

Implementation of soft-constrained MPC for Tracking using its semi-banded problem structure

Victor Gracia[†], Pablo Krupa^{*}, Daniel Limon[†], Teodoro Alamo[†]

Abstract—Model Predictive Control (MPC) is a popular control approach due to its ability to consider constraints, including input and state restrictions, while minimizing a cost function. However, in practice, said constraints can result in feasibility issues, either because the system model is not accurate or due to the existence of external disturbances. To mitigate this problem, a solution adopted by the MPC community is the use of soft constraints. In this article, we consider a not-so-typical methodology to encode soft constraints in a particular MPC formulation known as MPC for Tracking (MPCT), which has several advantages when compared to standard MPC formulations. The motivation behind the proposed encoding is to maintain the semi-banded structure of the ingredients of a recently proposed solver for the considered MPCT formulation, thus providing an efficient and fast solver when compared to alternative approaches from the literature. We show numerical results highlighting the benefits of the formulation and the computational efficiency of the solver.

Index Terms—Model predictive control, soft constraints, MPC for tracking, embedded systems, ADMM.

I. INTRODUCTION

Model Predictive Control (MPC) [1] is an advanced control methodology, based on mathematical optimization, whose most valuable feature is its ability to deal with (possibly joint) constraints in inputs and states while optimizing a performance index. To do so, it requires solving an optimization problem every sample time, which includes a cost function to be minimized, a model of the system, and the aforementioned constraints to be satisfied along a prediction horizon.

A subclass of MPC formulations is linear MPC [2], characterized by considering a linear prediction model and convex inequality constraints. It is a common choice in practical implementations given that the underlying optimization problem is a Quadratic Program (QP), which generally can be solved efficiently [3]. Linear MPC, therefore, is a sensible option in practice, given the limitations in computational power and memory of control systems.

A problem that MPC faces in real applications is that its optimization problem may be infeasible for the current system state due to the presence of the state/input constraints. Furthermore, even if the MPC problem is currently feasible, feasibility may be lost in the next sample time due to inaccuracies in the prediction model and/or external disturbances. This issue is particularly relevant in the case of linear MPC, where model

mismatch is almost always present. A practical approach to deal with this issue is the use of soft constraints, where the constraints are allowed to be violated at a certain cost. For instance, in [4], the authors use a classical soft-constrained approach to implement standard MPC, where non-negative slack variables are included in the constraints and penalized in the cost function.

Some feasibility problems from standard MPC formulations are addressed by the MPC for Tracking (MPCT) formulation [5], such as infeasibility when the reference is not reachable, or when it undergoes abrupt changes. This formulation is characterized by including some extra decision variables that work as an artificial reference. This change implies a notably larger domain of attraction and feasibility region, where the drawback lies on a typically more complex QP to be solved.

However, a solver for MPCT is proposed in [6], whose computation times are shown to be in the same order as the ones required to solve standard linear MPC formulations using state-of-the-art QP solvers. The computational efficiency of the algorithm results from the exploitation of the semi-banded structure present in the ingredients of the Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers (ADMM) [7] when applied to the MPCT formulation. Another efficient solver for the same formulation was proposed in [8], where an extended ADMM algorithm [9] is used instead.

Even though MPCT typically suffers from less feasibility issues than standard linear MPC, its optimization problem may still become infeasible, for the same reasons previously stated. Thus, the use of soft constraints in MPCT is still a reasonable choice in practice. Indeed, in [10], the authors propose a soft-constrained MPCT formulation by means of the slack variables approach. In this article, we propose an alternative way of encoding the soft constraints, which allows us to retain the simple semi-banded structure exploited by the solver proposed in [6]. This results in a particularly simple way of dealing with soft constraints, allowing us to provide a structure-exploiting solver for the soft-constrained MPCT formulation.

This article is structured as follows. Section II presents the MPCT formulation and our proposed approach to encode soft constraints. Section III shows how the modified MPCT formulation can be efficiently solved by means of the ADMM algorithm. Section IV provides numerical results demonstrating the practical benefits of the proposed solver when compared to alternative approaches and solvers. Finally, the main results of the article are summarized in Section V.

Notation: The set of positive definite matrices of size $n \times n$ is denoted as \mathcal{S}_n^+ . The set of integers from a to b , both included, is written as \mathbb{Z}_a^b . The j -th component of a vector x is referred to as $x_{(j)}$. The Euclidean norm of a vector x is defined as $\|x\|_2 = \sqrt{x^\top x}$. For a matrix $Q \in \mathcal{S}_n^+$, $\|x\|_Q \doteq \sqrt{x^\top Q x}$.

[†] Universidad de Sevilla, Sevilla, Spain.

^{*} Gran Sasso Science Institute (GSSI), L'Aquila, Italy.

The authors acknowledge support from grants PID2022-142946NA-I00 and PID2022-141159OB-I00 funded by MCIN/AEI/ 10.13039/501100011033 and by ERDF A way of making Europe; the MUR-PRO3 project on Software Quality; and the MUR-PRIN project DREAM (20228FT78M). Corresponding author: Victor Gracia. E-mails: vgracia@us.es, pablo.krupa@gssi.it, dlm@us.es, talamo@us.es

The identity matrix of dimension n is denoted as I_n , and the zero matrix of dimension $n \times m$ as $0_{n \times m}$, respectively, where the sub-index may be omitted if the dimension is evident. A vector of ones in \mathbb{R}^n is referred to as $\mathbb{1}_n$. Component-wise inequalities of two vectors x and y is written as $x \leq (\geq) y$. The symbol \otimes refers to Kronecker product. The concatenation of vectors x_1 to x_N conforming a column vector is denoted as (x_1, \dots, x_N) . We denote the block diagonal matrix formed by the concatenation of A_1 to A_N (possibly of different dimensions) as $\text{diag}(A_1, A_2, \dots, A_N)$. Given scalars a_1 to a_n , $\max(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ returns the maximum element of a_1 to a_n .

II. SOFT-CONSTRAINED MPC FOR TRACKING

Consider a discrete-time system of the form

$$x(t+1) = Ax(t) + Bu(t), \quad (1a)$$

$$y(t) = Cx(t) + Du(t), \quad (1b)$$

where $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$, $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ and $y(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y}$ are the state, input and output vectors at sample time t , respectively. Assume that the system is constrained as

$$\underline{x} \leq x(t) \leq \bar{x}, \quad (2a)$$

$$\underline{u} \leq u(t) \leq \bar{u}, \quad (2b)$$

$$\underline{y} \leq y(t) \leq \bar{y}, \quad (2c)$$

where $\underline{x}, \bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$, $\underline{u}, \bar{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$, $\underline{y}, \bar{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y}$ are such that $\underline{x} < \bar{x}$, $\underline{u} < \bar{u}$ and $\underline{y} < \bar{y}$. The control objective is to stabilize the system at an equilibrium point (x_r, u_r) , namely the reference, while satisfying the constraints (2). The controller should steer the system to (x_r, u_r) , provided it is admissible. Otherwise, it should converge to its closest admissible equilibrium point.

A particularly suitable MPC formulation to this end is *MPC for tracking* (MPCT) [5]. In particular, we focus on the following MPCT formulation with terminal equality constraint

$$\min_{\substack{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \\ x_s, u_s}} V_o(x_s, u_s; x_r, u_r) + \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} l(x_i, u_i, x_s, u_s) \quad (3a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } x_0 = x(t), \quad (3b)$$

$$x_{i+1} = Ax_i + Bu_i, \quad i \in \mathbb{Z}_0^{N-2}, \quad (3c)$$

$$x_s = Ax_{N-1} + Bu_{N-1}, \quad (3d)$$

$$x_s = Ax_s + Bu_s, \quad (3e)$$

$$\underline{u}_i \leq u_i \leq \bar{u}_i, \quad i \in \mathbb{Z}_0^{N-1}, \quad (3f)$$

$$\underline{x}_i \leq x_i \leq \bar{x}_i, \quad i \in \mathbb{Z}_1^{N-1}, \quad (3g)$$

$$\underline{y}_i \leq Cx_i + Du_i \leq \bar{y}_i, \quad i \in \mathbb{Z}_1^{N-1}, \quad (3h)$$

$$\underline{x}_s \leq x_s \leq \bar{x}_s, \quad (3i)$$

$$\underline{u}_s \leq u_s \leq \bar{u}_s, \quad (3j)$$

$$\underline{y}_s \leq Cx_s + Du_s \leq \bar{y}_s, \quad (3k)$$

where the decision variables vectors $\mathbf{x} = (x_0, \dots, x_{N-1})$, $\mathbf{u} = (u_0, \dots, u_{N-1})$ are the sequence of states and inputs predicted along the prediction horizon N , respectively; $x(t)$ is the state of the system at current sample time t ; (x_s, u_s) are decision variables that work as an artificial reference that is required to be an admissible steady state of the system by means of constraints (3e), (3i), (3j) and (3k), which are

responsible of the numerous benefits of MPCT over classical MPC; $l(x_i, u_i, x_s, u_s) = \|x_i - x_s\|_Q^2 + \|u_i - u_s\|_R^2$ is the stage cost and $V_o(x_s, u_s; x_r, u_r) = \|x_s - x_r\|_T^2 + \|u_s - u_r\|_S^2$ is the offset cost, where $Q \in \mathcal{S}_{>}^{n_x}$, $R \in \mathcal{S}_{>}^{n_u}$, $T \in \mathcal{S}_{>}^{n_x}$ and $S \in \mathcal{S}_{>}^{n_u}$ are weight matrices; $\underline{x}_i, \bar{x}_i, \underline{x}_s, \bar{x}_s \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$, $\underline{u}_i, \bar{u}_i, \underline{u}_s, \bar{u}_s \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ and $\underline{y}_i, \bar{y}_i, \underline{y}_s, \bar{y}_s \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y}$ are vectors that impose the box constraints limits, with $\underline{x}_i < \bar{x}_i$, $\underline{u}_i < \bar{u}_i$ and $\underline{y}_i < \bar{y}_i$, $\forall i$, and $\underline{x}_s < \bar{x}_s$, $\underline{u}_s < \bar{u}_s$, $\underline{y}_s < \bar{y}_s$. Note that the sub-index i in (3f), (3g) and (3h) allows changes in the limits (2) along the prediction horizon to make (3) more flexible, providing the possibility of implementing tube-based robust MPC [11], [12].

Formulation (3) features key characteristics such as recursive feasibility when controlling the system under nominal conditions from a feasible initial state, even when abrupt changes occur in (x_r, u_r) , and guarantees convergence to its closest admissible equilibrium point of the system [5], where distance is measured according to the offset cost function $V_o(\cdot)$. However, in real implementations, discrepancies between the prediction model (1), strong disturbances, or even inaccuracies in the solution provided by the solver applied to (3), may eventually lead to an infeasible problem. To mitigate this issue, we now present a soft-constrained version of (3).

Let us start by showing the approach used to “soften” inequality constraints in (3). Given the vectors $w, \underline{w}, \bar{w} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ that determine a hard inequality constraint $\underline{w} \leq w \leq \bar{w}$ in an optimization problem, we can use a “soft version” of it by replacing the constraint with a penalizing cost that measures the violation of the constraint. To this end, we denote

$$\gamma_\beta(w; \bar{w}, \underline{w}) \doteq \sum_{j=1}^p \beta_{(j)} \max(w_{(j)} - \bar{w}_{(j)}, \underline{w}_{(j)} - w_{(j)}, 0),$$

where the non-negative vector $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p$ weights the penalization associated to the different components of w .

For convenience, let us define

$$v_t \doteq (y_0, x_1, u_1, y_1, \dots, x_{N-1}, u_{N-1}, y_{N-1}, x_s, u_s, y_s),$$

where $y_i = Cx_i + Du_i$ and $y_s = Cx_s + Du_s$, and

$$v \doteq (x_0, u_0, v_t), \quad (4)$$

of dimension $n_v = (N+1)(n_x + n_u + n_y)$. Defining

$$\bar{v}_t \doteq (\bar{y}_0, \bar{x}_1, \bar{u}_1, \bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_{N-1}, \bar{u}_{N-1}, \bar{y}_{N-1}, \bar{x}_s, \bar{u}_s, \bar{y}_s),$$

$$\underline{v}_t \doteq (\underline{y}_0, \underline{x}_1, \underline{u}_1, \underline{y}_1, \dots, \underline{x}_{N-1}, \underline{u}_{N-1}, \underline{y}_{N-1}, \underline{x}_s, \underline{u}_s, \underline{y}_s),$$

we have that the constraints in (3) impose $\underline{v}_t \leq v_t \leq \bar{v}_t$. Thus, we can transform (3) into its soft-constrained variant

$$\min_{\substack{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \\ x_s, u_s}} V_o(x_s, u_s; x_r, u_r) + \gamma_\beta(v_t; \bar{v}_t, \underline{v}_t) + \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} l(x_i, u_i, x_s, u_s) \quad (5a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } x_0 = x(t), \quad (5b)$$

$$x_{i+1} = Ax_i + Bu_i, \quad i \in \mathbb{Z}_0^{N-2}, \quad (5c)$$

$$x_s = Ax_{N-1} + Bu_{N-1}, \quad (5d)$$

$$x_s = Ax_s + Bu_s, \quad (5e)$$

$$\underline{u} \leq u_0 \leq \bar{u}, \quad (5f)$$

Algorithm 1: ADMM

Require : $v^0, \lambda^0, \rho > 0, \epsilon_p > 0, \epsilon_d > 0$

1 $k \leftarrow 0$

2 **repeat**

3 $z^{k+1} \leftarrow \arg \min_z \mathcal{L}_\rho(z, v^k, \lambda^k)$

4 $v^{k+1} \leftarrow \arg \min_v \mathcal{L}_\rho(z^{k+1}, v, \lambda^k)$

5 $\lambda^{k+1} \leftarrow \lambda^k + \rho(Cz^{k+1} + Dv^{k+1})$

6 $k \leftarrow k + 1$

7 **until** $\|Cz^k + Dv^k\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_p$ and $\|v^k - v^{k-1}\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_d$

Output: $\tilde{z}^* \leftarrow z^k, \tilde{v}^* \leftarrow v^k, \tilde{\lambda}^* \leftarrow \lambda^k$

where $\gamma_\beta(v_t; \bar{v}_t, \underline{v}_t)$ penalizes the violation of the constraints $\underline{u}_i \leq u_i \leq \bar{u}_i, i \in \mathbb{Z}_1^{N-1}$, as well as (3g)-(3k). Note that we do not relax the constraints $\underline{u}_0 \leq u_0 \leq \bar{u}_0$, given that, in practice, bounds in system inputs are typically given by the physical limits of the actuators. The main advantage of this soft-constrained approach w.r.t. (3) is that the underlying optimization problem (5) is always feasible if N is greater than the controllability index of the system.

Remark 1. *The concept of exact penalty function guarantees that, for sufficiently large values of β , the optimal solution of (5) is equal to the optimal solution of (3) if the latter is feasible [13, Theorem 14.3.1], [14].*

III. EFFICIENTLY APPLYING ADMM TO SOFTENED MPCT

Due to the non-smoothness of (5a), it is reasonable to think that the proposed formulation leads to a challenging optimization problem. However, we now present an ADMM-based solver that takes advantage of the structure of the ingredients of the ADMM method when applied to the MPCT formulation (3), see [6], and efficiently deals with the soft constraints introduced in (5).

A. Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers

Consider the convex, closed and proper functions $f : \mathbb{R}^{n_z} \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ and $g : \mathbb{R}^{n_v} \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$. Let $z \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z}, v \in \mathbb{R}^{n_v}, E \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda \times n_z}$ and $F \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda \times n_v}$. The optimization problem considered by the ADMM optimization method is

$$\min_{z,v} f(z) + g(v) \quad (6a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } Ez + Fv = 0, \quad (6b)$$

with augmented Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_\rho : \mathbb{R}^{n_z} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_v} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda} \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$

$$\mathcal{L}_\rho(z, v, \lambda) = f(z) + g(v) + \lambda^\top (Ez + Fv) + \frac{\rho}{2} \|Ez + Fv\|_2^2,$$

where $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda}$ gathers dual variables and $\rho > 0$ is the penalty parameter. We refer to a solution of (6) as (z^*, v^*, λ^*) , which is assumed to exist.

ADMM (Algorithm 1) guarantees convergence to a sub-optimal solution $(\tilde{z}^*, \tilde{v}^*, \tilde{\lambda}^*)$ of (6) starting from an initial condition (v^0, λ^0) . The suboptimality of $(\tilde{z}^*, \tilde{v}^*, \tilde{\lambda}^*)$ depends on the selected $\epsilon_p, \epsilon_d > 0$, which are the primal and dual exit tolerances, respectively [7].

B. Applying ADMM to MPCT

To solve (5) using Algorithm 1, we first transform (5) into (6). Taking v defined in (4) and

$$z \doteq (\tilde{x}_0, \tilde{u}_0, \tilde{x}_1, \tilde{u}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_{N-1}, \tilde{u}_{N-1}, \tilde{x}_s, \tilde{u}_s),$$

where $\tilde{x}_s, \tilde{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}, \tilde{u}_s, \tilde{u}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}, i \in \mathbb{Z}_0^{N-1}$, and defining the indicator function

$$\mathcal{I}_{(G\hat{z}=b)}(\hat{z}) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } G\hat{z} = b, \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

we have that

$$f(z) = \frac{1}{2} z^\top H z + q^\top z + \mathcal{I}_{(Gz=b)}(z), \quad (7)$$

where $q = -(0, 0, \dots, 0, T x_r, S u_r), b = (x(t), \dots, 0)$,

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} Q & 0 & \cdots & -Q & 0 \\ 0 & R & \cdots & 0 & -R \\ 0 & 0 & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ -Q & 0 & \cdots & NQ + T & 0 \\ 0 & -R & \cdots & 0 & NR + S \end{bmatrix}, \quad (8a)$$

$$G = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ A & B & -I & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & A & B & -I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & (A - I) & B \end{bmatrix}, \quad (8b)$$

with $G \in \mathbb{R}^{m_z \times n_z}, n_z = (N+1)(n_x + n_u), m_z = (N+2)n_x$. Defining now, for $a, \bar{a}, \underline{a} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_a}$, the indicator function

$$\mathcal{I}_{[\underline{a}, \bar{a}]}(a) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \underline{a} \leq a \leq \bar{a}, \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

we have that $g(v) = \gamma_\beta(v_t; \bar{v}_t, \underline{v}_t) + \mathcal{I}_{[\underline{u}_0, \bar{u}_0]}(u_0)$. Finally, let

$$\hat{E} = \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_x} & 0 \\ 0 & I_{n_u} \\ C & D \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then, considering the definitions of z and v , we have that $E = \text{diag}(\hat{E}, \dots, \hat{E}), F = -I_{n_v}$ and $n_\lambda = n_v$.

C. Computation of z^{k+1}

Step 3 in Algorithm 1 provides z^{k+1} , which consists in minimizing $\mathcal{L}_\rho(z, v^k, \lambda^k)$ over z . Particularizing it for (7), E and F , we have

$$z^{k+1} = \arg \min_z \frac{1}{2} z^\top P z + (p^k)^\top z \quad (9a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } Gz = b, \quad (9b)$$

where $P = H + \rho E^\top E$ and $p^k = q + E^\top (\lambda^k - \rho v^k)$. Matrix P is "semi-banded", a term we now introduce.

Definition 1. *A non-singular matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is semi-banded if it can be decomposed as $\Gamma + UV$, where $\Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is banded diagonal and full rank, $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}, V \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, with $n \gg m$. We say a linear system $Mz = d$ is semi-banded if M is semi-banded.*

The authors in [6] propose a way of efficiently solving (9) by decoupling the semi-banded structure of the problem. We will provide here a brief description of the approach for completeness. We refer the reader to [6] for further explanation.

Proposition 1 ([3, §5.5.3]). *A sufficient and necessary condition for z^* to be an optimal solution of (9) is the existence of a vector $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^{m_z}$ satisfying*

$$Gz^* = b, \quad (10a)$$

$$Pz^* + G^\top \mu + p^k = 0. \quad (10b)$$

Defining $W \doteq GP^{-1}G^\top$, and using simple arithmetic operations, we can express (10) as

$$P\xi = p^k, \quad (11a)$$

$$W\mu = -(G\xi + b), \quad (11b)$$

$$Pz^* = -(G^\top \mu + p^k), \quad (11c)$$

where $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m_z \times m_z}$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z}$. The three linear systems (11) can be solved efficiently to obtain z^{k+1} thanks to the semi-banded structures of P and W , combined with the following Woodbury matrix identity [15].

Property 1 (Woodbury matrix identity). *Consider a semi-banded matrix M . If $I + V\Gamma^{-1}U$ is non-singular, then*

$$M^{-1} = (\Gamma + UV)^{-1} = \Gamma^{-1} - \Gamma^{-1}U(I + V\Gamma^{-1}U)^{-1}V\Gamma^{-1}.$$

Proposition 2 ([6, Proposition 2]). *Denote $Y \doteq -\mathbb{1}_N^\top \otimes \text{diag}(Q, R)$. Then, P and W in (11) can be decomposed as $P = \hat{\Gamma} + \hat{U}\hat{V}$ and $W = \tilde{\Gamma} + \tilde{U}\tilde{V}$ by taking*

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Gamma} &= \text{diag}(Q, R, Q, R, \dots, NQ + T, NR + S) + \rho E^\top E, \\ \hat{U} &= \begin{bmatrix} Y^\top & 0 \\ 0 & I_{(n_x+n_u)} \end{bmatrix}, \hat{V} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I_{(n_x+n_u)} \\ Y & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \tilde{\Gamma} = G\hat{\Gamma}^{-1}G^\top, \\ \tilde{U} &= -G\Gamma^{-1}\hat{U}(I + \hat{V}\hat{\Gamma}^{-1}\hat{U})^{-1}, \tilde{V} = \hat{V}\hat{\Gamma}^{-1}G^\top. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, since matrix G provided in (8b) is full-column rank, matrices P , W , $\hat{\Gamma}$ and $\tilde{\Gamma}$ are positive definite.

Proposition 3 ([6, Proposition 3]). *Consider the semi-banded system of equations $Mz = d$, where $M = \Gamma + UV$ satisfies Property 1. Then, Algorithm 2 provides \tilde{z} satisfying $M\tilde{z} = d$.*

We refer the reader to [6] for the proofs of Propositions 2 and 3. Algorithm 2 can be sequentially applied to each of the three linear systems shown in (11) in order to compute z^{k+1} .

Remark 2. *The computational cost of Steps 1 and 3 of Algorithm 2 when applied to equations (11a) and (11c) is low, given that $\hat{\Gamma}$ is block diagonal. On the other hand, when the same steps are applied to (11b), given that $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is banded-diagonal instead, the computational cost is higher. As in [6], a Cholesky decomposition of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ can be used to efficiently solve Steps 1 and 3 of Algorithm 2 when applied to (11b).*

Remark 3. *Solving Step 2 of Algorithm 2 applied to the three linear systems in (11) turns out to be inexpensive due to the fact that matrices \hat{U} , \hat{V} , \tilde{U} and \tilde{V} shown in Proposition 2 lead to small-dimensional matrices $I + \hat{V}\hat{\Gamma}^{-1}\hat{U}$ and $I + \tilde{V}\tilde{\Gamma}^{-1}\tilde{U}$.*

Algorithm 2: Solve semi-banded system $(\Gamma + UV)\tilde{z} = d$
(From [6, Algorithm 2])

Require : Γ, U, V, d

- 1 Compute z_1 solving $\Gamma z_1 = d$
- 2 Compute z_2 solving $(I + V\Gamma^{-1}U)z_2 = Vz_1$
- 3 Compute z_3 solving $\Gamma z_3 = Uz_2$

Output: $\tilde{z} \leftarrow z_1 - z_3$

D. Efficient computation of v^{k+1}

The iterate v^{k+1} is obtained in Step 4 of Algorithm 1 as

$$v^{k+1} = \arg \min_{x_0, u_0, v_t} \gamma_\beta(v_t; \bar{v}_t, \underline{v}_t) - \lambda^\top v + \frac{\rho}{2} \|Ez - v\|_2^2 \quad (12)$$

s.t. $\underline{u}_0 \leq u_0 \leq \bar{u}_0$,

which is separable. Note that it considers a non-differentiable piece-wise quadratic functional due to the inclusion of the $\max(\cdot)$ operator in the $\gamma_\beta(\cdot)$ function. Since (12) is separable, each element of its optimal solution can be obtained from a scalar optimization problem, whose solution is provided by the following proposition. We provide its proof in the Appendix.

Proposition 4. *Consider the strictly convex scalar optimization problem*

$$y^* = \arg \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{2} y^2 - by + \alpha \max(c - y, y - d, 0), \quad (13)$$

where $\alpha > 0$, $b, c, d \in \mathbb{R}$ and $c < d$. Define $y_1 = b + \alpha$, $y_2 = b$, $y_3 = b - \alpha$. Then,

$$y^* = \begin{cases} y_1 & \text{if } y_1 \leq c, \\ c & \text{if } y_1 > c \text{ and } y_2 < c, \\ y_2 & \text{if } c \leq y_2 \leq d, \\ d & \text{if } y_2 > d \text{ and } y_3 < d, \\ y_3 & \text{if } y_3 \geq d. \end{cases}$$

Proposition 4 leads to the following corollary, which provides the optimal solution for the elements v_t of (12). We provide no proof because the result is derived by simply equating terms between (12) and (13).

Corollary 1. *Denote $c_{(j)} \doteq (Ez^{k+1} + \frac{1}{\rho}\lambda^k)_{(j+n_x+n_u)}$, for $j \in \mathbb{Z}_1^{n_v - n_x - n_u}$. Then, each component of v_t^{k+1} is given by*

$$v_t^{k+1} = \begin{cases} c_{(j)} + \frac{\beta_{(j)}}{\rho} & \text{if } c_{(j)} + \frac{\beta_{(j)}}{\rho} < \underline{v}_{t(j)}, \\ \underline{v}_{t(j)} & \text{if } c_{(j)} + \frac{\beta_{(j)}}{\rho} > \underline{v}_{t(j)} \text{ and } c_{(j)} < \underline{v}_{t(j)}, \\ c_{(j)} & \text{if } \underline{v}_{t(j)} \leq c_{(j)} \leq \bar{v}_{t(j)}, \\ \bar{v}_{t(j)} & \text{if } c_{(j)} > \bar{v}_{t(j)} \text{ and } c_{(j)} - \frac{\beta_{(j)}}{\rho} < \bar{v}_{t(j)}, \\ c_{(j)} - \frac{\beta_{(j)}}{\rho} & \text{if } c_{(j)} - \frac{\beta_{(j)}}{\rho} \geq \bar{v}_{t(j)}. \end{cases}$$

Now, let $\bar{v} \doteq (\mathbb{1}_{n_x} \cdot \infty, \bar{u}_0)$, $\underline{v} \doteq (-\mathbb{1}_{n_x} \cdot \infty, \underline{u}_0)$. Then, the rest of elements of v^{k+1} , which are the ones corresponding to (x_0, u_0) , i.e., $v_{(j)}^{k+1}$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}_1^{n_x+n_u}$, can be computed as

$$v_{(j)}^{k+1} = \min \left(\max \left(Ez_{(j)}^{k+1} + \frac{1}{\rho}\lambda_{(j)}^k, \underline{v}_{(j)} \right), \bar{v}_{(j)} \right).$$

Formulation	Iterations				Computation time [seconds]			
	Avg.	Median	Max.	Min.	Avg.	Median	Max.	Min.
(5) using Spcies	30.7	31.0	45.0	27.0	3.80×10^{-4}	3.66×10^{-4}	6.93×10^{-4}	3.18×10^{-4}
(3) using Spcies	30.7	31.0	45.0	27.0	3.70×10^{-4}	3.60×10^{-4}	6.12×10^{-4}	3.16×10^{-4}
(3) using OSQP	46.8	50.0	75.0	25.0	6.27×10^{-4}	6.13×10^{-4}	1.53×10^{-3}	4.16×10^{-4}
[10]* using OSQP	50.1	50.0	75.0	50.0	2.40×10^{-3}	2.32×10^{-3}	4.70×10^{-3}	2.28×10^{-3}

*The soft-constrained formulation from [10] has been implemented using the quadratic offset cost from this article for a fair comparison.

TABLE I: Number of iterations and computation times.




Fig. 1: Oscillating masses system

IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS

Let us consider a system, inspired by the case study in [16], consisting of three masses connected by springs, with the ones to the far left and right connected to unmovable walls, as illustrated in Figure 1. The inputs are the two forces applied to each of the masses connected to the walls, i.e., F_f and F_l , whereas the state vector is given by $x = (p_1, p_2, p_3, v_1, v_2, v_3)$, where p_i and v_i are the position and velocity of mass i , respectively. The physical parameters of the system are $m_1 = m_2 = m_3 = 1\text{kg}$, $k = 2\text{N/m}$. A model (1) is obtained by discretizing the continuous dynamics of the system using a sample time of 0.2 seconds. We consider two outputs, which are the relative distance between the center of masses m_1 and m_2 , and the center of masses m_2 and m_3 . Therefore, we have

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, D = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The constraints we consider for the system are

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{x} &= (0.6, 0.6, 0.6, 1, 1, 1), \underline{x} = -\bar{x}, \bar{x}_s = \bar{x}, \underline{x}_s = \underline{x}, \\ \bar{u} &= (1, 1), \underline{u} = (0, 0), \bar{u}_s = \bar{u}, \underline{u}_s = \underline{u}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

All constraints in (5) for the artificial reference and the predicted states and inputs along N are set to the bounds (14). The control objective is to steer the system from an initial state to the reference $x_r = (0.4, 0.4, 0.4, 0, 0, 0)$, $u_r = (0.8, 0.8)$, which is an admissible equilibrium point of the system.

We set the parameters of (5) to

$$\begin{aligned} N &= 15, Q = \text{diag}(2.5, 2.5, 2.5, 0.5, 0.5, 0.5), \\ R &= \text{diag}(0.3, 0.3), S = \text{diag}(1, 1), \\ T &= \text{diag}(200, 200, 200, 10, 10, 10), \beta = 10 \cdot \mathbf{1}_{n_v}, \end{aligned}$$

and select $\rho = 1.2$ and $\epsilon_p = \epsilon_d = 1 \times 10^{-4}$ for the ADMM algorithm. We set the same parameters for (3). We perform a set of 1000 experiments, using an Intel Core i5-1135G7, where $x(t)$ are randomly selected from a uniform distribution within the range $-(0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.2, 0.2, 0.2) \leq x(t) \leq (0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.2, 0.2, 0.2)$, which has been selected so as to ensure that all experiments are feasible for (3), but with a significant number of them leading to active constraints in their optimal solution.

The results are shown in Table I, where we implement (3) and (5) using version v0.3.11 of the Spcies toolbox for MATLAB [17]. We also solve (3) using the OSQP solver [18] (version 0.6.2), in order to provide a comparison with a state-of-the-art QP solver. Additionally, also using OSQP, we include the soft-constrained MPCT formulation from [10] (but using the offset cost function of (3) for a fair comparison), to compare the classical slack-variable approach to implement soft constraints with the approach proposed in Section II. We consider the 1-norm for penalizing the slack-variables of [10], and take its parameters as $\xi = 0.001$, $S = 20 \cdot I$ and $\rho_\epsilon = 10$.

The computational results indicate that the proposed structure-exploiting solvers provide better computational results than when using general-purpose QP solvers, such as OSQP. We also note that the computation times are marginally larger for (5) than for (3), given the extra operations described in Corollary 1. We remark that, for our choice of β , the sub-optimal solutions of (3) and (5) are nearly indistinguishable, as discussed in Remark 1. Regarding the approach from [10], we observe that the computational times required are notably larger, mainly due to the inclusion of the slack variables as additional decision variables of the optimization problem, which increase its complexity and lead to the loss of its simple semi-banded structure.

Remark 4. A relevant difference between (5) and the soft-constrained MPCT formulation in [10] is that, in the former, only the first input of the predicted sequence along N is subject to hard constraints, whereas, in the latter, the entire sequence of inputs is subject to hard constraints. Consequently, in contrast to (5), the formulation in [10] is not always feasible.

Next, we include closed-loop results starting from an initial state $x(t) = (0, 0, 0, -0.5, 0, 0, 0)$, with output limits

$$\bar{y} = (0.07, 0.07), \underline{y} = -\bar{y}, \bar{y}_s = \bar{y}, \underline{y}_s = \underline{y},$$

while maintaining the rest of MPC parameters the same. In this case, (3) is infeasible, unlike (5). Results are shown in Figure 2, where we observe that the applied input does not violate its constraints, as (5f) considers hard inequality constraints for u_0 . We remark that, when (3) is not feasible, the number of iterations required by (5) depends on the values of β . In the experiment in Figure 2, the number of iterations is 271 in average, and requires a maximum of 506.

V. CONCLUSION

This article has introduced an efficient way of implementing the MPCT formulation with most of its hard inequality constraints softened, so that the resulting optimization problem is always feasible. This provides the ability to deal with




Fig. 2: Closed-loop experiment of the oscillating masses system using the soft-constrained formulation (5).

situations where model mismatch or disturbances might cause the original formulation to become infeasible. We propose an encoding of the soft constraints that allows us to retain the semi-banded structure of the formulation that is exploited by a recently proposed ADMM-based solver. Numerical results show that the proposed approach provides good computational results when compared to state-of-the-art QP solvers and with the classical slack-variable approach to encode soft constraints.

REFERENCES

- [1] E. F. Camacho and C. B. Alba, *Model Predictive Control*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [2] J. Rawlings, D. Mayne, and M. Diehl, *Model Predictive Control: Theory, Computation, and Design*. Nob Hill Publishing, 2017.
- [3] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [4] K. P. Wabersich, R. Krishnadas, and M. N. Zeilinger, “A soft constrained MPC formulation enabling learning from trajectories with constraint violations,” *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 6, pp. 980–985, 2022.
- [5] D. Limon, I. Alvarado, T. Alamo, and E. Camacho, “MPC for tracking piecewise constant references for constrained linear systems,” *Automatica*, vol. 44, no. 9, pp. 2382–2387, 2008.
- [6] V. Gracia, P. Krupa, D. Limon, and T. Alamo, “Efficient implementation of MPC for tracking using ADMM by decoupling its semi-banded structure,” *Accepted in the IEEE European Control Conference, 2024, available at arXiv:2402.09912*, 2024.
- [7] S. Boyd, N. Parikh, E. Chu, B. Peleato, and J. Eckstein, “Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers,” *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–122, 2011.
- [8] P. Krupa, I. Alvarado, D. Limon, and T. Alamo, “Implementation of model predictive control for tracking in embedded systems using a sparse extended ADMM algorithm,” *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 1798–1805, 2021.
- [9] X. Cai, D. Han, and X. Yuan, “On the convergence of the direct extension of ADMM for three-block separable convex minimization models with one strongly convex function,” *Computational Optimization and Applications*, vol. 66, pp. 39–73, 2017.
- [10] M. N. Zeilinger, M. Morari, and C. N. Jones, “Soft constrained model predictive control with robust stability guarantees,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 59, no. 5, pp. 1190–1202, 2014.
- [11] D. Limon, I. Alvarado, T. Alamo, and E. Camacho, “Robust tube-based MPC for tracking of constrained linear systems with additive disturbances,” *Journal of Process Control*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 248–260, 2010.
- [12] I. Alvarado, P. Krupa, D. Limon, and T. Alamo, “Tractable robust MPC design based on nominal predictions,” *Journal of Process Control*, vol. 111, pp. 75–85, 2022.
- [13] R. Fletcher, *Non-Smooth Optimization*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2000, ch. 14, pp. 357–416.
- [14] E. C. Kerrigan and J. M. Maciejowski, “Soft constraints and exact penalty functions in model predictive control,” in *UKACC International Conference (Control)*, Cambridge, 2000.
- [15] D. Tylavsky and G. Sohie, “Generalization of the matrix inversion lemma,” *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 74, no. 7, pp. 1050–1052, 1986.
- [16] M. Kögel and R. Findeisen, “A fast gradient method for embedded linear predictive control,” *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 1362–1367, 2011, 18th IFAC World Congress.

- [17] P. Krupa, V. Gracia, D. Limon, and T. Alamo, “SPCIES: Suite of Predictive Controllers for Industrial Embedded Systems,” <https://github.com/GepocUS/Spicies>, Dec 2020.
- [18] B. Stellato, G. Banjac, P. Goulart, A. Bemporad, and S. Boyd, “OSQP: an operator splitting solver for quadratic programs,” *Mathematical Programming Computation*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 637–672, 2020.

APPENDIX : PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4

Clearly, the function to be minimized

$$h(y) = \frac{1}{2}y^2 - by + \alpha \max(c - y, y - d, 0),$$

can be written as $h(y) = \max\{h_1(y), h_2(y), h_3(y)\}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} h_1(y) &= \frac{1}{2}y^2 - by + \alpha(c - y), & h_2(y) &= \frac{1}{2}y^2 - by, \\ h_3(y) &= \frac{1}{2}y^2 - by + \alpha(y - d). \end{aligned}$$

We can check that the proposed values for y_1 , y_2 and y_3 satisfy

$$y_i = \arg \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}} h_i(y), \quad i = 1, 2, 3.$$

Suppose now that $y_1 \leq c$, and recall that $c < d$. Then

$$h(y_1) = h_1(y_1) \leq h_1(y^*) \leq h(y^*).$$

We notice that the first equality is due to $y_1 \leq c$ and $c < d$, the first inequality is due to the optimality of y_1 , and the second one to the fact that $h(y) \geq h_1(y)$, $\forall y$. We thus infer that, for this case, $h(y^*) \geq h(y_1)$, implying $y^* = y_1$. Suppose now that $y_2 \in [c, d]$. Under this assumption, we obtain analogously $h(y_2) = h_2(y_2) \leq h_2(y^*) \leq h(y^*)$, which implies $y^* = y_2$. The assumption $y_3 \geq d$ translates into $h(y_3) = h_3(y_3) \leq h_3(y^*) \leq h(y^*)$, that is, $y^* = y_3$. In order to finish the proof it suffices to check when the optimum is attained at the non differentiable points c and d . For this purpose, we analyze the limiting derivatives at c and d respectively

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{y \rightarrow c^-} h'(y) &= c - b - \alpha = c - y_1, \\ \lim_{y \rightarrow c^+} h'(y) &= c - b = c - y_2, \\ \lim_{y \rightarrow d^-} h'(y) &= d - b = d - y_2, \\ \lim_{y \rightarrow d^+} h'(y) &= d - b + \alpha = d - y_3. \end{aligned}$$

From the previous expressions, it is simple to check that the conditions $y_1 > c$ and $y_2 < c$ imply that 0 belongs to the sub-gradient of $h(y)$ at $y = c$, leading to $y^* = c$. Similarly, the condition $y_2 > d$ and $y_3 < d$ imply that 0 belongs to the sub-gradient of $h(y)$ at $y = d$, which translates into $y^* = d$. ■