

Data-Based Control of Continuous-Time Linear Systems with Performance Specifications [★]

Victor G. Lopez, Matthias A. Mueller

Leibniz University Hannover, Institute of Automatic Control, 30167 Hannover, Germany

Abstract

The design of direct data-based controllers has become a fundamental part of control theory research in the last few years. In this paper, we consider three classes of data-based state feedback control problems for linear systems. These control problems are such that, besides stabilization, some additional performance requirements must be satisfied. First, we formulate and solve a trajectory-reference control problem, on which desired closed-loop trajectories are known and a controller that allows the system to closely follow those trajectories is computed. Then, in the area of data-based optimal control, we solve two different problems: the inverse problem of optimal control, and the solution of the LQR problem for continuous-time systems. Finally, we consider the case in which the precise position of the desired poles of the closed-loop system is known, and introduce a data-based variant of a robust pole-placement procedure. Although we focus on continuous-time systems, all of the presented methods can also be easily formulated for the discrete-time case. The applicability of the proposed methods is tested using numerical simulations.

Key words: Data-based control, continuous-time systems, linear matrix inequalities, pole placement, optimal control.

1 Introduction

Designing stabilizing controllers directly from measured data, without resorting to an explicit model identification procedure, has been the focus of plenty of the research in control theory in recent years. In the case of discrete-time (DT) systems, the result known as Willems' fundamental lemma [33] has been the basis of much of the recent progress in this field. For an overview of many of these developments, the reader is referred to the survey in [23] and the references therein. Partly inspired by these results in discrete-time, some recent works have addressed the control design for continuous-time (CT) systems, as in [2,4,24,14,27]. The main goal of many of these works is to determine stabilizing controllers, without concerns about other closed-loop system characteristics. However, some results have been obtained for data-based control with performance specifications. In the following, we describe three classes of such controllers in the literature. These classes are optimal control, pole placement, and model-reference

control. We focus the discussion on works that aim to determine a state feedback gain, and omit other classes of data-based controllers with performance guarantees as, for example, predictive control [11,1].

In [12], the first data-based methods for computing state feedback gains based on Willems' lemma were proposed. These methods rely on solving a set of linear matrix inequalities (LMIs). Besides obtaining stabilizing controllers, the authors also show how to obtain optimal controllers by solving the discrete-time linear quadratic regulator (LQR) problem using only persistently excited data. Other data-based solutions of the discrete-time LQR problem using LMIs have been studied in [30,13]. Besides LQR, the data-based H_2 optimization problem has been studied for discrete-time [31] and continuous-time [27] systems. Different from the use of LMIs, methods based on reinforcement learning have also been used to determine optimal controllers without knowledge of the system model. In particular, reinforcement learning algorithms have been used to solve the LQR and the H_∞ problems for discrete-time [7,19,18] and continuous-time systems [17,21,25].

Pole placement is a different control design method for linear systems that allows to specify a desired closed-loop performance. Already in [30], a particular case of data-based pole placement was described during the de-

[★] This paper was not presented at any IFAC meeting. Corresponding author V. G. Lopez. Tel. +49 511 762 5189.

Email addresses: lopez@irt.uni-hannover.de (Victor G. Lopez), mueeller@irt.uni-hannover.de (Matthias A. Mueller).

sign of a deadbeat controller. A more general data-based pole placement algorithm was presented in [3]. Although model-based pole placement methods with robustness properties against model uncertainties are known (see, e.g., [29,32]), they were not exploited in the data-based context [3]. A data-based method to locate the poles of the system with robustness against noisy data was studied in [5]. However, [5] does not study the problem of *exact* pole placement. Instead, the authors consider the related problem where the precise positions of the closed-loop poles are not specified, but instead LMIs are used to define desired regions of the complex space for such poles. A model-free method for exact pole placement with robustness properties has not yet been reported.

In model-reference control problems, the objective is to determine a feedback controller such that the closed-loop system emulates as closely as possible the behavior of a desired reference model. An example of a direct data-based model-reference method is *virtual reference feedback tuning* [10]. A disadvantage of this method is that the designer requires to select a suitable set of transfer functions in order to obtain an appropriate controller. Recently, a different approach was followed in [8], where LMIs are leveraged to solve the discrete-time model-reference control problem in state space.

In this paper, we formulate and solve three different classes of data-based control problems for CT systems with performance specifications. For the first problem, we introduce a *trajectory-reference* controller. Here it is assumed that, instead of a reference model, only data about desired closed-loop state trajectories are available. This is the case, for example, when state data from an expert system is available (e.g., a human driving a vehicle [16]), and a controller must be designed for an autonomous system to imitate such behavior. Although the trajectory-reference problem is related to the model-reference problem, the former can be solved directly when only data about the desired trajectories are known. The second class of considered controllers is optimal control, where two different problems are solved. On the one hand, we solve the data-based *inverse problem of optimal control* [6, Section 10.6]. In this case, a known feedback matrix is given and the objective is to determine a quadratic cost function that is close to being minimized by such feedback gain. On the other hand, the continuous-time LQR problem is solved in a data-based fashion. Finally, for the third class of controllers, we present a robust exact pole placement algorithm that corresponds to a data-based version of the method described in [29].

The proposed solutions to these problems are based on the use of the data-based system representation of CT systems presented in [20], where a continuous-time version of Willem's lemma was introduced. This result is used to design stabilizing and optimal controllers in the same spirit as it was done using the original DT Willem's

lemma.

The contributions of this paper are the following. First, we present a set of data-based conditions for stability of CT systems and establish the connection between these conditions and the data-based system representation in [20]. We also show that the obtained conditions recover various known stability results in the literature. Then, using the developed control framework, we formulate and solve the continuous-time data-based control problems described above. To the best of our knowledge, the data-based formulations of the trajectory-reference problem and the inverse problem of optimal control are novel in the data-based control literature. The solution of the data-based LQR problem has been presented for DT systems, but not for the CT case. The proposed robust pole placement algorithm is a solution to the exact pole placement problem (unlike [5]) that provides robustness properties against noisy measurements (unlike [3]).

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents useful definitions to be used throughout the paper. In Section 3, conditions for stabilization of continuous-time systems are obtained and compared to those in the existing literature. The trajectory-reference control problem is described and solved in Section 4. Data-based optimal control for CT systems is studied in Section 5. Section 6 presents the solution to the data-based robust pole placement problem. Section 7 presents numerical examples of the proposed controllers, and Section 8 concludes the paper.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we define the notation and introduce the concepts that will be used in the remainder of the paper.

2.1 Notation

The notation $P \succ 0$ denotes that P is a symmetric, positive definite matrix. The Frobenius norm of a matrix M is written as $\|M\|_F$. For any matrix M , the notation $M_{(a:b)}$, for $a, b > 0$, denotes the submatrix composed with the rows a to b of M . The notation $\text{diag}\{M_i\}_{i=1}^q$ represents a block-diagonal matrix with the block elements M_i , $i = 1, \dots, q$, on the diagonal. Similarly, $M = \text{row}\{M_i\}_{i=1}^q$ denotes the block-row matrix defined by the horizontal concatenation of the submatrices M_i , i.e., $M := [M_1 \cdots M_q]$.

The following definition will be of particular use in Section 6. Consider a matrix $M = \text{row}\{M_i\}_{i=1}^q$ defined such that, if the block element M_i is complex, then its complex conjugate M_i^* is also a block element of M . The matrix $\text{Re}(M)$ is then defined as a matrix with the same

dimensions as M , but with each pair of complex conjugate blocks M_i and M_i^* replaced by the real matrices $(1/2)(M_i + M_i^*)$ and $(1/2j)(M_i - M_i^*)$, respectively.

2.2 Persistence of excitation for continuous-time systems

The developments of this paper focus on continuous-time linear time-invariant (LTI) systems of the form

$$\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Bu(t), \quad (1)$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are the state and input vectors of the system, respectively. The pair (A, B) is assumed to be unknown but controllable throughout the paper.

The nominal system (1) is used to obtain the exact data-based system representation introduced in [20], and to analyze the conditions for stability of CT systems. However, for control purposes it is useful to consider the disturbed system

$$\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Bu(t) + w(t), \quad (2)$$

where $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the disturbance term.

Following the procedure described in [20], we consider continuous-time data measured from (1) and use it to define time-varying matrices that will be used in the next subsection to span system trajectories. Consider the integer $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and a positive scalar $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Let $\xi : [0, NT] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\sigma$, with $[0, NT] \subset \mathbb{R}$, denote a continuous-time signal of length NT . Using the trajectory ξ , the following time-varying matrix is defined

$$\mathcal{H}_T(\xi(t)) := \begin{bmatrix} \xi(t) & \xi(t+T) & \cdots & \xi(t+(N-1)T) \end{bmatrix} \quad (3)$$

for $0 \leq t \leq T$. At each time instant t , $\mathcal{H}_T(\xi(t))$ resembles a Hankel matrix of depth 1 for a signal sampled every T time units. Notice that $\mathcal{H}_T(\xi(t))$ is only defined on the interval $0 \leq t \leq T$, since the available signal $\xi(t)$ has finite length.

For given values of $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$, let the input signal $u : [0, NT] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ be applied to system (1), and let the resulting state signal $x : [0, NT] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be measured. Moreover, throughout this paper we assume that the state derivative information $\dot{x} : [0, NT] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is also available. This is a common assumption in the literature for data-based analysis and control of continuous-time systems [2,4,24,14]. This derivative information can be either measured or estimated using the available state data. As it is suggested in [26, Appendix A] and [21], also in the present work the need for derivative information can be replaced by a data integration procedure. For simplicity, throughout the paper we assume the availability of the signal \dot{x} .

The data sets available from system (1) are, thus, arranged in the time-varying matrices $\mathcal{H}_T(u(t))$, $\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))$ and $\mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t))$, defined as in (3). Notice that, from (1) and (3), it holds that

$$\mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t)) = A\mathcal{H}_T(x(t)) + B\mathcal{H}_T(u(t)). \quad (4)$$

As in the discrete-time case, the design of stabilizing controllers using these matrices is only possible if the data are informative enough. A sufficient condition for the data to be highly informative is known to be persistence of excitation [33]. In [20], a definition of persistence of excitation for continuous-time systems that will be useful for our subsequent operations was proposed.

Definition 1 ([20]) *The data $u : [0, NT] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, $x : [0, NT] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$, measured from system (1) is said to be persistently excited of order $n + 1$ if*

$$\text{rank} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_T(u(t)) \\ \mathcal{H}_T(x(t)) \end{bmatrix} \right) = m + n \quad (5)$$

for all $0 \leq t \leq T$.

Notice that, in [20], a more general version of Definition 1 is presented, where persistence of excitation can be of higher order than $n + 1$. Here, we consider only persistence of excitation of order $n + 1$ because this is the only order of excitation used throughout the paper. This allows us to simplify our notation.

A persistently exciting (PE) input for continuous-time systems is an input signal that guarantees the satisfaction of the condition (5) in Definition 1. The following definition introduces a class of such input signals.

Definition 2 (Piecewise constant PE input)

Consider a time interval $T > 0$ such that

$$T \neq \frac{2\pi k}{|\mathcal{I}_m(\lambda_i - \lambda_j)|}, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (6)$$

where λ_i and λ_j are any two eigenvalues of matrix A in (1), and $\mathcal{I}_m(\cdot)$ is the imaginary part of a complex number. A piecewise constant persistently exciting (PCPE) input of order L for continuous-time systems is defined as $u(t + iT) = \mu_i$ for all $0 \leq t < T$, $i = 0, \dots, N-1$, where the sequence of constant vectors $\{\mu_i\}_{i=0}^{N-1}$, $\mu_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$, is such that

$$\text{rank} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \mu_0 & \mu_1 & \cdots & \mu_{N-L} \\ \mu_1 & \mu_2 & \cdots & \mu_{N-L+1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mu_{L-1} & \mu_L & \cdots & \mu_{N-1} \end{bmatrix} \right) = mL.$$

Notice that condition (6) imposes restrictions on the possible values of the time interval T . Although the expression (6) uses model knowledge in the form of the eigenvalues of matrix A , it can be observed that almost any value of T satisfies this requirement. The values of T that do not satisfy (6) form a set of measure zero and, therefore, an arbitrary selection of T is almost surely useful for Definition 2.

Remark 3 *If a piecewise constant input as in Definition 2 is used to excite the system, then the matrix $\mathcal{H}_T(u(t))$ as in (3) is constant in t . Throughout this paper we assume that this is the case and, therefore, we denote this matrix simply as*

$$\mathcal{H}_T(u) := \mathcal{H}_T(u(t)).$$

The following lemma shows that the data collected from system (1) after the application of a PCPE input satisfies the excitation condition of Definition 1.

Lemma 4 ([20]) *Consider system (1), let the pair (A, B) be controllable, and let u be a PCPE input of order $n + 1$ as defined in Definition 2. Then, (5) holds for all $0 \leq t \leq T$.*

The following subsection summarizes the result for data-based system representation of continuous-time systems that leverages the property (5) of persistently excited data.

2.3 A continuous-time version of Willems' lemma

Willem's fundamental lemma allows to represent every possible input-output trajectory of a discrete-time LTI system using the measurements of a single PE trajectory [33]. In [20], a continuous-time version of Willems' lemma was introduced. Lemma 5 and Theorem 6 below describe this result as it will be used in the remainder of this paper.

Lemma 5 ([20]) *Consider a system (1) such that the pair (A, B) is controllable. Let $u : [0, NT] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, $T > 0$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, be a PCPE input of order $n + 1$, and let $x : [0, NT] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, be the corresponding state of (1). Moreover, consider an arbitrary continuously differentiable signal $\bar{u} : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ and let $\bar{x}(0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be an arbitrary vector. Then, there exists a solution $\alpha(t)$ of the differential equation with initial condition constraint*

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_T(u) \\ \mathcal{H}_T(x(t)) \end{bmatrix} \dot{\alpha}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{\bar{u}}(t) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_T(u) \\ \mathcal{H}_T(x(0)) \end{bmatrix} \alpha(0) = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{u}(0) \\ \bar{x}(0) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

for $0 \leq t \leq T$.

Theorem 6 ([20]) *Let the conditions in Lemma 5 hold, where $u : [0, NT] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is a PCPE input of order $n + 1$, and $x : [0, NT] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and $y : [0, NT] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ are the corresponding state and output of system (1), respectively. Then, any signals $\bar{u} : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, $\bar{y} : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$, where \bar{u} is continuously differentiable, are an input-output trajectory of (1) corresponding to some initial condition $\bar{x}(0)$ if and only if there exists a continuously differentiable vector $\alpha(t)$ such that the equations (7), (8) and*

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_T(u) \\ \mathcal{H}_T(y(t)) \end{bmatrix} \alpha(t) = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{u}(t) \\ \bar{y}(t) \end{bmatrix} \quad (9)$$

hold for $0 \leq t \leq T$.

Theorem 1 states that any input/output trajectory \bar{u} , \bar{y} of system (1) can be represented via (9) using one persistently excited data trajectory u , y collected from the system.

Here, we have presented Lemma 5 and Theorem 6 for the particular case in which a piecewise constant PE input u is applied to the system. Notice that the results presented in [20] allow for the application of more general PE inputs, as long as the conditions in Definition 1 are satisfied. On the other hand, note that the input trajectory \bar{u} that can be represented via (9) can be an arbitrary continuously differentiable signal and need not be piecewise constant.

In this paper, we are concerned with the design of state-feedback controllers. Therefore, we will use the data-based system representation (9) for the case of $y(t) = x(t)$. That is,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_T(u) \\ \mathcal{H}_T(x(t)) \end{bmatrix} \alpha(t) = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{u}(t) \\ \bar{x}(t) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (10)$$

In the following section, the results in Lemma 5 and Theorem 6 are used to analyze the conditions for a feedback gain matrix K to be stabilizing for system (1).

3 Conditions for stabilizing control of continuous-time systems

The goal of this section is to provide a framework that allows for state feedback design using the data-based system representation (7), (8), (10). The developments shown here will then be exploited in Sections 4-6 to develop solutions to the data-based control problems discussed in the Introduction. In the following, we first state a theorem that, given a matrix K , provides conditions for stability of the resulting closed-loop system. We then show how this result recovers the known stability conditions that were obtained in [12], [30] and [14].

Theorem 7 Consider the system (1) and let the pair (A, B) be controllable. Let $u : [0, NT] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, $T > 0$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, be a PCPE input of order $n + 1$, and let $x : [0, NT] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be the corresponding state of (1). Given a matrix $K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and a fixed time¹ $t \in [0, T]$, let the matrix $\Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n}$ be such that

$$\left(\mathcal{H}_T(u) + K\mathcal{H}_T(x(t)) \right) \Gamma = 0, \quad (11)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))\Gamma \text{ is nonsingular.} \quad (12)$$

The state feedback gain matrix K is stabilizing if and only if

$$\mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t))\Gamma \left(\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))\Gamma \right)^{-1} \text{ is Hurwitz.} \quad (13)$$

PROOF. The proof is obtained by noticing that the conditions in Theorem 6 hold and, therefore, we can make use of the equations (7), (8) and (10). Consider an arbitrary state of system (1) at some time t , denoted for convenience as $\bar{x}_1(t)$. Since the conditions of Theorem 6 hold, there exists a vector $\alpha_1(t) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ such that

$$\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))\alpha_1(t) = \bar{x}_1(t).$$

This is true for any arbitrary vector $\bar{x}_1(t)$ because, by persistence of excitation, the matrix $\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))$ has full row rank (compare (5)). Extending this expression to a set of n arbitrary vectors $\bar{x}_i(t)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, we can always determine vectors $\alpha_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_T(x(t)) [\alpha_1(t) \quad \alpha_2(t) \quad \cdots \quad \alpha_n(t)] \\ = [\bar{x}_1(t) \quad \bar{x}_2(t) \quad \cdots \quad \bar{x}_n(t)]. \end{aligned}$$

Rewriting this equation in matrix form, we get

$$\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))\Gamma(t) = X(t), \quad (14)$$

where

$$X(t) := [\bar{x}_1(t) \quad \bar{x}_2(t) \quad \cdots \quad \bar{x}_n(t)],$$

$$\Gamma(t) := [\alpha_1(t) \quad \alpha_2(t) \quad \cdots \quad \alpha_n(t)].$$

By (10), if the i th column of $X(t)$ is seen as the state of system (1) at time t , and the input $\bar{u}_i(t)$ is defined as $\bar{u}_i(t) = \mathcal{H}_T(u)\alpha_i(t)$, then the state derivative $\dot{\bar{x}}_i(t)$ as in (1) corresponds to the i th column of the matrix $\dot{X}(t)$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{X}(t) &= \mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t))\Gamma(t) + \mathcal{H}_T(x(t))\dot{\Gamma}(t) \\ &= \mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t))\Gamma(t), \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

¹ We use a *fixed* value of t in the sense that these conditions are not time-varying. If K is stabilizing and (5) holds, then for any value of t in the interval $[0, T]$ there is a Γ that satisfies these conditions.

where the second equality holds from the fact that ² $\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))\dot{\Gamma}(t) = 0$ by (7). Since the time t is fixed, in the following we omit the time argument in the variables $\alpha_i(t) =: \alpha_i$ and $\Gamma(t) =: \Gamma$.

Now, we wish to select each vector α_i such that the input \bar{u}_i is given by a feedback policy $\bar{u}_i = -K\bar{x}_i$. From the facts that $\bar{x}_i(t) = \mathcal{H}_T(x(t))\alpha_i$ and $\bar{u}_i(t) = \mathcal{H}_T(u)\alpha_i$ as in (10), this is achieved by selecting α_i such that $\mathcal{H}_T(u)\alpha_i = -K\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))\alpha_i$. Therefore, selecting the matrix Γ as in (11) implies that $\dot{X}(t)$ in (15) is given by

$$\dot{X}(t) = (A - BK)X(t).$$

Substituting (14) and (15) in this equation, we obtain

$$\mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t))\Gamma = (A - BK)\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))\Gamma. \quad (16)$$

Condition (12) implies that we can write

$$A - BK = \mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t))\Gamma \left(\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))\Gamma \right)^{-1}, \quad (17)$$

and K is stabilizing if and only if (13) holds.

Remark 8 Notice that (5) implies also that the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_T(u) + K\mathcal{H}_T(x(t)) \\ \mathcal{H}_T(x(t)) \end{bmatrix}$$

has full row rank for any $K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ and, therefore, by persistence of excitation it is always possible to determine a matrix Γ that satisfies (11)-(12).

In the existing literature, other data-based conditions for stability of linear systems have been described. In the following, we show that the conditions (11)-(13) in Theorem 7 are more general expressions that recover the existing results. The first set of data-based conditions for stability of CT systems were presented in [12, Remark 2]. Using our notation, these conditions are as follows³. The matrix K is stabilizing if, for a fixed $t \in [0, T]$, it can be written as

$$K = -\mathcal{H}_T(u)\Gamma(\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))\Gamma)^{-1}, \quad (18)$$

where the matrix $\Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times n}$ satisfies the LMIs

$$\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))\Gamma \succ 0, \quad (19)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t))\Gamma + \Gamma^\top \mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t))^\top \prec 0. \quad (20)$$

² Notice that, due to the conditions in the theorem, Lemma 5 applies and hence a solution $\dot{\Gamma}(t)$ that satisfies (7) always exists, regardless of the value of $\Gamma(t)$ in (14).

³ Different from [12], in this paper we use the negative feedback standard notation where $u = -Kx$. This results in sign differences in our notation.

Note that (11) together with (12) allows to express K as in (18). In (19), the selection of Γ is restricted to yield $\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))\Gamma = P$ for some $P \succ 0$, while in (12) we only require that $\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))\Gamma$ is nonsingular, but not necessarily positive definite. Finally, using $\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))\Gamma = P$, (20) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t))\Gamma \left(\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))\Gamma \right)^{-1} P \\ & + P \left(\Gamma^\top \mathcal{H}_T(x(t))^\top \right)^{-1} \Gamma^\top \mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t))^\top \prec 0 \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

which, using Lyapunov arguments, implies (13).

Other stability conditions in the literature can also be expressed as special cases of (11)-(13) if we constrain the matrix Γ to yield $\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))\Gamma = I$, where I is the identity matrix. In this case, the expressions (11)-(13) become

$$K = -\mathcal{H}_T(u)\Gamma, \quad (22)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))\Gamma = I, \quad (23)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t))\Gamma \text{ is Hurwitz}, \quad (24)$$

for some fixed $t \in [0, T]$. It can be observed that these expressions are analogous to the conditions for stability of discrete-time systems obtained in [30, Theorem 16], where Γ takes the role of a right inverse of $\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))$.

A final comparison of interest can be made with the results in [14], where informativity for stabilization of continuous-time systems was studied. There, the authors consider a system affected by disturbances as in (2), where the disturbance is assumed to satisfy the inequality

$$T\mathcal{H}_T(w(t))\mathcal{H}_T(w(t))^\top \preceq \bar{W}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad (25)$$

for some matrix $\bar{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $\bar{W} \succ 0$. The matrix $\mathcal{H}_T(w(t))$ is defined analogous to (3). A condition for stabilization of (2) was then presented as the existence of a scalar $\beta > 0$ and matrices $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $L \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ such that

$$P \succ 0, \quad K = -LP^{-1}, \quad (26)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} T \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t)) \\ -\mathcal{H}_T(x(t)) \\ -\mathcal{H}_T(u) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t)) \\ -\mathcal{H}_T(x(t)) \\ -\mathcal{H}_T(u) \end{bmatrix}^\top \\ - \begin{bmatrix} \bar{W} + \beta I & P & L \\ P & 0 & 0 \\ L & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

for a fixed $t \in [0, T]$. These stability conditions relate to

(11)-(13) if we let Γ satisfy

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_T(u) \\ \mathcal{H}_T(x(t)) \end{bmatrix} \Gamma = \begin{bmatrix} L \\ P \end{bmatrix} \quad (28)$$

for some $P \succ 0$. Then, (11) results in $L + KP = 0$, recovering (26). Finally, we have seen that the condition (13) and a proper selection of P imply that (21) holds, and therefore so does (20). Substituting (4) in (20) and rearranging terms results in

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} I \\ A^\top \\ B^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \Gamma^\top \mathcal{H}_T(x(t))^\top & \Gamma^\top \mathcal{H}_T(u)^\top \\ \mathcal{H}_T(x(t))\Gamma & 0 & 0 \\ \mathcal{H}_T(u)\Gamma & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ \times \begin{bmatrix} I \\ A^\top \\ B^\top \end{bmatrix} \prec 0. \end{aligned}$$

From this point, the same procedure as in [14] can be followed to obtain (27). Notice that the conditions (26)-(27) yield stabilizing matrices K if the data u, x, \dot{x} is informative for state-feedback stabilization. In this paper, we already consider the scenario in which persistently excited (and therefore informative) data is available.

Remark 9 Besides the relationships shown above between the conditions (11)-(13) and those in [12,30,14], it is important to highlight that the developments in the proof of Theorem 7 provide a novel meaning to the matrix Γ . In our approach, Γ is seen as a trajectory-generating matrix for system (1) as described by the equations (7), (8) and (10). This establishes a link between the stability conditions (11)-(13) and the data-based system representation in Lemma 5 and Theorem 6.

In the following sections, we exploit several of the expressions obtained in the proof of Theorem 2 to design stabilizing controllers with different performance requirements. In particular, apart from the conditions (11)-(13), the expressions in (16) and (17) will be especially useful.

4 Trajectory-reference control

The objective in the trajectory-reference problem is to use an available set of desired state trajectories to design a control policy that allows the system (1) to follow such trajectories as closely as possible. This problem is encountered, for example, when specific transient performances, from particular initial conditions, are desirable for the closed-loop system. Alternatively, in some applications the control designer has available trajectories generated by an expert system that provide a guide

for the desired behavior of system (1), for example in autonomous driving [16]. In this paper, we focus on the objective of stabilizing the system to the origin, such that the transient performance closely resembles the desired trajectories. This is formalized in the following problem statement.

Problem 10 Consider system (1), and let $\xi^i : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $i = 1, \dots, M$, be a set of $M \geq 1$ desired trajectories of length T . Moreover, let $\dot{\xi}^i : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $i = 1, \dots, M$, correspond to the known time derivatives of the desired trajectories ξ^i . For $0 \leq t \leq T$, define the matrices $\Xi(t), \dot{\Xi}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times M}$ as

$$\Xi(t) = [\xi^1(t) \quad \xi^2(t) \quad \dots \quad \xi^M(t)], \quad (29)$$

$$\dot{\Xi}(t) = [\dot{\xi}^1(t) \quad \dot{\xi}^2(t) \quad \dots \quad \dot{\xi}^M(t)]. \quad (30)$$

Using data measured from (1), determine a state feedback matrix K such that $A - BK$ is stable and, when $x(0) = \xi^i(0)$, then the difference $x(t) - \xi^i(t)$ is minimized for $0 \leq t \leq T$ and $i = 1, \dots, M$.

A solution to Problem 10 can be obtained by considering the data-based system representation in (10). Similarly as in (14), for every set of M trajectories of system (1) there exists a matrix $\Gamma(t)$, $0 \leq t \leq T$, such that

$$[\bar{x}^1(t) \quad \dots \quad \bar{x}^M(t)] =: X(t) = \mathcal{H}_T(x(t))\Gamma(t) \quad (31)$$

where, in order to generate a state feedback trajectory, $\Gamma(t)$ must satisfy $\mathcal{H}_T(u)\Gamma(t) = -KX(t)$, as well as the differential equation (7), that is

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_T(u) \\ \mathcal{H}_T(x(t)) \end{bmatrix} \dot{\Gamma}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} -K\dot{X}(t) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (32)$$

Thus, Problem 2 is solved if we determine a matrix $\Gamma(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times M}$ with these conditions and such that $X(t) \approx \Xi(t)$ for $0 \leq t \leq T$. Notice that, different from (14), here $X(t) = \mathcal{H}_T(x(t))\Gamma(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times M}$ is not necessarily a square matrix.

From these expressions, a *naive* optimization problem could be formulated as follows to solve Problem 10 (note that, in the benefit of clarity, we reserve the discussion about guaranteeing stability as required in Problem 10

for the end of this section).

$$\underset{\Gamma(t), K}{\text{minimize}} \quad \int_0^T \|\mathcal{H}_T(x(\tau))\Gamma(\tau) - \Xi(\tau)\|_F d\tau \quad (33a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \mathcal{H}_T(x(0))\Gamma(0) = \Xi(0), \quad (33b)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_T(u)\Gamma(0) = -\bar{K}\Xi(0), \quad (33c)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_T(u) \\ \mathcal{H}_T(x(t)) \end{bmatrix} \dot{\Gamma}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} -\bar{K}\mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t))\Gamma(t) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (33d)$$

for $0 \leq t \leq T$.

The constraints (33b) and (33c) set the initial conditions of the desired trajectories and the state feedback input, respectively. The cost (33a) then implies the minimization of the error between the desired trajectories $\Xi(t)$ and the system trajectories that evolve in time according to the differential equation (33d).

The following modifications are now performed to the problem (33) in order to construct a convex program applicable in practice. First, notice that we can avoid the need for the explicit use of the differential equation (33d) by using the fact that the equation $\mathcal{H}_T(u)\dot{\Gamma}(t) = -K\mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t))\Gamma(t)$ is satisfied for $0 \leq t \leq T$ if and only if $\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))\dot{\Gamma}(t) = 0$ and

$$\mathcal{H}_T(u)\Gamma(t) = -K\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))\Gamma(t) \quad (34)$$

hold for $0 \leq t \leq T$. This can be seen by taking the time derivative on both sides of (34).

In turn, the differential equation $\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))\dot{\Gamma}(t) = 0$ implies

$$\frac{d}{dt} (\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))\Gamma(t)) = \mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t))\Gamma(t).$$

Notice also that the desired objective $\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))\Gamma(t) = \Xi(t)$ implies $\frac{d}{dt} (\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))\Gamma(t)) = \dot{\Xi}(t)$. Thus, if the equations

$$\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))\Gamma(t) = \Xi(t), \quad (35)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t))\Gamma(t) = \dot{\Xi}(t) \quad (36)$$

hold for $0 \leq t \leq T$, then $\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))\dot{\Gamma}(t) = 0$ as desired.

Finally, although continuous signals are considered in Problem 10 for the desired trajectories, in practice only samples of such trajectories can be stored and manipulated in digital computers. Taking this into account, we can substitute the integral (33a) by a sum over the known samples of the desired trajectories. If there are available samples at times $\{t_0, t_1, \dots, t_{q-1}\}$, where $0 \leq t_i \leq T$ for $i = 0, \dots, q-1$, then using (34)-(36) we obtain the following optimization problem, which is an approxima-

tion of problem (33)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \underset{\Gamma(t_i), \bar{K}}{\text{minimize}} && \|\mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t_0))\Gamma(t_0) - \dot{\Xi}(t_0)\|_F && (37a) \\
& && + \sum_{i=1}^{q-1} \left(\|\mathcal{H}_T(x(t_i))\Gamma(t_i) - \Xi(t_i)\|_F \right. \\
& && + \|\mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t_i))\Gamma(t_i) - \dot{\Xi}(t_i)\|_F \\
& && \left. + \|\mathcal{H}_T(u)\Gamma(t_i) + \bar{K}\Xi(t_i)\|_F \right) \\
& \text{s.t.} && \mathcal{H}_T(x(t_0))\Gamma(t_0) = \Xi(t_0), && (37b) \\
& && \mathcal{H}_T(u)\Gamma(t_0) = -\bar{K}\Xi(t_0). && (37c)
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that (37) is a convex optimization problem. The hard constraints (37b)-(37c) imply that (34) and (35) hold for at least one time instant. By (5), the use of PE data guarantees that these constraints are feasible for any desired initial conditions $\Xi(t_0)$ and any value of \bar{K} . Hard constraints of the form $\mathcal{H}_T(u)\Gamma(t_i) = -\bar{K}\Xi(t_i)$ for $t_i > t_0$ cannot be used in the optimization problem (37) because, in general, we have that $\mathcal{H}_T(x(t_i))\Gamma(t_i) \neq \Xi(t_i)$ at these times. Thus, we include these terms as soft constraints in the cost function (37a). A similar reasoning leads us to consider the terms from (36) in the cost for all times t_i , $i = 0, \dots, q-1$. In the presence of noise in the measured data x , problem (37) remains feasible as long as (5) still holds for $t = t_0$. This occurs with probability 1 in the case of random noise, or when the magnitude of the noise is small enough such that it does not affect the rank property (5).

The following theorem states the circumstances under which the problem (37) yields a matrix \bar{K} that allows the system (1) to exactly reproduce the trajectories in $\Xi(t)$. Notice that one of these conditions is the availability of noise-free data.

Theorem 11 *Consider system (1) such that the pair (A, B) is controllable. Let $u : [0, NT] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, $T > 0$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, be a PCPE input of order $n+1$, and let $x : [0, NT] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, be the corresponding state of (1). Moreover, consider the desired trajectories in (29)-(30). If a matrix K exists such that*

$$\dot{\Xi}(t) = (A - BK)\Xi(t), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad (38)$$

then the solution \bar{K} of (37) satisfies (38) and the optimal cost (37a) equals zero.

PROOF. If a matrix K such that (38) holds exists, then the trajectories $\Xi(t)$ can be generated by the data-based system representation in Theorem 6. That is, there exists a $\Gamma(t)$ such that (34)-(36) hold for $0 \leq t \leq T$. Therefore, selecting the matrix \bar{K} in (37) as in (38) makes the cost (37a) equal to zero. Now, it remains to be shown that if the cost of (37) is zero, then the solution \bar{K} satisfies (38). This is obtained by noticing that a

zero cost implies $\mathcal{H}_T(u)\Gamma(t_i) = -\bar{K}\mathcal{H}_T(x(t_i))\Gamma(t_i)$ and, using similar arguments as in the proof of Theorem 7, $\mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t_i))\Gamma(t_i) = (A - B\bar{K})\mathcal{H}_T(x(t_i))\Gamma(t_i)$ is obtained (compare to (16)). Substituting $\mathcal{H}_T(x(t_i))\Gamma(t_i) = \Xi(t_i)$ and $\mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t_i))\Gamma(t_i) = \dot{\Xi}(t_i)$ in this expression yields $\dot{\Xi}(t) = (A - B\bar{K})\Xi(t)$, completing the proof.

Notice that, if T is large enough and $\Xi(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, then the matrix \bar{K} that minimizes (37) is likely to be stabilizing (unstable trajectories would greatly deviate from $\Xi(t)$ and be heavily penalized). This stabilizing property is, however, not yet guaranteed. Constraining the matrix \bar{K} in (37) to be stabilizing is a challenging task. One option is to use the stabilization conditions studied in Section 3 as constraints of the problem (37). However, these conditions require that $\mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t))\Gamma(t) \succ 0$ (see (19), (23) and (28)) which, in general, contrasts with the objective that $\mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t))\Gamma(t) = \dot{\Xi}(t)$. In Problem 10, we do not restrict $\Xi(t)$ to be a square, symmetric, positive definite matrix, and placing these conditions or transforming this matrix to achieve positive definiteness is undesirable.

Instead, constraining \bar{K} to be stabilizing can be achieved as a separate step after solving (37). Given a state feedback matrix \bar{K} that is potentially not stabilizing, we aim to determine a stabilizing matrix K of the same dimensions that renders the closed-loop matrix $A - BK$ as closely as possible to $A - B\bar{K}$. If \bar{K} was already stabilizing, we do not wish to modify it. This objective can be achieved by solving an additional optimization problem as follows.

Given the matrix \bar{K} and a fixed time instant $t \in [0, T]$, solve

$$\begin{aligned}
& \underset{G_1, G_2, P, L, \beta}{\text{minimize}} && \|\mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t))(G_1 - G_2)\|_F && (39a) \\
& \text{s.t.} && (27), && \\
& && P \succ 0, && (39b) \\
& && \mathcal{H}_T(x(t))G_1 = P, && (39c) \\
& && \mathcal{H}_T(u)G_1 = L, && (39d) \\
& && \mathcal{H}_T(x(t))G_2 = P, && (39e) \\
& && \mathcal{H}_T(u)G_2 = -\bar{K}P. && (39f)
\end{aligned}$$

Then, select the matrix K as $K = -LP^{-1}$. In problem (39), we make use of the stabilizing conditions (26)-(27), presented in [14], because this method allows to take into account noisy data collected from a disturbed system as in (2). Nevertheless, other stabilizing conditions (e.g., (18)-(20)) could have been used in a similar manner. The following theorem shows the properties of the solution K obtained from (39).

Theorem 12 *Consider system (2) with a controllable pair (A, B) and such that the noise $w : [0, NT] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$,*

$T > 0$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$ makes (25) hold. Let $u : [0, NT] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, $T > 0$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, be a PCPE input of order $n + 1$, and let $x : [0, NT] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, be the corresponding state of (2). Consider a matrix \bar{K} and a fixed time $t \in [0, T]$, and solve (39). The obtained matrix K is stabilizing and such that the difference $\|(A - BK)P - (A - B\bar{K})P\|_F$ is minimized. Moreover, if \bar{K} is stabilizing, then $K = \bar{K}$.

PROOF. The fact that K is stabilizing is due to the constraints (26) and (27) as is shown in [14]. The constraints (39c) and (39d) correspond to the condition (28) that links the matrices P and L to the data-based system representation in Theorem 6. Notice that, since $\bar{K} = -LP^{-1}$, then $L = -K\bar{K}P$ and we can write $\mathcal{H}_T(u)G_1 = L$ as

$$\mathcal{H}_T(u)G_1 = -KP = -K\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))G_1.$$

From the discussion in Section 3 (compare (11) and the proof of Theorem 7), this implies that (16) holds with Γ replaced by G_1 . By (39c), (16) can be rewritten as $\mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t))G_1 = (A - BK)P$.

The constraints (39e) and (39f) have the same structure as (39c) and (39d), except that the use of G_2 replaces K by \bar{K} . Therefore, we obtain $\mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t))G_2 = (A - B\bar{K})P$. This shows that the cost (39a) is equivalent to $\|(A - BK)P - (A - B\bar{K})P\|_F$ as claimed.

Finally, if \bar{K} is stabilizing, then it can always be written as $\bar{K} = -LP^{-1}$ for some L and P that satisfy the stability conditions (26)-(27) [14]. Thus, the optimal solution to (39) is such that $G_1 = G_2$, leading to $K = \bar{K}$.

The final proposed algorithm to solve Problem 10 corresponds to the following steps:

- (1) Determine \bar{K} by solving (37).
- (2) Using \bar{K} , solve the optimization problem (39).
- (3) Using P, L , compute the solution $K = LP^{-1}$.

Remark 13 In [8], the related problem of data-based model matching was solved for discrete-time systems. However, we have proposed a method that is applicable when, rather than a reference model, a data set about the desired trajectories is available. Using the data directly in the optimization problem (37) avoids the need of using it to first identify a suitable reference model. Hence, the proposed procedure is a direct data-driven method both for specifying the control objective and for the control design.

5 Data-based optimal control for CT systems

In this section, two different problems related to the linear quadratic regulator for continuous-time systems are

solved using measured data. In both cases, we consider the quadratic cost function

$$\int_0^\infty \left(x(t)^\top Q x(t) + u(t)^\top R u(t) \right) dt \quad (40)$$

with $Q \succeq 0$ and $R \succ 0$. In the following subsection, we solve the data-based LQR problem.

5.1 Data-based Solution of the continuous-time LQR problem

The data-based LQR problem for CT systems is formulated as follows

Problem 14 For every initial condition of the CT system (1), determine the control input u that minimizes the cost (40).

It is well known that a control input $u = -K^*x$ that minimizes (40) exists and is unique if the pair (A, B) is controllable and $(A, Q^{1/2})$ is detectable. For discrete-time systems, several solutions to the data-based LQR problem have been proposed (see, e.g., [12,30]). To the best of our knowledge, for continuous-time systems the only data-based solutions in the literature correspond to the iterative algorithms based on reinforcement learning methods [17,21]. In [21] it is shown that these methods have attractive features (see their computational complexity analysis), but numerical issues with the required solvers for systems with high dimensions were reported. Here, we show that an algorithm analogous to the one in [30] for DT systems can also be developed for the CT case, providing a method that does not require to solve the matrix equations in [21].

Thus, consider the cost function (40) and let $K^* = R^{-1}B^\top P^*$ correspond to the optimal LQR solution, where $P^* \succ 0$ solves the algebraic Riccati equation (ARE)

$$Q + P^*A + A^\top P^* - P^*BR^{-1}B^\top P^* = 0. \quad (41)$$

Thus, it follows that the matrices K^* and P^* satisfy

$$Q + K^{*\top}RK^* + P^*(A - BK^*) + (A - BK^*)^\top P^* = 0. \quad (42)$$

The following result is straightforwardly obtained.

Lemma 15 Consider system (1) and the cost function (40). The unique solution $P^* \succ 0$ of (41) is such that $P^* \succeq P$ for any matrix $P \succ 0$ that satisfies

$$Q + K^{*\top}RK^* + P(A - BK^*) + (A - BK^*)^\top P \succeq 0. \quad (43)$$

PROOF. From (42) and (43) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} P(A - BK^*) + (A - BK^*)^\top P &\succeq \\ P^*(A - BK^*) + (A - BK^*)^\top P^*, \end{aligned}$$

and, therefore,

$$(P^* - P)(A - BK^*) + (A - BK^*)^\top (P^* - P) \preceq 0.$$

Since $A - BK^*$ is a stable matrix, we get $P^* - P \succeq 0$.

Following the procedure suggested in [30] for DT systems, we solve the LQR problem for CT systems as follows. First, for a fixed $t \in [0, T]$, solve the optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \text{maximize} \quad & \text{tr}(P) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & P \succ 0, \quad \mathcal{L}(P) \succeq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(P) = & \mathcal{H}_T(x(t))^\top Q \mathcal{H}_T(x(t)) + \mathcal{H}_T(u)^\top R \mathcal{H}_T(u) \\ & + \mathcal{H}_T(x(t))^\top P \mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t)) + \mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t))^\top P \mathcal{H}_T(x(t)). \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

Then, using the solution P^* of (44), determine Γ by solving the set of linear equations

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_T(x(t)) \\ \mathcal{L}(P^*) \end{bmatrix} \Gamma = \begin{bmatrix} I \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (46)$$

In Lemma 16 and Theorem 17 below, we show that with the resulting value of Γ from (44) and (46), the solution to the CT LQR problem is given by⁴ $K^* = -\mathcal{H}_T(u)\Gamma$.

Lemma 16 *Consider system (1) and the cost (40) such that (A, B) is controllable and $(A, Q^{1/2})$ is detectable. Let $u : [0, NT] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, $T > 0$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, be a PCPE input of order $n + 1$, and let $x : [0, NT] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, be the corresponding state of (1). Then the problem (44) is feasible, its solution P^* is unique, and P^* satisfies the ARE (41).*

PROOF. Define $\mathcal{L}(P)$ as in (45) and, using (4), rewrite the LMI $\mathcal{L}(P) \succeq 0$ as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_T(x(t)) \\ \mathcal{H}_T(u) \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} Q + PA + A^\top P & PB \\ B^\top P & R \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_T(x(t)) \\ \mathcal{H}_T(x(t)) \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0. \quad (47)$$

⁴ Instead of the identity matrix, any nonsingular matrix can be used in the first block row of the right-hand side of (46). In that case, the optimal LQR solution is given by $K^* = -\mathcal{H}_T(u)\Gamma(\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))\Gamma)^{-1}$.

Since (5) holds by persistence of excitation, this inequality holds if and only if

$$\begin{bmatrix} Q + PA + A^\top P & PB \\ B^\top P & R \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0. \quad (48)$$

Using the Schur complement and the fact that $R \succ 0$, we notice that this LMI holds if and only if $Q + PA + A^\top P - PBR^{-1}B^\top P \succeq 0$. Thus, one feasible solution to this problem is the solution $P^* \succ 0$ of the ARE (41). By Lemma 16, $P^* - P \succeq 0$ for any other feasible solution P of (44), and therefore $\text{tr}(P^*) \geq \text{tr}(P)$. The proof is completed by showing that, if $P \neq P^*$, then $\text{tr}(P^*) > \text{tr}(P)$. This can be seen by noticing that, unless $P = P^*$, $\text{tr}(P^* - P) = 0$ implies the presence of both positive and negative eigenvalues in $P^* - P$, contradicting $P^* - P \succeq 0$.

Theorem 17 *Let the conditions in Lemma 16 hold. Moreover, let Γ be computed as in (46), where P^* is the solution to the convex optimization problem (44). Then, the matrix $K = -\mathcal{H}_T(u)\Gamma$ corresponds to the unique solution of the LQR problem defined by the cost (40).*

PROOF. From (46), we have that $\Gamma^\top \mathcal{L}(P^*)\Gamma = 0$ and $\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))\Gamma = I$. This second equation, together with $K = -\mathcal{H}_T(u)\Gamma$, implies that $\mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t))\Gamma = A - BK$. This can be seen similarly as in the proof of Theorem 7 (see (11), (12) and (16)). Substituting these expressions in $\Gamma^\top \mathcal{L}(P^*)\Gamma = 0$, with $\mathcal{L}(P^*)$ as in (45), yields

$$Q + K^\top RK + P^*(A - BK) + (A - BK)^\top P^* = 0. \quad (49)$$

By Lemma 16, P^* also satisfies (42), where K^* is the optimal LQR solution. Subtracting (42) from (49), we obtain $K^\top RK - K^{*\top}RK^* - P^*B(K - K^*) - (K - K^*)^\top B^\top P^* = 0$. Finally, using the fact that $B^\top P^* = RK^*$, we get $(K - K^*)R(K - K^*) = 0$, which implies $K = K^*$.

5.2 The inverse problem of optimal control

In [6, Section 10.6], the *inverse problem of optimal control* is described as follows. Given a CT linear system (1) and a matrix K , determine, if they exist, matrices $Q \succeq 0$ and $R \succ 0$ such that the pair $(A, Q^{1/2})$ is detectable and the control input $u = -Kx$ minimizes the cost function (40). The (model-based) solution of this problem is given by the following feasibility problem

$$\begin{aligned} \text{find} \quad & Q, R, P, P_1 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & Q, P \succeq 0, \quad R, P_1 \succ 0, \\ & Q + K^\top RK + P(A - BK) + (A - BK)^\top P = 0, \\ & RK - B^\top P = 0, \\ & Q - P_1 A - A^\top P_1 \succ 0. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Here, solving the two equality constraints is equivalent to solving the algebraic Riccati equation (41) and defining the optimal gain matrix as $K = R^{-1}B^\top P$. The last inequality constraint guarantees that $(A, Q^{1/2})$ is detectable [6].

In this subsection, we consider a variant of this problem on which the model of system (1) is unknown and measured data must be used instead. Given a stabilizing matrix K , we can apply the control input $u = -Kx$ to (1) and collect the corresponding input-state trajectories. Knowledge of these trajectories is additional to that of PE data. Although knowledge of these additional trajectories presents a similar scenario to that of Problem 10, the focus here is not necessarily in following these trajectories as closely as possible. Instead, the objective is to determine a cost function for which those trajectories are (close to) optimal. Formally, we formulate the problem as follows.

Problem 18 Consider system (1) and a stabilizing matrix K . Applying the input $u = -Kx$ to the system, collect $M \geq 1$ trajectories $\nu^i : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, $\xi^i : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\dot{\xi}^i : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $i = 1, \dots, M$, defined such that

$$\dot{\xi}^i(t) = (A - BK)\xi^i(t), \quad (51)$$

$$\nu^i(t) = -K\xi^i(t). \quad (52)$$

With these trajectories, define the matrices (29), (30) and

$$\mathcal{U}(t) = [\nu^1(t) \quad \nu^2(t) \quad \dots \quad \nu^M(t)] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times M}. \quad (53)$$

Using the available trajectories, as well as persistently excited data measured from (1), determine matrices $Q, P \succeq 0$, $R, P_1 \succ 0$ such that $Q - P_1A - A^\top P_1 \succ 0$, $Q + K^\top RK + P(A - BK) + (A - BK)^\top P$ and the norm $\|RK - B^\top P\|_F$ is minimized.

Notice that, different from the original model-based problem formulation in [6], we do not make the assumption that K is optimal with respect to any matrices Q, R . If K is not optimal, then the constraints in (50) cannot be all satisfied simultaneously. For this reason, Problem 18 only requires the minimization of the norm $\|RK - B^\top P\|_F$. All other constraints can be satisfied for any stabilizing matrix K .

To obtain the weight matrices Q and R in Problem 18, we have available the trajectories in $\Xi(t)$, $\dot{\Xi}(t)$ and $\mathcal{U}(t)$, as well as the PE data measured from (1) in the matrices $\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))$, $\mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t))$ and $\mathcal{H}_T(u)$. In the following, it will be useful to have knowledge of an additional matrix, denoted as $H_A(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times N}$ and defined as

$$H_A(t) = A\mathcal{H}_T(x(t)), \quad (54)$$

for all $0 \leq t \leq T$. Notice that each column of $H_A(t)$, as it evolves through time, does not necessarily correspond

to a trajectory of system (1). To compute (54) in a data-based fashion, we make use again of the data-based system representation in Theorem 6 as follows.

At each instant t , determine a matrix $\bar{\Gamma}_t$ such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_T(u) \\ \mathcal{H}_T(x(t)) \end{bmatrix} \bar{\Gamma}_t = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \mathcal{H}_T(x(t)) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (55)$$

Recall that this is possible due to (5), which holds by persistence of excitation. Then, compute $H_A(t)$ as

$$H_A(t) = \mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t))\bar{\Gamma}_t. \quad (56)$$

It can be easily observed that, for each fixed $t \in [0, T]$, this implies

$$H_A(t) = A\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))\bar{\Gamma}_t = A\mathcal{H}_T(x(t)), \quad (57)$$

by using (10), (55), and following a similar procedure as the one that resulted in (16).

Now, in the proposed solution to Problem 18, we use again the fact that samples of the data measured from (1) are known. In particular, samples of the trajectories ξ^i , ν^i and $\dot{\xi}^i$ are available at times $\{t_0, t_1, \dots, t_{q-1}\}$, $0 \leq t_j \leq T$, $j = 0, \dots, q-1$. Using these samples, define the matrices

$$\hat{\Xi} = \text{row}\{\Xi(t_j)\}_{j=0}^{q-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times qM},$$

$$\dot{\hat{\Xi}} = \text{row}\{\dot{\Xi}(t_j)\}_{j=0}^{q-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times qM}$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{U}} = \text{row}\{\mathcal{U}(t_j)\}_{j=0}^{q-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times qM},$$

and let the following assumption hold.

Assumption 19 The matrix $\hat{\Xi}$ has full row rank.

Notice that Assumption 19 is always satisfied if $M \geq n$ and there are n linearly independent initial conditions of the M trajectories $\xi^i(0)$. However, Assumption 19 can also potentially be satisfied even if as few as one single trajectory ξ^1 is available (depending on the initial condition $\xi^1(0)$, the dynamics in (51) and the sampling times t_j).

Using these definitions, we can express the conditions in (50) in a data-based fashion. Consider the equation $Q + K^\top RK + P(A - BK) + (A - BK)^\top P = 0$. Multiplying on the left by $\hat{\Xi}^\top$ and on the right by $\hat{\Xi}$, we obtain the equivalent equation

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Xi}^\top Q \hat{\Xi} + \hat{\Xi}^\top K^\top RK \hat{\Xi} + \hat{\Xi}^\top P(A - BK) \hat{\Xi} \\ + \hat{\Xi}^\top (A - BK)^\top P \hat{\Xi} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where equivalence follows from Assumption 19. Using (51)-(52), we notice that $(A-BK)\hat{\Xi} = \hat{\Xi}$ and $-K\hat{\Xi} = \hat{\mathcal{U}}$. Substituting, we obtain the model-free condition

$$\hat{\Xi}^\top Q \hat{\Xi} + \hat{\mathcal{U}}^\top R \hat{\mathcal{U}} + \hat{\Xi}^\top P \hat{\Xi} + \hat{\Xi}^\top P \hat{\Xi} = 0. \quad (58)$$

Consider now the equation $RK - B^\top P = 0$. Multiplying on the right by $\hat{\Xi}$ and on the left by $\mathcal{H}_T(u)$, we get

$$\mathcal{H}_T(u)^\top R \hat{\mathcal{U}} - \mathcal{H}_T(u)^\top B^\top P \hat{\Xi} = 0.$$

Here, the equations are equivalent if $\mathcal{H}_T(u)$ has also full row rank, as is the case if the input is PE. For a fixed $t \in [0, T]$, add and subtract $\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))^\top A^\top P \hat{\Xi}$ to the left-hand side of this expression to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_T(u)^\top R \hat{\mathcal{U}} - \mathcal{H}_T(u)^\top B^\top P \hat{\Xi} + \mathcal{H}_T(x(t))^\top A^\top P \hat{\Xi} \\ - \mathcal{H}_T(x(t))^\top A^\top P \hat{\Xi} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

$$\Rightarrow \mathcal{H}_T(u)^\top R \hat{\mathcal{U}} - \mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t))^\top P \hat{\Xi} + H_A(t)^\top P \hat{\Xi} = 0 \quad (59)$$

where (4) was also used. Finally, multiplying the inequality $Q - P_1 A - A^\top P_1 \succ 0$ from the right by $\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))$ and on the left by $\mathcal{H}_T(x(t))^\top$ for some $t \in [0, T]$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_T(x(t))^\top Q \mathcal{H}_T(x(t)) - \mathcal{H}_T(x(t))^\top P_1 H_A(t) \\ - H_A(t)^\top P_1 \mathcal{H}_T(x(t)) \succ 0. \quad (60) \end{aligned}$$

We can use (58), (59) and (60) to rewrite the problem (50) in a data-based form. However, in Problem 18 we wish to obtain weighting matrices Q and R for (40), whether or not K corresponds to the optimal solution of an LQR problem. To achieve this, we observe the following. The conditions (58) and (60) are always feasible because (58) is equivalent to the Lyapunov equation $Q + K^\top R K + P(A - BK) + (A - BK)^\top P = 0$, and $A - BK$ is stable by assumption. Thus, the condition (59) is the only one that can fail to be satisfied for some R and P . Therefore, the following optimization problem is proposed

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{Q, R, P, P_1}{\text{minimize}} \quad & \|\mathcal{H}_T(u)^\top R \hat{\mathcal{U}} - \mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t))^\top P \hat{\Xi} + H_A(t)^\top P \hat{\Xi}\|_F \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & Q, P \succeq 0, \quad R, P_1 \succ 0, \quad (58), \quad (60). \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

If Assumption 19 holds, then it is clear, by construction, that the solution to the convex optimization problem (61) yields the matrices Q and R required by Problem 18. Moreover, if the matrix K is optimal with respect to some pair of matrices Q and R , then (59) is feasible and the cost of (61) is zero. In this case, solving the LQR problem for the obtained Q and R will return the optimal gain K . This is formalized in the next theorem, whose proof is given by the developments in this subsection.

Theorem 20 *Consider system (1) such that the pair (A, B) is controllable. Let $u : [0, NT] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, $T > 0$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, be a PCPE input of order $n + 1$, and let $x : [0, NT] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, be the corresponding state of (1). Moreover, consider the matrix \bar{K} and the data $\xi^i, \nu^i, \dot{\xi}^i$ as defined in Problem 18, and let Assumption 19 hold. Then, the solution to problem (61) returns the matrices $Q \succeq 0$ and $R \succ 0$ requested in Problem 18. Moreover, if the gain \bar{K} is optimal with respect to some cost function as (40), then the cost of (61) equals zero.*

6 Data-based robust pole placement

Our objective in this section is to design a data-based algorithm that places the poles of system (1) in desired locations. This goal is formalized as follows.

Problem 21 *Let $\Lambda = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ be a self-conjugate set of complex numbers. Using data measured from (1), determine a state-feedback matrix K such that the poles of $A - BK$ are located at the positions specified by Λ .*

In [3], a method to solve Problem 21 was proposed. However, this method did not exploit the robustness properties that some existing model-based pole placement algorithms possess. A model-based solution to the robust exact pole placement problem was described in [29]. In the following, we present a data-based variant of this method. Here heavily rely on the notation introduced in Section 2.1.

Consider the set $\bar{\Lambda} = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\nu\} \subseteq \Lambda$, such that the algebraic multiplicity of λ_i is η_i , and $\eta_1 + \dots + \eta_\nu = n$. Moreover, for some scalar $s \geq 0$, let the values $\lambda_i, i \leq 2s$, be complex numbers while $\lambda_i, i \geq 2s+1$, are real. Finally, for all odd $i < 2s$, $\lambda_{i+1} = \lambda_i^*$.

For $\lambda_i \in \bar{\Lambda}$, fix a value of $t \in [0, T]$ and define the matrices

$$S(\lambda_i) = \mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t)) - \lambda_i \mathcal{H}_T(x(t)), \quad i = 1, \dots, \nu. \quad (62)$$

Let $\bar{\mathcal{N}}_i \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times s_i}$, be a basis for the right null space of $S(\lambda_i)$. Moreover, for the given t , let $\mathcal{N}_i \in \mathbb{C}^{n+m \times s_i}$ be a set of linearly independent columns of the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_T(u) \\ \mathcal{H}_T(x(t)) \end{bmatrix} \bar{\mathcal{N}}_i, \text{ such that}$$

$$\text{rank}(\mathcal{N}_i) = \text{rank} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_T(u) \\ \mathcal{H}_T(x(t)) \end{bmatrix} \bar{\mathcal{N}}_i \right).$$

With the matrices \mathcal{N}_i , construct the matrix

$$\mathcal{N} = \text{row}\{\mathcal{N}_i\}_{i=1}^\nu = [\mathcal{N}_1 \quad \dots \quad \mathcal{N}_\nu]. \quad (63)$$

The following theorem provides a method to solve Problem 21.

Theorem 22 Consider system (1) such that the pair (A, B) is controllable. Let $u : [0, NT] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, $T > 0$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, be a PCPE input of order $n + 1$, and let $x : [0, NT] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, be the corresponding state of (1). Using these data, compute the matrices $S(\lambda_i)$ in (62) and construct \mathcal{N} in (63). Let $G := \text{diag}\{G_i\}_{i=1}^{\nu}$, $G_i \in \mathbb{C}^{s_i \times \eta_i}$, be an arbitrary parameter matrix such that for all odd $i < 2s$, G_i is complex with $G_{i+1} = G_i^*$, and for all $i > 2s$, G_i is real. Define the following matrices

$$M(G) = \mathcal{N}G, \quad (64)$$

$$X(G) = M(G)_{(1:n)}, \quad (65)$$

$$V(G) = \text{Re}(M(G))_{(1:n)}, \quad (66)$$

$$W(G) = \text{Re}(M(G))_{(n+1:n+m)}. \quad (67)$$

For almost every choice of G , $X(G)$ has full row rank. Moreover, the set of all gain matrices K that solve Problem 21 is given by

$$K(G) = W(G)V(G)^{-1}, \quad (68)$$

where G is such that $X(G)$ has full row rank.

PROOF. First, we show that each matrix \mathcal{N}_i in (63) is a basis for the null space of the model-based matrix $[A - \lambda_i I \quad B]$, $\lambda_i \in \bar{\Lambda}$. Recall that \mathcal{N}_i is constructed with a set of linearly independent columns of the product

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_T(u) \\ \mathcal{H}_T(x(t)) \end{bmatrix} \bar{\mathcal{N}}_i. \text{ Moreover, using (4), notice that}$$

$$\begin{aligned} [A - \lambda_i I \quad B] \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_T(x(t)) \\ \mathcal{H}_T(u) \end{bmatrix} \bar{\mathcal{N}}_i \\ = \left(\mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t)) - \lambda_i \mathcal{H}_T(x(t)) \right) \bar{\mathcal{N}}_i = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the definition of $\bar{\mathcal{N}}_i$ as a basis for the null space of (62). This implies that $[A - \lambda_i I \quad B] \bar{\mathcal{N}}_i = 0$. Furthermore, consider any vector v such that $[A - \lambda_i I \quad B] v = 0$. Since the conditions in Lemma 4 are satisfied, (5) holds and we can always find a vector w such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_T(x(t)) \\ \mathcal{H}_T(u) \end{bmatrix} w = v.$$

Therefore,

$$0 = [A - \lambda_i I \quad B] v = \left(\mathcal{H}_T(\dot{x}(t)) - \lambda_i \mathcal{H}_T(x(t)) \right) w,$$

and, by definition of $\bar{\mathcal{N}}_i$, there is a vector \bar{w} such that we can write $w = \bar{\mathcal{N}}_i \bar{w}$. The fact that

$$[A - \lambda_i I \quad B] v = [A - \lambda_i I \quad B] \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_T(x(t)) \\ \mathcal{H}_T(u) \end{bmatrix} \bar{\mathcal{N}}_i \bar{w}$$

shows that v can always be expressed in terms of $\bar{\mathcal{N}}_i$, implying that $\bar{\mathcal{N}}_i$ is a basis for the null space of $[A - \lambda_i I \quad B]$.

From this point, the rest of the proof of the theorem follows as in the proof of [29, Proposition 2.1].

Theorem 22 shows that the solution (68) of Problem 21 is parameterized by a matrix G , which provides degrees of freedom to design the stabilizing feedback gain. This fact, together with the Bauer-Fike theorem [15, Theorem 7.2.2], has been used in different pole placement design methods in the literature (see, e.g., [29,32]) to provide robustness properties against model uncertainties. This is achieved by minimizing the condition number of the matrix $V(G)$ in (66), thereby reducing the sensitivity of the eigenvalues of the closed-loop matrix $A - BK$ with respect to disturbances in its values. In [29] it is shown that a computationally efficient method to incorporate this idea into the pole placement procedure described above is to solve the optimization problem

$$\underset{G}{\text{minimize}} \quad \|V(G)\|_F + \|V(G)^{-1}\|_F \quad (69)$$

subject to the conditions in Theorem 22. Note that since $V(G)$ can be computed from data (compare (64)-(66)), solving this optimization problem can be done in a completely data-based fashion. Since the presence of model uncertainties is analogous to the presence of noisy data measurements in our framework, solving the minimization problem (69) provides robustness characteristics to the method proposed in Theorem 22 when the state data is collected from the disturbed system (2) and/or when the state data is corrupted by measurement noise. Methods to solve problem (69) have been developed in the literature. For additional details about these methods, as well as about the performance of the proposed procedure, the reader is referred to [29,28].

7 Simulation examples

7.1 Trajectory-reference control

The performance of the optimization problems (37) and (39) to solve the trajectory-reference control problem is tested on the linearized model of an aircraft, described

in [22], and given by (1) with

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} -0.493 & 0.015 & -1 & 0.02 \\ -61.176 & -7.835 & 4.991 & 0 \\ 31.804 & -0.235 & -0.994 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -0.015 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} -0.002 & 0.002 \\ 8.246 & 1.849 \\ 0.249 & -0.436 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (70)$$

such that the system states correspond to the sideslip angle, pitch rate, yaw rate and roll angle. Suppose that we have available a single desired stable trajectory, potentially given by an expert system, for the states of this system. This means that the matrices $\Xi(t)$ and $\dot{\Xi}(t)$ in (29)-(30) have a single column, e.g., $\Xi(t) = \xi^1(t)$.

Numerical simulations show that, if the trajectory $\xi^1(t)$ is feasible for system (70), i.e., there exists a matrix K such that $\dot{\xi}^1(t) = (A - BK)\xi^1(t)$ for $0 \leq t \leq T$, then such K is returned by (37) as guaranteed by Theorem 11. A more interesting setting is obtained when $\xi^1(t)$ cannot be exactly followed by the states of (70). This case is presented in Figure 1, where some desired trajectories for system (70) are presented in blue color. For reproducibility, these trajectories were generated by a system of the form $\dot{\xi}^1(t) = \bar{A}\xi^1(t)$, where

$$\bar{A} = \begin{bmatrix} -0.5254 & 0.0399 & -1.4516 & 0.1061 \\ -1.8232 & -2.4526 & 1.8725 & -0.6407 \\ 3.1222 & -2.4746 & -3.3309 & -1.3357 \\ 0.0046 & 1.3289 & 0.0157 & 0.0490 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The output \bar{K} of (37) using these data is given by

$$\bar{K} = \begin{bmatrix} 6.6951 & 0.4425 & 1.3996 & 0.6780 \\ -61.9583 & -4.8843 & -4.5553 & -2.6773 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since \bar{K} is stabilizing, the problem (39) does not modify it, and the final gain matrix $K = \bar{K}$ is the outcome of our method. When the initial states of (70) coincide with $\xi^1(0)$, the obtained control input provides the closed-loop trajectories represented with the red, dashed lines in Figure 1. It can be seen that the reference trajectories are closely followed.

7.2 The inverse problem of optimal control

Consider the same continuous-time system described by the matrices in (70). To test the applicability of the op-




Fig. 1. A trajectory (blue) for each state is given as reference for problem (37). The states of system (70) (dashed red) when the resulting input is applied, closely follow the desired references.

timization problem (61), consider first the case in which the matrix K in Problem 18 is indeed optimal with respect to some cost function of the form (40). For example, notice that the matrix

$$K_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -0.8653 & 0.2988 & 0.3105 & 0.7025 \\ -0.1511 & 0.0537 & -0.1108 & 0.0930 \end{bmatrix} \quad (71)$$

is optimal with respect to (40) with $\bar{Q} = I_n$, $\bar{R} = 2I_m$. Using this matrix K_1 , we generate a single trajectory from system (1), starting from the initial condition $x(0) = [1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1]^T$, and taking a sample every 0.1 seconds until Assumption 1 is satisfied. Using this data in problem (61), we obtain the resulting matrices

$$Q_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 18.1835 & -1.3941 & 2.3407 & -1.6438 \\ -1.3941 & 9.3171 & -0.0452 & -0.0037 \\ 2.3407 & -0.0452 & 10.3060 & 1.5255 \\ -1.6438 & -0.0037 & 1.5255 & 9.2587 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$R_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 18.6623 & -0.1772 \\ -0.1772 & 19.6845 \end{bmatrix}.$$

For testing purposes, we applied the optimization problem (44) to solve the LQR problem with these matrices Q_1 and R_1 . The result is that the matrix (71) is recovered. Thus, the values of Q and R that were obtained from (61) correspond to one of the (non-unique) pair of matrices that have K_1 as optimal gain.

Suppose now that the matrix

$$K_2 = \begin{bmatrix} -3 & 1 & 0.5 & 1.5 \\ -0.5 & 0.1 & -0.4 & 0.2 \end{bmatrix},$$

which is not optimal with respect to any cost function of the form (40), is used in the problem (61). That is, we

collect data with the same conditions as in the previous simulation, except that the matrix K_1 is replaced by K_2 . The outcome of the algorithm is

$$Q_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0.2696 & 0.0061 & 0.7463 & -0.2356 \\ 0.0061 & 2.5569 & -0.2157 & -0.8690 \\ 0.7463 & -0.2157 & 2.1796 & -0.1602 \\ -0.2356 & -0.8690 & -0.1602 & 2.3436 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$R_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1.0128 & 0.0264 \\ 0.0264 & 1.0543 \end{bmatrix}.$$

If we solve the LQR problem the program (44) for these matrices Q_2, R_2 , we obtain

$$K = \begin{bmatrix} -3.0019 & 0.9795 & 0.5054 & 1.4997 \\ -0.4777 & 0.1734 & -0.4052 & 0.2016 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Thus, the application of the procedure described in Section 5 yielded matrices Q and R such that the original matrix K_2 is close to the optimal one.

7.3 Robust pole placement

In [9], the performance of a (model-based) robust pole placement algorithm is tested on eleven different systems with varying properties. These have become benchmark examples in subsequent pole placement works in the literature [29]. In this subsection, we apply the data-based method proposed in Section 6 to these eleven systems. To test the robustness of this method, noise of different magnitudes is added to the measured state data as $\tilde{x} = x + v$, with bounded noise $v \leq \bar{v}$. Two different magnitudes of noise are considered in the simulations, with $\bar{v} = 10^{-3}$ and $\bar{v} = 10^{-2}$. As a test for the accuracy of the obtained closed-loop eigenvalues, we compute $\varepsilon = \sum_{i=1}^n |\lambda_i - \lambda_i^*|$, where λ_i are the obtained eigenvalues, λ_i^* are the desired eigenvalues, and the index i sorts the eigenvalues in order of magnitude. To solve the optimization problem (69), we used the Matlab toolbox kindly provided to us by the authors of [29]; their (model-based) *span* toolbox was properly modified by us to execute our data-based procedure.

Since the accuracy of the proposed method varies according to the PE data collected, we perform 100 experiments per example and average the errors ε . In each experiment, the vectors μ in Definition 1 are selected randomly from a uniform distribution $\mathcal{U}(-5, 5)^m$. Similarly, the initial state of the PE data is selected from $\mathcal{U}(-5, 5)^n$.

For comparison, the same noisy data is used to solve the pole placement problem using the data-based pole placement method in [3]. The simulation results are shown in

Example from [9]	Avg. error, $\bar{v} = 10^{-3}$		Avg. error, $\bar{v} = 10^{-2}$	
	RPP	PP	RPP	PP
1	0.0053	0.0832	0.0240	0.0553
2	0.2512	0.8299	1.6981	2.6842
3	0.0395	0.1010	0.3894	0.8933
4	0.0482	0.2125	0.4614	1.0039
5	0.0053	0.0301	0.0420	0.0653
6	0.1625	0.4237	1.2576	11.2209
7	0.0135	0.1836	0.1070	0.8459
8	0.0134	0.0305	0.0889	0.2173
9	0.1821	0.3501	1.9451	2.4716
10	0.0061	0.0205	0.0365	0.1211
11	27.5198	216.1408	32.1955	127.6611

Table 1

Average error $\sum_i |\lambda_i - \lambda_i^*|$ comparison between the method in Section 6 (RPP), and the method in [3] (PP).

Table 1, where the acronym RPP is used to refer to our robust pole placement procedure, while PP is used for the method in [3]. The table shows that, as expected, the RPP algorithm outperforms the PP one.

8 Conclusion

In this paper, we presented the solution to four different data-based control problems for continuous-time systems, where specific closed-loop performances are required. The first problem is a trajectory-reference control problem, where desired closed-loop trajectories are given and a controller is designed to make the system follow those trajectories as closely as possible. Then, we solved the data-based LQR problem for continuous-time systems, as well as the inverse problem of optimal control, where a matrix K is given and a cost function such that K is (close to) optimal must be computed. The final problem corresponds to a robust pole placement procedure which, different from other results in the literature, addresses the *exact* pole placement problem while considering robustness against the effect of noisy measurements. The solution to these problems was facilitated by leveraging the data-based continuous-time system representation proposed in [20]. Following analogous steps, the reader can note that all of these problems can be formulated and solved for discrete-time systems as well. An important direction for future work is the development of control protocols for (classes of) nonlinear CT systems, similarly as it has been done in the DT case.

Acknowledgements

This work has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's

Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 948679).

References

- [1] Julian Berberich, Johannes Köhler, Matthias A. Müller, and Frank Allgöwer. Data-driven model predictive control with stability and robustness guarantees. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 66(4):1702–1717, 2021.
- [2] Julian Berberich, Stefan Wildhagen, Michael Hertneck, and Frank Allgöwer. Data-driven analysis and control of continuous-time systems under aperiodic sampling. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 54(7):210–215, 2021.
- [3] Gianluca Bianchin. Data-driven exact pole placement for linear systems. *arXiv:2303.11469*, 2023.
- [4] Andrea Bisoffi, Claudio De Persis, and Pietro Tesi. Data-driven control via Petersen’s lemma. *Automatica*, 145:110537, 2022.
- [5] Andrea Bisoffi, Claudio De Persis, and Pietro Tesi. Learning controllers for performance through LMI regions. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 68(7):4351–4358, 2023.
- [6] Stephen Boyd, Laurent El Ghaoui, Eric Feron, and Venkataramanan Balakrishnan. *Linear Matrix Inequalities in System and Control Theory*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 1994.
- [7] S. J. Brattke, B. E. Ydstie, and A. G. Barto. Adaptive linear quadratic control using policy iteration. In *Proceedings of 1994 American Control Conference*, volume 3, pages 3475–3479, 1994.
- [8] Valentina Breschi, Claudio De Persis, Simone Formentin, and Pietro Tesi. Direct data-driven model-reference control with Lyapunov stability guarantees. In *2021 60th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 1456–1461, 2021.
- [9] Ralph Byers and Stephen G. Nash. Approaches to robust pole assignment. *International Journal of Control*, 49(1):97–117, 1989.
- [10] M.C. Campi, A. Lecchini, and S.M. Savaresi. Virtual reference feedback tuning: a direct method for the design of feedback controllers. *Automatica*, 38(8):1337–1346, 2002.
- [11] Jeremy Coulson, John Lygeros, and Florian Dörfler. Data-enabled predictive control: In the shallows of the DeePC. In *2019 18th European Control Conference (ECC)*, pages 307–312, 2019.
- [12] Claudio De Persis and Pietro Tesi. Formulas for data-driven control: Stabilization, optimality, and robustness. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 65(3):909–924, 2020.
- [13] Florian Dörfler, Pietro Tesi, and Claudio De Persis. On the certainty-equivalence approach to direct data-driven LQR design. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, pages 1–8, 2023.
- [14] Jaap Eising and Jorge Cortes. When sampling works in data-driven control: Informativity for stabilization in continuous time. *arXiv:2301.10873*, 2023.
- [15] Gene H. Golub and Charles F. van Loan. *Matrix Computations*. The Johns Hopkins University Press, London, UK, 3 edition, 1996.
- [16] Zhiyu Huang, Jingda Wu, and Chen Lv. Efficient deep reinforcement learning with imitative expert priors for autonomous driving. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 34(10):7391–7403, 2023.
- [17] Yu Jiang and Zhong-Ping Jiang. Computational adaptive optimal control for continuous-time linear systems with completely unknown dynamics. *Automatica*, 48:2699–2704, 2012.
- [18] B. Kiumarsi, F.L. Lewis, and Z.P. Jiang. H_∞ control of linear discrete-time systems: Off-policy reinforcement learning. *Automatica*, 78:144–152, 2017.
- [19] Victor G. Lopez, Mohammad Alsalti, and Matthias A. Müller. Efficient off-policy Q-learning for data-based discrete-time LQR problems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 68(5):2922–2933, 2023.
- [20] Victor G. Lopez and Matthias A. Müller. On a continuous-time version of Willems’ lemma. In *2022 IEEE 61st Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 2759–2764, 2022.
- [21] Victor G. Lopez and Matthias A. Müller. An efficient off-policy reinforcement learning algorithm for the continuous-time LQR problem. *arXiv:2303.17819*, 2023.
- [22] Jia Luo and C. Edward Lan. Determination of weighting matrices of a linear quadratic regulator. *Journal of Guidance, Control and Dynamics*, 18(6):1462–1463, 1995.
- [23] Ivan Markovsky and Florian Dörfler. Behavioral systems theory in data-driven analysis, signal processing, and control. *Annual Reviews in Control*, 52:42–64, 2021.
- [24] Jared Miller and Mario Sznajder. Data-driven gain scheduling control of linear parameter-varying systems using quadratic matrix inequalities. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 7:835–840, 2023.
- [25] Hamidreza Modares, Frank L. Lewis, and Zhong-Ping Jiang. H_∞ tracking control of completely unknown continuous-time systems via off-policy reinforcement learning. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 26(10):2550–2562, 2015.
- [26] C. De Persis, R. Postoyan, and P. Tesi. Event-triggered control from data. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, pages 1–16, 2023.
- [27] P. Rapisarda, H.J. van Waarde, and M.K. Camlibel. Orthogonal polynomial bases for data-driven analysis and control of continuous-time systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, pages 1–12, 2023.
- [28] Robert Schmid, Thang Nguyen, and Amit Pandey. Optimal pole placement with Moore’s algorithm. In *2011 Australian Control Conference*, pages 124–129, 2011.
- [29] Robert Schmid, Amit Pandey, and Thang Nguyen. Robust pole placement with Moore’s algorithm. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 59(2):500–505, 2014.
- [30] Henk J. van Waarde, Jaap Eising, Harry L. Trentelman, and M. Kanat Camlibel. Data informativity: A new perspective on data-driven analysis and control. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 65(11):4753–4768, 2020.
- [31] Henk J. van Waarde and Mehran Mesbahi. Data-driven parameterizations of suboptimal LQR and H_2 controllers. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 53(2):4234–4239, 2020. 21st IFAC World Congress.
- [32] A. Varga. Robust pole assignment via Sylvester equation based state feedback parametrization. In *CACSD. Conference Proceedings. IEEE International Symposium on Computer-Aided Control System Design*, pages 13–18, 2000.
- [33] Jan C. Willems, Paolo Rapisarda, Ivan Markovsky, and Bart L.M. De Moor. A note on persistency of excitation. *Systems & Control Letters*, 54(4):325–329, 2005.