

Closed-loop Performance Optimization of Model Predictive Control with Robustness Guarantees

Riccardo Zuliani, Efe C. Balta, and John Lygeros

Abstract—Model mismatch and process noise are two frequently occurring phenomena that can drastically affect the performance of model predictive control (MPC) in practical applications. We propose a principled way to tune the cost function and the constraints of linear MPC schemes to achieve good performance and robust constraint satisfaction on uncertain nonlinear dynamics with additive noise. The tuning is performed using a novel MPC tuning algorithm based on backpropagation developed in our earlier work. Using the scenario approach, we provide probabilistic bounds on the likelihood of closed-loop constraint violation over a finite horizon. We showcase the effectiveness of the proposed method on linear and nonlinear simulation examples.

I. INTRODUCTION

Model predictive control (MPC) is a model-based control technique that can efficiently solve challenging control tasks under input and process constraints by solving, at each time-step, a receding horizon optimization problem. The mismatch between the nominal model used by the MPC and the true dynamics poses an important challenge in maintaining good closed-loop performance and ensuring constraint satisfaction. Many robust MPC methods have been developed in the literature, often relying on constraint tightening or probabilistic satisfaction guarantees. However, most existing methods can be over-conservative since tuning the constraint tightening for maximal closed-loop performance is challenging. Here, we study the MPC problem with model uncertainty and provide a structured strategy for optimal constraint tightening.

Tube MPC is a principled way to robustify MPC schemes whenever the process dynamics are unknown or subject to disturbances [1]. This strategy tightens the MPC constraints so that the resulting closed-loop state-input trajectory satisfies the nominal constraints. The tightening is generally designed based on the support of the uncertainty/noise set, which is assumed to be bounded [2]. Tube MPC schemes have been developed for linear systems subject to bounded additive noise [2], multiplicative uncertainty [3], and parametric uncertainty [4]. Moreover, extensions to nonlinear Tube MPC to deal with additive noise [1] and model uncertainty [5] have been developed. Despite its popularity, Tube MPC can be conservative, since constraint tightening is often designed for the worst-case uncertainty realization, which is unlikely to occur in many practical applications, leading to overly cautious MPC designs. Moreover, nonlinear

tube-based solutions are generally cumbersome to implement numerically and may require significant tuning effort [6].

A way to reduce conservatism is to construct a representation of the uncertain elements (either implicitly or explicitly) using data and derive probabilistic bounds on the likelihood of constraint satisfaction. A notable example is the *scenario approach* [7], where samples of the uncertain parameters (called scenarios) are used to obtain a control scheme with good out-of-sample performance. Unlike robust tube MPC, the scenario approach can be applied without accurate knowledge of the underlying uncertainty distribution. However, constraint satisfaction is guaranteed only in probability instead of in worst case, where a smaller constraint violation probability will likely produce a more conservative performance. For example, [8] proposes a scenario approach-based MPC design for uncertain linear systems subject to additive disturbances and shows guarantees on the closed-loop probability of constraint violation at each time step. The scheme of [9], under a similar setting, is guaranteed to have a small average constraint violation. The scenario approach can also be used in settings where the model dynamics are completely unknown [10]. Existing methods, however, are almost exclusively limited to linear system dynamics, or have guarantees for single time-steps, providing little insight into the behavior over closed-loop trajectories.

In this paper, we design the cost and the constraints of an MPC scheme to maximize performance while ensuring robust constraint satisfaction. Our contribution is twofold: i) we provide a novel approach for optimal tuning of robust nonlinear MPC problems and ii) we use the scenario approach to provide sample-efficient guarantees on the closed-loop probability of constraint violation. The tuned MPC can be formulated as a convex quadratic program (QP), which can be solved efficiently and reliably with specialized software. The design parameters are the terminal cost and the input cost of the MPC, as well as linear constraint tightenings. All variables are tuned using the recently proposed *BackPropagation-MPC (BP-MPC)* algorithm [11], which can achieve optimal closed-loop MPC designs using a sensitivity-based procedure. Since the sensitivity information involves the closed-loop trajectory, our method greatly reduces the conservatism compared to existing offline-designed tube-based techniques.

Notation: We use $\mathbb{Z}_{[a,b]} = \mathbb{Z} \cap [a,b]$ where \mathbb{Z} is the set of integers. We use $x \sim \mathcal{P}$ to say that x is drawn from the probability distribution \mathcal{P} . $\mathbb{E}[x]$ and $\mathbb{P}[x]$ denote the expectation and probability of the random variable x .

Research supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation under NCCR Automation (grant agreement 51NF40_180545). R. Zuliani and J. Lygeros are with the Automatic Control Laboratory (IfA), ETH Zürich, 8092 Zürich, Switzerland {rzuliani,lygeros}@ethz.ch. E. C. Balta is with Inspire AG, 8005 Zürich, Switzerland and IfA efe.balta@inspire.ch.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

We consider an uncertain nonlinear system subject to additive disturbances

$$x_{t+1} = f(x_t, u_t, d) + w_t, \quad x_0 \sim \mathcal{P}_{x_0}, \quad (1)$$

where x_t and u_t denote, the state and input at time t , respectively, and \mathcal{P}_{x_0} is an unknown distribution with known mean \bar{x}_0 . The parameter d is a random variable representing model uncertainty with unknown distribution \mathcal{P}_d . The additive noise w_t is drawn i.i.d. for every t from the unknown distribution \mathcal{P}_w . The system needs to satisfy the following state and input constraints for all t

$$H_x x_t \leq h_x, \quad H_u u_t \leq h_u. \quad (2)$$

We consider the case where the input u_t is determined online by an MPC policy $u_t = \text{MPC}(x_t, p, \eta)$, where p and η are design parameters. The closed-loop dynamics are then given by

$$x_{t+1} = f(x_t, \text{MPC}(x_t, p, \eta), d) + w_t \quad (3)$$

The nominal dynamics can be obtained from (3) by setting $d = 0$ and $w_t = 0$

$$\bar{x}_{t+1} = f(\bar{x}_t, \text{MPC}(\bar{x}_t, p, \eta)) \quad (4)$$

where we used $f(\bar{x}_t, \bar{u}_t) := f(\bar{x}_t, \bar{u}_t, 0)$, and \bar{x}_t and $\bar{u}_t = \text{MPC}(\bar{x}_t, p, \eta)$ denote the nominal state and the nominal input, respectively.

Our goal is to design an MPC policy that steers the system to the origin while satisfying (2) for all possible $w_t \sim \mathcal{P}_w$, $d \sim \mathcal{P}_d$, and $x_0 \sim \mathcal{P}_{x_0}$ within a finite time horizon $T \gg 0$. Both these objectives are captured by the following optimization problem.

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{p, \eta, x, u}{\text{minimize}} && \mathbb{E}_{w, d, x_0} \left[\sum_{t=0}^T \|x_t\|_{Q_x}^2 \right] \\ & \text{subject to} && x_{t+1} = f(x_t, u_t, d) + w_t, \\ & && u_t = \text{MPC}(x_t, p, \eta), \\ & && H_x x_t \leq h_x, \quad H_u u_t \leq h_u, \\ & && \forall w_t, d, x_0, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0, T]}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $Q_x \succ 0$ and $w := (w_0, \dots, w_T)$. Our framework can easily allow for more complex cost functions. For simplicity, we limit \mathcal{C} to be a quadratic function of x , and refer the reader to [11, Section VI-C] for more information.

We focus on MPC policies that can be expressed as strongly convex quadratic programs. Specifically, given two design parameters $p := (P, R)$, with $P, R \succ 0$ (terminal and input cost), and $\eta := (\eta_x, \eta_u)$ (state and input constraint tightenings), we choose $\text{MPC}(x_t, p, \eta) = v_{0|t}$ by solving

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{z_t, v_t} && \|z_{N|t}\|_P^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \|z_{k|t}\|_{Q_x}^2 + \|v_{k|t}\|_R^2 \\ & \text{s.t.} && z_{k+1|t} = A_{k|t} z_{k|t} + B_{k|t} v_{k|t} + c_{k|t}, \quad z_{0|t} = x_t, \\ & && H_x z_{k|t} \leq h_x - \eta_{x,k}^2, \quad H_u v_{k|t} \leq h_u - \eta_{u,k}^2, \\ & && \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0, N-1]}, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $z_t := (z_{0|t}, \dots, z_{N|t})$, $v_t := (v_{0|t}, \dots, v_{N-1|t})$, $\eta_x := (\eta_{x,0}, \dots, \eta_{x,N})$, $\eta_u := (\eta_{u,0}, \dots, \eta_{u,N-1})$, and the square in the tightenings is applied elementwise. The prediction horizon N of the MPC is generally much smaller than T . Since (6) may become infeasible in practice, we relax the state constraints with the technique of [11, Section VI-D].

The equality constraints in (6) should be designed to ensure that $A_{k|t} z_{k|t} + B_{k|t} v_{k|t} + c_{k|t} \approx f(z_{k|t}, v_{k|t})$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0, N-1]}$. To this end, denoting with (z_{t-1}, v_{t-1}) the optimal state-input trajectory obtained by solving (6) at time-step $t-1$, we set

$$\begin{aligned} A_{k|t} &= \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(z_{k+1|t-1}, v_{k+1|t-1}), \quad B_{k|t} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial u}(z_{k+1|t-1}, v_{k+1|t-1}), \\ c_{k|t} &= f(z_{k+1|t-1}, v_{k+1|t-1}) - A_{k|t} z_{k+1|t-1} - B_{k|t} v_{k+1|t-1}. \end{aligned}$$

This technique is commonly known as successive linearization [12]. For simplicity, we assume that $A_{k|t} \equiv A$, $B_{k|t} \equiv B$ and $c_{k|t} \equiv 0$ and refer the reader to [11, Section VI-A].

III. IMPROVING NOMINAL PERFORMANCE

To solve (5), we first design $\theta := (p, \eta)$ to minimize the cost in (5) for the nominal dynamics (4) by solving

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\theta, \bar{x}}{\text{minimize}} && \sum_{t=0}^T \|\bar{x}_t\|_{Q_x}^2 \\ & \text{subject to} && \bar{x}_{t+1} = f(\bar{x}_t, \text{MPC}(\bar{x}_t, \theta)), \quad \bar{x}_0 \text{ given}, \\ & && H_x \bar{x}_t \leq h_x, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0, T]}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

We omit the input constraints since the MPC policy (6) satisfies them by design. Using a penalty function, we can reformulate (7) as the unconstrained minimization problem

$$\underset{\theta}{\text{minimize}} \quad \ell(\bar{x}(\theta)), \quad (8)$$

where $x(\theta) := (\bar{x}_0(\theta), \dots, \bar{x}_T(\theta))$ is the function mapping θ to the nominal closed-loop trajectory $\bar{x}(\theta)$ obtained by setting $\bar{x}_0(\theta) = \bar{x}_0$ and by iterating the nominal dynamics $\bar{x}_{t+1} = f(\bar{x}_t, \text{MPC}(\bar{x}_t, \theta))$ until time-step T , and

$$\ell(x) := \sum_{t=0}^T \|x_t(\theta)\|_{Q_x}^2 + c_1 \|\max\{H_x x_t(\theta) - h_x, 0\}\|_1$$

with $c_1 > 0$ and \max applied elementwise. If (7) is sufficiently well-behaved, and c_1 is large enough, we can prove that (8) and (7) are equivalent.

Lemma 1 ([13, Theorem 2.1]). *The set of calm local minima of (7) coincide with the set of local minima of (8) provided that c_1 is chosen at least as large as the calmness modulus.*

For a discussion about calmness and calmness modulus, the reader should refer to [13].

A. Conservative Jacobians

Problem (8) can be solved using a simple gradient-based scheme. However, since the cost function in (8) is typically nondifferentiable, a more general notion of gradient is needed. To this end, we use the concept of conservative Jacobians [14].

Definition 1 ([14, Section 2]). Let $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ be a locally Lipschitz function. We say that $\mathcal{J}_\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^m$ is a *conservative Jacobian* for φ , if \mathcal{J}_φ is nonempty-valued, outer semicontinuous, locally bounded, and for all paths¹ $\rho : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and almost all $t \in [0, 1]$

$$\frac{d\varphi}{dt}(\rho(t)) = \langle v, \dot{\rho}(t) \rangle, \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{J}_\varphi(\rho(t)).$$

The function φ is *path-differentiable* if it admits a conservative Jacobian.

Given two path-differentiable functions $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\chi : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$, the function $\psi := \varphi \circ \chi$ is path-differentiable with $\mathcal{J}_\psi(z) = \mathcal{J}_\varphi(\chi(z))\mathcal{J}_\chi(z)$. Importantly, not all locally Lipschitz functions are path-differentiable. In this paper, we focus on the class of semialgebraic functions.

Definition 2 ([15, Definitions 2.1.4 and 2.2.5]). A set \mathcal{A} in \mathbb{R}^n is *semialgebraic* if it can be expressed as a finite number of polynomial equalities or inequalities

$$\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{i=1}^I \bigcap_{j=1}^J \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : P_{ij}(x) < 0, Q_{ij}(x) = 0\},$$

where $I, J < \infty$ and P_{ij} and Q_{ij} are polynomials. A function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is semialgebraic if its graph $\{(x, v) : v = \varphi(x)\}$ is semialgebraic.

Locally Lipschitz semialgebraic functions are ubiquitous in control and optimization, and admit a conservative Jacobian. Moreover, they can be minimized (locally) with Algorithm 1, which is guaranteed to converge to a critical point for a suitable choice of step sizes.

Algorithm 1 Minimization of path-differentiable function

Input: $x^0, \{\alpha_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}, \text{tol} > 0.$

- 1: **for** $k = 1$ to ∞ **do**
 - 2: $p^k \in \mathcal{J}_\varphi(x^k)$
 - 3: $x^{k+1} = x^k - \alpha_k p^k$
 - 4: **If** $\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|_2 < \text{tol}$ **return** $x^* = x^{k+1}$
 - 5: **end for**
-

Lemma 2 ([16, Theorem 6.2]). *Let φ be locally Lipschitz semialgebraic, assume that $\sup_k \|x^k\|_2 < \infty$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and that*

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k = \infty, \quad \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k^2 < \infty. \quad (9)$$

Then x^k in Algorithm 1 converges to some x^ , with $0 \in \mathcal{J}_\varphi(x^*)$.*

One way to guarantee bounded iterates x^k is to introduce a projection to a large enough polytopic set \mathcal{X} in the gradient descent update, i.e., $x^{k+1} = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X}}[x^k - \alpha_k p^k]$ (see discussion in [16, Section 6.1]).

¹A *path* is an absolutely continuous function $\rho : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ admitting a derivative $\dot{\rho}$ for almost every $t \in [0, 1]$ and for which the Lebesgue integral of $\dot{\rho}$ between 0 and any $t \in [0, 1]$ equals $\rho(t) - \rho(0)$.

To ensure that (8) can be solved with Algorithm 1, we require $\ell(\bar{x}(\theta))$ to be locally Lipschitz and semialgebraic. This is the case if ℓ and \bar{x} are locally Lipschitz semialgebraic, as both these properties are preserved by composition.

Assumption 1. The cost function ℓ is locally Lipschitz and semialgebraic.

B. The BP-MPC algorithm

The BP-MPC algorithm, recently proposed in [11], uses backpropagation to efficiently construct \mathcal{J}_x for a given d recursively

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_{x_{t+1}}(\theta) = & \mathcal{J}_{f,u}(x_t, u_t, d) [\mathcal{J}_{\text{MPC},x_t}(x_t, \theta)\mathcal{J}_{x_t}(p) \\ & + \mathcal{J}_{\text{MPC},\theta}(x_t, \theta)] + \mathcal{J}_{f,x}(x_t, u_t, d)\mathcal{J}_{x_t}(p), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where $\mathcal{J}_{f,x}$ and $\mathcal{J}_{f,u}$ are the partial conservative Jacobians of f with respect to its arguments (and similarly for $\mathcal{J}_{\text{MPC},x_t}$ and $\mathcal{J}_{\text{MPC},\theta}$), and $\mathcal{J}_x(\theta) = 0$, since x_0 is independent of θ . We provide here a general algorithm that works for any value of w, d , and x_0 , and later consider the nominal case. To apply (10) we require the following.

Assumption 2. The function f is locally Lipschitz semialgebraic in (x, u) for all $d \sim \mathcal{P}_d$.

To compute the conservative Jacobian \mathcal{J}_{MPC} of the MPC map, we rewrite (6) as a quadratic program in standard form

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{y}{\text{minimize}} \quad & \frac{1}{2} y^\top Q(p)y + q(x_t, p)^\top y \\ \text{subject to} \quad & G(p)y \leq g(x_t, p, \eta), \\ & F(p)y = \phi(x_t, p), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

and obtain its Lagrange dual

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{z}{\text{minimize}} \quad & \frac{1}{2} z^\top H(p)z + h(x_t, p, \eta)^\top z \\ \text{subject to} \quad & z = (\lambda, \mu) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\text{in}}} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_{\text{eq}}}, \lambda \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Note that both problems (11) and (12) do not depend on the choice of d and w , since the MPC (6) utilizes an approximation of the nominal dynamics (4). The solution $y(\bar{p})$ of (11), where $\bar{p} := (x_t, p, \eta)$, is obtained from the solution $z(\bar{p})$ of (12) as $y(\bar{p}) = \mathcal{G}(z(\bar{p}), \bar{p})$, where

$$\mathcal{G}(z(\bar{p}), \bar{p}) := -Q(p)^{-1} ([G(p) \ F(p)]^\top z(\bar{p}) + q(\bar{p})).$$

The existence of \mathcal{J}_y can be guaranteed under the following assumptions.

Assumption 3. The maps $Q(p), q(\bar{p}), G(p), g(\bar{p}), F(p)$, and $\phi(\bar{p})$ are locally Lipschitz semialgebraic. Moreover, $Q^{-1}(p)$ is locally Lipschitz.

Assumption 4. For all values of x_t, p , and η , problem (11) is feasible, strongly convex, and satisfies the linear independence constraint qualification (LICQ).

Assumption 3 is not restrictive in practice, as the class of locally Lipschitz semialgebraic functions comprises most functions commonly used in control and optimization. The feasibility assumption is not restrictive as state constraints

can be relaxed using the technique of [11, Section VI-D]. The LICQ assumption holds e.g. if the constraints in (2) are box constraints $x_{\min} \leq x_t \leq x_{\max}$, $u_{\min} \leq u_t \leq u_{\max}$.

Proposition 1 ([11, Theorem 1]). *Under Assumptions 3 and 4, the optimizer $z(\bar{p})$ of (12) is unique and locally Lipschitz semialgebraic. Its conservative Jacobian $\mathcal{J}_z(\bar{p})$ contains elements of the form $-U^{-1}V$, where*

$$\begin{aligned} U &\in T(I - \gamma H(p)) - I, \\ V &\in -\gamma T(Az + B), \\ T &= \text{diag}(\text{sign}(\lambda_1), \dots, \text{sign}(\lambda_{n_{in}}), 1, \dots, 1), \end{aligned}$$

where $z = (\lambda, \mu)$, $A \in \mathcal{J}_H(p)$, $B \in \mathcal{J}_h(\bar{p})$, and γ is any positive constant. Moreover, the optimizer $y(\bar{p})$ of (11) is unique and locally Lipschitz semialgebraic with conservative Jacobian

$$W - Q(p)^\top [G(p)^\top F(p)^\top] Z \in \mathcal{J}_y(\bar{p}),$$

where $Z \in \mathcal{J}_z(\bar{p})$ and $W \in \mathcal{J}_{G,\bar{p}}(z(\bar{p}), \bar{p})$.

Proposition 1 provides a way to compute the conservative Jacobian \mathcal{J}_{MPC} of the MPC map. Combining with (10), we can iteratively construct the conservative Jacobian \mathcal{J}_x of the closed-loop trajectory x for any value of w , d , x_0 . The procedure is summarized in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2 Conservative Jacobian computation

Input: θ , w , d , x_0 .

Init: $\mathcal{J}_{x_0}(\theta) = 0$.

- 1: **for** $t = 0$ to T **do**
 - 2: Solve (6) and set $u_t = \text{MPC}(x_t, \theta)$.
 - 3: Compute $\mathcal{J}_{x_{t+1}}(\theta)$ using (10) and Proposition 1.
 - 4: Compute next state $x_{t+1} = f(x_t, u_t, d) + w_t$.
 - 5: **end for**
 - 6: **return** $\mathcal{J}_x(\theta)$
-

To compute the conservative Jacobian of \bar{x} for a given θ it suffices to set $w = 0$, $d = 0$, and $x_0 = \bar{x}_0$ in Algorithm 2.

C. A gradient-based solution

Once the conservative Jacobian of the closed-loop trajectory \bar{x} is available, we can obtain the conservative Jacobian of the objective in (8) using the chain rule $\mathcal{J}_\ell(\theta) = \mathcal{J}_\ell(\bar{x})\mathcal{J}_{\bar{x}}(\theta)$. Combining this with Algorithms 1 and 2, we obtain Algorithm 3, which converges to a critical point of (8).

Algorithm 3 BP-MPC for Nominal Performance

Input: θ^0 , $\{\alpha_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\text{tol} > 0$.

- 1: **for** $k = 0$ to ∞ **do**
 - 2: Compute $J_1^k \in \mathcal{J}_{\bar{x}}(\theta^k)$ with Algorithm 2.
 - 3: Compute $J_2^k \in \mathcal{J}_\ell(\bar{x})$.
 - 4: Compute $J^k = J_2^k J_1^k$.
 - 5: Update $\theta^{k+1} = \theta^k - \alpha_k J^k$.
 - 6: **If** $\|\theta^{k+1} - \theta^k\|_2 < \text{tol}$ **return** $\theta^* = \theta^{k+1}$
 - 7: **end for**
-

Theorem 1. *Suppose that Assumptions 1, 2, 3 and 4 hold, that $\{\alpha_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfy (9), and that $\sup_k \|p^k\|_2 < \infty$. Then θ^k as obtained in Algorithm 3 converges to a critical point θ^* of (8). Moreover, if (7) is calm at θ^* , and c_1 in (8) is chosen at least as large as the calmness modulus, then θ^* is also a local minimizer of (7).*

Proof. The first part follows immediately by recognizing that Algorithm 3 is implementing a gradient-descent rule equivalent to that in Algorithm 1, and by applying Lemma 2. The second follows from Lemma 1. \square

IV. ROBUST CONSTRAINT SATISFACTION

We now focus on ensuring robust constraint satisfaction by solving the problem

$$\begin{aligned} &\underset{\theta, x, u}{\text{minimize}} && \|\tilde{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2^2 \\ &\text{subject to} && x_{t+1} = f(x_t, u_t, d) + w_t, \\ & && u_t = \text{MPC}(x_t, \tilde{\theta}), \\ & && H_x x_t \leq h_x, \quad H_u u_t \leq h_u, \\ & && \forall w_t, d, x_0, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0, T]}, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where θ^* is the solution of (7) obtained with Algorithm 3. By penalizing the difference between $\tilde{\theta}$ and θ^* , we ensure that $\tilde{\theta}^* \approx \theta^*$ while satisfying the constraints.

A. Robust constraint satisfaction using BP-MPC

To solve (13), we assume that a set of i.i.d. samples is available:

$$\mathcal{S} := \{(w^j, d^j, x_0^j)_{j=1}^M : w^j \sim \mathcal{P}_w^T, d^j \sim \mathcal{P}_d, x_0^j \sim \mathcal{P}_{x_0}\}.$$

Utilizing the samples, we substitute the cost and the constraints in (13) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} &\underset{\tilde{\theta}, x^j, u^j, j \in \mathbb{Z}_{[1, M]}}{\text{minimize}} && \|\tilde{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2^2 \\ &\text{subject to} && x_{t+1}^j = f(x_t^j, u_t^j, d^j) + w_t^j, \\ & && u_t^j = \text{MPC}(x_t^j, \tilde{\theta}), \\ & && H_x x_t^j \leq h_x, \quad \forall (w^j, d^j, x_0^j) \in \mathcal{S}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

With the same strategy as in Section III, we can remove all constraints from (14) using a penalty function to obtain an unconstrained minimization problem

$$\underset{\tilde{\theta}}{\text{min.}} \quad \|\tilde{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2^2 + c_1 \sum_{j=1}^M \sum_{t=0}^T \|\max\{H_x x_t^j(\tilde{\theta}) - h_x, 0\}\|_1, \quad (15)$$

where $x^j(\theta) := (x_0^j(\theta), \dots, x_T^j(\theta))$ is the function mapping θ to the closed-loop trajectory $x^j(\theta)$ obtained by setting $x_0^j(\theta) = x_0^j$ and by iterating (1) until time-step T with parameters θ , w^j , and d^j .

Solving (15) using Algorithm 3 is computationally expensive, since each gradient computation requires the simulation of the closed loop trajectory for all samples of w , d , and x_0 . To reduce the computational burden while retaining convergence properties, we use a stochastic gradient descent

scheme that considers a single sample (w^j, d^j, x_0^j) at a time. The procedure is summarized in Algorithm 4.

Algorithm 4 BP-MPC for Robust Constraint Satisfaction

Input: θ^* , $\{\alpha_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, \mathcal{S} , $\max_it \in \mathbb{N}$,

Init: $\tilde{\theta}^0 = \theta^*$.

- 1: **for** $k = 0$ to \max_it **do**
 - 2: Sample $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{[1, M]}$ randomly.
 - 3: Compute $J_1^{k, j} \in \mathcal{J}_{x^j}(\tilde{\theta}^k)$ with Algorithm 2.
 - 4: Compute $J_2^{k, j} = \tilde{\theta}^k - \theta^*$.
 - 5: Update $\tilde{\theta}^{k+1} = \tilde{\theta}^k - \alpha_k J_2^{k, j} J_1^{k, j}$.
 - 6: **end for**
 - 7: **return** $\tilde{\theta}^* = \tilde{\theta}^{k+1}$
-

Theorem 2. *Suppose that Assumptions 2, 3 and 4 hold, that $\{\alpha_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfy (9), and that $\sup_k \|\tilde{\theta}^k\|_2 < \infty$. Then $\tilde{\theta}^k$ as obtained in Algorithm 4 converges to a critical point $\tilde{\theta}^*$ of (15). Moreover, if (14) is calm at $\tilde{\theta}^*$, and c_1 in (15) is chosen at least as large as the calmness modulus, then $\tilde{\theta}^*$ is also a local minimizer of (14).*

Proof. The proof is identical to that of Theorem 1, we only need to show that the stochastic gradient descent update used in Algorithm 4 ensures convergence to a critical point of (15). To prove this, we can invoke [14, Theorem 3]. \square

B. Out-of-sample constraint satisfaction

In this section, we study how well $\tilde{\theta}^*$ performs on unseen samples obtained from $\mathcal{P}_w, \mathcal{P}_d, \mathcal{P}_{x_0}$ (that is, assuming no distribution shift) by adapting the results of [17]. We want to ensure that the constraint violation probability

$$V(\tilde{\theta}^*) := \mathbb{P}_{w, d, x_0} \left\{ H_x x_t(\tilde{\theta}^*, w, d, x_0) > h_x \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0, T]} \right\}.$$

is smaller than a certain tolerance $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, i.e., $V(\tilde{\theta}^*) \leq \epsilon$, where $x(\tilde{\theta}^*, w, d, x_0)$ denotes the closed-loop trajectory obtained from (1) starting from x_0 with parameters w, d , and θ . This bound is well approximated by the condition

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ V(\tilde{\theta}^*) > \epsilon \right\} \leq \beta \quad (16)$$

if $\beta \in (0, 1)$ is close to 0. In (16) the stochasticity is in the choice of \mathcal{S} in (14), which is drawn from $\mathcal{P}_w^T \times \mathcal{P}_d \times \mathcal{P}_{x_0}$. If (16) is satisfied for very small values of β (e.g. $\beta = 10^{-6}$), we can practically guarantee $V(\tilde{\theta}^*) \leq \epsilon$ [17].

Before proceeding, we need to introduce the following. For simplicity, let $\delta := (w, d, x_0)$.

Definition 3 (Support constraint). Given a collection of samples $\mathcal{S} = \{\delta^j, j \in \mathbb{Z}_{[1, M]}\}$, a *support subsample* is a collection of k elements $\mathcal{D} = \{\delta^{j_i} : i \in \mathbb{Z}_{[1, k]}\}$, with $j_1 < \dots < j_k$, such that solving (14) with \mathcal{S} replaced with \mathcal{D} produces the same solution.

The support constraints of (15) comprise the samples $(w, d, x_0) \in \mathcal{S}$ satisfying $H_x x_t(\tilde{\theta}^*, w, d, x_0) = h_x$ for at least one $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0, T]}$, as all other constraints do not affect the gradient of the objective of (15).

We further require the following assumption, which is verified if the calmness constraint qualification is satisfied and c_1 in (15) is chosen large enough.

Assumption 5. For all $(w, d, x_0) \in \mathcal{S}$, $H_x x_t(\tilde{\theta}^*, w, d, x_0) \leq h_x$, where $\tilde{\theta}^*$ is the solution of (14) obtained with Algorithm 4.

Theorem 3 ([17, Theorem 1]). *Let Assumption 5 hold, and let $\beta \in (0, 1)$. Let $\epsilon : \{0, M\} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be any function satisfying*

$$\epsilon(M) = 1, \quad \sum_{k=0}^M \binom{M}{k} (1 - \epsilon(k))^{M-k} = \beta.$$

Then $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{S}}\{V(\tilde{\theta}^) > \epsilon(k^*)\} \leq \beta$, where k^* is the number of support constraints of (14).*

We can choose, for example

$$\epsilon(k) = \begin{cases} 1 - \sqrt[M-k]{\frac{\beta}{M \binom{M}{k}}} & \text{if } k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0, M-1]}, \\ 1 & \text{if } k = M. \end{cases}$$

Remark 1. *Note that (5) can be solved directly by applying Algorithm 4 on a problem with the constraints of (14) and cost function $1/M \sum_{i=1}^M \ell(x^j(\theta))$. The obtained solution may perform well on unseen samples; however, it would be challenging to identify the number of support constraints because of the dependency of the cost function on the samples in \mathcal{S} . The two-step strategy of this paper seeks a suboptimal solution of (5) for which identifying the support constraints is easier. This can potentially produce worse out-of-samples performance, but will have a known and guaranteed upper bound on the chance of closed-loop constraint violation.*

V. SIMULATION EXAMPLE

A. Nonlinear example

We test our method on the pendulum on a cart of [18]

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{x}(t) &= \frac{m\mu g \sin(\phi) - \mu \cos(\phi)(u + \mu \dot{\phi}^2 \sin(\phi))}{mJ - \mu^2 \cos(\phi)^2}, \\ \ddot{\phi} &= \frac{J(u + \mu \dot{\phi}^2 \sin(\phi)) - \mu^2 g \sin(\phi) \cos(\phi)}{mJ - \mu^2 \cos(\phi)^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where x and \dot{x} are the linear position and velocity of the cart, and ϕ and $\dot{\phi}$ are the angular position and velocity of the pendulum, respectively. The input u is the force applied to the cart. We use Runge-Kutta 4 with a sample time of 0.05 seconds to obtain discrete time dynamics, and impose the constraints $u(t) \in [-0.75, 0.75]$, $x(t) \in [-0.2, 0.2]$, $\dot{x}(t) \in [-1, 1]$. The mass m , the inertia J and the coefficient μ of the system are given by

$$m = \bar{m}(1 + d_1), \quad J = \bar{J}, \quad \mu = \bar{\mu}(1 + d_2),$$

where $\bar{m}, \bar{J}, \bar{\mu}$ are known nominal values of [18], and $d = (d_1, d_2)$ is a random variable uniformly distributed in the set $[-0.025, 0.025]^2$. The noise w_t is sampled uniformly

from the set $\{0\} \times [-0.05, 0.05] \times \{0\} \times [-0.05, 0.05]$. The initial condition is $x_0 = \bar{x}_0 + (0, \omega_1, 0, \omega_2)$, where $\bar{x}_0 = (0, 0, -\pi, 0)$ (pendulum down) and ω_1, ω_2 are sampled independently and uniformly from the interval $[-0.05, 0.05]$. We use the successive linearization strategy of [11] to obtain linear dynamics for (6). Moreover, we choose a short horizon $N = 5$ and $Q_x = \text{diag}(1, 0.001, 1, 0.001)$.

We run Algorithm 3 to obtain θ^* , and then run Algorithm 4 with a set \mathcal{S} of 250 samples for 4000 iterations with $c_3 = 80$. We additionally add a squared 2-norm penalty on the constraint violation to the cost of (15), multiplied by the factor $c_2 = 80$. This introduces an additional degree of freedom for tuning the algorithm without compromising the results of Theorem 2. To ensure constraint satisfaction for the original problem (14), we additionally run 100 iterations of gradient descent on (15) by replacing \mathcal{S} with the set $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ of samples associated to constraints that are violated after 4000 iterations. Then, we test the tuned MPC policy $\text{MPC}(\cdot, \tilde{\theta}^*)$ on 1000 unseen samples of (w, d, x_0) .

Table I compares the performance of our method against the nominal MPC obtained with Algorithm 3, and against a nominal nonlinear MPC controller with horizon $N = 15$. Both these alternatives fail to satisfy the constraints on every scenario, whereas our method has a closed-loop constraint violation of only 1.8%. The number of support constraints is $k^* = 1$, which provides a theoretical bound of $V_{\mathcal{S}}(\eta^*) \leq 0.095$ with confidence $\beta = 1 - 10^{-6}$.

TABLE I
CLOSED-LOOP COST AND CONSTRAINT VIOLATION – NONLINEAR

	Average closed-loop cost	Constraint violation
$\text{MPC}(\cdot, \tilde{\theta}^*)$	233.497	1.8%
$\text{MPC}(\cdot, \theta^*)$	225.442	100%
Nonlinear MPC	277.828	100%

B. Linear example

We further compare our method to the Tube MPC of [19] on the linear system of [19]. In this setting, the model is known but subject to additive noise. We use $N = 5$ for our scheme and $N = 15$ for the tube MPC. We draw 500 samples to construct \mathcal{S} and obtain $\epsilon = 0.0512$ with confidence $1 - 10^{-6}$. The results (obtained by simulating with 1000 unseen samples) are reported in Table II. Note that we achieve a 50% performance improvement at the cost of marginal constraint violations.

TABLE II
CLOSED-LOOP COST AND CONSTRAINT VIOLATION – LINEAR

	Average closed-loop cost	Constraint violation
Proposed method	216.149	0.3%
Tube MPC of [19]	434.232	0%

VI. CONCLUSION

We proposed a principled way to design the cost and the constraint tightenings of an MPC scheme to achieve

good performance and constraint satisfaction under noise and uncertainty. We used the scenario approach to provide a probabilistic bound on the closed-loop constraint violation. Future work will focus on developing a design strategy that allows the constraint violation chance to be user-defined.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Q. Mayne, E. C. Kerrigan, E. Van Wyk, and P. Falugi, “Tube-based robust nonlinear model predictive control,” *International journal of robust and nonlinear control*, vol. 21, no. 11, pp. 1341–1353, 2011.
- [2] L. Chisci, J. A. Rossiter, and G. Zappa, “Systems with persistent disturbances: predictive control with restricted constraints,” *Automatica*, vol. 37, no. 7, pp. 1019–1028, 2001.
- [3] J. Fleming, B. Kouvaritakis, and M. Cannon, “Robust tube mpc for linear systems with multiplicative uncertainty,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 60, no. 4, pp. 1087–1092, 2014.
- [4] M. Bujarbaruah, X. Zhang, M. Tanaskovic, and F. Borrelli, “Adaptive mpc under time varying uncertainty: Robust and stochastic,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.13473*, 2019.
- [5] J. Köhler, R. Soloperto, M. A. Müller, and F. Allgöwer, “A computationally efficient robust model predictive control framework for uncertain nonlinear systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 2, pp. 794–801, 2020.
- [6] I. M. Ross, Q. Gong, M. Karpenko, and R. Proulx, “Scaling and balancing for high-performance computation of optimal controls,” *Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics*, vol. 41, no. 10, pp. 2086–2097, 2018.
- [7] M. C. Campi, S. Garatti, and M. Prandini, “The scenario approach for systems and control design,” *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 149–157, 2009.
- [8] G. C. Calafiore and L. Fagiano, “Robust model predictive control via scenario optimization,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 219–224, 2012.
- [9] G. Schildbach, L. Fagiano, C. Frei, and M. Morari, “The scenario approach for stochastic model predictive control with bounds on closed-loop constraint violations,” *Automatica*, vol. 50, no. 12, pp. 3009–3018, 2014.
- [10] F. Micheli and J. Lygeros, “Scenario-based stochastic mpc for systems with uncertain dynamics,” in *2022 European Control Conference (ECC)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 833–838.
- [11] R. Zuliani, E. C. Balta, and J. Lygeros, “BP-MPC: Optimizing Closed-Loop Performance of MPC using BackPropagation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.15521*, 2023.
- [12] A. Zhakhatayev, B. Rakhim, O. Adiyatov, A. Baimyshev, and H. A. Varol, “Successive linearization based model predictive control of variable stiffness actuated robots,” in *2017 IEEE international conference on advanced intelligent mechatronics (AIM)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 1774–1779.
- [13] J. V. Burke, “An exact penalization viewpoint of constrained optimization,” *SIAM Journal on control and optimization*, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 968–998, 1991.
- [14] J. Bolte, T. Le, E. Pauwels, and T. Silveti-Falls, “Nonsmooth implicit differentiation for machine-learning and optimization,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 34, pp. 13 537–13 549, 2021.
- [15] J. Bochnak, M. Coste, and M.-F. Roy, *Real algebraic geometry*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013, vol. 36.
- [16] D. Davis, D. Drusvyatskiy, S. Kakade, and J. D. Lee, “Stochastic subgradient method converges on tame functions,” *Foundations of computational mathematics*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 119–154, 2020.
- [17] M. C. Campi, S. Garatti, and F. A. Ramponi, “A general scenario theory for nonconvex optimization and decision making,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 63, no. 12, pp. 4067–4078, 2018.
- [18] K. Guemghar, B. Srinivasan, P. Mullhaupt, and D. Bonvin, “Predictive control of fast unstable and nonminimum-phase nonlinear systems,” in *Proceedings of the 2002 American Control Conference (IEEE Cat. No. CH37301)*, vol. 6. IEEE, 2002, pp. 4764–4769.
- [19] D. Q. Mayne, M. M. Seron, and S. Raković, “Robust model predictive control of constrained linear systems with bounded disturbances,” *Automatica*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 219–224, 2005.