then, the value function $Q^j(\cdot)$ satisfies the following inequality for all $x \in \mathcal{SS}^j$:

$$\sum_{m=1}^M p_m Q^j(Ax + Bu + w^m) \geq \mathbb{E}_w[Q^j(Ax + Bu + w)]. \quad (13)$$

Proof: We have the following.

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_w[Q^j(Ax + Bu + w)] \\ & = \int_{w \in \mathcal{W}} Q^j(Ax + Bu + w)p(w)dw \\ & \leq \int_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \sum_{m=1}^M \mu_m(w)Q^j(Ax + Bu + w^m)p(w)dw \\ & = \sum_{m=1}^M Q^j(Ax + Bu + w^m) \int_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \mu_m(w)p(w)dw \\ & = \sum_{m=1}^M p_m Q^j(Ax + Bu + w^m), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where the first inequality is due to the convexity of the value function $Q^j(\cdot)$ and the definition of $\mu_m(w)$ (6), and the last equality is from the definition of p_m in (9). ■

We will prove that $Q^j(\cdot)$ is a convex function in IV-C.

In Section V-B, we show that property (13) is related to the stochastic stability of the closed loop system [16]. In Proposition 5 in Sec. V-B, we prove that $Q^{j-1}(x) \geq \hat{V}^j(x)$, then the following result follows from Proposition 1:

$$\begin{aligned} & Q^{j-1}(x) \\ & \geq \underbrace{\ell(x, \pi^{j*}(x)) + \sum_{m=1}^M p_m Q^j(Ax + B\pi^{j*}(x) + w^m)}_{\hat{V}^j(x) \text{ from (11)}} \\ & \geq \ell(x, \pi^{j*}(x)) + \mathbb{E}_w[Q^j(Ax + B\pi^{j*}(x) + w)]. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Inequality (15) implies that $Q^{j-1}(x)$ decreases at each step. This result will be key in proving that the closed-loop system (2) controlled by the MPC policy (12) converges to the target set \mathcal{O} with probability 1. Details will be provided in Sec. V-B.

IV. LEARNING THE SAFE SET \mathcal{SS}^j AND VALUE FUNCTION $Q^j(\cdot)$ USING DATA

In this section, we present how the safe set \mathcal{SS}^j and the value function $Q^j(\cdot)$ in (11) are updated using the data, which is the "Learning" block in Fig. 1. This section is organized as follows. First, we describe how to initialize the safe set \mathcal{SS}^j and the value function $Q^j(\cdot)$, i.e., how to compute \mathcal{SS}^0 and $Q^0(\cdot)$. Second, we present *Exploration*, which is a new method to explore the state space while satisfying the constraints (3). This is the novel part and one of our contributions. Third, we describe how to update \mathcal{SS}^j and $Q^j(\cdot)$ offline using the data. This part is similar to the methods in [20, Sec.V.B-D]. At the end of this section, we introduce the properties of the safe set \mathcal{SS}^j and the value function $Q^j(\cdot)$.

A. Initialization

In this subsection, we describe how to compute \mathcal{SS}^0 and $Q^0(\cdot)$. To do that, we make the following assumption on the existence of a feasible solution to the problem (4).

Assumption 7: A sub-optimal controller of the infinite horizon OCP (4) is available, and the system (2) controlled by this sub-optimal controller ends the episode within a finite time.

Remark 3: Assumption 7 is not overly restrictive in some practical applications. For instance, in autonomous racing scenarios, which can be formulated as an infinite horizon OCP as in [17, 18], a tube MPC [15], which follows a planned trajectory, can be utilized for designing a sub-optimal controller as in [25].

We provide a concise summary of the design process for \mathcal{SS}^0 and $Q^0(\cdot)$ using the tube MPC method [15]. For a more comprehensive understanding, please refer to Appendix B.

We conduct one closed-loop episode of the system (2) controlled by the tube MPC and collect the predicted nominal state and tube surrounding the nominal state. Then, we construct an initial state data matrix \mathbf{X}^0 , comprising these nominal states and tube vertices. Specifically, the initial safe set is defined as:

$$\mathcal{SS}^0 = \text{conv} \left\{ \mathcal{O} \cup \left\{ \bigcup_{i=1}^L \{[\mathbf{X}^0]_i\} \right\} \right\}, \quad (16)$$

where L is the number of the states stored in the state data matrix \mathbf{X}^0 , and $[\mathbf{X}^0]_i$ denotes i -th column vector of \mathbf{X}^0 . Thus,

\mathcal{SS}^0 is the convex hull of the target set \mathcal{O} and every column vector in \mathbf{X}^0 .

Similarly, during the episode, we collect the corresponding control input of each column vector of \mathbf{X}^0 . Let π_{Tube} denote the tube MPC policy. Then, i -th column vector of the initial input data matrix \mathbf{U}^0 is defined as follows:

$$[\mathbf{U}^0]_i = \pi_{\text{Tube}}([\mathbf{X}^0]_i). \quad (17)$$

For each state in \mathbf{X}^0 and the corresponding input in \mathbf{U}^0 , we calculate an estimated cost-to-go value and store it in a cost data matrix \mathbf{J}^0 . This cost data matrix \mathbf{J}^0 should satisfy the following conditions:

$$Q^0(x) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\dim(\mathbf{J}^0)} [\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{0*}]_i \left\{ \ell([\mathbf{X}^0]_i, [\mathbf{U}^0]_i) + \sum_{m=1}^M p_m Q^0(A[\mathbf{X}^0]_i + B[\mathbf{U}^0]_i + w^m) \right\} \quad (18)$$

where $Q^0(\cdot)$ is the initial value function defined on \mathcal{SS}^0 computed using \mathbf{X}^0 and \mathbf{J}^0 as:

$$Q^0(x) = \min_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^0} \mathbf{J}^0 \boldsymbol{\lambda}^0 \quad \text{s.t.}, \quad \mathbf{X}^0 \boldsymbol{\lambda}^0 = x, \quad \boldsymbol{\lambda}^0 \geq \mathbf{0}, \quad \mathbf{1}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda}^0 = 1, \quad (19)$$

and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{0*}$ is an optimal vector of the problem (19), which represents $x \in \mathcal{SS}^0$ as a convex combination of the data points of \mathbf{X}^0 as described in the first constraint of (19). In Appendix B, we present a way to calculate \mathbf{J}^0 to satisfy the condition (18) when the sub-optimal controller satisfied Assumption 7 is a Tube MPC [15]. Note that $Q^0(x)$ is a convex, piecewise affine function as it is an optimal objective function of the multi-parametric linear program [5]. When calculating the optimal input in (20) at episode $j = 1$, the function $Q^0(x)$ does not have to be calculated in prior as the minimization problem (19) can be incorporated into the problem (20) and form a single unified optimization problem.

In summary, we initialize \mathcal{SS}^j and $Q^j(\cdot)$ with \mathcal{SS}^0 in (16) and $Q^0(\cdot)$ in (19).

B. Exploration

Exploration refers to finding a subset of the set $\{x \in \mathcal{X} | x \notin \mathcal{SS}^{j-1}, \text{ and } (11) \text{ is feasible}\}$ after the episode j is completed and before the episode $j + 1$ starts. The condition "(11) is feasible." implies that the state x can be robustly steered to the safe set \mathcal{SS}^{j-1} . This condition will be used to prove the robust positive invariance of the updated set \mathcal{SS}^j in Proposition 3, which is a key to ensure the recursive feasibility of (11) in Sec. V-A. The set of explored states will be appended to the set \mathcal{SS}^{j-1} and utilized to update the function $\hat{V}^j(\cdot)$ to improve the expected cost in (4) of the closed-loop system (2) controlled by the MPC policy (12), which we will refer to as controller "performance".

We introduce an exploration strategy that allows improving the cost $\hat{V}^{j+1}(\cdot)$ of (11) and enlarging the safe set \mathcal{SS}^j of problems (11) at the next episode $j + 1$ when compared to $\hat{V}^j(\cdot)$ and \mathcal{SS}^{j-1} at current episode j .

Remark 4: In previous LMPC papers [18, 19, 20], the exploration outside of the safe set was naturally incorporated into the formulation. In their setups, the horizon length is $N > 1$, which meant that some visited states x_k^j might not be in the safe set \mathcal{SS}^{j-1} . However, in our problem setting, all visited states x_k^j are in the safe set \mathcal{SS}^{j-1} . This is because we solve the MPC (11) with prediction horizon $N = 1$ and enforce $\bar{x}_{1|k}^j \in \mathcal{SS}^{j-1} \ominus \mathcal{W}$, which implies $x_{1|k}^j \in \mathcal{SS}^{j-1}$, $\forall w_k \in \mathcal{W}$.

The exploration can be carried out by randomly selecting a state x from the set $\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{SS}^{j-1}$ and checking whether the state x is feasible for the MPC (11). Alternatively, one can find the farthest reachable states from \mathcal{SS}^{j-1} along predetermined directions as described in [7, Algorithm 2]. However, as this method selects the directions of exploration not necessarily relevant to the direction of improving the performance, it can be computationally inefficient. The proposed approach in this paper involves two steps. Specifically, we first calculate a descent direction for improving the performance through exploration and subsequently find states outside of the safe set in the descent direction.

1) *Calculating a descent direction:* First, to find the direction that is relevant to decreasing the cost, we calculate a descent direction at the optimal solution of (11), $\pi^{j*}(x_k^j)$. For brevity, we reformulate the problem (11) as follows:

$$\min_u f^j(u) \quad (20a)$$

$$\text{s.t.}, \quad H(Ax_k^j + Bu) \leq h, \quad (20b)$$

$$H_u u \leq h_u, \quad (20c)$$

where $f^j(\cdot)$ is a cost function in abstract form and $\mathcal{SS}^{j-1} \ominus \mathcal{W} = \{x | Hx \leq h\}$. Note that $\mathcal{SS}^{j-1} \ominus \mathcal{W}$ is a convex polytope that will be introduced in Sec. IV-C. Although the parameters H and h in (20b) are updated for every episode j , we denote the constraint without any superscript j for brevity. The goal is to calculate the descent direction using the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions [6].

The optimal solutions of (20), u^* , satisfies the following stationarity condition of the KKT conditions:

$$\nabla f^j(u^*) + (HB)^\top \boldsymbol{\nu}_k^{j*} + H_u^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}_k^{j*} = \mathbf{0}, \quad (21a)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\nu}_k^{j*} \geq \mathbf{0}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_k^{j*} \geq \mathbf{0}$ are the optimal dual variables at time step k of the episode j associated with the constraints (20b) and (20c), respectively. From the condition (21a), we can calculate the gradient of the cost function $\nabla f^j(u^*)$ as follows:

$$-\nabla f^j(u^*) = (HB)^\top \boldsymbol{\nu}_k^{j*} + H_u^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}_k^{j*} \quad (22)$$

Using $\nabla f^j(u^*)$, the descent direction $\mathbf{d}_{\text{exp}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ is a vector which satisfies the following inequality:

$$\nabla f^j(u^*)^\top \mathbf{d}_{\text{exp}} \leq 0. \quad (23)$$

Note that $\mathbf{d}_{\text{exp}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ is the vector in the input space.

Remark 5: KKT conditions[6] require the differentiability of the cost function. While Assumption 5 guarantees the differentiability of the stage cost $\ell(\cdot, \cdot)$, the function $Q^j(\cdot)$ is continuous and piecewise affine, which will be introduced in Sec. IV-C, but lacks differentiability at certain points. However, these non-differentiable points have zero probability

of occurring in states. Hence, in this paper, we primarily use gradient notation instead of subgradient notation for the cost function in (20). If the cost function $f^j(u)$ becomes non-differentiable, its subgradient must be used.

2) *Finding states to be explored*: Second, we find states to be explored. These states are outside of the safe set and located in the descent direction. Moreover, these states are robustly controlled to the current safe set \mathcal{SS}^{j-1} .

Our exploration strategy is as follows: for each collected state x_k^j , we find a 1-step robust reachable set¹ from the given state x_k^j that is situated at the maximum distance from the current safe set \mathcal{SS}^{j-1} in the descent direction \mathbf{d}_{exp} . To ensure that all states in a 1-step robust reachable set are feasible solutions of (11), we impose the following constraint: all states in the 1-step robust reachable set should be robustly steered to \mathcal{SS}^{j-1} . In particular, we try to solve the following optimization problem where the decision variables are the descent direction vector $\mathbf{d}_{\text{exp}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ and a control policy $\pi_{\text{exp}}: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ as follows:

$$d_{\mathcal{SS}^j}(x_k^j) = \quad (24a)$$

$$\max_{\substack{\mathbf{d}_{\text{exp}}, \\ \pi_{\text{exp}}(\cdot)}} \text{dist}(x_{k,\text{exp}}^j, \mathcal{SS}^{j-1}) \quad (24b)$$

$$\text{s.t.}, \nabla f^j(u^*)^\top \mathbf{d}_{\text{exp}} \leq 0 \quad (24c)$$

$$x_{k,\text{exp}}^j = Ax_k^j + B(u^* + \mathbf{d}_{\text{exp}}) + w, \quad w \sim p(w), \quad (24d)$$

$$x_{k,\text{exp}}^j \in \mathcal{X}, \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{W}, \quad (24e)$$

$$u^* + \mathbf{d}_{\text{exp}} \in \mathcal{U}, \quad (24f)$$

$$Ax_{k,\text{exp}}^j + B\pi_{\text{exp}}(x_{k,\text{exp}}^j) \in \mathcal{SS}^{j-1}, \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{W}, \quad (24g)$$

$$\pi_{\text{exp}}(x_{k,\text{exp}}^j) \in \mathcal{U}, \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{W}, \quad (24h)$$

where $x_{k,\text{exp}}^j$ is a state to be explored. The cost function (24b) is a distance measure between the state $x_{k,\text{exp}}^j$ and the safe set \mathcal{SS}^{j-1} . The constraint (24c) equal to (23) ensures that the vector \mathbf{d}_{exp} is a descent direction. The set of feasible solutions $x_{k,\text{exp}}^j$ for all $w \in \mathcal{W}$ is 1-step robust reachable set because of (24d), (24e), and (24f). The constraints (24g) and (24h) are to robustly steer the 1-step robust reachable set to \mathcal{SS}^{j-1} .

There are two main challenges in solving the exploration optimization problem (24). First, optimizing over control policies $\pi_{\text{exp}}(\cdot)$ involves an infinite-dimensional optimization. Second, maximizing a distance measure is a non-convex problem.

We address the first challenge by approximating the control policy with a convex combination of the finite number of inputs, denoted as $u_i^{\mathcal{W}}$, where $i \in \{1, \dots, l_w\}$. Remind that l_w is the number of vertices of \mathcal{W} and $v_i^{\mathcal{W}}$ is the i -th vertex of \mathcal{W} . Each control input $u_i^{\mathcal{W}}$ satisfies the following:

$$\begin{aligned} u_i^{\mathcal{W}} &\in \mathcal{U}, \\ Ax_i^{\mathcal{W}} + Bu_i^{\mathcal{W}} + w &\in \mathcal{SS}^{j-1}, \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{W}, \\ x_i^{\mathcal{W}} &= Ax_k^j + B(u^* + \mathbf{d}_{\text{exp}}) + v_i^{\mathcal{W}}. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

This means that a control input $u_i^{\mathcal{W}}$ robustly steers back the system (2) at $x_i^{\mathcal{W}}$ to the safe set \mathcal{SS}^{j-1} , where $x_i^{\mathcal{W}}$ is a

predicted state of the system (2) starting from x_k^j , controlled by $u^* + \mathbf{d}_{\text{exp}}$ and perturbed by $v_i^{\mathcal{W}}$. The control policy is parameterized as a convex combination of $u_i^{\mathcal{W}}$, $i \in \{1, \dots, l_w\}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\pi}_{\text{exp}}(x) &\in \{u|u = [u_1^{\mathcal{W}}, \dots, u_{l_w}^{\mathcal{W}}]\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\lambda} \geq 0, \mathbf{1}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda} = 1, \\ x &= Ax_k^j + B(u^* + \mathbf{d}_{\text{exp}}) + [v_1^{\mathcal{W}}, \dots, v_{l_w}^{\mathcal{W}}]\boldsymbol{\lambda}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Now, we prove that (26) is a control policy that satisfies the constraints (24g) and (24h).

Proposition 2: (The control policy (26) is a valid policy.) Suppose that \mathcal{SS}^{j-1} is a convex set. Let Assumption 1 hold. Then, the control policy (26) satisfies the constraints (24g) and (24h).

Proof: Note that $x_i^{\mathcal{W}}$, where $i \in \{1, \dots, l_w\}$, are the predicted states perturbed by i -th vertex of \mathcal{W} , $v_i^{\mathcal{W}}$, as described in (25). Since \mathcal{W} is a convex set, we can write the state $x_{k,\text{exp}}^j$ defined in (24d) for all $w \in \mathcal{W}$ as a convex combination of $x_i^{\mathcal{W}}$, where $i \in \{1, \dots, l_w\}$, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} x_{k,\text{exp}}^j &= \sum_{i=1}^{l_w} [\boldsymbol{\lambda}]_i x_i^{\mathcal{W}} \\ &= Ax_k^j + B(u^* + \mathbf{d}_{\text{exp}}) + [v_1^{\mathcal{W}}, \dots, v_{l_w}^{\mathcal{W}}]\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ is an associated convex coefficient vector such that $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \geq 0$, $\mathbf{1}^\top \boldsymbol{\lambda} = 1$, and $[\boldsymbol{\lambda}]_i$ is the i -th element of the vector $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. From $u_i^{\mathcal{W}} \in \mathcal{U}$ in (25), $\hat{\pi}_{\text{exp}}(\cdot)$ in (26), and (27), we have that

$$\hat{\pi}_{\text{exp}}(x_{k,\text{exp}}^j) = \sum_{i=1}^{l_w} [\boldsymbol{\lambda}]_i u_i^{\mathcal{W}} = [u_1^{\mathcal{W}}, \dots, u_{l_w}^{\mathcal{W}}]\boldsymbol{\lambda}. \quad (28)$$

This implies that $\hat{\pi}_{\text{exp}}(x_{k,\text{exp}}^j)$ can be written as a convex combination of $u_i^{\mathcal{W}}$, $i \in \{1, \dots, l_w\}$. As \mathcal{U} is a convex set, the input constraint (24h) is satisfied, i.e., $\hat{\pi}_{\text{exp}}(x_{k,\text{exp}}^j) \in \mathcal{U}$. Furthermore, from $Ax_i^{\mathcal{W}} + Bu_i^{\mathcal{W}} + w \in \mathcal{SS}^{j-1}$, $\forall w \in \mathcal{W}$ in (25) and by convexity of the set \mathcal{SS}^{j-1} , which will be described in Sec. IV-C, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{l_w} [\boldsymbol{\lambda}]_i (Ax_i^{\mathcal{W}} + Bu_i^{\mathcal{W}} + w) \\ = Ax_{k,\text{exp}}^j + B\pi_{\text{exp}}(x_{k,\text{exp}}^j) + w \in \mathcal{SS}^{j-1}, \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{W}, \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

which shows that $\pi_{\text{exp}}(x_{k,\text{exp}}^j)$ (26) satisfies (24g). ■

We will see that \mathcal{SS}^{j-1} is a convex set in IV-C.

We tackle the second challenge by choosing a distance measure in (24b) which is linear on the decision variable \mathbf{d}_{exp} and thus changing a non-convex problem (24) into a convex problem. The distance measure we choose is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dist}(x_{k,\text{exp}}^j, \mathcal{SS}^{j-1}) &= \min_{x_c} \|\bar{x}_{k,\text{exp}}^j - x_c\|_2 \\ \text{s.t.}, \boldsymbol{\nu}_k^{j* \top} H x_c &= \boldsymbol{\nu}_k^{j* \top} h, \\ \bar{x}_{k,\text{exp}}^j &= Ax_k^j + B(u^* + \mathbf{d}_{\text{exp}}), \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\nu}_k^{j*}$ is a dual variable of (20b) at time step k . By solving the problem (30), $\text{dist}(x_{k,\text{exp}}^j, \mathcal{SS}^{j-1}) = \boldsymbol{\nu}_k^{j* \top} H B \mathbf{d}_{\text{exp}}$.

Remark 6: If there exists a non-zero dual variable of (20b), i.e., $\boldsymbol{\nu}_k^{j*} \neq \mathbf{0}$, the distance measure $\text{dist}(x_{k,\text{exp}}^j, \mathcal{SS}^{j-1})$ in (30) is the distance from the disturbance-free state $\bar{x}_{k,\text{exp}}^j$ to the active constraint of (20b) as illustrated in Fig. 3.

In this case, at least one of the constraints (20b) is active, and the dual variable $\boldsymbol{\nu}_k^{j*}$ has non-zero elements associated with the active constraints from the dual feasibility and the

¹Refer to Appendix C for the definition.




Fig. 3. A two-dimensional example of the distance measure (30). The light blue polytope is the nominal safe set $\mathcal{SS}^{j-1} \ominus \mathcal{W} = \{x | Hx \leq h\}$ in (20b). The red line represents the active constraint.

complementary slackness of the KKT conditions [6]. Thus, the active constraints in (20b) are written as $\nu_k^{j* \top} Hx_c = \nu_k^{j* \top} h$ as in (30). Therefore, the problem (20b) is to find the distance from the state $\bar{x}_{k,exp}^j$ to the active constraint of (20b).

In summary, the exploration problem (24) is reformulated by approximating the control policy $\pi_{exp}(\cdot)$ with a control policy $\hat{\pi}_{exp}(\cdot)$ in (26), explicitly calculating the distance measure as in (30), and robustifying the constraints. The tractable reformulation of (24) for x_k^j is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 d_{\mathcal{SS}^j}(x_k^j) = & \\
 \max_{\mathbf{d}_{exp}, u_{1:l_w}^{\mathcal{W}}} & \nu_k^{j* \top} H B \mathbf{d}_{exp} \\
 \text{s.t.}, & \nabla f^j(u^*)^\top \mathbf{d}_{exp} \leq 0 \\
 & \bar{x}_{k,exp}^j = Ax_k^j + B(u^* + \mathbf{d}_{exp}), \\
 & \bar{x}_{k,exp}^j \in \mathcal{X} \ominus \mathcal{W}, u^* + \mathbf{d}_{exp} \in \mathcal{U}, \\
 & Ax_i^{\mathcal{W}} + Bu_i^{\mathcal{W}} \in \mathcal{SS}^{j-1} \ominus \mathcal{W}, \\
 & x_i^{\mathcal{W}} = Ax_k^j + B(u^* + \mathbf{d}_{exp}) + v_i^{\mathcal{W}}, \\
 & u_i^{\mathcal{W}} \in \mathcal{U}, \\
 & i \in \{1, \dots, l_w\}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

After solving (31) for x_k^j for all $k \in \{0, \dots, T^j\}$, we find states to be explored as follows:

$$\mathbf{X}_{k,exp}^j = [x_1^{\mathcal{W}*}, \dots, x_{l_w}^{\mathcal{W}*}]. \tag{32}$$

The states (32) are utilized to update the safe set \mathcal{SS}^{j-1} which will be introduced in Sec. IV-C.

To calculate the corresponding input to each explored state in $\mathbf{X}_{k,exp}^j$, we solve (11) for each element in $\mathbf{X}_{k,exp}^j$ as the initial condition and collect the optimal inputs as follows:

$$\mathbf{U}_{k,exp}^j = [\pi^{j*}(x_1^{\mathcal{W}*}), \dots, \pi^{j*}(x_{l_w}^{\mathcal{W}*})]. \tag{33}$$

Remind that $\pi^{j*}(\cdot)$ denotes the MPC policy (12). All elements in $\mathbf{X}_{k,exp}^j$ are feasible points of the problem (11) because the optimal solution $u_i^{\mathcal{W}}$, where $i \in \{1, \dots, l_w\}$, is a feasible input of the problem (11) for all elements in $\mathbf{X}_{k,exp}^j$.

C. Update the safe Set \mathcal{SS}^j and the value function $Q^j(\cdot)$

After the j -th task and the exploration are completed, \mathcal{SS}^{j-1} is updated. We augment the state and input data as follows:

$$\mathbf{X}^j = [\mathbf{X}^{j-1}, \overbrace{x_0^j, x_1^j, \dots, x_{T^j}^j}^{\text{Online}}, \underbrace{\mathbf{X}_{0,exp}^j, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{T^j,exp}^j}_{\text{From exploration}}], \tag{34}$$

$$\mathbf{U}^j = [\mathbf{U}^{j-1}, \pi^{j*}(x_0^j), \dots, \pi^{j*}(x_{T^j}^j), \mathbf{U}_{0,exp}^j, \dots, \mathbf{U}_{T^j,exp}^j]. \tag{35}$$

We update \mathcal{SS}^j by taking the convex hull operation of all elements in \mathbf{X}^j as follows:

$$\mathcal{SS}^j = \text{conv} \left\{ \bigcup_{i=1}^{d_x^j} [\mathbf{X}^j]_i \right\}, \tag{36}$$

where d_x^j is the number of states stored in the state matrix \mathbf{X}^j , i.e., $\mathbf{X}^j \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times d_x^j}$. Note that as we augment the state data matrix as shown in (34), the convex hull operation of them will continue to expand, i.e., $\mathcal{SS}^{j-1} \subset \mathcal{SS}^j$.

We set the value as i -th element of the cost data vector at j -th episode, i.e., $[\mathbf{J}^j]_i$, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 [\mathbf{J}^j]_i = & \ell([\mathbf{X}^j]_i, [\mathbf{U}^j]_i) \\
 & + \sum_{m=1}^M p_m Q^{j-1}(A[\mathbf{X}^j]_i + B[\mathbf{U}^j]_i + w^m).
 \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

where $Q^{j-1}(\cdot)$ is calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 Q^{j-1}(x) = & \min_{\lambda^{j-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{X}^{j-1}|}} \mathbf{J}^{j-1} \lambda^{j-1} \\
 \text{s.t.}, & \mathbf{X}^{j-1} \lambda^{j-1} = x, \\
 & \lambda^{j-1} \geq \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}^\top \lambda^{j-1} = 1.
 \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

We update $Q^j(\cdot)$ by solving the following optimization problem using (34) and (37).

$$\begin{aligned}
 Q^j(x) = & \min_{\lambda^j \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{X}^j|}} \mathbf{J}^j \lambda^j \\
 \text{s.t.}, & \mathbf{X}^j \lambda^j = x, \\
 & \lambda^j \geq \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}^\top \lambda^j = 1.
 \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

$Q^j(x)$ is a convex, piecewise affine function as it is an optimal objective function of the multi-parametric linear program [5]. When calculating the optimal input in (20) at episode j , the function $Q^j(x)$ does not have to be calculated in prior as the minimization problem (19) can be incorporated into the problem (20) and form a single unified optimization problem.

The function $Q^j(x)$ is defined on \mathcal{SS}^j because of $\mathbf{X}^j \lambda^j = x$ in (39). This constraint restricts its domain to the states expressible as a convex combination of the recorded states in (34), which is equal to \mathcal{SS}^j by construction (36). Since $Q^j(x)$ is defined on the bounded domain \mathcal{SS}^j and is piecewise affine, continuous, and bounded above, it is Lipschitz continuous in \mathcal{SS}^j defined as follows:

$$\|Q^j(x) - Q^j(y)\| \leq L^j \|x - y\|, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathcal{SS}^j, \tag{40}$$

where $L^j > 0$ is a Lipschitz constant.

Let λ^{j*} denote the optimal solution of (19) when $j = 0$ and of (39) when $j \geq 1$. We define the control policy $\pi_Q^j(\cdot)$ is defined for all $x \in \mathcal{SS}^j$ as follows:

$$\pi_Q^j(x) = \mathbf{U}^j \lambda^{j*}, \quad (41)$$

which will be used to prove the robust positive invariance of the safe set \mathcal{SS}^j and the pointwise non-increasing property of the function $Q^j(\cdot)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{SS}^j$.

D. Properties of \mathcal{SS}^j and $Q^j(\cdot)$

We introduce properties of the safe set \mathcal{SS}^j (36) and the value function $Q^j(\cdot)$ (39).

Proposition 3: (Robust Positive Invariance of \mathcal{SS}^j) Let Assumptions 1-7 hold. Then, $\forall j \geq 0$, \mathcal{SS}^j is a robust positive invariant set for the closed-loop system (2) controlled by a policy $\pi_Q^j(\cdot)$ (41).

Proof: See the Appendix D. ■

Proposition 4: (Pointwise non-increasing of $Q^j(\cdot)$) Let Assumptions 1-7 hold. Consider the value function $Q^j(\cdot)$ in (39). $\forall j \geq 1$, the value function does not increase pointwise:

$$\forall x \in \mathcal{SS}^{j-1}, Q^{j-1}(x) \geq Q^j(x). \quad (42)$$

Proof: We will prove the claim by induction.

(i) For the base case, we want to show $\forall x \in \mathcal{SS}^0$, $Q^0(x) \geq Q^1(x)$. Let $x_{i,m}^+ = A[\mathbf{X}^0]_i + B[\mathbf{U}^0]_i + w^m$. From (18), we have the following $\forall x \in \mathcal{SS}^0$,

$$\begin{aligned} Q^0(x) &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{\dim(\mathbf{J}^0)} [\lambda^{0*}]_i \{ \ell([\mathbf{X}^0]_i, [\mathbf{U}^0]_i) + \sum_{m=1}^M p_m Q^0(x_{i,m}^+) \}, \\ &\quad (43) \end{aligned}$$

From (37), we have that,

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathbf{J}^1]_i &= \ell([\mathbf{X}^1]_i, [\mathbf{U}^1]_i) \\ &\quad + \sum_{m=1}^M p_m Q^0(A[\mathbf{X}^1]_i + B[\mathbf{U}^1]_i + w^m). \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Note that, we augment the state data matrix \mathbf{X}^0 to define \mathbf{X}^1 as in (34). Thus, we can define $\lambda_{\text{cand}}^1 = [\lambda^{0*\top}, 0, 0, \dots, 0]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{\dim(\mathbf{J}^1)}$ so that $x = \mathbf{X}^0 \lambda^{0*} = \mathbf{X}^1 \lambda_{\text{cand}}^1$. Then, $\lambda_{\text{cand}}^1 \geq \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{1}^\top \lambda_{\text{cand}}^1 = 1$. These imply that λ_{cand}^1 is a feasible solution to the problem in (39) at episode $j = 1$. Therefore, from (43) and (44), the following inequalities holds $\forall x \in \mathcal{SS}^0$:

$$\begin{aligned} Q^0(x) &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{\dim(\mathbf{J}^0)} [\lambda^{0*}]_i \{ \ell([\mathbf{X}^0]_i, [\mathbf{U}^0]_i) + \sum_{m=1}^M p_m Q^0(x_{i,m}^+) \}, \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\dim(\mathbf{J}^1)} [\lambda_{\text{cand}}^1]_i [\mathbf{J}^1]_i, \\ &\geq Q^1(x). \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

The last inequality holds because λ_{cand}^1 is a feasible solution of (39) at episode $j = 1$, and $Q^1(x)$ is the optimal cost of (39) at x in episode $j = 1$.

(ii) Now, we make an induction hypothesis as follows:

$$\exists j \geq 1, \forall x \in \mathcal{SS}^{j-1}, Q^{j-1}(x) \geq Q^j(x). \quad (46)$$

We want to prove:

$$\forall x \in \mathcal{SS}^j, Q^j(x) \geq Q^{j+1}(x). \quad (47)$$

Suppose λ^{j*} is an optimal solution of (39) at the episode j . From the value function update (39) and the definition of the cost data (37) \mathbf{J}^j , we have that, $\forall x \in \mathcal{SS}^j$,

$$\begin{aligned} Q^j(x) &= \mathbf{J}^j \lambda^{j*} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\dim(\mathbf{J}^j)} [\lambda^{j*}]_i [\mathbf{J}^j]_i \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\dim(\mathbf{J}^j)} [\lambda^{j*}]_i \{ \ell([\mathbf{X}^j]_i, [\mathbf{U}^j]_i) \\ &\quad + \sum_{m=1}^M p_m Q^{j-1}(A[\mathbf{X}^j]_i + B[\mathbf{U}^j]_i + w^m) \} \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{\dim(\mathbf{J}^j)} [\lambda^{j*}]_i \{ \ell([\mathbf{X}^j]_i, [\mathbf{U}^j]_i) \\ &\quad + \sum_{m=1}^M p_m Q^j(A[\mathbf{X}^j]_i + B[\mathbf{U}^j]_i + w^m) \}. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

The last inequality is due to $A[\mathbf{X}^j]_i + B[\mathbf{U}^j]_i + w^m \in \mathcal{SS}^{j-1}$ by the terminal constraint in (11) and $Q^{j-1}(x) \geq Q^j(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{SS}^{j-1}$ from the induction hypothesis (46).

From (37), we have that,

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathbf{J}^{j+1}]_i &= \ell([\mathbf{X}^{j+1}]_i, [\mathbf{U}^{j+1}]_i) \\ &\quad + \sum_{m=1}^M p_m Q^j(A[\mathbf{X}^{j+1}]_i + B[\mathbf{U}^{j+1}]_i + w^m). \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Note that, we augment the state data matrix \mathbf{X}^j to define \mathbf{X}^{j+1} as in (34). Thus, we can define $\lambda_{\text{cand}}^{j+1} = [\lambda^{j*\top}, 0, 0, \dots, 0]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{\dim(\mathbf{J}^{j+1})}$ so that $x = \mathbf{X}^j \lambda^{j*} = \mathbf{X}^{j+1} \lambda_{\text{cand}}^{j+1}$. Then, $\lambda_{\text{cand}}^{j+1} \geq \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{1}^\top \lambda_{\text{cand}}^{j+1} = 1$. These imply that $\lambda_{\text{cand}}^{j+1}$ is a feasible solution to the problem in (39) at episode $j + 1$. Therefore, from (48) and (49), the following inequalities holds $\forall x \in \mathcal{SS}^j$:

$$\begin{aligned} Q^j(x) &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{\dim(\mathbf{J}^j)} [\lambda^{j*}]_i \{ \ell([\mathbf{X}^j]_i, [\mathbf{U}^j]_i) \\ &\quad + \sum_{m=1}^M p_m Q^j(A[\mathbf{X}^j]_i + B[\mathbf{U}^j]_i + w^m) \}, \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\dim(\mathbf{J}^{j+1})} [\lambda_{\text{cand}}^{j+1}]_i [\mathbf{J}^{j+1}]_i, \\ &\geq Q^{j+1}(x). \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

By induction, (42) holds. ■

V. CONTROLLER PROPERTIES

In this section, we show the main properties of the proposed control algorithm.

A. Feasibility

First, we prove the recursive feasibility of the MPC (11).

Theorem 1: Let Assumptions 1-7 hold. Then, for all time steps $k \geq 0$ and all episodes $j \geq 1$, the MPC (11) is feasible if the state x_k^j is obtained by applying the MPC policy (12) to the system (2) starting from any initial state $x_S \in \mathcal{S}$.

Proof: We will prove the claim by induction.

For the base case, we prove that the problem (11) is feasible at $k = 0$, $\forall j \geq 1$. From (36), we have $x_0^j \in \mathcal{SS}^{j-1}$. Thus, from the Proposition 3, we have that $\pi_Q^{j-1}(x_0^j) \in \mathcal{U}$ and $Ax_0^j + B\pi_Q^{j-1}(x_0^j) + w \in \mathcal{SS}^{j-1}$, $\forall w \in \mathcal{W}$, which implies $Ax_0^j + B\pi_Q^{j-1}(x_0^j) \in \mathcal{SS}^{j-1} \ominus \mathcal{W}$. Therefore, $\pi_Q^{j-1}(x_0^j)$ is a feasible solution to (11) at $k = 0$, $\forall j \geq 1$.

Now use an induction step. Suppose the problem (11) is feasible at some $k = t \geq 0$ at episode $j \geq 1$. We want to prove the problem (11) is feasible at some $k = t+1$ at episode $j \geq 1$. From the induction hypothesis, we have that $Ax_t^j + B\pi^{j*}(x_t^j) \in$

$\mathcal{SS}^{j-1} \ominus \mathcal{W}$, which is the terminal constraint of (11) and implies $x_{t+1}^j \in \mathcal{SS}^{j-1}$, $\forall w_t^j \in \mathcal{W}$. From the Proposition 3, we have that $\pi_Q^{j-1}(x_{t+1}^j) \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $Ax_{t+1}^j + B\pi_Q^{j-1}(x_{t+1}^j) \in \mathcal{SS}^{j-1} \ominus \mathcal{W}$. Thus, $\pi_Q^{j-1}(x_{t+1}^j)$ is a feasible solution to (11) at $k = t+1$ at episode j . By induction, the claim is proved. ■

Based on the Theorem 1, we can prove the feasibility of the exploration problem (31).

Corollary 1: Consider the exploration problem (31) where the argument is the state x_k^j , the primal optimal solution of the MPC problem in (11) is $u_{0|k}^{j*}$, and the corresponding dual optimal solutions are ν_k^{j*} and γ_k^{j*} . Let Assumptions 1-7 hold. Then the exploration problem (31) has a feasible solution.

Proof: From Proposition 3, \mathcal{SS}^{j-1} is a robust positive invariant set for the closed-loop system (2) controlled by $\pi_Q^{j-1}(\cdot)$ (41). Thus, we can find a feasible point of (31):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{d}_{k,\text{exp}}^j &= \mathbf{0}, \\ u_i^{\mathcal{W}} &= \pi_Q^{j-1}(Ax_k^j + Bu^* + v_i^{\mathcal{W}}). \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

Thus, the problem (31) has a feasible solution. ■

B. Convergence

In this subsection, we prove the convergence in probability, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(x_k^j \in \mathcal{O}) = 1$. We first prove the following.

Proposition 5: For $j \geq 0$, consider the value function $Q^j(\cdot)$ in (39) and the LMPC policy (12) at episode $j+1$, i.e., $\pi^{j+1*}(\cdot)$. Let Assumptions 1-7 hold. Then, the value function $Q^j(\cdot)$ satisfies the following inequality for all $x \in \mathcal{SS}^j$:

$$Q^j(x) \geq \ell(x, \pi^{j+1*}(x)) + \sum_{m=1}^M p_m Q^j(Ax + B\pi^{j+1*}(x) + w^m).$$

Proof: From Assumption 5, the stage cost $\ell(\cdot, \cdot)$ is convex. Moreover, as $Q^j(\cdot)$ is an optimal objective function of the mp-LP problem (39), it is convex. Suppose λ^{j*} is an optimal solution of (39) in the episode j . Then, we have that $\sum_{i=1}^{\dim(\mathbf{J}^j)} [\lambda^{j*}]_i [\mathbf{X}^j]_i = x$ from (39), and $\sum_{i=1}^{\dim(\mathbf{J}^j)} [\lambda^{j*}]_i [\mathbf{U}^j]_i = \pi_Q^j(x)$ from (41). Using these facts, we can derive the following inequalities for all $x \in \mathcal{SS}^j$ starting from the first inequality of (50):

$$\begin{aligned} Q^j(x) &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{\dim(\mathbf{J}^j)} [\lambda^{j*}]_i \{ \ell([\mathbf{X}^j]_i, [\mathbf{U}^j]_i) \\ &\quad + \sum_{m=1}^M p_m Q^j(A[\mathbf{X}^j]_i + B[\mathbf{U}^j]_i + w^m) \} \\ &\geq \ell \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\dim(\mathbf{J}^j)} [\lambda^{j*}]_i [\mathbf{X}^j]_i, \sum_{i=1}^{\dim(\mathbf{J}^j)} [\lambda^{j*}]_i [\mathbf{U}^j]_i \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{m=1}^M p_m Q^j \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\dim(\mathbf{J}^j)} [\lambda^{j*}]_i (A[\mathbf{X}^j]_i + B[\mathbf{U}^j]_i + w^m) \right) \\ &= \ell(x, \pi_Q^j(x)) + \sum_{m=1}^M p_m Q^j(Ax + B\pi_Q^j(x) + w^m). \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

The second inequality is due to the convexity of the stage cost $\ell(\cdot, \cdot)$ and the value function $Q^j(\cdot)$.

From the proof of Theorem 1, any $\pi_Q^j(x)$ is a feasible solution of the MPC (11) for all $x \in \mathcal{SS}^j$, $\forall k \geq 0$. In the MPC (11) at episode j , the cost $\ell(x, u) + \sum_{m=1}^M p_m Q^j(Ax +$

$Bu + w^m)$ is minimized so we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} Q^j(x) &\geq \ell(x, \pi_Q^j(x)) + \sum_{m=1}^M p_m Q^j(Ax + B\pi_Q^j(x) + w^m) \\ &\geq \ell(x, \pi^{j+1*}(x)) + \sum_{m=1}^M p_m Q^j(Ax + B\pi^{j+1*}(x) + w^m), \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

which proves the claim. ■

Theorem 2: For $j \geq 1$, consider the closed-loop system (2) controlled by the MPC controller (11) and (12) at episode j . Let Assumptions 1-7 hold. Then, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(x_k^j \in \mathcal{O}) = 1$.

Proof: From the Proposition 1 and 5, the following inequality holds:

$$Q^{j-1}(x) \geq \ell(x, \pi^{j*}(x)) + \mathbb{E}_w[Q^{j-1}(Ax + B\pi^{j*}(x) + w)],$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{SS}^j$. Then, starting from $x_0^j = x_S$, we can derive the following inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} Q^{j-1}(x_0^j) &\geq \mathbb{E}_{w_0^j}[\ell(x_0^j, \pi^{j*}(x_0^j)) + Q^{j-1}(x_1^j)] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_{w_{0:1}^j}[\ell(x_0^j, \pi^{j*}(x_0^j)) + \ell(x_1^j, \pi^{j*}(x_1^j)) + Q^{j-1}(x_2^j)] \quad (54) \\ &\dots \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_{w_{0:\infty}^j} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \ell(x_k^j, \pi^{j*}(x_k^j)) + Q^{j-1}(x_{\infty}^j) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By definition of the value function, $Q^{j-1}(\cdot) \geq 0$. Thus, the following inequalities hold from (54):

$$Q^{j-1}(x_0^j) \geq \mathbb{E}_{w_{0:\infty}^j} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \ell(x_k^j, \pi^{j*}(x_k^j)) \right]. \quad (55)$$

We know that from Proposition 4, $Q^{j-1}(x_S) \leq Q^0(x_S)$. Moreover, from Assumption 7 and (19), $Q^0(x_S) < \infty$.

Let $S_n = \mathbb{E}_{w_{0:n-1}^j} \left[\sum_{k=0}^n \ell(x_k^j, \pi^{j*}(x_k^j)) \right]$ for $n \geq 1$. Since $\ell(\cdot, \cdot) \geq 0$ by Assumption 5, S_n is monotonically increasing with n . Moreover, we know that it is bounded above by (55). Therefore, we have that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n = \mathbb{E}_{w_{0:\infty}^j} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \ell(x_k^j, \pi^{j*}(x_k^j)) \right]$ converges to a finite value [21]. Thus, we can conclude that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{w_k^j}[\ell(x_k^j, \pi^{j*}(x_k^j))] = 0$ [21]. By Assumption 5, this implies $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(x_k^j \in \mathcal{O}) = 1$, which proves the claim. ■

Remark 7: (55) shows that $Q^{j-1}(x_0^j)$ is a performance upper bound of the expected cost of the system (2) controlled by the MPC policy (12) at episode j . Moreover, by Proposition 4, this upper bound decreases over episodes, which is one of our contributions.

C. Optimality

In this subsection, we show the value function at any initial state $x_S \in \mathcal{S}$, i.e., $Q^j(x_S)$ (39), converges close to the optimal value function, i.e., $Q^*(x_S)$ (4), as the episode $j \rightarrow \infty$ under some assumptions.

We use the following assumptions.

Assumption 8: As $j \rightarrow \infty$, the MPC policy, the safe set, and the value function converge as follows:

$$\pi^{j*}(\cdot) \rightarrow \pi^{\infty}(\cdot), \quad \mathcal{SS}^j \rightarrow \mathcal{SS}^{\infty}, \quad Q^j(\cdot) \rightarrow Q^{\infty}(\cdot).$$

Furthermore, the closed-loop state at the time step k of the system (2) controlled by $\pi^{\infty}(\cdot)$, x_k^{∞} , are located in the relative

interior of the set \mathcal{SS}^∞ , and the end time T^∞ starting from an initial state $x_S \in \mathcal{S}$ is finite.

Assumption 9: There exists an optimal value function of (4), denoted as $Q^* : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Furthermore, the system (2) controlled by the optimal control policy $\pi^*(\cdot)$ finishes the episode within a finite time, denoted as T^* .

Note that the optimal value function $Q^*(\cdot)$ is convex as it is a sum of convex stage costs as written in (4).

We define the approximate Bellman operator \hat{T} as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{T}Q(x) &:= \min_u \ell(x, u) + \sum_{m=1}^M p_m Q(Ax + Bu + w^m) \\ \text{s.t. } &x \in \mathcal{X}, u \in \mathcal{U}, \\ &Ax + Bu \in \mathcal{SS}^\infty \ominus \mathcal{W}. \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

Proposition 6: Let Assumptions 1-9 hold. For all $x \in \mathcal{SS}^\infty$, $Q^\infty(x) = \hat{T}Q^\infty(x)$.

Proof: The inequality $Q^\infty(x) \geq \hat{T}Q^\infty(x)$ is true from Proposition 5. Now, we prove $Q^\infty(x) \leq \hat{T}Q^\infty(x)$ using proof by contradiction.

Suppose for some $x_v \in \mathcal{SS}^\infty$, $Q^\infty(x_v) > \hat{T}Q^\infty(x_v)$. As the number of episodes j goes to ∞ , the probability of visiting x_v approaches 1. Thus, x_v is one of the column vectors within the state data matrix \mathbf{X}^∞ defined in (34). Thus, from (37), $\hat{T}Q^\infty(x_v)$ is an element of the cost data matrix \mathbf{J}^∞ .

Moreover, considering that $Q^\infty(\cdot)$ is the optimal cost function of (39) as j tends towards ∞ , it follows that $\hat{T}Q^j(x_v) \geq Q^j(x_v)$. However, this contradicts the initial hypothesis.

In summary, both inequalities $Q^\infty(x) \geq \hat{T}Q^\infty(x)$ and $Q^\infty(x) \leq \hat{T}Q^\infty(x)$ are true, which proves the claim. ■

Proposition 7: Let Assumptions 1-8 hold. Let $\delta(w, M)$ satisfies the inequality in (7), and $\delta = \max_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \delta(w, M)$. Then, the following inequalities hold for all $x \in \mathcal{SS}^\infty$:

$$\mathbb{E}_w[Q^\infty(x + w)] - \sum_{m=1}^M p_m Q^\infty(x + w^m) \geq -L^\infty \delta, \quad (57)$$

where L^∞ is a Lipschitz constant of the function $Q^\infty(\cdot)$.

Proof: For the $m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ such that $\mu_m(w) \neq 0$, we have the following:

$$\|Q^\infty(x + w) - Q^\infty(x + w^m)\| \leq L^\infty \|w - w^m\| \leq L^\infty \delta. \quad (58)$$

The first inequality is from (40), and the second inequality is due to (7) and $\delta(w, M) \leq \delta$ by definition. As $\sum_{m=1}^M \mu_m(w) = 1$, we can derive the following from (58):

$$Q^\infty(x + w) \geq \sum_{m=1}^M \mu_m(w) Q^\infty(x + w^m) - L^\infty \delta. \quad (59)$$

Taking expectations to both sides of (59), we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_w[Q^\infty(x + w)] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_w[\sum_{m=1}^M \mu_m(w) Q^\infty(x + w^m) - L^\infty \delta] \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbb{E}_w[\mu_m(w)] Q^\infty(x + w^m) - L^\infty \delta \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^M p_m Q^\infty(x + w^m) - L^\infty \delta, \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

which proves the claim. ■

Theorem 3: Let Assumptions 1-9 hold. Let $\delta(w, M)$ satisfies the inequality in (7), and $\delta = \max_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \delta(w, M)$. Then, the following hold for all $x \in \mathcal{SS}^\infty$:

$$Q^\infty(x_S) \geq Q^*(x_S) \geq Q^\infty(x_S) - cTL^\infty \delta, \quad (61)$$

where $c > 1$ is a constant, and $T = \max(T^*, T^\infty)$.

Proof: We first prove $Q^\infty(x_S) \geq Q^*(x_S)$. As the MPC problem (11) imposes the state and input constraint and is feasible from Proposition 1, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} x_{k+1}^\infty &= Ax_k^\infty + B\pi^{\infty*}(x_k^\infty) + w_k, \\ x_0^\infty &= x_S, w_k \sim p(w), \\ x_k^\infty &\in \mathcal{SS}^\infty \subset \mathcal{X}, \pi^{\infty*}(x_k^\infty) \in \mathcal{U}, \forall w_k \in \mathcal{W}, \\ &\forall k \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

This implies that $\pi^{\infty*}(\cdot)$ is a feasible control policy of (4). Moreover, $Q^*(x_S)$ is an optimal value function of (4). Therefore, $Q^\infty(x_S) \geq Q^*(x_S)$.

Now, we prove $Q^*(x_S) \geq Q^\infty(x_S) - cTL^\infty \delta$. If $T \geq T^\infty$, the linear policy $u(x_k^\infty) = Kx_k^\infty$ is applied to the system (2) for $k \in \{T^\infty, \dots, T\}$. This control policy maintains the closed-loop state $x_k^\infty \in \mathcal{O}$ and the resulting stage cost $\ell(x_k^\infty, Kx_k^\infty) = 0$ for $k \in \{T^\infty, \dots, T\}$ by Assumption 4 and 5. As x_k^∞ are located in the relative interior of the set \mathcal{SS}^∞ by Assumption 8, there exists $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ such that:

$$x_k^c = \lambda x_k^\infty + (1 - \lambda)x_k^* \in \mathcal{SS}^\infty, k \in \{0, \dots, T\}, \quad (63)$$

which represents that x_k^c is a convex combination of x_k^∞ and x_k^* . By linearity of the system in (2), x_k^c is a closed-loop state of the system (2) controlled by the following control policy:

$$\pi^c(x) = \lambda \pi^\infty(x) + (1 - \lambda)\pi^*(x). \quad (64)$$

Since the closed-loop states $x_k^c \in \mathcal{SS}^\infty$ for all $k \in \{0, \dots, T\}$ from (63), $Ax_k^c + B\pi^c(x_k^c) + w_k \in \mathcal{SS}^\infty$ for all $k \in \{0, \dots, T\}$ and for all realization of disturbance $w_k \in \mathcal{W}$. This implies $Ax_k^c + B\pi^c(x_k^c) \in \mathcal{SS}^\infty \ominus \mathcal{W}$ for all $k \in \{0, \dots, T\}$. $\pi^\infty(x) \in \mathcal{U}$, and $\pi^*(x) \in \mathcal{U}$ for all $x \in \mathcal{SS}^\infty$. Moreover, \mathcal{U} is a convex set. Thus, $\pi^c(x) \in \mathcal{U}$ for all $x \in \mathcal{SS}^\infty$. This implies that $\pi^c(x)$ is a feasible solution of (56) for the given $x \in \mathcal{SS}^\infty$.

As $\ell(\cdot, \cdot)$ is convex from Assumption 5, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{w_0:T-1}[\sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \ell(x_k^c, \pi^c(x_k^c))] \\ &\leq \lambda \mathbb{E}_{w_0:T-1}[\sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \ell(x_k^\infty, \pi^\infty(x_k^\infty))] \\ &\quad + (1 - \lambda) \mathbb{E}_{w_0:T-1}[\sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \ell(x_k^*, \pi^*(x_k^*))] \\ &\leq \lambda Q^\infty(x_S) + (1 - \lambda)Q^*(x_S), \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

where the second inequality is from (55).

Furthermore, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} &Q^\infty(x) \\ &= \hat{T}Q^\infty(x) \\ &\leq \ell(x, \pi^c(x)) + \sum_{m=1}^M p_m Q^\infty(Ax + B\pi^c(x) + w^m) \\ &\leq \ell(x, \pi^c(x)) + \mathbb{E}_w[Q^\infty(Ax + B\pi^c(x) + w)] + L^\infty \delta. \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

The first equality is from Proposition 6, the first inequality is because $\pi^c(\cdot)$ is a feasible solution of (56), and the second

inequality is from Proposition 7. From (66), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& Q^\infty(x_S) \\
& \leq \ell(x_S, \pi^c(x_S)) + \mathbb{E}_{w_0}[Q^\infty(Ax_S + B\pi^c(x_S) + w_0)] + L^\infty\delta \\
& \leq \ell(x_S, \pi^c(x_S)) + \mathbb{E}_{w_0}[\ell(x_1^c, \pi^c(x_1^c))] \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E}_{w_{0:1}}[Q^\infty(Ax_1^c + B\pi^c(x_1^c) + w_1)] + 2L^\infty\delta \\
& \quad \dots \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}_{w_{0:T-1}}\left[\sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \ell(x_k^c, \pi^c(x_k^c))\right] + TL^\infty\delta,
\end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

where the last inequality is because for all $w_{T-1} \in \mathcal{W}$, $Ax_{T-1}^c + B\pi^c(x_{T-1}^c) + w_{T-1} \in \mathcal{S}\mathcal{S}^\infty$, and $Q^\infty(Ax_{T-1}^c + B\pi^c(x_{T-1}^c) + w_{T-1}) = 0$.

From (65) and (67), we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
Q^\infty(x) & \leq \lambda Q^\infty(x_S) + (1 - \lambda)Q^*(x_S) + TL^\infty\delta \\
\iff Q^*(x_S) & \geq Q^\infty(x) - \frac{1}{1 - \lambda}TL^\infty\delta,
\end{aligned}$$

which proves the claim. \blacksquare

Remark 8: As described in Assumption 6 of Sec. III-B, $\delta = \max_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \delta(w, M)$ is related to the approximation in the expected terminal cost in (5). Moreover, as we sample a sufficiently large number of discretized disturbances, we can decrease the bound from (8). Thus, the steady-state function $Q^\infty(\cdot)$ converges sufficiently close to the optimal value function $Q^*(\cdot)$ as the number of discretized disturbances increases, which is one of our contributions.

VI. SIMULATION RESULTS

In this section, we present numerical simulations. We consider an infinite horizon OCP (4) with the following parameters. We consider the system:

$$\begin{aligned}
A & = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 0.5 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{W} = \left\{ w \mid \|w\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{3} \right\}, \\
\mathcal{S} & = \begin{bmatrix} 30 \\ 5 \end{bmatrix} \oplus \left\{ x_0 \mid \|x_0\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{3} \right\},
\end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

$p(w)$ is a uniform distribution at \mathcal{W} , and $p(x_0)$ is a uniform distribution at \mathcal{S} .

The constraints are defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{X} = \left\{ x \mid \begin{bmatrix} -10 \\ -40 \end{bmatrix} \leq x \leq \begin{bmatrix} 40 \\ 10 \end{bmatrix} \right\}, \quad \mathcal{U} = \{ u \mid -5 \leq u \leq 5 \}.$$

The target set \mathcal{O} is set to the minimum robust positive invariant set for the closed-loop system (2) controlled by linear policy $u(x) = Kx$ where K is the optimal LQR gain with the parameters $Q_{\text{LQR}} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ and $R_{\text{LQR}} = 0.01$. We utilize this minimum robust positive invariant set to design a tube MPC for initialization.

The stage cost is defined as follows:

$$\ell(x, u) = \|x\|_{\mathcal{O}}^2 + \|u\|_{\mathcal{K}\mathcal{O}}^2, \tag{69}$$

where

$$\|x\|_{\mathcal{O}} = \min_{d \in \mathcal{O}} \|x - d\|_2, \quad \|u\|_{\mathcal{K}\mathcal{O}} = \min_{d \in \mathcal{K}\mathcal{O}} \|u - d\|_2. \tag{70}$$

Note that (69) is differentiable as it is a sum of the square of the distance to the convex polytope.

We set the number of the discretized disturbances M as 100. To calculate the coefficient p_m (9), we sample 10,000 disturbances from the distribution $p(w)$ and perform Monte Carlo integration [24].

A. Comparison between the proposed method and LMPC with a Certainty Equivalent cost

This subsection compares the proposed method with an LMPC that minimizes a certainty equivalent cost, i.e., a nominal cost [19]. Both algorithms utilize data from previous tasks and update their safe set and terminal cost for each episode. However, the proposed method minimizes the expected sum of the stage cost, while the LMPC in [19] minimizes the sum of the certainty equivalent stage cost.

To evaluate the performance of each algorithm, we conduct 100 Monte-Carlo simulations of the system in (2) with (68) as the parameters, controlled by each algorithm without updating the safe set and the value function for each episode j . We then investigate the sample mean of the total cost incurred by the system. After completing the 100 Monte-Carlo simulations of episode j , we update the safe set and the value function using data from one of the 100 simulations as shown in (36) and (39). Then, we conduct another 100 Monte-Carlo simulations for episode $j + 1$. We repeat this process iteratively to evaluate the algorithms.

Fig. 4 shows the results of the comparison between the proposed method and the certainty equivalent LMPC [19]. At episode 10, the proposed method achieves a total cost of 4616.8, while the certainty equivalent LMPC [19] achieves 5360.0, resulting in a 16.1% improvement for the proposed method. The certainty equivalent LMPC [19] converges faster than the proposed method, as it has a longer horizon. However, its cost function is different from the expected cost, and its control policy parameterization makes the performance conservative. On the other hand, the proposed method takes a few more episodes to converge, but as it minimizes the approximation of the expected cost (10), it shows better performance in terms of the realized cost.




Fig. 4. sample mean of the realized cost for episode j

B. Comparison between the proposed MPC and the Value iteration method

In this subsection, we compare the value function of the proposed method algorithm with the value function calculated

from the value iteration method in [26] which grids the state and input space and approximates the Bellman operator as a convex optimization. We grid the state space with grid size 1 and the input space with grid size 0.5.

In Fig. 5, we present a comparison of the value function for both algorithms at $x_S = [30 \ 5]^\top$. There are two notable points. First, as proved in Proposition 4, the value function of the proposed algorithm at point x_S , $Q^j(x_S)$ monotonically decrease over episodes. Second, as the episode j increases, the error between $Q^j(x_S)$ and the value function calculated from the value iteration [26] decreases.




Fig. 5. Comparison: (a) Value function at x_S calculated from the value iteration method and (b) Terminal cost $Q^j(x_S)$ of the proposed MPC.

In terms of computation time, the value iteration [26] took 25hr 20min for 20 iterations while the proposed method took 1hr 37min for 20 episodes including offline and online calculation. Thus, for this scenario, the proposed method is 15.57 times faster than the value iteration method. Note that as the grid size becomes finer, the computation time gap will exponentially increase by Curse of Dimensionality [12]. However, as illustrated in Fig. 6, the proposed method only finds the value function locally, meaning that it only calculates the value function where the closed-loop systems (2) controlled by the proposed MPC (11) swept, while the value iteration calculates the value function in the entire region. For both figures, the light region indicates the feasible region. The dark blue grid represents the infeasible region for the value iteration method. For the proposed method, the dark blue grid represents either the infeasible region or the region that has not been visited.

VII. CONCLUSION

We proposed a Model Predictive Control (MPC) method to approximately solve a class of infinite horizon optimal control problems where the objective is to minimize the expected sum of the stage costs for linear uncertain systems. The uncertainty included is bounded, state additive random disturbance. The control task considered is to steer the linear uncertain system from a randomly sampled initial state within a given initial set to a given target set. The proposed method achieved robust satisfaction of the state and input constraints and convergence in probability to the target set. We further proved that as the number of episodes increases, the value function monotonically decreases, and under some assumptions,




Fig. 6. Comparison: (a) Value function calculated from the value iteration method and (b) Terminal cost $Q^j(\cdot)$ of the proposed MPC.

the value function converges to the optimal value function. With numerical simulations, we demonstrated that the proposed method obtained 16.1% performance improvement compared to the LMPC with minimizing a certainty equivalent cost. Moreover, compared to the value iteration, the proposed method is up to fifteen times faster while the value function of the proposed method converges towards that of the value iteration.

REFERENCES

- [1] Dimitri Bertsekas. *Convex optimization theory*. Athena Scientific, 2009.
- [2] Dimitri Bertsekas. *Dynamic programming and optimal control: Volume I*. Athena scientific, 2012.
- [3] Dimitri Bertsekas. *Dynamic programming and optimal control: Volume II*. Athena scientific, 2015.
- [4] Dimitri Bertsekas. “Newton’s method for reinforcement learning and model predictive control”. In: *Results in Control and Optimization* 7 (2022), p. 100121.
- [5] Francesco Borrelli, Alberto Bemporad, and Manfred Morari. *Predictive control for linear and hybrid systems*. Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- [6] Stephen Boyd and Lieven Vandenberghe. *Convex optimization*. Cambridge university press, 2004.
- [7] Monimoy Bujarbaruah et al. “Robust MPC for LPV systems via a novel optimization-based constraint tightening”. In: *Automatica* 143 (2022), p. 110459.
- [8] Mark Cannon et al. “Stochastic tube MPC with state estimation”. In: *Automatica* 48.3 (2012), pp. 536–541.
- [9] Biswa Datta. *Numerical methods for linear control systems*. Vol. 1. Academic Press, 2004.

- [10] Marcello Farina et al. “An approach to output-feedback MPC of stochastic linear discrete-time systems”. In: *Automatica* 55 (2015), pp. 140–149.
- [11] Lukas Hewing, Kim P Wabersich, and Melanie N Zeilinger. “Recursively feasible stochastic model predictive control using indirect feedback”. In: *Automatica* 119 (2020), p. 109095.
- [12] Donald E Kirk. *Optimal control theory: an introduction*. Courier Corporation, 2004.
- [13] Zhaojian Li, Uroš Kalabić, and Tianshu Chu. “Safe reinforcement learning: Learning with supervision using a constraint-admissible set”. In: *2018 Annual American Control Conference (ACC)*. IEEE. 2018, pp. 6390–6395.
- [14] Matthias Lorenzen et al. “Constraint-tightening and stability in stochastic model predictive control”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 62.7 (2016), pp. 3165–3177.
- [15] David Q Mayne, María M Seron, and SV Raković. “Robust model predictive control of constrained linear systems with bounded disturbances”. In: *Automatica* 41.2 (2005), pp. 219–224.
- [16] D Munoz de la Penad, Alberto Bemporad, and Teodoro Alamo. “Stochastic programming applied to model predictive control”. In: *Proceedings of the 44th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*. IEEE. 2005, pp. 1361–1366.
- [17] Ugo Rosolia and Francesco Borrelli. “Learning how to autonomously race a car: a predictive control approach”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology* 28.6 (2019), pp. 2713–2719.
- [18] Ugo Rosolia and Francesco Borrelli. “Learning model predictive control for iterative tasks. a data-driven control framework”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 63.7 (2017), pp. 1883–1896.
- [19] Ugo Rosolia, Xiaojing Zhang, and Francesco Borrelli. “A stochastic MPC approach with application to iterative learning”. In: *2018 IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE. 2018, pp. 5152–5157.
- [20] Ugo Rosolia, Xiaojing Zhang, and Francesco Borrelli. “Robust Learning Model-Predictive Control for Linear Systems Performing Iterative Tasks”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 67.2 (2021), pp. 856–869.
- [21] Walter Rudin et al. *Principles of mathematical analysis*. Vol. 3. McGraw-hill New York, 1976.
- [22] Richard S Sutton and Andrew G Barto. *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press, 2018.
- [23] Kim P Wabersich and Melanie N Zeilinger. “Linear model predictive safety certification for learning-based control”. In: *2018 IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE. 2018, pp. 7130–7135.
- [24] Stefan Weinzierl. “Introduction to monte carlo methods”. In: *arXiv preprint hep-ph/0006269* (2000).
- [25] Alexander Wischnewski et al. “A tube-MPC approach to autonomous multi-vehicle racing on high-speed ovals”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles* (2022).
- [26] Insoon Yang. “A convex optimization approach to dynamic programming in continuous state and action

spaces”. In: *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* 187.1 (2020), pp. 133–157.

APPENDIX

A. Calculating the coefficient $\mu_m(w)$ in (6) and p_m (9)

1) *Using a multi-parametric linear programming (mp-LP)*: We can calculate $\mu_m(w)$ by solving the following multi-parametric linear programming (mp-LP) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} J^*(w, M) &= \min_{\mu_{1:M}(w)} \sum_{m=1}^M \|w^m\|_2^2 \mu_m(w) \\ \text{s.t.,} \quad & w = \sum_{m=1}^M \mu_m(w) w^m, \\ & \sum_{m=1}^M \mu_m(w) = 1, \\ & \mu_m(w) \geq 0, \quad \forall m \in \{1, \dots, M\}. \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

The solution of (71), $\mu_m^*(w)$, is given by an explicit piecewise affine function [5].

Several methods can be used to compute the expectation (9) offline. If probability distribution is available, one can use numerical integration by gridding [9]. When the probabilistic distribution is not available, one can use recorded disturbances to perform the Monte Carlo integration [24].

2) *Using multiple linear programming (LP)*: As mp-LP might be computationally intractable for high-dimensional systems, we propose an alternate way to solve this problem. Considering that using Monte Carlo integration [24] to calculate (9), then we can write (9) as follows:

$$p_m = \frac{1}{N_{\text{sampled}}} \sum_{n=1}^{N_{\text{sampled}}} \mu_m(w_n) \quad (72)$$

for a large number N_{sampled} . For each sampled disturbance w_n , we can calculate $\mu_m(w_n)$ by solving the following linear programming (LP) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} J_{\text{LP}}^*(w_n, M) &= \min_{\mu_{1:M}(w_n)} \sum_{m=1}^M \|w_n^m\|_2^2 \mu_m(w_n) \\ \text{s.t.,} \quad & w_n = \sum_{m=1}^M \mu_m(w_n) w_n^m, \\ & \sum_{m=1}^M \mu_m(w_n) = 1, \\ & \mu_m(w_n) \geq 0, \quad \forall m \in \{1, \dots, M\}. \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

After solving the LP (73) for all $n \in \{1, \dots, N_{\text{sampled}}\}$, we calculate (9) as in (72).

3) *Prove that Assumption 6 is satisfied.*: We will prove that Assumption 6 is satisfied for the optimal solution of the problem (71). Based on this proof, it is straightforward that the optimal solution of (73) satisfies Assumption 6, which will be described at the end of this section.

It is trivial that there exists a bound $\delta(w, M)$ as the discretized disturbances w^m , $\forall m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ are located within the bounded set \mathcal{W} . In the following, we will prove that as the number of the discretized disturbances goes to infinity, the bound $\delta(w, M)$ in (7) converges to zero.

We consider the problem (71). For a given w , let $\mu_m^*(w)$ denote the optimal solution of the problem (71). Moreover, let p_i , $i \in \{1, \dots, P\}$ denote the discretized disturbances where the associated coefficient $\mu_m^*(w)$ are non-zero. Let $a_i(w)$, $i \in$

$\{1, \dots, P\}$ denote associated coefficient of p_i , $i \in \{1, \dots, P\}$. Then, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} J^*(w, M) &= \sum_{i=1}^P \|p_i\|_2^2 a_i(w) \\ w &= \sum_{i=1}^P a_i(w) p_i. \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

Proposition 8: For a given w , there do not exist discretized disturbances q_j , $j \in \{1, \dots, Q\}$ that satisfies the following conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} w &= \sum_{j=1}^Q b_j(w) q_j, \\ \sum_{j=1}^Q b_j(w) &= 1, \\ b_j(w) &\geq 0, \quad \forall j \in \{1, \dots, Q\}, \\ \text{conv} \left\{ \bigcup_{j=1}^Q q_j \right\} &\subset \text{relint} \left(\text{conv} \left\{ \bigcup_{i=1}^P p_i \right\} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

where $\text{relint}(\cdot)$ represents the relative interior of the set.

Proof: We use proof by contradiction. Suppose such discretized disturbances q_j , $j \in \{1, \dots, Q\}$ exist.

Since q_j is located within the relative interior of the convex hull of p_i , $i \in \{1, \dots, P\}$ from (75), each q_j , $j \in \{1, \dots, Q\}$ can be represented as a strict convex combination of p_i , $i \in \{1, \dots, P\}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} q_j &= \sum_{i=1}^P c_i p_i, \quad j \in \{1, \dots, Q\} \\ \sum_{i=1}^P c_i &= 1, \quad c_i > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

Moreover, as a quadratic function is strictly convex, we have the following for all $j \in \{1, \dots, Q\}$:

$$q_j^\top q_j = \left(\sum_{i=1}^P c_i p_i \right)^\top \left(\sum_{i=1}^P c_i p_i \right) < \sum_{i=1}^P c_i p_i^\top p_i. \quad (77)$$

(77) holds for any convex coefficient that satisfies (76).

Now, consider the following two sets:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{CP} &= \text{conv} \left\{ \bigcup_{i=1}^P \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} p_i^\top p_i \\ p_i \end{bmatrix} \right\} \right\}, \\ \mathcal{CQ} &= \text{conv} \left\{ \bigcup_{j=1}^Q \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} q_j^\top q_j \\ q_j \end{bmatrix} \right\} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

Note that $J^*(w, M) = \sum_{i=1}^P \|p_i\|_2^2 a_i(w) = \sum_{i=1}^P p_i^\top p_i a_i(w)$ and $w = \sum_{i=1}^P a_i(w) p_i$ from (74). This implies that a point $\begin{bmatrix} J^*(w, M) & w^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top$ can be written as a convex combination of $\begin{bmatrix} p_i^\top p_i & p_i^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top$, $i \in \{1, \dots, P\}$, which are the elements of \mathcal{CP} . Thus, $\begin{bmatrix} J^*(w, M) & w^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top \in \mathcal{CP}$.

Similarly, let $\hat{J}(w) = \sum_{j=1}^Q q_j^\top q_j b_j(w)$. From (75), we also have that $w = \sum_{j=1}^Q b_j(w) q_j$. Thus, $\begin{bmatrix} \hat{J}(w) & w^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top \in \mathcal{CQ}$. Furthermore, from (77), all vectors $\begin{bmatrix} q_j^\top q_j & q_j^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top$, $j \in \{1, \dots, Q\}$ cannot be written as a convex combination of $\begin{bmatrix} p_i^\top p_i & p_i^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top$, $i \in \{1, \dots, P\}$. Thus, we have that:

$$\begin{bmatrix} q_j^\top q_j \\ q_j \end{bmatrix} \notin \mathcal{CP}, \quad (79)$$

which implies that \mathcal{CP} and \mathcal{CQ} are disjoint.

Now, we will prove $\hat{J}(w) < J^*(w, M)$ by contradiction. If $\hat{J}(w) = J^*(w, M)$, there exists an element $\begin{bmatrix} J^*(w, M) & w^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top$ in $\mathcal{CP} \cap \mathcal{CQ}$, which contradicts the result \mathcal{CP} and \mathcal{CQ} are disjoint.

Suppose $\hat{J}(w) > J^*(w, M)$. Consider the following line segments for $t \in [0, 1]$:

$$\begin{aligned} L_P(t) &= \begin{bmatrix} J^*(w, M) \\ w \end{bmatrix} + s \left(\begin{bmatrix} \sum_{i=1}^P c_i p_i^\top p_i \\ \sum_{i=1}^P c_i p_i \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} J^*(w, M) \\ w \end{bmatrix} \right), \\ L_Q(t) &= \begin{bmatrix} \hat{J}(w) \\ w \end{bmatrix} + t \left(\begin{bmatrix} q_j^\top q_j \\ q_j \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} \hat{J}(w) \\ w \end{bmatrix} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

Note that $L_P(t) \subset \mathcal{CP}$ and $L_Q(t) \subset \mathcal{CQ}$ by convexity of \mathcal{CP} and \mathcal{CQ} , respectively.

At $t = 1$, the first elements of the line segments satisfy that $[L_P(1)]_1 = \sum_{i=1}^P c_i p_i^\top p_i > q_j^\top q_j = [L_Q(1)]_1$ from (77), while other elements are same $[L_P(1)]_{2:n_x+1} = [L_Q(1)]_{2:n_x+1} = \sum_{i=1}^P c_i p_i = q_j$ from (76).

At $t = 0$, $[L_P(0)]_1 = J^*(w, M) < \hat{J}(w) = [L_Q(0)]_1$ based on the hypothesis, while $[L_P(0)]_{2:n_x+1} = [L_Q(0)]_{2:n_x+1} = w$. Thus, by the intermediate value theorem [21], there exists an intersection point of $L_P(t)$ and $L_Q(t)$. This implies that there exists an element in $\mathcal{CP} \cap \mathcal{CQ}$ contradicting the result that \mathcal{CP} and \mathcal{CQ} are disjoint. Hence, $\hat{J}(w) < J^*(w, M)$.

However, $\hat{J}(w) < J^*(w, M)$ contradicts that $J^*(w, M)$ is the optimal cost of the problem (71). This proves the claim. ■

Proposition 8 implies the following: Consider the scenario when we continuously sample the disturbance within \mathcal{W} while maintaining the previous M_1 samples until there exist discretized disturbances q_j , $j \in \{1, \dots, Q\}$ that satisfy (75) for some w . Then, we can find a smaller bound than the bound $\delta(w, M_1)$. Specifically, we have the following:

$$\exists N > M_1, \quad \forall M_2 \geq N, \quad \delta(w, M_1) > \delta(w, M_2). \quad (81)$$

Therefore, the optimal solution of (71) satisfies Assumption 6. When using (73), Proposition 8 can be proved by replacing w with w_n and $J^*(w, M)$ with $J_{\text{LP}}^*(w_n, M)$.

B. Initialization using Tube MPC

For initialization, we have the following suboptimal controller that satisfies Assumption 7.

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{V}_{0 \rightarrow T}^0(\bar{x}_S) &= \min_{\bar{u}_{0:T}^0} 0 \\ \text{s.t.}, \quad \bar{x}_{k+1}^0 &= A \bar{x}_k^0 + B \bar{u}_k^0, \\ \bar{x}_0^0 &= \bar{x}_S, \\ \bar{x}_{k+1}^0 &\in \mathcal{X} \ominus \mathcal{E}, \quad \bar{u}_k^0 \in \mathcal{U} \ominus K \mathcal{E}, \\ \bar{x}_{T+1}^0 &\in \mathcal{O} \ominus \mathcal{E}, \\ k &\in \{0, \dots, T\}, \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

where the superscript 0 is to denote an initialization, \bar{x}_k^0 and \bar{u}_k^0 are a nominal state and a nominal input at time step k , respectively, and \mathcal{E} is a robust positive invariant set for the autonomous system $x_{k+1} = (A + BK)x_k + w_k$, $w_k \in \mathcal{W}$ and K is a given state feedback gain such that $A + BK$ is Hurwitz. Moreover, $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \bar{x}_S \oplus \mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{O}$. Remind that \mathcal{S} is defined in Assumption 3.

Remark 9: This problem is a tube MPC [15] with horizon length $N = T + 1$. By [15, Prop.1], the state x_k^0 of the closed-loop system (2) under the control policy $\pi_{\text{Tube}}(x_k^0) = \bar{u}_k^{0*} + K(x_k^0 - \bar{x}_k^{0*})$ always satisfies the state constraint \mathcal{X} while $\pi_{\text{Tube}}(x_k^0) \in \mathcal{U}$. Moreover, the terminal state $x_{T+1}^0 \in \mathcal{O}$.

1) *Compute the initial safe set \mathcal{SS}^0* : We denote the optimal nominal inputs and the associated states of (82) as $\bar{u}_{0:T}^{0*}$ and $\bar{x}_{0:T}^{0*}$, respectively. We define the following sets:

$$\mathcal{E}_k = \bar{x}_k^{0*} \oplus \mathcal{E}, \quad k \in \{0, \dots, T+1\}. \quad (83)$$

Note that, since \mathcal{E} is invariant, the number of vertices of \mathcal{E}_k is same for all $k \in 0, \dots, T+1$. Let l denote the number of vertices of \mathcal{E}_k and $v_1^{\mathcal{E}_k}, \dots, v_l^{\mathcal{E}_k}$ denotes the vertices of \mathcal{E}_k .

The initial safe set is defined as:

$$\mathcal{SS}^0 = \text{conv} \left\{ \mathcal{O} \cup \left\{ \bigcup_{k=0}^{T+1} \mathcal{E}_k \right\} \right\}, \quad (84)$$

where \mathcal{SS}^0 is the convex hull of the target set \mathcal{O} and $\bigcup_{k=0}^{T+1} \mathcal{E}_k$.

2) *Compute the initial value function $Q^0(\cdot)$* : To construct the initial value function $Q^0(\cdot)$, we define a state data matrix, an input data matrix, and a cost-to-go data vector. First, we define an initial state data matrix \mathbf{X}^0 as follows:

$$\mathbf{X}^0 = \left[v_1^{\mathcal{O}}, \dots, v_{l_{\mathcal{O}}}^{\mathcal{O}}, v_1^{\mathcal{E}_0}, \dots, v_l^{\mathcal{E}_0}, \dots, v_1^{\mathcal{E}_{T+1}}, \dots, v_l^{\mathcal{E}_{T+1}} \right],$$

which consists of the vertices of the target set \mathcal{O} and $\mathcal{E}_k(\bar{x}_k^{0*})$, $\forall k \in \{0, \dots, T+1\}$.

Second, we define an initial input data matrix \mathbf{U}^0 where we store the corresponding input of each element of the initial state data matrix \mathbf{X}^0 as follows:

$$\mathbf{U}^0 = \left[K v_1^{\mathcal{O}}, K v_2^{\mathcal{O}}, \dots, K v_{l_{\mathcal{O}}}^{\mathcal{O}}, \pi_{\text{Tube}}(v_1^{\mathcal{E}_0}), \dots, \pi_{\text{Tube}}(v_l^{\mathcal{E}_0}), \dots, \pi_{\text{Tube}}(v_1^{\mathcal{E}_{T+1}}), \dots, \pi_{\text{Tube}}(v_l^{\mathcal{E}_{T+1}}) \right].$$

As the target set \mathcal{O} is the robust positive invariant set for the closed-loop system controlled by the linear policy $u(x) = Kx$, the corresponding inputs for the vertices of \mathcal{O} are $K v_1^{\mathcal{O}}, K v_2^{\mathcal{O}}, \dots, K v_{l_{\mathcal{O}}}^{\mathcal{O}}$.

Third, we introduce an initial cost-to-go data vector denoted as \mathbf{J}^0 , where i -th element of \mathbf{J}^0 , i.e., $[\mathbf{J}^0]_i$, corresponds to $[\mathbf{X}^0]_i$ and $[\mathbf{U}^0]_i$. For $k \in \{0, \dots, T+1\}$, we compute the cost-to-go value J_k^0 for each tube \mathcal{E}_k (83), i.e., $f: \mathcal{E}_k \rightarrow J_k^0$, by solving the following optimization problem:

$$J_k^0 = \max_x \ell(x, \pi_{\text{Tube}}(x)) + J_{k+1}^0 \quad (85)$$

s.t., $x \in \mathcal{E}_k(\bar{x}_k^{0*})$,

Note that $J_{T+1}^0 = 0$ since $\mathcal{E}_{T+1} \subseteq \mathcal{O}$. If $[\mathbf{X}^0]_i$ falls within a tube \mathcal{E}_k , we assign the corresponding cost-to-go value J_k^0 to it.

Remark 10: As the objective function in (85) is convex and $\mathcal{E}_k(\bar{x}_k^{0*})$ is a polytope, there exists a vertex of $\mathcal{E}_k(\bar{x}_k^{0*})$ which is the global maximizer of (85) [1, Prop. 1.3.4]. Thus, we can solve this maximization problem (85) by enumerating the cost-to-go values of all vertices of $\mathcal{E}_k(\bar{x}_k^{0*})$. The enumeration number is $T \cdot l_w$.

For the first $l_{\mathcal{O}}$ elements of the cost data vector \mathbf{J}^0 , their corresponding state data in \mathbf{X}^0 are the vertices of \mathcal{O} . Thus, the first $l_{\mathcal{O}}$ elements of the \mathbf{J}^0 are zeros. The remaining elements of the \mathbf{J}^0 are assigned based on the tube to which the respective state belongs. To sum up, we define the initial cost data vector \mathbf{J}^0 as follows:

$$\mathbf{J}^0 = \left[\underbrace{[0, 0, \dots, 0]}_{l_{\mathcal{O}}}, \underbrace{[J_0^0, \dots, J_0^0]}_l, \dots, \underbrace{[J_{T+1}^0, \dots, J_{T+1}^0]}_l \right]. \quad (86)$$

3) *Prove that the cost-data vector (86) satisfies the condition (18)*: For the simplicity of the proof, we define the function $J^0(\cdot)$ as follows:

$$J^0(x) = \begin{cases} J_k^0, & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{E}_k, \quad k \in \{0, \dots, T\}, \\ 0, & \text{else if } x \in \mathcal{O}, \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (87)$$

Note that this is a function whose output is the cost-to-go value (85) of the tube to which the argument x belongs. Thus, for any i -th column of \mathbf{X}^0 , the following is satisfied:

$$J^0([\mathbf{X}^0]_i) = [\mathbf{J}^0]_i. \quad (88)$$

By construction of the tubes $\mathcal{E}_k(\bar{x}_k^{0*})$, $k \in \{0, \dots, T\}$ (83) and by Assumption 4, for any state in \mathbf{X}^0 , the corresponding input in \mathbf{U}^0 will steer the system (2) inside one of the tubes (83) or the target set \mathcal{O} . Therefore, we have that:

$$J^0(A[\mathbf{X}^0]_i + B[\mathbf{U}^0]_i + w) = \text{const.} < \infty, \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{W}. \quad (89)$$

In (85), we define the cost-to-go value by taking a maximization over the tube while setting the cost-to-go value in the target set \mathcal{O} to zero. This implies the following inequality is satisfied for all elements of \mathbf{X}^0 :

$$J^0([\mathbf{X}^0]_i) \geq \ell([\mathbf{X}^0]_i, [\mathbf{U}^0]_i) + J^0(A[\mathbf{X}^0]_i + B[\mathbf{U}^0]_i + w), \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{W}, \quad (90)$$

From (89), we know that $J^0(A[\mathbf{X}^0]_i + B[\mathbf{U}^0]_i + w)$ is constant for any realization of $w \in \mathcal{W}$. Thus, we can rewrite (90) as:

$$J^0([\mathbf{X}^0]_i) \geq \ell([\mathbf{X}^0]_i, [\mathbf{U}^0]_i) + \sum_{m=1}^M p_m J^0(A[\mathbf{X}^0]_i + B[\mathbf{U}^0]_i + w^m), \quad (91)$$

Remind that w^m is the m -th discretized disturbance. For brevity of the proof, we will denote $A[\mathbf{X}^0]_i + B[\mathbf{U}^0]_i + w^m$ as $x_{i,m}^+$ in the rest of the proof.

Suppose an optimal solution of (19) is λ^{0*} . From the definition of $Q^0(x)$ (19), we have that:

$$Q^0(x) = \mathbf{J}^0 \lambda^{0*} = \sum_{i=1}^{\dim(\mathbf{J}^0)} [\lambda^{0*}]_i J^0([\mathbf{X}^0]_i) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\dim(\mathbf{J}^0)} [\lambda^{0*}]_i \{ \ell([\mathbf{X}^0]_i, [\mathbf{U}^0]_i) + \sum_{m=1}^M p_m J^0(x_{i,m}^+) \}, \quad (92)$$

where the last inequality is due to (91).

Next, we want to prove:

$$J^0(x_{i,m}^+) \geq Q^0(x_{i,m}^+). \quad (93)$$

As aforementioned in (89), $x_{i,m}^+$ belongs to either the target set \mathcal{O} or one of the tubes $\mathcal{E}_k(\bar{x}_k^{0*})$, $k \in 1, \dots, T$. Let us denote the set to which $x_{i,m}^+$ belongs as $S_{i,m}^+$. Then, we can express $x_{i,m}^+$ as a convex combination of the vertices of the set $S_{i,m}^+$ which are the elements of \mathbf{X}^0 . Let λ^v is the associated convex coefficients, i.e., $\mathbf{X}^0 \lambda^v = x_{i,m}^+$. Moreover, $J^0(x_{i,m}^+)$ is constant over the tube $S_{i,m}^+$. Thus, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{J}^0 \lambda^v &= J^0(x_{i,m}^+), \\ \mathbf{X}^0 \lambda^v &= x_{i,m}^+, \\ \lambda^v &\geq \mathbf{0}, \quad \mathbf{1}^\top \lambda^v = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (94)$$

This implies λ^v is a feasible solution of the mp-LP problem in (19) and thus $J^0(x_{i,m}^+) \geq Q^0(x_{i,m}^+)$. From (92) and $J^0(x_{i,m}^+) \geq Q^0(x_{i,m}^+)$, we show that the cost-data vector (86) satisfies the condition (18).

C. Robust Reachable Set [5]

Definition 1: (Robust Successor Set): Given a control policy $\pi(\cdot)$ and the closed-loop system $x_{k+1} = Ax_k + B\pi(x_k) + w_k$, $w_k \in \mathcal{W}$, we define the robust successor set from the \mathcal{S} as:

$$\text{Succ}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{W}, \pi) = \{x_{k+1} \mid \exists x_k \in \mathcal{S}, \exists w_k \in \mathcal{W},$$

$$x_{k+1} = Ax_k + B\pi(x_k) + w_k\}.$$

Given the set \mathcal{S} , the robust successor set $\text{Succ}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{E}_n, \pi)$ denotes the set of the states that the uncertain autonomous system can reach in one time step.

Definition 2: (N step Robust Reachable Set): Given a control policy $\pi(\cdot)$ and the closed-loop system $x_{k+1} = Ax_k + B\pi(x_k) + w_k$, $w_k \in \mathcal{W}$, we recursively define the N step robust reachable set from a given initial set \mathcal{S} subject to a constraint $x_k \in \mathcal{X}$ as:

$$\mathcal{R}_0(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{W}, \pi) = \mathcal{S},$$

$$\mathcal{R}_{i+1}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{W}, \pi) = \text{Succ}(\mathcal{R}_i(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{W}, \pi), \mathcal{W}, \pi) \cap \mathcal{X},$$

$$i = 0, 1, \dots, N - 1.$$

D. Proof of Proposition 3

We will prove the claim by induction. Consider the case $j = 0$. Since the terminal constraint in (82) is $\bar{x}_{T+1}^0 \in \mathcal{O} \ominus \mathcal{E}$, the realized state x_{T+1}^0 of the closed-loop system (2) controlled by $\pi_{\text{Tube}}(\cdot)$ is in the target set \mathcal{O} . Moreover, for all $N \in$

$\{0, \dots, T + 1\}$, N -th tubes \mathcal{E}_N (83) contains a N -step robust reachable set $\mathcal{R}_N(x_S, \mathcal{W}, \pi_{\text{Tube}})$. Thus, by [20, Proposition 1], \mathcal{SS}^0 is a robust positive invariant set for the closed-loop system (2) controlled by the policy $\pi_Q^0(\cdot)$ (41).

Assuming for a particular $j - 1 \geq 0$, \mathcal{SS}^{j-1} is a robust positive invariant set for the closed-loop system (2) controlled by the policy $\pi_Q^{j-1}(\cdot)$. We want to show that \mathcal{SS}^j is a robust positive invariant set for the closed-loop system (2) controlled by the policy $\pi_Q^j(\cdot)$. From the formulation of the (11) and the control policy (12), we have that,

$$Ax_k^j + B\pi^{j*}(x_k^j) + w \in \mathcal{SS}^{j-1}, \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{W}. \quad (95)$$

Similarly, for any element x_{exp}^j of $\mathbf{X}_{k,\text{exp}}^j$ and $u_{\text{exp}}^j = \pi^{j*}(x_{\text{exp}}^j)$ of $\mathbf{U}_{k,\text{exp}}^j$ where $k \in \{0, \dots, T^j\}$, we have that,

$$Ax_{\text{exp}}^j + Bu_{\text{exp}}^j + w \in \mathcal{SS}^{j-1}, \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{W}. \quad (96)$$

Moreover, by the induction hypothesis and (41), $\forall x \in \mathcal{SS}^{j-1}$,

$$A \underbrace{\mathbf{X}^{j-1} \lambda^{j-1*}}_x + B \underbrace{\mathbf{U}^{j-1} \lambda^{j-1*}}_{\pi_Q^{j-1}(x)} + w \in \mathcal{SS}^{j-1}, \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{W}. \quad (97)$$

The above equations (95), (96) and (97) imply that $\forall x = \mathbf{X}^j \lambda^{j*} \in \mathcal{SS}^j$ at episode j , satisfy the following equation:

$$A \underbrace{\mathbf{X}^j \lambda^{j*}}_x + B \underbrace{\mathbf{U}^j \lambda^{j*}}_{\pi_Q^j(x)} + w \in \mathcal{SS}^{j-1}, \quad \forall w \in \mathcal{W}. \quad (98)$$

Also, by (36), $\mathcal{SS}^{j-1} \subset \mathcal{SS}^j$. Therefore, $\forall x \in \mathcal{SS}^j$, $Ax + B\pi_Q^j(x) + w \in \mathcal{SS}^{j-1} \subset \mathcal{SS}^j$, $\forall w \in \mathcal{W}$. This implies that \mathcal{SS}^j is a robust positive invariant set for the closed-loop system (2) controlled by the policy $\pi_Q^j(\cdot)$.