# Fast System Level Synthesis: Robust Model Predictive Control using Riccati Recursions<sup> $\star$ </sup>

Antoine P. Leeman<sup>∗</sup> Johannes Köhler <sup>∗</sup> Florian Messerer <sup>∗</sup>\* Amon Lahr <sup>∗</sup> Moritz Diehl ∗∗,∗∗∗ Melanie N. Zeilinger <sup>∗</sup>

∗ Institute for Dynamic Systems and Control, ETH Zurich, Zurich 8053, Switzerland (e-mail:{aleeman; jkoehle; amlahr; mzeilinger}@ethz.ch)

∗∗ Department of Microsystems Engineering (IMTEK), University of Freiburg, 79110 Freiburg, Germany (e-mail: {florian.messerer; moritz.diehl}@imtek.uni-freiburg.de) ∗∗∗ Department of Mathematics, University of Freiburg, 79104

Freiburg, Germany

Abstract: System level synthesis enables improved robust MPC formulations by allowing for joint optimization of the nominal trajectory and controller. This paper introduces a tailored algorithm for solving the corresponding disturbance feedback optimization problem for linear time-varying systems. The proposed algorithm iterates between optimizing the controller and the nominal trajectory while converging q-linearly to an optimal solution. We show that the controller optimization can be solved through Riccati recursions leading to a horizon-length, state, and input scalability of  $\mathcal{O}(N^2(n_x^3+n_y^3))$  for each iterate. On a numerical example, the proposed algorithm exhibits computational speedups by a factor of up to  $10<sup>3</sup>$  compared to general-purpose commercial solvers.

Keywords: Optimization and Model Predictive Control, Robust Model Predictive Control, Real-Time Implementation of Model Predictive Control

# 1. INTRODUCTION

The ability to plan safe trajectories in real-time, despite model mismatch and external disturbances, is a key enabler for high-performance control of autonomous systems (Majumdar and Tedrake, 2017; Schulman et al., 2014). iLQR (Li and Todorov, 2004; Giftthaler et al., 2018) methods have shown great practical benefits (Neunert et al., 2016; Howell et al., 2019; Singh et al., 2022) by producing a feedback controller based on the optimal nominal trajectory. However, robust stability and robust constraint satisfaction are generally only addressed heuristically (Manchester and Kuindersma, 2017).

Model predictive control (MPC) (Rawlings et al., 2017) has emerged as a key technology for control subject to (safety) constraints. Real-time feasibility of MPC, even in fast-sampled systems, is largely due to advancements in numerical optimization (Frison, 2016; Domahidi et al., 2012). These tailored algorithms exploit the stage-wise structure of the nominal trajectory optimization problem, utilizing, e.g., efficient Riccati recursions. Robust MPC approaches can account for model mismatch and external disturbances by propagating them over the prediction horizon. While few robust MPC approaches optimize a feedback policy (Scokaert and Mayne, 1998; Villanueva et al., 2017; Messerer and Diehl, 2021; Kim et al., 2024), most robust MPC designs use an offline-fixed controller (Mayne et al., 2005; Köhler et al., 2020; Zanelli et al., 2021) for computational efficiency.

Disturbance feedback for linear time-varying (LTV) systems (Goulart et al., 2006; Ben-Tal et al., 2004) overcomes this limitation by using a convex controller parametrization. Building on this parametrization, system level synthesis (SLS) (Anderson et al., 2019; Tseng et al., 2020; Li et al., 2023) facilitates the consideration of (structural) constraints on the closed-loop response. SLS has also been proposed within an MPC formulation (Sieber et al., 2021; Chen et al., 2024; Leeman et al., 2023a,b). However, the large number of decision variables in SLS poses a major obstacle for real-time implementation. Asynchronous updates (Sieber et al., 2023) or GPU parallelization (Alonso and Tseng, 2022) can reduce the computational time. Goulart et al. (2008) derived a structure-exploiting solver for disturbance feedback optimization, reducing the scalability of a naive interior-point method implementation from  $\mathcal{O}(N^4)$  to  $\mathcal{O}(N^3)$  per iteration. In this work, we leverage results in numerical optimization (Wright et al., 1999; Messerer and Diehl, 2021) to propose a customized optimization solver for SLS with  $\mathcal{O}(N^2)$  scalability, significantly improving the computation times.

 $\star$  This work has been supported by the European Space Agency under OSIP 4000133352, the Swiss Space Center, the Swiss National Science Foundation under NCCR Automation (grant agreement 51NF40 180545), by DFG via project 424107692, and by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme, Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 953348, ELO-X.



Fig. 1. Illustration how the robust MPC problem (7) is solved by alternating between a nominal trajectory optimization problem with tightened constraints and the computation of optimal feedback gains  $K_{k,i}$  using Riccati recursions.

Contribution This work addresses robust MPC for LTV systems using an SLS formulation (Section 2). Our key contribution is an efficient solution achieved through iterative optimization of the nominal trajectory and the controller (Section 3), as inspired by Messerer and Diehl (2021) and illustrated in Fig. 1.

The proposed algorithm has the following properties:

- It converges q-linearly to an optimal solution of a tightened robust MPC problem.
- Each controller optimization is solved with efficient Riccati recursions with a combined scalability of  $\mathcal{O}(N^2(n_{\rm x}^3+n_{\rm u}^3)).$
- The proposed algorithm also allows for parallelization, leading to a scalability of  $\mathcal{O}(N(n_x^3 + n_u^3)).$

Furthermore, we discuss how the approach can be extended to nonlinear systems via sequential convex programming (SCP) (Remark 3.5). We showcase the numerical properties of our solver for a range of state dimensions and horizon lengths in comparison to the commercial general-purpose solvers Gurobi Optimization (2023), and Mosek ApS (2019) (Section 4).

Notation We denote stacked vectors or matrices by  $(a, \ldots, b) = [a^{\top}, \ldots, b^{\top}]^{\top}$ . The matrix I denotes the identity with its dimensions either inferred from the context or indicated by the subscript, i.e.,  $I_{n_x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_x}$ , the matrix  $\mathbf{0}_{n,m} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  has all its elements zeros, and the vector  $\mathbf{1}_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$  has all its elements one. For a sequence of matrices  $\pmb{\Phi}_{k,j}^{\mathrm{u}},$  we define  $\pmb{\Phi}_{0:k,j}^{\mathrm{u}} := (\pmb{\Phi}_{0,j}^{\mathrm{u}}, \dots, \pmb{\Phi}_{k,j}^{\mathrm{u}})$ . Similarly, for a sequence of vectors  $x_k$ , we define  $\mathbf{x} := (x_0, \dots, x_k)$ . We denote the 2-norm, resp. induced 2-norm, of a vector, resp. of a matrix, as ∥·∥2. We define the Frobenius norm of a matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ , as  $||A||_{\mathcal{F}} = \text{Trace}(A^{\top}A)$ . For a nona matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ , as  $||A||_{\mathcal{F}} = \text{Trace}(A \setminus A)$ . For a non-<br>negative vector  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , the square root  $\sqrt{x}$  is to be understood elementwise. Besides,  $0 \leq x \perp y \leq 0$  is the shorthand notation for the three conditions  $x_i \cdot y_i = 0, x_i \geq$ 0,  $y_i \leq 0$ ,  $i = 1, \ldots, n$ . The set of positive definite matrices is denoted by  $\mathbb{S}_{++}^n$ . We denote the unit ball, centered at the origin,  $\mathcal{E}_n := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \|x\|_2 \leq 1\}$ . For a vector-valued function  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^q$ , we denote by  $\nabla \phi(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times q}$  the transposed Jacobian, i.e.,  $\nabla \phi(x) = \frac{\partial \phi(x)}{\partial x}$ ⊤ .

## 2. PROBLEM SETUP & SYSTEM LEVEL SYNTHESIS

We consider the following uncertain LTV system:

$$
x_{k+1} = A_k x_k + B_k u_k + E_k w_k, \ x_0 = \bar{x}_0,\tag{1}
$$

with state  $x_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ , input  $u_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$  and disturbance lying in a unit ball  $w_k \in \mathcal{E}_{n_x} := \{w \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}, ||w||_2 \leq 1\}$ . To simplify the exposition, we assume that the disturbance scaling matrix  $E_k$  is invertible. Remark 3.4 discusses the extension to left-invertible matrices  $E_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_w}$  with  $w_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w}$ . The initial condition is given by  $\bar{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ .

We consider the problem of designing an optimal controller minimizing the cost function

$$
J(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} x_k^{\top} Q x_k + u_k^{\top} R u_k + x_N^{\top} P x_N,
$$
 (2)

with  $Q \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{n_x}$ ,  $R \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{n_u}$ ,  $P \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{n_x}$  while robustly satisfying the constraints

$$
g_{k,i}^{\top}(x_k, u_k) + b_{k,i} \le 0, \ \forall i = 1, ..., n_c,
$$
 (3a)

$$
g_{\text{f},i}^{\top} x_N + b_{\text{f},i} \leq 0, \ \forall i = 1,\dots, n_{\text{f}},
$$
 (3b)

for  $k = 0, ..., N - 1$  with  $g_{k,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x + n_u}$ , and  $g_{f,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ .

We optimize over disturbance feedback

$$
u_k = v_k + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \mathbf{\Phi}^{\mathbf{u}}_{k,j} w_j,
$$
 (4)

with nominal input  $v_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ , i.e., we assign a distinct disturbance feedback matrix  $\mathbf{\Phi}_{k,j}^{\mathrm{u}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\mathrm{u}} \times n_{\mathrm{x}}}$  for each disturbance  $w_j$  and control  $u_k$  with  $k > j$ . As common in SLS, the resulting state sequence can be expressed as

$$
x_k = z_k + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \mathbf{\Phi}_{k,j}^{\mathbf{x}} w_j, \ z_0 = x_0,\tag{5}
$$

where  $z_k$  is the corresponding nominal state and the corresponding closed-loop response  $\Phi_{k,j}^{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\mathbf{x}} \times n_{\mathbf{x}}}$  denotes the influence of the disturbance  $w_j$  on the state  $x_k$ . Starting with  $\mathbf{\Phi}_{j+1,j}^{\mathbf{x}} = E_j$ , the propagation of the disturbance, commonly used in SLS, is governed by

$$
\Phi_{k+1,j}^{x} = A_k \Phi_{k,j}^{x} + B_k \Phi_{k,j}^{u},
$$
  
\n $j = 0, ..., N - 1, k = j + 1, ..., N - 1.$  (6)

Combining the disturbance propagation for each time step (6), we formulate the robust optimal control problem via SLS as a second-order cone program (SOCP),

$$
\min_{\substack{\mathbf{\Phi}^{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{\Phi}^{\mathbf{u}},\\ \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}}} J(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}) + \tilde{H}_0(\mathbf{\Phi}),\tag{7a}
$$

s.t. 
$$
z_{k+1} = A_k z_k + B_k v_k
$$
,  $z_0 = \bar{x}_0$ ,  
\n $k = 0, ..., N - 1$ , (7b)

$$
\Phi_{k+1,j}^{\mathbf{x}} = A_k \Phi_{k,j}^{\mathbf{x}} + B_k \Phi_{k,j}^{\mathbf{u}}, \ \Phi_{j+1,j}^{\mathbf{x}} = E_j, \quad (7c)
$$
  

$$
j = 0, \dots, N-1, \ k = j+1, \dots, N-1,
$$

$$
\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \|g_{k,i}^{\top} \mathbf{\Phi}_{k,j}\|_{2} + g_{k,i}^{\top}(z_k, v_k) + b_{k,i} \le 0, \qquad (7d)
$$

$$
i = 1, ..., n_c, \ k = 0, ..., N - 1,
$$
  
\n
$$
\sum_{j=0}^{N-1} ||g_{f,i}^{\top} \Phi_{N,j}||_2 + g_{f,i}^{\top} z_N + b_{f,i} \le 0,
$$
  
\n
$$
i = 1, ..., n_f,
$$
\n(7e)

with  $\mathbf{\Phi}_{k,j} := (\mathbf{\Phi}_{k,j}^{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{\Phi}_{k,j}^{\mathbf{u}}), \mathbf{\Phi}_{N,j} := \mathbf{\Phi}_{N,j}^{\mathbf{x}}$ . Conditions (7b) implement nominal dynamics, while the tightened constraints  $(7d)$ – $(7e)$  ensure the constraints  $(3)$  are satisfied robustly (see Proposition 1). The cost (7a) also minimizes the uncertainty propagation via the closed-loop response<sup>1</sup> $\Phi$ .

$$
\tilde{H}_0(\Phi) := \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \left( \|\bar{P}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Phi_{N,j}^{\mathbf{x}}\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \sum_{k=j}^{N-1} \left( \|\bar{Q}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Phi_{k,j}^{\mathbf{x}}\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \|\bar{R}^{\frac{1}{2}} \Phi_{k,j}^{\mathbf{u}}\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 \right) \right),
$$
\n(8)

with  $\overline{Q} \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{n_x}$ ,  $\overline{R} \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{n_u}$ ,  $\overline{P} \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{n_x}$ , and the highdimensional variable  $\Phi$  collecting all  $\Phi^x$ , and  $\Phi^u$ . While this SLS formulation is equivalent to disturbance feedback (Goulart et al., 2006), its specificity is to consider explicitly the disturbance propagation (7c).

Proposition 1. (Goulart et al., 2006) System (1) in closedloop with (4) satisfies constraints (3) for all disturbances  $w = (w_0, \ldots, w_{N-1}) \in \mathcal{E}_{n_x} \times \cdots \times \mathcal{E}_{n_x}$  if and only if  $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v})$ and  $(\mathbf{\Phi}^{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{\Phi}^{\mathbf{u}})$  satisfy the constraints in (7).

Remark 2.1. Under suitable terminal ingredients  $P$ ,  $q_{f,i}$ ,  $b_{f,i}$ , the optimization problem (7), used in a recedinghorizon fashion, is recursively feasible and ensures a stable closed-loop system, see, e.g., (Goulart et al., 2006).

Remark 2.2. In the SLS literature, the constraint (7c) is often written equivalently in its matrix form:

$$
[\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{A}, -\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{B}] \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Phi}^{\mathbf{x}} \\ \mathbf{\Phi}^{\mathbf{u}} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{E}, \tag{9}
$$

see, e.g., (Anderson et al., 2019, Eq.(2.7)).

Remark 2.3. The disturbance feedback (4) can be equivalently reformulated as a state feedback, see, e.g., (Goulart et al., 2006).

In the following, we exploit the structural similarity between the optimization problem (7), and the optimization problem efficiently solved in (Messerer and Diehl, 2021). In contrast to standard tube-based MPC, the SLS-based formulation (13) is not conservative (Proposition 1). However, this approach results in a large number of decision variables, e.g.,  $\frac{N \cdot (N-1)}{2} n_x n_u$  for  $\Phi^u$ . This paper proposes a structure-exploiting solver for the optimization problem (7).

#### 3. EFFICIENT ALGORITHM FOR SLS

In this section, we show how to efficiently solve the SLSbased problem (7). The Karush–Kuhn–Tucker (KKT) conditions (Wright et al., 1999) of (7) are decomposed into two subsets. The proposed algorithm iteratively solves each subset, corresponding to the nominal trajectory optimization and controller optimization employing efficient Riccati recursions (cf. Fig.1).

# 3.1 SLS and its KKT conditions

To write the optimization problem (7) concisely, we introduce the auxiliary variables  $\beta_{k,j} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_c}$  and the corresponding equality constraints

$$
\beta_{k,j} = \tilde{H}_{k,j}(\mathbf{\Phi}),\tag{10}
$$

similar for  $\beta_N$ , where we define

$$
\tilde{H}_{k,j}(\mathbf{\Phi}) := (\|g_{k,1}^{\top} \mathbf{\Phi}_{k,j}\|_{2}^{2}, \ldots, \|g_{k,n_{c}}^{\top} \mathbf{\Phi}_{k,j}\|_{2}^{2}).
$$
 (11)

Based on these auxiliary variables  $\beta_{k,j}$ , the constraint tightening terms in (7d)-(7e) result as

$$
h_k^{\text{ct}}(\beta_k) := \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \sqrt{\beta_{k,j} + \epsilon_{\beta}}, \ h_0^{\text{ct}} := 0_{n_c}, \quad (12)
$$

with  $\beta_k := (\beta_{k,0}, \ldots, \beta_{k,k-1})$ . We note that the tightenings (12) are equivalent to those used in (7) if  $\epsilon_{\beta} = 0$ . However, in the following, we use a fixed  $\epsilon_{\beta} > 0$  to circumvent points of non-differentiability.

We summarize the SLS problem (7) as

$$
\min_{y,\mathbf{\Phi},\beta} J(y) + \tilde{H}_0(\mathbf{\Phi}),\tag{13a}
$$

$$
s.t. \t f(y) = 0,
$$
\t(13b)

$$
D(\mathbf{\Phi}) = 0,\t(13c)
$$

$$
h(y) + h^{\text{ct}}(\beta) \le 0,\tag{13d}
$$

$$
\tilde{H}(\Phi) - \beta = 0,\t(13e)
$$

where  $\beta := (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_N)$ , and  $y = (\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y}$  contains the variables associated with the nominal trajectory, the constraint (13b) encodes the nominal dynamics (7b), and the constraint (13c) encodes the disturbance propagation (7c). The tightened constraints (7d)-(7e) are split into two constraints: Inequality (13d) captures the nominal constraints  $h(y)$  with a constraint tightening  $h^{ct}(\beta)$  :=  $(0_{n_c}, h_1^{\text{ct}}(\beta_1), \ldots, h_N^{\text{ct}}(\beta_N))$  and Equality (13e) captures the nonlinear relation (10)–(11) between  $\beta$  and the disturbance propagation Φ.

To derive an efficient algorithm for solving the SLSbased problem (13), we first condense the disturbance propagation (13c) within the tightening definition (13e). This is achieved by recursively substituting all  $\mathbf{\Phi}_{k,j}^{\mathbf{x}}$  with a corresponding function of the gains  $\mathbf{\Phi}_{k,j}^{\mathrm{u}}$  and disturbance gains  $E_i$  using (6). After substitution, we obtain the equivalent, more compact, optimization problem

$$
\min_{y,M,\beta} \quad J(y) + H_0(M),\tag{14a}
$$

$$
s.t. \t f(y) = 0,
$$
\t(14b)

$$
h(y) + h^{\text{ct}}(\beta) \le 0,\tag{14c}
$$

$$
H(M) - \beta = 0,\t(14d)
$$

where M collects all the disturbance feedback controller gains  $\mathbf{\Phi}_{k,j}^{\mathrm{u}}$  in a vector, and H is a composition function condensing the disturbance propagation (13c), such that  $H(M) = \tilde{H}(\mathbf{\Phi})$  and  $H_0(M) = \tilde{H}_0(\mathbf{\Phi})$ , for any  $\mathbf{\Phi}$  with  $D(\Phi) = 0$ . The Lagrangian of (14) is given by

$$
\mathcal{L}(y,\beta,M,\lambda,\mu,\eta) = J(y) + H_0(M) + \lambda^{\top} f(y) + \mu^{\top} (h(y) + h^{\text{ct}}(\beta)) \quad (15) + \eta^{\top} (H(M) - \beta),
$$

with the dual variables  $\lambda$ ,  $\mu$ , and  $\eta$ . The KKT conditions of (14) are given by

<sup>1</sup> This cost corresponds to the expected value of the variance of  $J(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$  under stochastic noise  $w_k$ , as detailed in (Goulart, 2007).

$$
\nabla J(y) + \nabla f(y)\lambda + \nabla h(y)\mu = 0,
$$
 (16a)

$$
\nabla h^{\text{ct}}(\beta)\mu - \eta = 0,\tag{16b}
$$

$$
\nabla H_0(M) + \nabla H(M)\eta = 0, \qquad (16c)
$$

$$
f(y) = 0,\t(16d)
$$

$$
0 \le \mu \perp h(y) + h^{\text{ct}}(\beta) \le 0,
$$
 (16e)

$$
H(M) - \beta = 0,\t(16f)
$$

where ⊥ denotes a complementarity condition. The next section shows how to exploit the structure in (16) to efficiently solve the SLS-based problem.

#### 3.2 Iterative trajectory and controller optimization

In the following, we derive the proposed algorithm and we outline its convergence properties. The main idea of the proposed algorithm is to partition the KKT conditions (16) into two subsets solved alternatingly: one subset corresponding to the nominal trajectory optimization and the other to controller optimization.

In particular, the subset of necessary conditions (16a), (16b), (16d), (16e) with fixed  $\beta$ , corresponds to a nominal trajectory optimization,

$$
\nabla J(y) + \nabla f(y)\lambda + \nabla h(y)\mu = 0, \qquad (17a)
$$

$$
f(y) = 0,\t(17b)
$$

$$
0 \le \mu \perp h(y) + h^{\text{ct}}(\bar{\beta}) \le 0,
$$
 (17c)

$$
\nabla h^{\text{ct}}(\bar{\beta})\mu - \eta = 0. \tag{17d}
$$

Conditions (17) yield an optimal dual  $\bar{\eta}$ . This optimal dual is fixed to solve the remaining necessary conditions (16c), (16f), corresponding to the controller optimization

$$
\nabla H_0(M) + \nabla H(M)\bar{\eta} = 0,\t(18a)
$$

$$
H(M) - \beta = 0. \tag{18b}
$$

The solution to (18) yields a new update for  $\beta$ , used in (17). A similar iterative scheme was derived in (Messerer and Diehl, 2021) for a different robust optimal control problem, with each iteration refining the trajectory based on the computed feedback, while ensuring convergence towards an optimal solution (see Proposition 2). Next, we detail how the decomposition in subsets (17) and (18) enables a fast solution.

#### 3.3 Algorithm

The solution of (17) can be obtained by solving a nominal trajectory optimization problem,

$$
\min_{\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}} J(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}),\tag{19a}
$$

s.t. 
$$
z_{k+1} = A_k z_k + B_k v_k
$$
,  $z_0 = \bar{x}_0$ , (19b)

$$
h_k^{\text{ct}}(\bar{\beta}_k) + G_k(z_k, v_k) + b_k \le 0,
$$
  
\n $k = 0, ..., N - 1,$  (19c)

$$
h_N^{\text{ct}}(\bar{\beta}_N) + G_{\text{f}} z_N + b_{\text{f}} \le 0, \tag{19d}
$$

with the tightenings based on a fixed  $\bar{\beta}$ , and where  $G_k$ and  $G_f$  collect, respectively, all  $g_{k,i}^{\top}$  and  $g_{f,i}^{\top}$  in a matrix. Importantly, the stage-wise optimal control structure of the quadratic program (QP) (19) enables the use of tailored QP solvers (Kouzoupis et al., 2018) including efficient Riccati recursions (Steinbach, 1995; Rao et al., Algorithm 1 fast-SLS Require:  $Q, R, P, A_k, B_k, E_k, G_k, b_k, G_f, b_i$  $\beta, \bar{x}_0 \leftarrow$  Initialize tightening (e.g.,  $\epsilon_{\beta}$ ), current state while KKT (16) not satisfied do  $\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}, \mu \leftarrow \text{Optimize nominal trajectory}$   $\triangleright$  (19)  $\eta, C_{k,j} \leftarrow \text{Update dual, and cost}$   $\Phi^{\mathbf{x}}, \Phi^{\mathbf{u}} \leftarrow \text{Optimize controller}$   $\triangleright$  (25)  $\mathbf{\Phi}^{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{\Phi}^{\mathbf{u}} \leftarrow \text{Optimize controller}$   $\triangleright$  (25)  $\beta \leftarrow \text{Update tightening}$   $\triangleright$  (7c), (10) end while Output:  $z^*$ ,  $v^*$ ,  $\Phi^{x^*}$ ,  $\Phi^{u^*}$  satisfy (13)

1998; Frison and Diehl, 2020). The optimal value of  $\eta$  is then obtained by evaluating (17d), i.e.,

$$
\eta_{k,j} = \frac{\mu_k}{2\sqrt{\bar{\beta}_{k,j}}} \ j = 0, \dots, N-1, \ k = j, \dots, N-1, \ (20)
$$

where  $\eta_{k,j} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_c}$  are the dual variables that correspond to each  $\beta_{k,j}$  for the equality constraint (16f), and  $\mu_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_c}$ are the dual variables that correspond, at time step  $k$ , to the tightened constraints (16e).

Then, to efficiently solve (18) given a fixed  $\bar{\eta}$ , we notice that the stationarity condition  $(18a)$  is linear in M and has a unique solution. This condition can be solved with efficient Riccati recursions, as detailed in Section 3.4. Finally, the updated tightenings are obtained by evaluating (18b), which corresponds to the forward simulation given by (7c), and (10). Algorithm 1 summarizes the steps previously outlined.

Proposition 2. Denote by  $s^* := (y^*, M^*, \beta^*)$  the unique optimal solution of (13) or (14) and assume standard regularity conditions hold at  $s^*$ , i.e., linear independence constraint qualification (LICQ), the second order sufficient condition (SOSC), and strict complementarity. Then, the sequences  $\{s_i\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ , generated by Algorithm 1, converge to  $s^*$  if  $\sigma = \max_k ||E_k||_2$  is sufficiently small and if  $\beta$  and the corresponding y are initialized sufficiently close to  $s^*$ . The convergence rate is q-linear in the nominal trajectory variables y and r-linear in the controller variables  $\Phi$ , and β.

Proof. The proof is analogous to (Messerer and Diehl, 2021, Thm. 10). Specifically, by fixing  $\bar{\beta}$  in (17), we implicitly neglect the corresponding Jacobians with respect to the remaining variables. As in (Messerer and Diehl, 2021), the magnitude of the neglected Jacobians is proportional to  $\sigma$ . Hence, for  $\sigma$  small enough, we obtain linear convergence, whereas quadratic convergence is not possible because of the neglected gradients. Notably, Messerer and Diehl (2021) use a gradient-correction to ensure convergence to a KKT point. However, this is not needed for the convex problem (13) and Algorithm 1 converges to the global minimizer  $s^*$ . □

Remark 3.1. Without inequality constraints, a single trajectory and Riccati recursion for the controller optimization yields an optimal solution.

Remark 3.2. As stopping criterion, we compare the norm of the difference between two consecutive primal solutions to a specified threshold, denoted as  $\epsilon_m$ .

Remark 3.3. The solution of (19) is feasible with respect to the SOCP (7) at every iteration of the iterative scheme Algorithm 1, allowing for safe early termination.

Next, we focus on exploiting the structure of (18a).

#### 3.4 Controller optimization via efficient Riccati recursions

We exploit the numerical structure in  $(18a)$ , to efficiently compute a solution. Equation (18a) corresponds to firstorder necessary conditions of

$$
\min_{\mathbf{\Phi}} \quad \eta^{\top} \tilde{H}(\mathbf{\Phi}) + \tilde{H}_0(\mathbf{\Phi}), \tag{21a}
$$

$$
s.t. \quad D(\Phi) = 0. \tag{21b}
$$

The structure of the cost function (21a) can be interpreted intuitively: the tightenings  $||g_{k,i}^{\top} \mathbf{\dot{\Phi}}_{k,j}||_2^2$  associated with larger dual variables  $\eta$  in (16c) are penalized more heavily, leading to stronger disturbance rejection in that direction.

After some algebraic manipulations, the optimization problem (21) can be written equivalently as

$$
\min_{\mathbf{\Phi}^{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{\Phi}^{\mathbf{u}}} \quad \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \|C_{N,j} \mathbf{\Phi}_{N,j}^{\mathbf{x}}\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \sum_{k=j}^{N-1} \|C_{k,j} \mathbf{\Phi}_{k,j}\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2, \quad (22a)
$$

$$
\begin{aligned} \text{s.t. } & \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{k+1,j}^{\mathbf{x}} = A_k \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{k,j}^{\mathbf{x}} + B_k \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{k,j}^{\mathbf{u}}, \\ & \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{j+1,j}^{\mathbf{x}} = E_j, \end{aligned} \tag{22b}
$$

$$
j = 0, \ldots, N - 1, \ k = j + 1, \ldots, N - 1,
$$

where we define the concatenation

$$
C_{k,j} := \left(\text{diag}\left(\sqrt{\eta_{k,j}}\right) G_k, \begin{bmatrix} \bar{Q}^{1/2} & \mathbf{0}_{n_x, n_y} \\ \mathbf{0}_{n_y, n_x} & \bar{R}^{1/2} \end{bmatrix}\right),
$$
  

$$
C_{N,j} := \left(\text{diag}\left(\sqrt{\eta_{N,j}}\right) G_f, \bar{P}^{1/2}\right).
$$
 (23)

Each term of  $\tilde{H}_0(\mathbf{\Phi})$  in (21a) has been incorporated in the sum (22a) by leveraging Frobenius norm properties.

We introduce the block decomposition

$$
\begin{bmatrix} C_{k,j}^{\mathbf{x}} & C_{k,j}^{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{u}} \\ C_{k,j}^{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{u}} & C_{k,j}^{\mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}} \end{bmatrix} := C_{k,j}^{\top} C_{k,j}, \qquad (24)
$$

such that  $C_{k,j}^{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{n_{\mathbf{x}}}, C_{k,j}^{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathbb{S}_{++}^{n_{\mathbf{u}}}$  and  $C_{k,j}^{\mathbf{ux}} = C_{k,j}^{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{u}}$ of corresponding dimension, for  $j = 0, \ldots, N-1, k =$  $j, \ldots, N-1$ , and similar for  $C_{N,j}^{\mathbf{x}}$ . The following Theorem shows that the solution to  $(22)$  is given by N independent Riccati recursions.

Theorem 3. Problem (22) has a unique minimizer which is given by N parallel backward Riccati recursions,

$$
S_{N,j} = C_{N,j}^{\mathbf{x}},
$$
  

$$
K_{k,j} = -\left(C_{k,j}^{\mathbf{u}} + B_k^{\top} S_k\right)
$$

$$
K_{k,j} = -\left(C_{k,j}^{\mathrm{u}} + B_k^{\top} S_{k+1,j} B_k\right)^{-1} \left(C_{k,j}^{\mathrm{ux}} + B_k^{\top} S_{k+1,j} A_k\right),
$$
  
\n
$$
S_{k,j} = C_{k,j}^{\mathrm{x}} + A_k^{\top} S_{k+1,j} A_k + \left(C_{k,j}^{\mathrm{xu}} + A_k^{\top} S_{k+1,j} B_k\right) K_{k,j},
$$
  
\n(25)

followed by N parallel forward propagations,

$$
\Phi_{j+1,j}^{\mathbf{x}} = E_j
$$
  
\n
$$
\Phi_{k,j}^{\mathbf{u}} = K_{k,j} \Phi_{k,j}^{\mathbf{x}}, \ \Phi_{k+1,j}^{\mathbf{x}} = (A_k + B_k K_{k,j}) \Phi_{k,j}^{\mathbf{x}}, \tag{26}
$$

for  $j = 0, \ldots, N - 1, k = j + 1, \ldots, N - 1$ .

Proof. First, we note that each disturbance feedback controller operates independently, allowing us to address the solution for each disturbance  $j = 0, \ldots, N - 1$  as follows:

$$
\min_{\substack{\Phi_{j+1:N,j}^{\mathbf{x}},\\ \Phi_{j+1:N,j}^{\mathbf{x}}} \ \|C_{N,j}\Phi_{N,j}^{\mathbf{x}}\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2 + \sum_{k=j+1}^{N-1} \|C_{k,j}\Phi_{k,j}\|_{\mathcal{F}}^2, \qquad (27a)
$$

$$
\begin{aligned} \text{s.t. } \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{j+1,j}^{\mathbf{x}} &= E_j, \\ \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{k+1,j}^{\mathbf{x}} &= A_k \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{k,j}^{\mathbf{x}} + B_k \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{k,j}^{\mathbf{u}}, \end{aligned} \tag{27b}
$$

$$
k = j + 1, ..., N - 1.
$$
 (210)  
(211)

We have a quadratic cost,

$$
||C_{k,j}\Phi_{k,j}||_{\mathcal{F}}^2 = \text{Trace}\left(\Phi_{k,j}^\top C_{k,j}^\top C_{k,j}\Phi_{k,j}\right)
$$
  

$$
= \sum_{i=1}^{n_x} e_i^\top \Phi_{k,j}^\top C_{k,j}^\top C_{k,j}\Phi_{k,j}e_i,
$$
 (28)

with  $e_i^{\top}$  is the *i*<sup>th</sup> row of the identity matrix  $I_{n_x}$ , and a linear unconstrained dynamics, as in (Tseng et al., 2020), with matrix dynamics. Notably, each column of  $\mathbf{\Phi}_{k,j}^{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{\Phi}_{k,j}^{\mathbf{u}},$  i.e.,  $\mathbf{\Phi}_{k,j}e_i$ , can be interpreted as independent states and input for each  $i = 1, \ldots, n_x$ , with identical cost and dynamics but different initial conditions. Hence, Problem (27) corresponds to  $n_x$  linear quadratic regulator (LQR) problems with different initial conditions and hence can be efficiently solved via a single identical Riccati recursion (25) and a forward matrix propagation (26).  $\Box$ Remark 3.4. For disturbances  $w_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w}$  with  $n_w < n_x$ , Theorem 3 can be extended to left-invertible  $E_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_w}$ as used in (Herold et al.,  $2022$ )<sup>2</sup>. In this case, Problem  $(22)$ is optimally solved by the Riccati recursions (25) and replacing  $(26)$  by N parallel forward propagations

$$
\begin{aligned} \mathbf{\Phi}_{j+1,j}^{\mathbf{x}} &= E_j, \ \Omega_j = E_j E_j^{\dagger}, \\ \mathbf{\Phi}_{k,j}^{\mathbf{u}} &= K_{k,j} \Omega_j \mathbf{\Phi}_{k,j}^{\mathbf{x}}, \ \mathbf{\Phi}_{k+1,j}^{\mathbf{x}} &= (A_k + B_k K_{k,j}) \mathbf{\Phi}_{k,j}^{\mathbf{x}}, \end{aligned} \tag{29}
$$

for  $j = 0, ..., N - 1, k = j + 1, ..., N - 1$ . Note that for  $E_j$  invertible, (29) reduces to (26) with  $\Omega_j = I_{n_x}$ .

Remark 3.5. The proposed algorithm can be extended to address a nonlinear robust MPC formulation (Leeman et al., 2023a). To efficiently solve the resulting NLP, a modified SCP can be utilized, solving a series of convex problems iteratively to approximate the original nonconvex problem. Each iterate in the sequence is equivalent to a convex SLS-based problem (7), which can be efficiently addressed using the proposed algorithm. Crucially, all the constraints of the convexified problems have the same numerical structure as in the linear case, and can hence be handled using Algorithm 1. A more detailed derivation can be found in Appendix A.

# 3.5 Scalability

For unconstrained linear quadratic problems, the Riccati recursion scales as  $\mathcal{O}(N(n_x^3+n_u^3))$  (Rawlings et al., 2017). Using a naive alternative based on state augmentation to solve equation (7), the number of states in each stage would grow from  $n_x$  to  $n_x + N n_x^2$ , with a similar expansion for the inputs. Consequently, this naive implementation approach leads to a computational scalability of  $\mathcal{O}(N^4(n_x^3+n_u^3)n_x^3)$ . The solver introduced by Goulart et al. (2008) leverages the sparsity structure for factorization

 $^2$  A left-invertible matrix  $E_k$  implies there exists a matrix  $E_k^\dagger$   $\in$  $\mathbb{R}^{n_{\mathrm{w}} \times n_{\mathrm{x}}}$  such that  $E_{k}^{\dagger} E_{k} = I_{n_{\mathrm{w}}}$ .



Fig. 2. Scalability of different solvers with horizon length for  $L = 10$  masses (left). Scalability of different solvers with the number of states for horizon  $N = 10$  (right). The proposed algorithm's (fast-SLS) computation times, and the Riccati recursions contributions (25) (fast-SLS: Riccati) are shown with standard deviations.



Fig. 3. Number of iterations required until convergence for 10<sup>3</sup> randomly sampled initial conditions, for horizon  $N = 25$ , and  $L = 25$  masses.

of the KKT matrix, leading to an improved scaling of  $\mathcal{O}(N^3(n_{\rm x}^3 + n_{\rm u}^3)).$ 

In contrast, the proposed algorithm alternatively solves two subsets of the KKT conditions. Hence, the computation times are dominated by the N Riccati recursions executed at each iteration. If implemented sequentially, this scales as  $\mathcal{O}(N^2(n_\text{x}^3 + n_\text{u}^3))$ . By parallelizing the Riccati recursions across  $N$  cores, the scalability can be reduced to  $\mathcal{O}(N(n_x^3 + n_u^3))$ , achieving the same computational scalability as the nominal trajectory optimization.

## 4. NUMERICAL EXAMPLE

In this section, we demonstrate the computational speedup achieved by the proposed algorithm compared to available alternatives. We show how the proposed algorithm scales with increasing horizon and increasing number of states. The nominal trajectory optimization (19) is solved with osqp (Stellato et al., 2020), via its CasADi interface (Andersson et al., 2019), while the Riccati recursions (25) are implemented using MATLAB <sup>3</sup> .

The proposed algorithm is compared against directly solving the SOCP (7) using general-purpose commercial solvers, Gurobi Optimization (2023) and Mosek ApS  $(2019)$ , both interfaced using YALMIP (Löfberg, 2004). Computations are carried out on a Macbook Pro equipped

https://gitlab.ethz.ch/ics/fast-sls,

with M1 processor with 8 cores and 16 GB of RAM, running macOS Sonoma.

In the following example, we consider a chain of  $L$  massspring-damper systems as in (Domahidi et al., 2012), corresponding to a linear system with  $n_x = 2 \cdot L$ , fixed at one end, with mass  $m = 1$ , spring constant  $k = 10$ , and damper constant  $d = 2$ , and a force actuation on each mass. The system is discretized using a time step  $\Delta t = 0.1$ . We use  $Q = P = 3I_{n_x}, R = I_{n_u}, E = 0.1I_{n_x}$ . The states x and the force input  $u$  are constrained at each time step as  $||x||_{\infty}$  ≤ 4, and  $||u||_{\infty}$  ≤ 4. We use a convergence tolerance on the primal variables y of  $\epsilon_m = 10^{-8}$ , and a minimal tightening of  $\epsilon_{\beta} = 10^{-10} \mathbf{1}_{n_c}$ . The computation times of the proposed algorithm are calculated based on an average of 30 randomly sampled feasible initial conditions. We also show the computation times for the Riccati recursions alone (25).

Scalability with state dimension For horizon  $N = 10$ , and an increasing number of masses L, we investigate the computation times for different solvers. In Fig. 2 (right), we see that the proposed algorithm improves computation times compared to Mosek and Gurobi, especially for systems with high state dimension, achieving an improvement in computation speed by a factor of up to  $10<sup>3</sup>$  times. However, as predicted, our method scales as  $\mathcal{O}(n_x^3)$ , which is the same asymptotic scaling as for Mosek and Gurobi.

Scalability with horizon length We investigate the computation times for different solvers, using  $L = 10$  masses and increasing horizon length  $N$ . In Fig. 2 (left), we see that our method scales as  $\mathcal{O}(N^2)$ . In comparison, Mosek and Gurobi scale respectively approximately as  $\mathcal{O}(N^3)$ , and  $\mathcal{O}(N^2)$ , indicating the use of a sparse factorization method, as in (Goulart et al., 2008). Crucially, the proposed algorithm improves computation times, especially for long horizons, achieving an improvement in computation speed by a factor of up to  $10^3$  times.

Convergence For horizon  $N = 25$ , and  $L = 25$  masses, we evaluate the number of iterations required to numerically converge for  $10^3$  randomly sampled feasible initial conditions for the proposed solver. In Fig. 3, we see that,

<sup>3</sup> An open-source implementation is available at

doi: https://doi.org/10.3929/ethz-b-000666883

in the vast majority of cases, only a few iterations are required to converge to the optimal solution. All the solvers considered converge to the same optimal solution.

Remark 4.1. As seen in Fig. 2, the computation times are dominated by the Riccati recursions (25). It can be noted that due to overhead in the MATLAB implementation, the computation times are less reliable for small problems. The computation speed of the proposed algorithm could benefit from a more efficient implementation, e.g., relying on the Cholesky decomposition of the cost matrices (23), compare (Frison, 2016).

#### 5. CONCLUSION

SLS is a flexible technique to jointly optimize the nominal trajectory and controller in robust MPC by using a disturbance feedback parametrization. The resulting SLS-based MPC yields robust constraint satisfaction and provides stability. In this paper, we address the main bottleneck of SLS: the computation times. The proposed algorithm iteratively optimizes the nominal trajectory and then the controller. The nominal trajectory optimization is solved via an efficient QP solver and controller optimizations are solved via Riccati recursions. Each iterate scales with  $\mathcal{O}(N^2(n_{\rm x}^3 + n_{\rm u}^3))$ . Leveraging results from Messerer and Diehl (2021), the proposed algorithm locally converges qlinearly to an optimal solution. In a numerical comparison, the proposed algorithm offers speed ups of up to  $10^3$  compared to general-purpose commercial solvers. We expect that the proposed algorithm can be adapted to address variations of SLS, particularly those involving sparsity, structural constraints (Tseng et al., 2020) or polytopic disturbances and parameters (Chen et al., 2024).

#### REFERENCES

- Alonso, C.A. and Tseng, S.H. (2022). Effective GPU parallelization of distributed and localized model predictive control. In Proc. 17th International Conference on Control & Automation (ICCA), 199–206. IEEE.
- Anderson, J., Doyle, J.C., Low, S.H., and Matni, N. (2019). System level synthesis. Annual Reviews in Control, 47, 364–393.
- Andersson, J.A.E., Gillis, J., Horn, G., Rawlings, J.B., and Diehl, M. (2019). CasADi – A software framework for nonlinear optimization and optimal control. Mathematical Programming Computation, 11(1), 1–36.
- ApS, M. (2019). The MOSEK optimization toolbox for MATLAB manual. Version 9.0. URL http://docs. mosek.com/9.0/toolbox/index.html.
- Ben-Tal, A., Goryashko, A., Guslitzer, E., and Nemirovski, A. (2004). Adjustable robust solutions of uncertain linear programs. Mathematical programming, 99(2), 351–376.
- Bock, H.G., Diehl, M., Kostina, E., and Schlöder, J.P. (2007). Constrained optimal feedback control of systems governed by large differential algebraic equations. In Real-Time PDE-constrained optimization, 3–24. SIAM.
- Chen, S., Preciado, V.M., Morari, M., and Matni, N. (2024). Robust model predictive control with polytopic model uncertainty through system level synthesis. Automatica, 162, 111431.
- Domahidi, A., Zgraggen, A.U., Zeilinger, M.N., Morari, M., and Jones, C.N. (2012). Efficient interior point

methods for multistage problems arising in receding horizon control. In Proc. 51st IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), 668–674. IEEE.

- Frison, G. (2016). Algorithms and methods for highperformance model predictive control. Ph.D. thesis, Technical University of Denmark.
- Frison, G. and Diehl, M. (2020). HPIPM: a highperformance quadratic programming framework for model predictive control. IFAC-PapersOnLine, 53(2), 6563–6569.
- Giftthaler, M., Neunert, M., Stäuble, M., Buchli, J., and Diehl, M. (2018). A family of iterative gauss-newton shooting methods for nonlinear optimal control. In Proc. International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS), 1–9. IEEE.
- Goulart, P.J., Kerrigan, E.C., and Maciejowski, J.M. (2006). Optimization over state feedback policies for robust control with constraints. Automatica, 42(4), 523– 533.
- Goulart, P.J., Kerrigan, E.C., and Ralph, D. (2008). Efficient robust optimization for robust control with constraints. Mathematical Programming, 114(1), 115–147.
- Goulart, P.J. (2007). Affine feedback policies for robust control with constraints. Ph.D. thesis, University of Cambridge.
- Gurobi Optimization (2023). Gurobi Optimizer Reference Manual. URL https://www.gurobi.com.
- Herold, T., Berkel, F., Trachte, A., and Specker, T. (2022). A computationally efficient system level parametrization for robust model predictive control. In Proc. European Control Conference (ECC), 826–832. IEEE.
- Houska, B. (2011). Robust optimization of dynamic systems. Ph.D. thesis, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven.
- Howell, T.A., Jackson, B.E., and Manchester, Z. (2019). Altro: A fast solver for constrained trajectory optimization. In Proc. International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS), 7674–7679. IEEE.
- Kim, T., Elango, P., and Açıkmeşe, B. (2024). Joint synthesis of trajectory and controlled invariant funnel for discrete-time systems with locally lipschitz nonlinearities. International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control.
- Köhler, J., Soloperto, R., Müller, M.A., and Allgöwer, F. (2020). A computationally efficient robust model predictive control framework for uncertain nonlinear systems. IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr., 66(2), 794–801.
- Kouzoupis, D., Frison, G., Zanelli, A., and Diehl, M. (2018). Recent advances in quadratic programming algorithms for nonlinear model predictive control. Vietnam Journal of Mathematics, 46(4), 863–882.
- Leeman, A.P., Köhler, J., Zanelli, A., Bennani, S., and Zeilinger, M.N. (2023a). Robust nonlinear optimal control via system level synthesis. arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.04943.
- Leeman, A.P., Sieber, J., Bennani, S., and Zeilinger, M.N. (2023b). Robust optimal control for nonlinear systems with parametric uncertainties via system level synthesis. In Proc. 62nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), 4784–4791. IEEE.
- Li, W. and Todorov, E. (2004). Iterative linear quadratic regulator design for nonlinear biological movement systems. In Proc. First International Conference on Informatics in Control, Automation and Robotics, volume 2,

222–229. SciTePress.

- Li, Z., Hu, C., Zhao, W., and Liu, C. (2023). Learning predictive safety filter via decomposition of robust invariant set. arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.06769.
- Löfberg, J.  $(2004)$ . YALMIP : A toolbox for modeling and optimization in matlab. In Proc. of the CACSD Conference. Taipei, Taiwan.
- Majumdar, A. and Tedrake, R. (2017). Funnel libraries for real-time robust feedback motion planning. The Int. Journal of Robotics Research, 36(8), 947–982.
- Manchester, Z. and Kuindersma, S. (2017). DIRTREL: Robust trajectory optimization with ellipsoidal disturbances and LQR feedback. In Proc. Robotics: Science and Systems (RSS), Cambridge.
- Mayne, D.Q., Seron, M.M., and Raković, S. (2005). Robust model predictive control of constrained linear systems with bounded disturbances. Automatica, 41(2), 219– 224.
- Messerer, F., Baumgärtner, K., and Diehl, M. (2021). Survey of sequential convex programming and generalized gauss-newton methods. ESAIM: Proceedings and Surveys, 71, 64–88.
- Messerer, F. and Diehl, M. (2021). An efficient algorithm for tube-based robust nonlinear optimal control with optimal linear feedback. In Proc. 60th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), 6714–6721. IEEE.
- Neunert, M., De Crousaz, C., Furrer, F., Kamel, M., Farshidian, F., Siegwart, R., and Buchli, J. (2016). Fast nonlinear model predictive control for unified trajectory optimization and tracking. In Proc. International conference on robotics and automation (ICRA), 1398–1404. IEEE.
- Rao, C.V., Wright, S.J., and Rawlings, J.B. (1998). Application of interior-point methods to model predictive control. Journal of optimization theory and applications, 99, 723–757.
- Rawlings, J.B., Mayne, D.Q., and Diehl, M. (2017). Model predictive control: theory, computation, and design, volume 2. Nob Hill Publishing Madison, WI.
- Schulman, J., Duan, Y., Ho, J., Lee, A., Awwal, I., Bradlow, H., Pan, J., Patil, S., Goldberg, K., and Abbeel, P. (2014). Motion planning with sequential convex optimization and convex collision checking. The International Journal of Robotics Research, 33(9), 1251– 1270.
- Scokaert, P. and Mayne, D. (1998). Min-max feedback model predictive control for constrained linear systems. IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr., 43(8), 1136–1142.
- Sieber, J., Bennani, S., and Zeilinger, M.N. (2021). A system level approach to tube-based model predictive control. IEEE Control Systems Letters, 6, 776–781.
- Sieber, J., Zanelli, A., Leeman, A.P., Bennani, S., and Zeilinger, M.N. (2023). Asynchronous computation of tube-based model predictive control. IFAC-PapersOnLine, 56(2), 8432–8438.
- Singh, S., Slotine, J.J., and Sindhwani, V. (2022). Optimizing trajectories with closed-loop dynamic sqp. In Proc. International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA), 5249–5254. IEEE.
- Steinbach, M. (1995). Fast recursive SQP methods for large-scale optimal control problems. Ph.D. thesis, Universität Heidelberg.
- Stellato, B., Banjac, G., Goulart, P., Bemporad, A., and Boyd, S. (2020). OSQP: an operator splitting solver for quadratic programs. Mathematical Programming Computation, 12(4), 637–672.
- Tran-Dinh, Q. and Diehl, M. (2010). Local convergence of sequential convex programming for nonconvex optimization. In Recent Advances in Optimization and its Applications in Engineering: The 14th Belgian-French-German Conference on Optimization, 93–102. Springer.
- Tseng, S.H., Alonso, C.A., and Han, S. (2020). System level synthesis via dynamic programming. In Proc. 59th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), 1718–1725. IEEE.
- Villanueva, M.E., Quirynen, R., Diehl, M., Chachuat, B., and Houska, B. (2017). Robust MPC via min–max differential inequalities. Automatica, 77, 311–321.
- Wright, S., Nocedal, J., et al. (1999). Numerical optimization. Springer Science.
- Zanelli, A., Frey, J., Messerer, F., and Diehl, M. (2021). Zero-order robust nonlinear model predictive control with ellipsoidal uncertainty sets. IFAC-PapersOnLine, 54(6), 50–57.

## Appendix A. NONLINEAR EXTENSION

In the following, we show how the efficient solution to the SOCP (7) can be extended to address nonlinear systems. Based on (Leeman et al., 2023a,b), we address robust control of nonlinear systems using the following nonlinear program

$$
\min_{\substack{\mathbf{\Phi}_{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{\Phi}_{\mathbf{u}},\\ \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}, \tau}} J(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}) + \tilde{H}_0(\mathbf{\Phi}),\tag{A.1a}
$$

s.t. 
$$
z_{k+1} = \phi(z_k, v_k), z_0 = \bar{x}_0, k = 0, ..., N - 1,
$$
  
(A.1b)  

$$
\mathbf{\Phi}_{k+1,j}^{\mathbf{x}} = \nabla_z \phi(z_k, v_k)^{\top} \mathbf{\Phi}_{k,j}^{\mathbf{x}} + \nabla_v \phi(z_k, v_k)^{\top} \mathbf{\Phi}_{k,j}^{\mathbf{u}},
$$

$$
\Phi_{j+1,j}^{x} = \alpha_1^{-1} E_j + \alpha_2^{-1} \sqrt{n_x} \mu \tau_j^2, \tag{A.1c}
$$

$$
j = 0, ..., N - 1, k = j + 1, ..., N - 1,
$$
  
\n
$$
\sum_{k=1}^{k-1} ||e_{k}^{\top} \Phi_{k,i}||_{2} - \tau_{k} < 0.
$$
 (A.1e)

$$
\sum_{j=0} \left\| e_i^\top \mathbf{\Phi}_{k,j} \right\|_2 - \tau_k \le 0,
$$
\n(A.1e)

$$
\begin{aligned}\ni &= 1, \dots, n_{\mathbf{x}} + n_{\mathbf{u}}, k = 0, \dots, N - 1, \\
&\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left\| g_{k,i}^{\top} \Phi_{k,j} \right\|_{2} + g_{k,i}^{\top} \left( z_{k}, v_{k} \right) + b_{k,i} \leq 0, \qquad \text{(A.1f)}\n\end{aligned}
$$

$$
i = 1, ..., n_c, \ k = 0, ..., N - 1,
$$
  
\n
$$
\sum_{j=0}^{N-1} ||g_{\mathbf{f},i}^{\top} \mathbf{\Phi}_{N,j}^{\mathbf{x}}||_2 + g_{\mathbf{f},i}^{\top} z_N + b_{\mathbf{f},i} \le 0,
$$
  
\n
$$
i = 1, ..., n_{\mathbf{f}},
$$
\n(A.1g)

where  $\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}^N$  and  $e_i^{\top}$  is the *i*<sup>th</sup> row of the identity matrix  $I_{n_x+n_u}$ . The function  $\phi$ :  $\mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \to \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$  is assumed to be three times continuously differentiable and is used to define the dynamics (A.1b), and the disturbance propagation (A.1c). In (A.1d) the effect of the additive disturbance  $w_k$  and the linearization error based on the worstcase curvature  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_x}$  of  $\phi$  is lumped, see (Leeman et al., 2023a). Here,  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \geq 0$  is used to over-approximate the sum of ellipsoids (Houska, 2011, Thm 2.4) with  $\alpha_1$  +  $\alpha_2 \leq 1$ . The constraints (A.1e) are used to optimize the dynamic linearization error over-bound  $\tau_k$ , while still jointly optimizing the nonlinear nominal trajectory, and feedback controller, such that robust constraint satisfaction is guaranteed for the nonlinear dynamics using (A.1f), and  $(A.1g)$ .

We write the optimization problem (A.1) compactly as

$$
\min_{y,\Phi,\beta} J(y) + \tilde{H}_0(\Phi), \tag{A.2a}
$$

s.t. 
$$
f_{n1}(y) = 0,
$$
 (A.2b)

$$
D_{\rm nl}(y, \Phi) = 0,\tag{A.2c}
$$

$$
\tilde{h}(y) + h^{\text{ct}}(\beta) \le 0,\tag{A.2d}
$$

$$
\tilde{H}(\Phi) - \beta = 0, \tag{A.2e}
$$

where  $y := (\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\tau})$  collects all the nominal trajectory variables, including  $\tau$ . The constraint (A.2b) corresponds to the nominal trajectory (A.1b). The disturbance propagation  $D_{\text{nl}}(y, \boldsymbol{\Phi})$  in  $(A.2c)$  is linear in  $\Phi$ , and  $(A.2d)$ ,  $(A.2e)$  lump all the inequality constraints  $(A.1e)$ ,  $(A.1f)$ , and  $(A.1g)$ .



After substituting (A.2c) in (A.2e), similarly as in the linear case Section 3.1, we obtain an equivalent optimization problem

$$
\min_{y,M,\beta} \quad J(y) + H_0(M),\tag{A.3a}
$$

s.t. 
$$
f_{nl}(y) = 0,
$$
 (A.3b)

$$
\tilde{h}(y) + h^{\text{ct}}(\beta) \le 0,\tag{A.3c}
$$

$$
H(M, y) - \beta \le 0. \tag{A.3d}
$$

In (A.3d), we replaced the equality constraint  $H(M, y)$  –  $\beta \leq 0$  by an *inequality*, which is convex in M. Likewise, the inequality (A.3c) can be losslessly convexified using auxiliary variables. These modifications do not alter the optimal solution y and M of (A.3), as the tightenings  $\beta$ do not appear in the cost (A.3a). Applying a standard SCP approach (Tran-Dinh and Diehl, 2010), we first linearize the nonconvex constraints in  $(A.3)$  at  $\bar{y}$ ,  $\bar{M}$ , yielding

$$
\min_{\Delta y, M, \beta} J(\bar{y} + \Delta y) + H_0(M) \tag{A.4a}
$$

$$
\text{s.t.} \quad f_{\text{nl}}(\bar{y}) + \nabla f_{\text{nl}}^{\top}(\bar{y}) \Delta y = 0, \tag{A.4b}
$$

$$
\tilde{h}(\bar{y} + \Delta y) + h^{\text{ct}}(\beta) \le 0,\tag{A.4c}
$$

$$
H(M, \bar{y}) + \Gamma \Delta y - \beta \le 0,
$$
 (A.4d)

with the gradient

$$
\Gamma := \nabla_y H(\bar{M}, \bar{y})^\top. \tag{A.5}
$$

*Remark A.1.* In the SOCP  $(A.4)$ , the constraints  $(A.4d)$ only include the linearization with respect to  $y$ , preserving the advantageous numerical structure of the optimization problem.

In the optimization problem (A.4), the term  $\Gamma \Delta y$  in (A.4d) prevents the direct use of Algorithm 1 to solve (A.4). Hence, to be able to use Algorithm 1, and leverage the structure we use a variation of SCP (Bock et al., 2007), where the constraint (A.4d) is approximated with

$$
H(M, \bar{y}) - \beta \le 0. \tag{A.6}
$$

Due to this inexact Jacobian approximation (Bock et al., 2007), a correction in the cost function (A.4a) is needed to maintain convergence properties of the SCP scheme. In particular, we iteratively solve a series of optimization problems, equivalent to the SOCP (7):

$$
\min_{\Delta y, M, \beta} \quad J(\bar{y} + \Delta y) + H_0(M) + \Gamma \bar{\eta} \Delta y,\tag{A.7a}
$$

$$
\text{s.t.} \quad f_{\text{nl}}(\bar{y}) + \nabla f_{\text{nl}}(\bar{y})^{\top} \Delta y = 0,\tag{A.7b}
$$

$$
\tilde{h}(\bar{y} + \Delta y) + h^{\text{ct}}(\beta) \le 0,\tag{A.7c}
$$

$$
H(M, \bar{y}) - \beta \le 0,\tag{A.7d}
$$

and iteratively update the optimal nominal trajectory  $\bar{y}$ and the optimal dual variable  $\bar{\eta}$  associated to (A.7). Using this approximation, each SOCP iterate (A.7) has the same structure as (14), and, hence, can be efficiently solved using the proposed algorithm, described in Section 3. Indeed, the

inequality in (A.7d) can be replaced by an equality without changing the optimal solution in  $\Delta y$  and M. Algorithm 2 summarizes the steps previously outlined.

Under some standard regularity conditions, the SCP based on (A.7) converges to a KKT point (Messerer et al., 2021) of the original optimization problem (A.1). In particular, the optimization problems  $(A.7)$  and  $(A.4)$  have the same stationarity conditions.