# Optimal Data-Driven Prediction and Predictive Control using Signal Matrix Models

Roy S. Smith, Mohamed Abdalmoaty, & Mingzhou Yin

Abstract— Data-driven control uses a past signal trajectory to characterise the input-output behaviour of a system. Willems' lemma provides a data-based prediction model allowing a control designer to bypass the step of identifying a statespace or transfer function model. This paper provides a more parsimonious formulation of Willems' lemma that separates the model into initial condition matching and predictive control design parts. This avoids the need for regularisers in the predictive control problem that are found in other data-driven predictive control methods. It also gives a closed form expression for the optimal (minimum variance) unbiased predictor of the future output trajectory and applies it for predictive control. Simulation comparisons illustrate very good control performance.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Model-based control design has a long history. Obtaining a suitable model can be a challenging task and is often addressed by a combination of first principles modeling and identification from data. The modeling and design steps are not independent and the best model depends strongly on the control design objectives. The recent resurgence in learning methods has driven a renewed interest in designing control systems directly from the measured system signal data. One potential benefit of these data-driven methods is that bypassing the modeling step in the design process might allow the process to be simplified, or even semi-automated, avoiding the costly and time-consuming identification step. However many of the experiment design considerations that go into system identification process arise in obtaining signal data for the data-driven methods.

This class of data-driven control should not be considered as being "model-free". Rather, the parameterisation of the model is in terms of a set of past data. This data-based model is used for prediction of the system responses to future control input signals. Our term for this class of models is Signal Matrix Models (SMM).

We start from the framework used in the current datadriven control work (summarised in [1], [2]), and formulate the problem as decoupled prediction and predictive control steps. This allows us to pose and solve optimal prediction problems which are tailored to the predictive control objective. One major advantage is that regularisation is not required for the prediction and control steps, in contrast to the current data-driven approaches.

Our development will bring out the strong connection between Subspace Predictive Control (SPC) [3] and the more recent data-driven methods based on Willems' Lemma [4], [5]). Data Enabled Predictive Control (DeePC) [6] is a prototypical approach and uses a single vector variable to parametrise both the initial condition matching, or equivalently the prediction, and the predictive control steps. Achieving the best trade-off between these conflicting conditions is achieved via regularisation.

The method developed by [7], [8], known as  $\gamma$ -DDPC, reformulates the characterisation of the dynamics and provides a different regularisation approach. One choice of regularisers gives an equivalence with DeePC. Generalised Data-Driven Predictive Control (GDPC), described in [9], splits the control input in two with one part using the SPC prediction methods to predict the output response and the other optimised online to satisfy the control objectives. GDPC also requires regularisation to achieve the prediction-control trade-off for the optimised part of the control input signal.

High fidelity simulations, or digital twins, generate ideal data for this approach. If dedicated experiments are possible noise and excitation problems can be addressed through experiment design. Data taken from historical operation measurements can have both noise and persistency of excitation problems. The regularisation approaches of DeePC,  $\gamma$ -DDPC, and GDPC, can help ameliorate the noise problem, but a theoretical basis for this is incomplete. The work in [10] develops maximum likelihood methods for the case where the SMM is corrupted by stochastic noise. Its use in predictive control requires some heuristics.

Our approach is somewhat different. We will consider  $H_y$  to be noise-free and derive the optimal predictor to be used in the predictive control step. In the case that there is noise in  $H_y$  this amounts to considering a high-order model—one that fits the noise in addition to the system response. The method given here can be further improved by applying denoising methods to the SMM matrices (see [11]).

#### A. Notation

The set of (strictly) positive definite matrices, of dimension n is denoted by  $(\mathcal{S}_{+}^{n}) \mathcal{S}^{n}$ . We denote the weighted  $l_{2}$ -norm of a vector x by  $||x||_{P} = (x^{T}Px)^{1/2}$  where  $P \in \mathcal{S}_{+}^{n}$ . A random vector x, has expectation  $\mathcal{E}\{x\}$  and covariance  $\operatorname{cov}(x)$ . The range space of a matrix H is  $\operatorname{range}(H)$ . The

This work was supported by the NCCR Automation Grant 51NF40\_180545 funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation.

The authors are with the Automatic Control Laboratory, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (ETH Zurich), Physikstrasse 3, 8092 Zürich, Switzerland, {rsmith,mabdalmoaty,myin} @control.ee.ethz.ch.

Kronecker product between matrices X and Y is denoted by  $X \otimes Y$ . If two vectors,  $x_1$  and  $x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  are orthogonal this is denoted by  $x_1 \perp x_2$ .

## II. DATA-DRIVEN CONTROL

## A. Problem Formulation

The problem to be considered is the control of a linear time-invariant system, G, with input,  $u(k) \in \mathcal{R}^{n_u}$ , and output  $y(k) \in \mathcal{R}^{n_y}$ . We assume that system G has finite order,  $n_x$ . Rather than specify G in terms of a order- $n_x$  minimal state-space representation, our characterisation of G is in terms of a past record of input-output data over K consecutive time-steps,  $(u^d(k), y^d(k)), k = 1, \ldots, K$ . The superscript, d, is used to contrast the past data with current or future values of u and y. In the SMM development we assume that  $u^d$  and  $y^d$  are noise-free.

The predictive controller uses input and measured output signals from an immediate past horizon of length- $T_p$  to calculate the optimal control input over a length- $T_f$  horizon into the future. The measured output contains i.i.d. noise. At every time-step k,

$$y_{\text{meas}}(k) = y(k) + v(k), \tag{1}$$

with  $\mathcal{E}{v(k)} = 0$ , and  $var(v(k)) = \Sigma_v$ . The length- $T_p$  sequence of past inputs and outputs are written as vectors,

$$u_{\mathbf{p}}(k) = \begin{bmatrix} u(k - T_{\mathbf{p}} + 1) \\ \vdots \\ u(k) \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } y_{\mathbf{p}}(k) = \begin{bmatrix} y(k - T_{\mathbf{p}} + 1) \\ \vdots \\ y(k) \end{bmatrix}.$$
(2)

Future inputs and outputs are indexed from the next time step,

$$u_{\mathbf{f}}(k) = \begin{bmatrix} u(k+1) \\ \vdots \\ u(k+T_{\mathbf{f}}) \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad y_{\mathbf{f}}(k) = \begin{bmatrix} y(k+1) \\ \vdots \\ y(k+T_{\mathbf{f}}) \end{bmatrix}.$$
(3)

The control problem is posed in terms of a cost function over the length- $T_{\rm f}$  future horizon. For simplicity we will consider a quadratic cost, defined by  $P \in \mathcal{S}^{n_y T_{\rm f}}_+$  and  $R \in \mathcal{S}^{n_u T_{\rm f}}_+$ , but more general cost functions are easily handled.

Problem 1 (Data-driven predictive control): Given an immediate past input and measured output signals,  $u_p(k)$  and  $y_{p,meas}(k)$ , find a future input sequence,  $u_f(k)$ , solving

$$\begin{array}{ll} \underset{u_{\mathrm{f}}, y_{\mathrm{f}}}{\mathrm{minimise}} & \|y_{\mathrm{f}}\|_{P} + \|u_{\mathrm{f}}\|_{R}, \\ \text{subject to:} & \begin{bmatrix} y_{\mathrm{p}} \\ y_{\mathrm{f}} \end{bmatrix} = G\left( \begin{bmatrix} u_{\mathrm{p}} \\ u_{\mathrm{f}} \end{bmatrix} \right), \quad u_{\mathrm{f}} \in \mathcal{U}, \quad y_{\mathrm{f}} \in \mathcal{Y}.$$

$$(4)$$

In the standard receding horizon predictive control structure only the first time step of  $u_{\rm f}$  is applied to the plant. At the next time-step new measurement data is available and the entire problem is resolved.

The sets  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  denote input and output constraint sets, which are typically assumed to be convex. There are several difficulties in the above formulation. To begin, we have only

the measured past output,  $y_{p,meas}$ , but the characterisation of the dynamics applies to (at best) the noise-free past output,  $y_p$ . In addition, the characterisation of the plant inputoutput mapping above is in a generic operator form. Standard model predictive control assumes that the future output,  $y_f$ , is characterised in terms of a measured state and the future input,  $u_f$ . Data-driven predictive control, on the other hand, uses the characterisation of  $y_f$  directly in terms of  $u_p$ ,  $y_p$ , and  $u_f$ . The basis of this is the Willems' Lemma described in the next section.

# B. Willems' Fundamental Lemma

Our model of the system is specified in terms of a single, length-K, trajectory. The extension to multiple trajectories is straightforward and given in [12]. The input-output model will characterise all length-T input-output data sequences that can be generated by the system.

Hankel matrices, of dimension  $(n_u T) \times M$  and dimension  $(n_y T) \times M$  are created,

$$H_u = \begin{bmatrix} u^{d}(1) & u^{d}(2) & \cdots & u^{d}(M) \\ u^{d}(2) & u^{d}(2) & \cdots & u^{d}(M+1) \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ u^{d}(T) & u^{d}(T+1) & \cdots & u^{d}(M+T-1) \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$H_{y} = \begin{bmatrix} y^{d}(1) & y^{d}(2) & \cdots & y^{d}(M) \\ y^{d}(2) & y^{d}(3) & \cdots & y^{d}(M+1) \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ y^{d}(T) & y^{d}(T+1) & \cdots & y^{d}(M+T-1) \end{bmatrix}$$

We assume that T has been chosen so that  $n_y T_p \ge n_x$ . Furthermore M has been chosen such that  $M \ge 2T(n_u + n_y)$ . The input sequence u is assumed to be persistently exciting of order at least  $n_u T + n_x$ . These conditions require that the data length satisfies,  $K \ge M + T - 1$ .

Under the persistency of excitation assumption  $H_u$  has full row rank, equal here to  $n_u T$ . Generically  $H_y$  also has full row rank (equal to  $n_y T$ ).

Lemma 2 (Willems' Fundamental Lemma): Under the matrix-size and persistency of excitation assumptions, the length-T input-output pair (u,y) is a trajectory of the system G, iff there exists  $g \in \mathcal{R}^M$  such that,

$$\begin{bmatrix} u \\ y \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} H_u \\ H_y \end{bmatrix} g.$$
(5)

See Theorem 1 in [4] and Lemma 2 in [13].

It follows that the matrix of stacked Hankel matrices,  $\begin{bmatrix} H_u^T & H_y^T \end{bmatrix}^T$ , has rank equal to  $n_u T + n_x$ . The if and only if nature of the result means that the matrix multiplication in (5) can be used as a complete characterisation of the trajectories specified by Equation 4 in Problem 1.

#### C. Data-Driven Predictive Control: DeePC

To apply (5) to predictive control we partition the signal sequences into past and future, as given in (2) and (3),

satisfying  $T = T_p + T_f$ . We also partition the  $H_u$  and  $H_y$ correspondingly,

$$H_u = \left\lfloor \frac{H_{up}}{H_{uf}} \right\rfloor, \text{ with } H_{up} \in \mathcal{R}^{(n_u T_p) \times M}, H_{uf} \in \mathcal{R}^{(n_u T_f) \times M}$$

and

$$H_y = \begin{bmatrix} H_{yp} \\ \hline H_{yf} \end{bmatrix}, \text{ with } H_{yp} \in \mathcal{R}^{(n_y T_p) \times M}, H_{yf} \in \mathcal{R}^{(n_y T_f) \times M}$$

We assume that this partition satisfies  $n_y T_p \ge n_x$  so that the assumptions in Lemma 2 also apply to  $H_{yup}$  (defined subsequently).

As reordering the rows of both u and y commensurately with reordering the rows of the stacked Hankel matrices in (5) does not affect g, we can replace (5) with the following characterisation of the dynamics.

$$\begin{bmatrix} u_{\mathbf{p}} \\ y_{\mathbf{p}} \\ u_{\mathbf{f}} \\ y_{\mathbf{f}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} H_{u\mathbf{p}} \\ H_{y\mathbf{p}} \\ H_{u\mathbf{f}} \\ H_{y\mathbf{f}} \end{bmatrix} g$$
(6)

Applying this characterisation of the dynamics in Problem 1 gives the DeePC problem formulation.

Problem 3 (DeePC): Given an immediate past input and measured output signals,  $u_{p}(k)$  and  $y_{p,meas}(k)$ , find a future input sequence,  $u_{\rm f}(k)$ , solving

$$\begin{array}{ll} \underset{g,u_{\mathrm{f}},y_{\mathrm{f}},\sigma_{y}}{\text{minimise}} & \|y_{\mathrm{f}}\|_{P} + \|u_{\mathrm{f}}\|_{R} + \lambda_{1}\|\sigma_{y}\|_{2}^{2} + \lambda_{2}\rho(g) \\ \\ \text{subject to:} & \begin{bmatrix} u_{\mathrm{p}} \\ y_{\mathrm{p,meas}} - \sigma_{y} \\ u_{\mathrm{f}} \\ y_{\mathrm{f}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} H_{u\mathrm{p}} \\ H_{y\mathrm{p}} \\ H_{u\mathrm{f}} \\ H_{y\mathrm{f}} \end{bmatrix} g, \qquad (7) \\ \\ u_{\mathrm{f}} \in \mathcal{U}, \quad u_{\mathrm{f}} \in \mathcal{Y}.
\end{array}$$

$$u_{\mathrm{f}} \in \mathcal{U}, \quad y_{\mathrm{f}} \in \mathcal{U}$$

The DeePC formulation above has several variants all of which differ in significant ways from the generic Problem 1. One difference is that as  $y_{p,meas}$  contains noise, it is almost certain that,

$$\begin{bmatrix} u_{\mathbf{p}} \\ y_{\mathbf{p},\text{meas}} \end{bmatrix} \notin \text{range} \left( \begin{bmatrix} H_{u\mathbf{p}} \\ H_{y\mathbf{p}} \end{bmatrix} \right).$$

The variable  $\sigma_y$  acts as a surrogate for this noise, making (7) solvable, and its size minimisation is included as a regularisation term,  $\lambda_1 \|\sigma_y\|_2^2$ .

The other aspect is that g plays a dual role. The first two block rows of (7) are constraining g such that the initial conditions (specified by the immediate past data) are close to being satisfied. The second role is the use of g in finding the optimal  $u_{\rm f}$  and  $y_{\rm f}$ . The potential conflict can be seen by noting that g may select a "best-case" noise  $\sigma_y$  from the point of view of the minimisation of the quadratic cost. The regularisation of g, specified by  $\lambda_2 \rho(g)$ , is used to trade-off between these potential conflicting roles of q. In the case where  $H_{y}$  is actually created from noisy measurements the matrix of stacked past Hankel matrices is full rank and (7) does not impose any constraint on the initial condition matching (see [14]). In this case the regularisation is essential to achieving good performance with DeePC.

The more recent data-driven predictive control formulations,  $\gamma$ -DDPC and GDPC, improve upon the DeePC formulation by compressing the representation and partially separating the initial condition matching and predictive control parameterisations. Regularisations are still required although [1] provides simulations that illustrate that they can outperform DeePC.

# **III. OPTIMAL MULTI-STEP PREDICTION**

Our formulation is conceptually based on the idea that we will separate the q vector in (6) into two orthogonal parts,

$$\begin{bmatrix} u_{\rm p} \\ y_{\rm p} \\ u_{\rm f} \\ y_{\rm f} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} H_{up} \\ H_{yp} \\ H_{uf} \\ H_{yf} \end{bmatrix} (g_{\rm p} + g_{\rm f}), \tag{8}$$

where  $g_p$  matches the initial conditions specified by  $u_p$  and  $y_{\rm p}$ , and  $g_{\rm f}$  specifies the mapping between  $u_{\rm f}$  and  $y_{\rm f}$ . While  $g_{\rm p}$  also specifies a future input-output trajectory,  $H_{up}g_{\rm f} =$  $H_{yp}g_{\rm f} = 0$ . Furthermore  $g_{\rm p} \perp g_{\rm f}$  and so  $g_{\rm f}$  can completely determine the  $u_{\rm f}$ ,  $y_{\rm f}$  mapping for the predictive control step. See [15] for the use of a similar concept for DeePC regularisation.

#### A. Derivation of a Parsimonious Formulation

The mapping in (6) will be condensed into a minimal parameterisation, similar in motivation to the parameterisations used in  $\gamma$ -DDPC and GDPC.

Consider stacked Hankel matrices representing the past and future input-output sequences,

$$H_{yup} = \begin{bmatrix} H_{up} \\ H_{yp} \end{bmatrix}$$
, and  $H_{yuf} = \begin{bmatrix} H_{uf} \\ H_{yf} \end{bmatrix}$ .

The matrix of immediate past data,  $H_{yup}$ , is factorised into,

$$H_{yup} = L_p Q_p^T$$

where  $L_{p} \in \mathcal{R}^{((n_{u}+n_{y})T_{p}) \times M}$  is lower triangular and  $Q_{p} \in$  $\mathcal{R}^{M \times M}$  is unitary. This can be further partitioned into,

$$\begin{bmatrix} H_{up} \\ H_{yp} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} L_{up} & 0 & 0 \\ \hline L_{yup} & L_{yp} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} Q_{up}^T \\ \hline Q_{yp}^T \\ \hline Q_{np}^T \end{bmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

where both  $L_{up} \in \mathcal{R}^{(n_u T_p) \times (n_u T_p)}$  and  $L_{yp} \in \mathcal{R}^{(n_y T_p) \times n_x}$ are lower triangular. The fact that  $L_{yp}$  has only  $n_x$  columns follows from the observation that Lemma 2 specifies that  $\operatorname{rank}(H_{yup}) = n_u T_p + n_x$  and the persistency of excitation gives  $\operatorname{rank}(L_{up}) = n_u T_p$ . This also implies that the dimension of the null space of  $H_{yup}$  (which is also the column dimension of  $Q_{np}$ ) is  $M - n_u T_p - n_x$ .

We can use this factorisation to simplify our representation of all length- $T_p$  sequences that could have been generated by the system. By solving for  $x_u \in \mathcal{R}^{n_u T_p}$  and  $x_y \in \mathcal{R}^{n_x}$ satisfying,  $u_p = L_{up}x_u$  and  $y_p = L_{yup}x_u + L_{yp}x_y$ , we can rewrite the past data part of Willems' condition as,

$$\begin{bmatrix} u_{\mathbf{p}} \\ y_{\mathbf{p}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} L_{u\mathbf{p}} & 0 \\ \hline L_{yu\mathbf{p}} & L_{y\mathbf{p}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_u \\ x_y \end{bmatrix}.$$

While we will parametrise the solutions in terms of  $x_u$  and  $x_y$ , it also possible to write  $g_p$  in (8) as,

$$g_{\mathbf{p}} = \begin{bmatrix} Q_{u\mathbf{p}} & Q_{y\mathbf{p}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_u \\ x_y \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note that all g in the null-space of  $H_{yup}$  are given by  $g = Q_{np}x_{np}$  where  $x_{np} \in \mathcal{R}^{M-n_u T_p-n_x}$  and that  $g_p$  is orthogonal to every column of  $Q_{np}$ . We will use this orthogonal decomposition to characterise all possible future input-output trajectories that match a specific past input-output trajectory. The specific  $g_p$  for a given  $u_p$ ,  $y_p$  trajectory depends of course on the trajectory. However the null-space parameterisation  $Q_{np}x_{np}$  is independent of the past trajectory being matched. The consequence of this independence is that the past input-output trajectory affects the future  $y_f$  (as we would expect from the dynamics) and also the future  $u_f$ .

We will now apply the LQ decomposition approach to the Hankel matrices that generate the length- $T_{\rm f}$  future inputoutput trajectories. As we want these to also match a past length- $T_{\rm p}$  input-output trajectory we will constrain the choice of  $g_{\rm f}$  to those that lie within the null-space of  $H_{yup}$ .

To do this the LQ factorisation is applied to  $H_{yuf}Q_{np}$  and

$$H_{yuf}Q_{\rm np} = \begin{bmatrix} H_{uf} \\ H_{yf} \end{bmatrix} Q_{\rm np} = L_f Q_f^T, \tag{10}$$

gives a lower triangular  $L_{\rm f} \in \mathcal{R}^{((n_u+n_y)T_{\rm f})\times(M-n_uT_{\rm p}-n_x)}$ and a unitary  $Q_{\rm f} \in \mathcal{R}^{(M-n_uT_{\rm p}-n_x)\times(M-n_uT_{\rm p}-n_x)}$ . If  $Q_{\rm np}$  has at least  $(n_u+n_y)T_{\rm f}$  columns, Equation 10 can be partitioned conformally with the future inputs and outputs,

$$H_{yuf}Q_{\rm np} = \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} L_{uf} & 0\\ \hline L_{yuf} & L_{yf} \end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c} Q_{yuf}^T\\ \hline Q_{\rm nf}^T \end{array} \right],\tag{11}$$

where  $L_{uf} \in \mathcal{R}^{(n_u T_f) \times (n_u T_f)}$  and  $L_{yuf} \in \mathcal{R}^{(n_y T_f) \times (n_u T_f)}$ . Note that the  $Q_{np}$  column dimension assumption is satisfied for any  $n_x \leq n_y T_p$  if  $M \geq 2T(n_u + n_y)$ . The following lemma, proven in the Appendix, illustrates several interesting structural properties of the decomposition in (11).

Lemma 4: The decomposition in (11) satisfies:

a) 
$$\operatorname{rank}(L_{uf}) = n_u T_f$$
 and b)  $L_{uf} = 0$ .

We can now reduce the dimension of the  $H_{yuf}Q_{np}$ parametrisation to the column dimension of  $Q_{yuf}$ . Consider  $g_{\rm f} = Q_{\rm np}Q_{yuf}z$ , with  $z \in \mathcal{R}^{n_u T_{\rm f}}$ , which results in,

$$H_{yuf} g_{\rm f} = \begin{bmatrix} L_{uf} \\ L_{yuf} \end{bmatrix} z.$$

Because  $L_{uf}$  is full rank, any specified future input will uniquely determine z. This in turn specifies a unique future output via  $L_{yuf}$ . However we must also account for the contribution of  $x_u$  and  $x_y$  to the future input and output.

We can now reformulate (6) more parsimoniously as

$$\begin{bmatrix} u_{\mathbf{p}} \\ y_{\mathbf{p}} \\ u_{\mathbf{f}} \\ y_{\mathbf{f}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} L_{u\mathbf{p}} & 0 & 0 \\ L_{yu\mathbf{p}} & L_{y\mathbf{p}} & 0 \\ S_{uu} & S_{uy} & L_{u\mathbf{f}} \\ S_{yu} & S_{yy} & L_{yu\mathbf{f}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_{u} \\ x_{y} \\ z \end{bmatrix},$$
(12)

where we have defined the S matrices via

$$\begin{bmatrix} S_{uu} & S_{uy} \\ S_{yu} & S_{yy} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} H_{uf} \\ H_{yf} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} Q_{up} & Q_{yp} \end{bmatrix}$$

Note that the lower triangular matrix in (12) is full column rank, with rank equal to  $n_uT + n_x$ .

#### B. Optimal multi-step predictor

We will now apply the parametrisation in (12) to a  $T_{\rm f}$ step ahead prediction of the future output. Optimality in this context refers to finding the minimum variance unbiased predictor of the future output. To begin we pose the prediction problem.

Problem 5: Given a length- $T_p$  input-output signal sequence,  $u_p$ ,  $y_{p,meas}$ , generated by the system G with output measurement noise specified by (1), and given a specified contiguous length- $T_f$  future input sequence,  $u_f$ , estimate the future system output,  $y_f$  (with the estimate denoted by  $\hat{y}_f$ ).

Consider the following linear form of the estimator,

$$\hat{y}_{\rm f} = E_{u\rm p}u_{\rm p} + E_{y\rm p}y_{\rm p,meas} + E_{u\rm f}u_{\rm f},\tag{13}$$

where the predictor matrices are given by,

$$\begin{split} E_{uf} &= L_{yuf} L_{uf}^{-1}, \quad E_{yup} = L_{yup} L_{up}^{-1}, \quad \Psi = S_{yy} - E_{uf}^{-1} S_{uy} \\ E_{up} &= (S_{yu} - E_{uf} S_{uu}) L_{up}^{-1} - \Psi E_{x_y} E_{yup}, \\ E_{yp} &= \Psi E_{x_y}, \end{split}$$

and the matrix  $E_{x_y}$  is given by,

$$E_{x_y} = \left(L_{yp}^T \Sigma_V^{-1} L_{yp}\right)^{-1} L_{yp}^T \Sigma_V^{-1},$$

where  $\Sigma_V = I_{T_p} \otimes \Sigma_v$ . Note that the predictor matrices  $E_{up}$ ,  $E_{yp}$ , and  $E_{uf}$ , can be calculated offline.

In SPC a linear predictor of the form in (13) is obtained as the least-squares solution to the data matrix equation,

$$H_{yf} = E_{up}H_{up} + E_{yp}H_{yp} + E_{uf}H_{uf}.$$

This is a good heuristic but not optimal. In contrast...

Theorem 6: Given: an LTI system, G, uniquely specified by SMM matrices; a length- $T_p$  immediate past data sequence  $(u_p, y_p)$ ; and a future input,  $u_f$ . The estimate  $\hat{y}_f$ , given in (13), is the best linear unbiased estimate (BLUE) of  $y_f$ . Furthermore the covariance of  $\hat{y}_f$  is equal to

$$\operatorname{cov}(\hat{y}_{\mathrm{f}}) = \Psi(L_{yp}^T \Sigma_V^{-1} L_{yp})^{-1} \Psi^T.$$

We now have an optimal (BLUE) estimator to apply to the MPC problem.

## IV. SIGNAL MATRIX MODEL PREDICTIVE CONTROL

One can immediately apply this approach to an MPC problem with (13) specifying the dynamics. The following MPC problem is an alternative to the DeePC approach given in Problem 3.

Problem 7 (SMMPC): Given an immediate past input and measured output signals,  $u_p$  and  $y_{p,meas}$ , find a future input sequence,  $u_f$ , solving



Fig. 1. Output trajectories, mean value and 1 std. dev. (shaded)

$$\begin{array}{ll} \underset{u_{f},\hat{y}_{f}}{\text{minimise}} & \|\hat{y}_{f}\|_{P} + \|u_{f}\|_{R} \\ \text{subject to:} & \hat{y}_{f} = E_{up}u_{p} + E_{yp}y_{p,\text{meas}} + E_{uf}u_{f}, \\ & u_{f} \in \mathcal{U}, \quad \hat{y}_{f} \in \mathcal{Y}. \end{array}$$

In contrast to DeePC,  $\gamma$ -DDPC, and GDPC, this formulation does not require the designer to select regularisation parameters. It also has fewer optimisation variables and as  $E_{up}$ ,  $E_{yp}$  and  $E_{uf}$  are calculated offline it will run more quickly. As with almost all MPC formulations it is common practice that the constraint  $\hat{y}_f \in \mathcal{Y}$  is specified with a penalised slack variable to avoid potential infeasibility.

## A. Simulation demonstration

The flight control benchmark problem in [1] is used to demonstrate the approach<sup>1</sup>. The model data experiment,  $\{u^d, y^d\}$ , is of length K = 2500 and, in contrast to the theoretical development in prior sections, contains noise with a variance of  $\Sigma_v = 0.25^2 I_{n_u}$ . To create the SMM model structure in (12) we take the maximal rank of the past data as the state dimension,  $n_x = n_y T_p$ . The horizon lengths are  $T_p = T_f = 40$ . The same noise variance is used for the measurement noise on  $y_p$  in the step response simulations. For a comparison we use the MPC plus Kalman filter design in [1]. The subspace identification function n4sid, truncated to the true system order, is used to give the state-space model.

Figure 1 illustrates the mean and standard deviation of a step response over 30 Monte Carlo runs (rebuilding the noisy models with each run). The corresponding input signals are given in Figure 2.

Three performance indices are shown in Figure 3. The axes are chosen as close as possible to those in [1] to facilitate comparison. The SMMPC method performs as well or better than the other methods.



Fig. 2. Input trajectories, mean value and 1 std. dev. (shaded)



Fig. 3. Performance indices over 30 Monte Carlo runs

The MPC optimisation problems were solved with OSQP [16]. The SMMPC calculation time is similar to the Kalman filter plus MPC computation time.

#### V. CONCLUSIONS

As is clear from Willems' fundamental lemma the SMM matrices specify a unique causal LTI system of finite order. The model specification in terms of past input-output trajectories avoids the need to specify a state representation. But of course the SMM matrix representation is equivalent, in terms of input-output responses, to a state-space representation. So the strong similarities, such as the dimension of  $x_y$  being equal to the system order, should not be surprising.

Another defining characteristic of state-space systems is that the entire past input-output behaviour affects the future input-output behaviour only via the initial state. A similar thing occurs here as  $u_p$  and  $y_p$  completely determine  $x_u$  and  $x_y$  which in turn uniquely specify the future input-output relationship. The difference in the SMM case is that we use  $x_u$  and  $x_y$  to specify a future input as well as a future

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>MATLAB code running this comparison is publicly available at https://doi.org/10.3929/ethz-b-000663423

output. This contrasts with state-space representations where the initial state specifies the future output corresponding to a future input of zero. The benefit of the SMM approach here is that it allows us to maintain linearity in the input-output relationships making it simpler to formulate an optimal prediction problem. However the part of the future input arising from  $x_u$  must be taken into consideration when selecting the future input for predictive control purposes. This is done via (13).

The optimal prediction problem given here is easily solved because the underlying system is causal and the dynamics are linear. Regularisation is not required to trade-off between the prediction and control parts of the problem as they are decoupled. However this doesn't necessarily mean that regularisation is not beneficial. The recent developments in using kernel-based regularisers for identification have given significant benefits in the system identification domain [17] and could be applied here to reduce noise in  $H_y$  when the signals come from experimental data.

Note also that the variance of the predictor (Theorem 6) depends directly on the experimental data used to generate the SMM matrices  $H_u$  and  $H_y$ . This makes it clear that the issues arising in experiment and input design for system identification also arise here.

#### APPENDIX

# A. Proof of Lemma 4:

To show a) note that the persistency of excitation assumption implies that  $H_u$  has rank  $n_u T$  and so rank $(L_{uf}) =$ rank $(H_{uf})$  as  $n_u T - n_u T_p = n_u T_f$ .

To show b) Assume that  $L_{yf} \neq 0$  and choose a vector  $\hat{w} \in \mathcal{R}^{M-n_uT-n_x}$  such that  $L_{yf}\hat{w} \neq 0$ . Calculate the vector  $\hat{g} \in \mathcal{R}^M$  via  $\hat{g} = Q_{np}Q_{nf}\hat{w}$ . Now consider the input-sequence corresponding to,

$$\begin{bmatrix} H_{yup} \\ H_{yuf} \end{bmatrix} \hat{g} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ H_{yuf} \hat{g} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ L_f Q_f^T Q_{nf} \hat{w} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ L_{yf} \hat{w} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}.$$

This corresponds to an input-output sequence with  $u_p = u_f = y_p = 0$ ,  $y_f = L_{yf}\hat{w}$ . This contradicts the uniqueness assumption on the system G as  $y_f = 0$  is also a solution to this case. Therefore  $L_{yf} = 0$ .

# B. Proof of Theorem 6

To remove the affine deterministic terms define

$$\zeta_{\mathrm{f}} = y_{\mathrm{f}} - E_{u\mathrm{p}}u_{\mathrm{p}} - E_{u\mathrm{f}}u_{\mathrm{f}}, \text{ and } \nu_{\mathrm{p}} = y_{\mathrm{p}} - E_{yu\mathrm{p}}u_{\mathrm{p}},$$

and note that the noise-free signals satisfy,

$$\zeta_{\rm f} = \Psi x_y$$
 and  $\nu_{\rm p} = L_{y{\rm p}} x_y$ .

The BLUE of  $x_y$  is,  $\hat{x}_y = E_{x_y}\nu_{p,meas}$ , where  $\nu_{p,meas} = y_{p,meas} - E_{yup}u_p$ . The estimator in (13) can be reformulated as

$$\hat{\zeta}_{\rm f} = \Psi \hat{x}_y,\tag{14}$$

and as it is a linear scaling of BLUE of  $x_y$ , it is the BLUE of  $\hat{\zeta}_f$ . The covariance is given by

$$\operatorname{cov} \hat{y}_{\mathbf{f}} = \operatorname{cov} \hat{\zeta}_{\mathbf{f}} = \Psi (L_{yp}^T \Sigma_V^{-1} L_{yp})^{-1} \Psi^T$$

To show that this is the BLUE consider all linear estimators,  $\hat{\zeta}_{f} = Z^{T} \nu_{p,meas}$ . To be unbiased they must satisfy  $\mathcal{E}\{Z^{T} \nu_{p,meas}\} = \zeta_{f}$ , or

$$Z^T \mathcal{E}\{\nu_{p,\text{meas}}\} - \Psi x_y = 0, \text{ for all } x_y$$

As  $\mathcal{E}\{\nu_{p,\text{meas}}\} = L_{yp}x_y$ , we must have,  $Z^T L_{yp} - \Psi = 0$ . This implies that  $\text{range}(Z^T) = \text{range}(\Psi)$  and  $Z^T$  can be expressed as a factorisation,  $Z^T = \Psi F$  with  $FL_{yp} = I_{nx}$ .

The covariance of the  $Z^T$  estimator is given by  $\operatorname{cov}(\hat{\zeta}_{\mathbf{f}}) = Z^T \Sigma_V Z$ . The difference with respect to the estimator in (14) is

$$Z^T \Sigma_V Z - \Psi (L_{yp}^T \Sigma_V^{-1} L_{yp})^{-1} \Psi^T$$
  
=  $\Psi F \Sigma_V F^T \Psi^T - \Psi (L_{yp}^T \Sigma_V^{-1} L_{yp})^{-1} \Psi^T,$ 

and by exploiting the fact that  $I_{n_r} = FL_{yup}$ ,

$$= \Psi F(\Sigma_V - L_{yp}(L_{yp}^T \Sigma_V^{-1} L_{yp})^{-1} L_{yup}^T) F^T \Psi^T$$
  
$$= \Psi F \Theta \Sigma_V^{-1} \Theta^T F^T \Psi^T \ge 0,$$

where  $\Theta = \Sigma_V - L_{yp} (L_{yp}^T \Sigma_V^{-1} L_{yp})^{-1} L_{yp}^T$ . Hence the estimator in (14) achieves the minimum covariance.

#### REFERENCES

- P. Verheijen, V. Breschi, and M. Lazar, "Handbook of linear datadriven predictive control: Theory, implementation and design," *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 56, p. 100914, 2023.
- [2] J. Berberich, J. Köhler, M. A. Müller, and F. Allgöwer, "Data-driven model predictive control with stability and robustness guarantees," *IEEE Trans. Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 4, pp. 1702–1717, Apr. 2021.
- [3] W. Favoreel, B. De Moor, and M. Gevers, "SPC: Subspace predictive control," in *Proc. IFAC World Congress*, 1999, pp. 4004–4009.
- [4] J. C. Willems, P. Rapisarda, I. Markovsky, and B. L. De Moor, "A note on persistency of excitation," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 54, no. 4, pp. 325–329, 2005.
- [5] F. Fiedler and S. Lucia, "On the relationship between data-enabled predictive control and subspace predictive control," in *Proc. European Control Conference*, 2021, pp. 222–229.
- [6] J. Coulson, J. Lygeros, and F. Dörfler, "Data-enabled predictive control: In the shallows of the DeePC," in *Proc. European Control Conference*, November 2019, pp. 307–312.
- [7] V. Breschi, M. Fabris, S. Formentin, and A. Chiuso, "Uncertaintyaware data-driven predictive control in a stochastic setting," in *IFAC PapersOnLine*, vol. 56-2, 2023, pp. 10083–10088.
- [8] V. Breschi, A. Chiuso, and S. Formentin, "Data-driven predictive control in a stochastic setting: a unified framework," *Automatica*, vol. 152, p. 110961, 2023.
- [9] M. Lazar and P. Verheijen, "Generalized data-driven predictive control: Merging subspace and Hankel predictors," *Mathematics*, vol. 11, p. 2216, 2023.
- [10] M. Yin, A. Iannelli, and R. S. Smith, "Maximum likelihood estimation in data-driven modeling and control," *IEEE Trans. Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 1, pp. 317–328, 2023.
- [11] M. Yin and R. S. Smith, "On low-rank Hankel matrix denoising," in *IFAC-PapersOnLine (System Identification Symposium)*, vol. 54, no. 7, 2021, pp. 198–203.
- [12] H. J. van Waarde, C. De Persis, M. K. Camlibel, and P. Tesi, "Willems' fundamental lemma for state-space systems and its extension to multiple datasets," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 602–607, 2020.
- [13] C. De Persis and P. Tesi, "Formulas for data-driven control: Stabilization, optimality and robustness," *IEEE Trans. Automatic Control*, vol. 65, no. 3, pp. 909–924, 2020.

- [14] P. Mattsson and B. Schön, Thomas, "On the regularization in DeePC," in *Proc. IFAC World Congress, IFAC PapersOnLine*, vol. 56-2, 2023, pp. 625–631.
  [15] F. Dörfler, J. Coulson, and I. Markovsky, "Bridging direct and indirect
- [15] F. Dörfler, J. Coulson, and I. Markovsky, "Bridging direct and indirect data-driven control formulations via regularizations and relaxations," *IEEE Trans. Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 2, pp. 883–897, 2023.
- [16] 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.
- [17] G. Pillonetto and G. De Nicolao, "A new kernel-based approach for linear system identification," *Automatica*, vol. 46, pp. 81–93, 2010.