

Computationally Efficient System Level Tube-MPC for Uncertain Systems

Jerome Sieber^a, Alexandre Didier^a, Melanie N. Zeilinger^a,

^a*Institute for Dynamic Systems and Control, ETH Zurich, 8092 Zurich, Switzerland*

Abstract

Tube-based model predictive control (MPC) is the principal robust control technique for constrained linear systems affected by additive disturbances. While tube-based methods that compute the tubes online have been successfully applied to systems with additive disturbances, their application to systems affected by additional model uncertainties is challenging. This paper introduces a new tube-based MPC method - named filter-based system level tube-MPC (SLTMPC) - which overapproximates both uncertainties with an online optimized disturbance set, while simultaneously computing the tube controller online. Extending prior work, we generalize the method to polytopic disturbance sets and for the first time provide rigorous closed-loop guarantees for the receding horizon controller. These guarantees are obtained by virtue of a new terminal controller design and an online optimized terminal set. To reduce the computational complexity of the proposed method, we additionally introduce an asynchronous computation scheme that separates the optimization of the tube controller and the nominal trajectory. Finally, we provide a comprehensive numerical evaluation of the proposed methods to demonstrate their effectiveness.

Key words: Robust model predictive control; Linear systems; Parametric model uncertainty; System level synthesis.

1 Introduction

Robust model predictive control (MPC) is the main robust control technique for constrained linear systems affected by bounded uncertainties. In the presence of model uncertainty, formulating a robust MPC problem is challenging, since the predicted trajectories are affected by the uncertain model and the computed control inputs, coupling the model uncertainty and the optimization variables. Early approaches to tackle this problem were based on linear matrix inequality (LMI) methods [1,2], which are computationally expensive and scale poorly with the system dimension. Therefore, tube-based MPC methods have recently become popular for these types of uncertain systems. Tube-based MPC is based on separating the system behavior into nominal and error dynamics, which describe the system dynamics neglecting uncertainties and the deviations from the nominal dynamics due to uncertainties, respectively. Since the uncertainties are assumed to be bounded, the error dynamics can be bounded in so-called tubes, which are computed based on the uncertainty bounds and a tube controller [3,4]. However, the challenge of disentangling

the model uncertainty and the optimization variables remains, which has been addressed by mainly two different strategies in the literature.

One strategy for managing both additive disturbances and model uncertainties with tube-based MPC involves lumping both uncertainties into a single state- and input-dependent additive term, which is subsequently bounded offline, resulting in a system with only additive uncertainty. This approach enables the use of various tube-based MPC methods proposed in the literature. Standard tube-MPC computes the tubes offline and optimizes the nominal trajectory subject to tightened constraints online, see e.g. [5,6,7]. To reduce conservativeness, homothetic tube-MPC [8] and elastic tube-MPC [9] enable online optimization of the tubes by fixing the tube shape but allowing dilation and translation of the tubes online. As shown in [10], online optimization of the tube controller enables tube flexibility beyond dilation and translation. The online optimization is facilitated by parameterizing the tube controller as a disturbance feedback policy [11,12] or via the system level parameterization (SLP) [13], which is part of the system level synthesis (SLS) framework [14]. Beyond tube-based MPC, the lumped uncertainty approach is also used in classical disturbance feedback control synthesis [15,16], which tightens the constraints

Email addresses: jsieber@ethz.ch (Jerome Sieber),
adidier@ethz.ch (Alexandre Didier),
mzeilinger@ethz.ch (Melanie N. Zeilinger).

with offline computed bounds as a function of the online computed control input. However, the lumped uncertainty approach is typically conservative, since it relies on offline computed global uncertainty bounds.

Another strategy treats the uncertainties separately and explicitly designs the tubes and the tube controller for the individual uncertainty descriptions. Most approaches following such a strategy build on either the homothetic tube-MPC formulation [17,18,19] or the elastic tube-MPC formulation [20,21]. Additionally, the methods proposed in [18,19,21] incorporate online model updates based on set-membership estimation [22] to reduce conservativeness. However, there are also tube-based methods that use configuration-constrained tubes [23], which do not explicitly parameterize a tube controller but compute a control input for every vertex of the tube, or use ellipsoidal tubes [24], which are computed via a linear fractional transformation (LFT)-based formulation of the uncertainties. More recently, [25] proposed a tube-based MPC method based on the SLP that simultaneously overapproximates both uncertainties and computes a tube controller online, which we denote as *filter-based system level tube-MPC (SLTMPC)*. This method provides highly flexible tubes and minimal offline design, but only provides closed-loop guarantees for a shrinking horizon formulation and is computationally expensive. The computational issue has been addressed on an algorithmic level by GPU parallelizations [26] and structure-exploiting solvers [27], and on a system theoretic level by asynchronous computation schemes [28], which split the computations of the tubes and the nominal trajectory into different processes. In this paper, we propose a filter-based SLTMPC method with closed-loop guarantees in receding horizon and adapt it to an asynchronous computation scheme to reduce its computational demand.

Contributions: Based on the filter-based SLTMPC approach introduced in [25], we propose a tube-based MPC method that overapproximates the combined effect of additive disturbances and model uncertainties with an online optimized disturbance set and simultaneously computes a tube controller. Different from previous results, the proposed approach can handle general polytopic disturbance sets and guarantees recursive feasibility in receding horizon. This is achieved by introducing a new terminal controller and an online optimized terminal set. These results extend the usage of filter-based SLTMPC to possibly infinite task horizons and avoids a shrinking horizon implementation via controller switching as in [25, Section 5.3]. We further propose a new asynchronous computation scheme for filter-based SLTMPC that reduces the computational complexity by splitting the tube and nominal trajectory optimizations into different processes. Lastly, we provide a comprehensive numerical evaluation of the proposed methods on a double integrator and a vertical take-off and landing (VTOL) vehicle.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 introduces the notation, the problem formulation, and some basic definitions. Section 3 discusses the filter-based system level tube-MPC (SLTMPC) generalized from [25], before Section 4 introduces the recursively feasible version, and Section 5 details the asynchronous computation scheme. Finally, Section 6 showcases the proposed filter-based SLTMPC variants on two numerical examples and Section 7 concludes the paper.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Notation & Definitions

We indicate column vectors, e.g. a , and matrices, e.g. A , with lowercase and uppercase letters, respectively. We denote stacked column vectors, e.g. \mathbf{a} , and block matrices, e.g., \mathbf{A} , with bold letters and index their (block) elements with subscripts, e.g., a_i , $A_{i,j}$. We use $\text{diag}_i(A)$ to denote the block-diagonal matrix, whose diagonal consists of i -times the A matrix. We define the operator $\text{shift}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})$ for a block-lower-triangular matrix \mathbf{A} with $N \times N$ block elements and a block row matrix \mathbf{B} with N block elements, i.e. $\mathbf{B} = [B_0 \dots B_{N-1}]$, as

$$\text{shift}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}) = \begin{bmatrix} A_{1,1} & & & \\ \vdots & \ddots & & \\ A_{N-1,1} & \dots & A_{N-1,N-1} & \\ B_0 & \dots & \dots & B_{N-1} \end{bmatrix},$$

which removes the first row and column of \mathbf{A} and inserts \mathbf{B} in the bottom block row. We use \mathbb{I}_n to denote the identity matrix of size $n \times n$. We distinguish between the states of a dynamical system $x(k)$ and the states predicted by an MPC algorithm x_i . We use \oplus and \ominus to denote Minkowski set addition and Pontryagin set subtraction, respectively, which are both formally defined in [3, Definition 3.10]. For a sequence of sets $\mathcal{A}_0, \dots, \mathcal{A}_j$, we use the convention that $\bigoplus_{i=0}^{-1} \mathcal{A}_i = \{0\}$, which is the set containing only the zero vector. We define \mathcal{K} -functions and uniform continuity of a function below.

Definition 1 (\mathcal{K} -function [29]) *A function $\gamma : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is called a \mathcal{K} -function, if it is continuous, strictly increasing, and $\gamma(0) = 0$.*

Definition 2 (Uniform continuity [29]) *A function $f(x, u) : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with sets $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, is uniformly continuous in x for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $u \in \mathcal{U}$, if there exists a \mathcal{K} -function $\beta(\cdot)$ such that*

$$\|f(x_1, u) - f(x_2, u)\| \leq \beta(\|x_1 - x_2\|), \quad \forall x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{X}, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{U}.$$

This also covers functions with a single argument, i.e.,

$$\|f(x_1) - f(x_2)\| \leq \beta(\|x_1 - x_2\|), \quad \forall x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{X}.$$

2.2 Problem Formulation

We consider linear time-invariant (LTI) dynamical systems with parametric and additive uncertainties of the form

$$x(k+1) = (A + \Delta_A)x(k) + (B + \Delta_B)u(k) + w(k), \quad (1)$$

with $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $w(k) \in \mathcal{W} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, and $(\Delta_A, \Delta_B) \in \mathcal{D}$, where \mathcal{W} and \mathcal{D} are convex polytopes defined as

$$\mathcal{W} = \{w \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid H_w w \leq h_w\}, \quad (2a)$$

$$\mathcal{D} = \text{co}\{(\Delta_A^i, \Delta_B^j)\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n_A, \quad j = 1, \dots, n_B, \quad (2b)$$

where $H_w \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w \times n}$, $h_w \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w}$, and n_A and n_B are the number of generators for Δ_A and Δ_B , respectively. The set \mathcal{D} is thus defined by the vertices $\mathcal{D}^d = (\Delta_A^d, \Delta_B^d)$, $d = 1, \dots, n_D$, with $n_D = n_A \cdot n_B$. The system is subject to compact polytopic state and input constraints

$$\mathcal{X} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid H_x x \leq h_x\}, \quad (3a)$$

$$\mathcal{U} = \{u \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid H_u u \leq h_u\}, \quad (3b)$$

where $H_x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n}$, $h_x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$, $H_u \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u \times m}$, $h_u \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$, with both sets containing the origin in their interior. To safely control system (1), we consider the following robust constraint satisfaction problem (CSP) over the task horizon \bar{N} .

Problem 1 (Robust CSP) *Find a sequence of inputs u_i , $i = 0, \dots, \bar{N}-1$, such that the following constraints are satisfied for all $i = 0, \dots, \bar{N}-1$:*

$$x_0 = x(k), \quad (4a)$$

$$x_{i+1} = (A + \Delta_A)x_i + (B + \Delta_B)u_i + w_i, \quad (4b)$$

$$x_i \in \mathcal{X}, \quad \forall (\Delta_A, \Delta_B) \in \mathcal{D}, \quad \forall w_i \in \mathcal{W}, \quad (4c)$$

$$u_i \in \mathcal{U}, \quad (4d)$$

$$x_{\bar{N}} \in \mathcal{S}_f, \quad (4e)$$

where x_i , u_i , and w_i denote the predicted state, input, and disturbance, respectively, and $\mathcal{S}_f \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ is a robust positively invariant (RPI) set according to Definition 3.¹

Definition 3 (RPI set for (1)) *The set $\mathcal{S}_f \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ is a robust positively invariant (RPI) set for system (1) with control law $u = K_f x \in \mathcal{U}$ for all $x \in \mathcal{S}_f$, if $x \in \mathcal{S}_f \implies x^+ \in \mathcal{S}_f$ for all $w \in \mathcal{W}$, $(\Delta_A, \Delta_B) \in \mathcal{D}$.*

In this paper, we solve the CSP using a tube-based MPC formulation [3,13] that tightens the constraints with so-called tubes for a shorter horizon $N < \bar{N}$ and apply the MPC in shrinking horizon or receding horizon. In the

¹ Note that we use an RPI set for simplicity, however a robust control invariant (RCI) set could be used instead.

following section, we detail how to derive such a formulation by generalizing the tube-based MPC formulation proposed in [25].

3 Filter-based System Level Tube-MPC

The filter-based SLTMPC proposed in [25] relies on designing an auxiliary disturbance set $\bar{\mathcal{W}}$, before transforming it online to overapproximate the combined effect of additive and parametric uncertainties. This enables online adaptation of the tube controller and results in a nonconservative tube-based MPC method. We extend this method to general polytopic disturbance sets $\bar{\mathcal{W}} = \{\bar{w} \mid H_{\bar{w}} \bar{w} \leq h_{\bar{w}}\}$ instead of norm-bounded disturbance sets $\bar{\mathcal{W}} = \{\bar{w} \mid \|\bar{w}\|_\infty \leq 1\}$, which extends the scope of the method and simplifies its exposition.

We first rewrite the prediction dynamics (4b) by collecting all uncertainties in a separate term denoted as η_i :

$$x_{i+1} = Ax_i + Bu_i + \eta_i, \quad (5)$$

$$\eta_i = \Delta_A x_i + \Delta_B u_i + w_i. \quad (6)$$

Then, following the idea presented in [25], we overapproximate the combined uncertainty η_i for $i = 0, \dots, N-1$ with *disturbance tubes*, i.e.,

$$\eta_i \in \{p_i\} \oplus \mathcal{F}_i(\Sigma) := \{p_i\} \oplus \bigoplus_{j=0}^i \Sigma_{i+1,j} \bar{\mathcal{W}}, \quad (7)$$

where $p_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\Sigma_{i+1,j} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ are online optimization variables denoting the nominal disturbance and the disturbance filter, respectively. The compact polytopic disturbance set $\bar{\mathcal{W}} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, which contains the origin in its interior, is designed offline. Note that these disturbance tubes (7) are a generalization of homothetic tubes [8]. This can be seen by setting $\Sigma_{i+1,i} = \alpha_i \cdot \mathbb{I}_n$ and $\Sigma_{i+1,j} = 0$ for $j = 0, \dots, i-1$, which simplifies the containment condition (7) to $\eta_i \in \{p_i\} \oplus \alpha_i \bar{\mathcal{W}}$, where α_i are the dilation factors and p_i are the tube centers in [8]. If we enforce (7) for all $w \in \mathcal{W}$, $(\Delta_A, \Delta_B) \in \mathcal{D}$ during online optimization, we can guarantee that for optimized p_i , $\Sigma_{i+1,j}$, there always exists a sequence of $\bar{w}_j \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}$, $j = 0, \dots, i$ such that

$$\eta_i = p_i + \sum_{j=0}^i \Sigma_{i+1,j} \bar{w}_j, \quad i = 0, \dots, N-1.$$

Therefore, we can equivalently write dynamics (5) as

$$x_{i+1} = Ax_i + Bu_i + p_i + \sum_{j=0}^i \Sigma_{i+1,j} \bar{w}_j, \quad (8)$$

when imposing that (7) holds. In the remainder of the paper, we use the auxiliary dynamics (8) and formulate

the filter-based SLTMPC problem by splitting (8) into nominal and error dynamics. We use z_i and e_i as the nominal and the error state, respectively, such that $x_i = z_i + e_i$. Together with the tube-based control policy $u_i = v_i + \nu_i$, where v_i and ν_i are the nominal and error inputs, we obtain

$$x_{i+1} = A(z_i + e_i) + B(v_i + \nu_i) + p_i + \sum_{j=0}^i \Sigma_{i+1,j} \bar{w}_j,$$

and thus – as is standard in tube-based MPC [3] – separation into nominal and error dynamics, i.e.,

$$z_{i+1} = Az_i + Bv_i + p_i, \quad (9)$$

$$e_{i+1} = Ae_i + B\nu_i + \sum_{j=0}^i \Sigma_{i+1,j} \bar{w}_j. \quad (10)$$

Since we consider MPC with horizon length N , we define the trajectories $\mathbf{z} = [z_0^\top, \dots, z_N^\top]^\top$, $\mathbf{v} = [v_0^\top, \dots, v_N^\top]^\top$, $\mathbf{p} = [p_0^\top, \dots, p_{N-1}^\top]^\top$, $\bar{\mathbf{w}} = [\bar{w}_0^\top, \dots, \bar{w}_{N-1}^\top]^\top$, $\mathbf{e} = [e_1^\top, \dots, e_N^\top]^\top$, and $\boldsymbol{\nu} = [\nu_1^\top, \dots, \nu_N^\top]^\top$ as the nominal state, nominal input, nominal disturbance, auxiliary disturbance, error state,² and error input trajectories, respectively. The nominal and error dynamics are then compactly written in terms of these trajectories as

$$\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{A}_{N+1}\mathbf{z} + \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{B}_{N+1}\mathbf{v} + \begin{bmatrix} z_0 \\ \mathbf{p} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (11)$$

$$\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{A}_N\mathbf{e} + \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{B}_N\boldsymbol{\nu} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \quad (12)$$

where \mathbf{Z} is a lower shift matrix, i.e., a matrix with ones on its first subdiagonal and zeros everywhere else, $\mathbf{A}_N = \text{diag}_N(A)$, $\mathbf{B}_N = \text{diag}_N(B)$, and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is the block-lower-triangular *disturbance filter* defined as

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_{1,0} \\ \Sigma_{2,0} & \Sigma_{2,1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \\ \Sigma_{N,0} & \Sigma_{N,1} & \dots & \Sigma_{N,N-1} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{Nn \times Nn}.$$

Next, we define the error input as the causal time-varying feedback controller $\boldsymbol{\nu} = \mathbf{K}\mathbf{e}$ with

$$\mathbf{K} = \begin{bmatrix} K_{1,1} \\ K_{2,1} & K_{2,2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \\ K_{N,1} & K_{N,2} & \dots & K_{N,N} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{Nm \times Nn}.$$

² Note that the initial error state e_0 is zero by construction, thus the trajectory \mathbf{e} starts with e_1 .

Substituting this error input into (12) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{e} &= (\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{A}_N + \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{B}_N\mathbf{K})\mathbf{e} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \\ \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{e} &= (\mathbb{I}_{Nn} - \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{A}_N - \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{B}_N\mathbf{K})^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\bar{\mathbf{w}}. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Note that the inverse in (13) always exists, since it admits a finite Neumann series due to the lower shift matrix \mathbf{Z} . As in [25], we use the filter-based system level parameterization (SLP) to reparameterize (13) and the associated error input $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ as

$$\mathbf{e} = (\mathbb{I}_{Nn} - \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{A}_N - \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{B}_N\mathbf{K})^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\bar{\mathbf{w}} = \boldsymbol{\Phi}^e\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \quad (14a)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\nu} = \mathbf{K}(\mathbb{I}_{Nn} - \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{A}_N - \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{B}_N\mathbf{K})^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\bar{\mathbf{w}} = \boldsymbol{\Phi}^\nu\bar{\mathbf{w}}, \quad (14b)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Phi}^e \in \mathbb{R}^{Nn \times Nn}$, $\boldsymbol{\Phi}^\nu \in \mathbb{R}^{Nm \times Nn}$ are the *error system responses*, which admit the following block-lower-triangular structure³

$$\boldsymbol{\Phi}^e = \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_{1,0}^e & & & \\ \Phi_{2,0}^e & \Phi_{2,1}^e & & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \\ \Phi_{N,0}^e & \Phi_{N,1}^e & \dots & \Phi_{N,N-1}^e \end{bmatrix}, \quad \boldsymbol{\Phi}^\nu = \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_{1,0}^\nu & & & \\ \Phi_{2,0}^\nu & \Phi_{2,1}^\nu & & \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \\ \Phi_{N,0}^\nu & \Phi_{N,1}^\nu & \dots & \Phi_{N,N-1}^\nu \end{bmatrix}.$$

Using [14, Theorem 2.1] and [25, Corollary 1] we guarantee that the error system responses $\boldsymbol{\Phi}^e$, $\boldsymbol{\Phi}^\nu$ parameterize all error trajectories \mathbf{e} , $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ that are realized by tube controller \mathbf{K} and disturbance filter $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$. Using the filter-based SLP (14), the error dynamics (12) are equivalently rewritten as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{I}_{Nn} - \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{A}_N & -\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{B}_N \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Phi}^e \\ \boldsymbol{\Phi}^\nu \end{bmatrix} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}. \quad (15)$$

Thereby, the error dynamics are completely defined by the closed-loop behavior, which allows optimization over the system responses in a convex fashion instead of optimizing the tube controller. Note that the filter-based SLP (14) can also be written in elementwise form, i.e., for $i = 1, \dots, N$

$$e_i = \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \Phi_{i,j}^e \bar{w}_j, \quad \nu_i = \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \Phi_{i,j}^\nu \bar{w}_j, \quad (16)$$

and that (15) constrains the block diagonals of $\boldsymbol{\Phi}^e$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ due to the lower shift matrices \mathbf{Z} , i.e., it holds that $\Phi_{i+1,i}^e = \Sigma_{i+1,i}$ for all $i = 0, \dots, N-1$.

In [25, Section 4] it is shown how to enforce containment condition (7) for norm-bounded auxiliary disturbance

³ Note that the indexing of $\Phi_{i,j}^e$ is different from the usual indexing in [13], [14], or [25] in order to reflect that $\Phi_{i,j}^e$ affects the i -th error state through the j -th auxiliary disturbance.

sets $\bar{\mathcal{W}}$. We extend this analysis to general polytopic disturbance sets \mathcal{W} in the following. First, we split the state x_i and input u_i in (6) into their nominal and error contributions and apply the elementwise SLP (16) to the error state e_i and error input ν_i , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}\eta_i &= \Delta_A(z_i + e_i) + \Delta_B(v_i + \nu_i) + w_i \\ &= \Delta_A z_i + \Delta_B v_i + \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} (\Delta_A \Phi_{i,j}^e + \Delta_B \Phi_{i,j}^\nu) \bar{w}_j + w_i.\end{aligned}$$

The containment condition (7) for $i = 0, \dots, N-1$ then reads as

$$\begin{aligned}\{\Delta_A z_i + \Delta_B v_i\} \oplus \bigoplus_{j=0}^{i-1} (\Delta_A \Phi_{i,j}^e + \Delta_B \Phi_{i,j}^\nu) \bar{\mathcal{W}} \oplus \mathcal{W} \\ \subseteq \{p_i\} \oplus \bigoplus_{j=0}^i \Sigma_{i+1,j} \bar{\mathcal{W}}, \quad \forall (\Delta_A, \Delta_B) \in \mathcal{D},\end{aligned}$$

and by collecting the singletons we get

$$\begin{aligned}\{\Delta_A z_i + \Delta_B v_i - p_i\} \oplus \bigoplus_{j=0}^{i-1} (\Delta_A \Phi_{i,j}^e + \Delta_B \Phi_{i,j}^\nu) \bar{\mathcal{W}} \oplus \mathcal{W} \\ \subseteq \bigoplus_{j=0}^i \Sigma_{i+1,j} \bar{\mathcal{W}} = \mathcal{F}_i(\Sigma), \quad \forall (\Delta_A, \Delta_B) \in \mathcal{D}.\end{aligned}\quad (17)$$

Since the superset of above inclusion is a Minkowski sum, embedding it in an optimization problem is conservative and nonconvex [30]. Therefore, we make use of the following lemma to convert (17) into a form that can be formulated linearly in the optimization variables.

Lemma 1 *Let $\mathcal{D}^d = (\Delta_A^d, \Delta_B^d)$ denote the d^{th} vertex of \mathcal{D} and define*

$$\psi_i^d := \Delta_A^d z_i + \Delta_B^d v_i - p_i, \quad (18a)$$

$$\Psi_{i,j}^d := \Delta_A^d \Phi_{i,j}^e + \Delta_B^d \Phi_{i,j}^\nu - \Sigma_{i+1,j}. \quad (18b)$$

Then, if the following inclusion holds for $i = 0, \dots, N-1$ and $d = 1, \dots, n_D$,

$$\{\psi_i^d\} \oplus \bigoplus_{j=0}^{i-1} \Psi_{i,j}^d \bar{\mathcal{W}} \oplus \mathcal{W} \subseteq \Sigma_{i+1,i} \bar{\mathcal{W}}, \quad (19)$$

containment condition (17) is satisfied.

PROOF. First, note that due to the separation $x = z + e$ and $u = v + \nu$, the same Δ_A^d and Δ_B^d are applied to the nominal and error variables. Therefore, the same vertex of \mathcal{D} is used in (18a), (18b) and we can prove the lemma for any vertex d , implying that the proof holds

for all $(\Delta_A^d, \Delta_B^d) \in \mathcal{D}$ due to convexity of \mathcal{D} . We start by rewriting (17) using (18) as

$$\{\psi_i^d\} \oplus \bigoplus_{j=0}^{i-1} (\Psi_{i,j}^d + \Sigma_{i+1,j}) \bar{\mathcal{W}} \oplus \mathcal{W} \subseteq \bigoplus_{j=0}^i \Sigma_{i+1,j} \bar{\mathcal{W}}, \quad (20)$$

where we used $\Psi_{i,j}^d + \Sigma_{i+1,j} = \Delta_A^d \Phi_{i,j}^e + \Delta_B^d \Phi_{i,j}^\nu$. Next, we note that the following inclusion holds

$$(\Psi_{i,j}^d + \Sigma_{i+1,j}) \bar{\mathcal{W}} \subseteq \Psi_{i,j}^d \bar{\mathcal{W}} \oplus \Sigma_{i+1,j} \bar{\mathcal{W}}, \quad (21)$$

which is a direct consequence of [30, Proposition 2]. Finally, we show (20) holds by using (21) and commutativity of the Minkowski sum, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}\{\psi_i^d\} \oplus \bigoplus_{j=0}^{i-1} (\Psi_{i,j}^d + \Sigma_{i+1,j}) \bar{\mathcal{W}} \oplus \mathcal{W} \\ \stackrel{(21)}{\subseteq} \{\psi_i^d\} \oplus \bigoplus_{j=0}^{i-1} \Psi_{i,j}^d \bar{\mathcal{W}} \oplus \mathcal{W} \oplus \bigoplus_{j=0}^{i-1} \Sigma_{i+1,j} \bar{\mathcal{W}} \\ \stackrel{(19)}{\subseteq} \Sigma_{i+1,i} \bar{\mathcal{W}} \oplus \bigoplus_{j=0}^{i-1} \Sigma_{i+1,j} \bar{\mathcal{W}} \\ = \bigoplus_{j=0}^i \Sigma_{i+1,j} \bar{\mathcal{W}}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have shown that enforcing (19) is sufficient for (17) to hold. \square

Additionally, we impose a diagonal structure on Σ , i.e., $\Sigma_{i+1,i} = \sigma_i \cdot \mathbb{I}_n$ for $i = 0, \dots, N-1$, which is similarly done in [25, Section 4.1]. Using the correspondence to homothetic tubes [8], we note that this diagonal structure with scalings σ_i is equivalent to the dilation factors α_i . After applying Lemma 1 and imposing the diagonal structure, the inclusion (17) for $i = 0, \dots, N-1$ and $d = 1, \dots, n_D$ reads as

$$\{\psi_i^d\} \oplus \bigoplus_{j=0}^{i-1} \Psi_{i,j}^d \bar{\mathcal{W}} \oplus \mathcal{W} \subseteq \sigma_{i+1} \bar{\mathcal{W}}, \quad (22)$$

which can be linearly embedded in an optimization problem as shown in Appendix A.1.

Remark 1 *Note that we can relax the structural constraint $\Sigma_{i+1,i} = \sigma \cdot \mathbb{I}_n$ to $\Sigma_{i+1,i} = \text{diag}(\sigma_{i,1}, \dots, \sigma_{i,n})$, if we design \mathcal{W} as a hyperrectangle, therefore recovering the same disturbance tube parameterization as in [25]. For more details, see Appendix A.1.*

Finally, we use nominal dynamics (9), error dynamics (15), and disturbance overapproximation (22) to

formulate the generalized version of the filter-based SLTMPC problem [25] as

$$\min_{\substack{z, v, p, \Sigma, \\ \Phi^e, \Phi^\nu}} l_f(z_N) + \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} l(z_i, v_i), \quad (23a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \forall i = 0, \dots, N-1:$$

$$z_0 = x(k), \quad (23b)$$

$$z_{i+1} = Az_i + Bv_i + p_i, \quad (23c)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{I}_{Nn} - \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{A}_N & -\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{B}_N \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Phi^e \\ \Phi^\nu \end{bmatrix} = \Sigma, \quad (23d)$$

$$z_i \in \mathcal{X} \ominus \mathcal{F}_i(\Phi^e), \quad (23e)$$

$$v_i \in \mathcal{U} \ominus \mathcal{F}_i(\Phi^\nu), \quad (23f)$$

$$z_N \in \mathcal{S}_f \ominus \mathcal{F}_N(\Phi^e), \quad (23g)$$

$$\{\psi_i^d\} \oplus \bigoplus_{j=0}^{i-1} \Psi_{i,j}^d \bar{\mathcal{W}} \oplus \mathcal{W} \subseteq \sigma_{i+1} \bar{\mathcal{W}}, \quad d = 1, \dots, n_D, \quad (23h)$$

where $l(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $l_f(\cdot)$ are suitable stage and terminal costs, ψ_i^d and $\Psi_{i,j}^d$ are defined as in (18), \mathcal{S}_f is an RPI terminal set according to Definition 3, and $\mathcal{F}_i(\Phi^e)$, $\mathcal{F}_i(\Phi^\nu)$ are the state and input tubes defined as

$$\mathcal{F}_i(\Phi^e) := \bigoplus_{j=0}^{i-1} \Phi_{i,j}^e \bar{\mathcal{W}}, \quad \mathcal{F}_i(\Phi^\nu) := \bigoplus_{j=0}^{i-1} \Phi_{i,j}^\nu \bar{\mathcal{W}}. \quad (24)$$

In order to show recursive feasibility of (23) we would need to show that $\mathcal{S}_f \ominus \mathcal{F}_N(\Phi^e)$ is RPI itself. However, since \mathcal{S}_f is RPI with respect to both $w \in \mathcal{W}$ and $(\Delta_A, \Delta_B) \in \mathcal{D}$ (Definition 3) this is difficult because $\mathcal{F}_N(\Phi^e)$ would need to be an exact reachable set of (1) for all $w \in \mathcal{W}$, $(\Delta_A, \Delta_B) \in \mathcal{D}$. This is clearly not the case, since $\mathcal{F}_N(\Phi^e)$ is computed via (17), which is an overapproximation of the combined uncertainties. Therefore, we need to restrict the SLTMPC (23) to a shrinking horizon regime similar to [16,25], which switch between solving the MPC problem with a shrinking horizon and exactly solving the robust CSP (4) for $N = 1$ to show recursive feasibility and robust stability. However, this strategy requires implementation of a switching logic and only works well if task horizon N is finite and known in advance. In the next section, we show how to modify the terminal constraints in (23) such that the resulting MPC can be applied in receding horizon. For a recursive feasibility proof of (23) in shrinking horizon, we refer to [16, Appendix 6].

4 Recursively Feasible Filter-based SLTMPC

The terminal constraints in (23) are not suitable to prove recursive feasibility in receding horizon, due to \mathcal{S}_f being computed for system (1) with combined uncertainty η

and $\mathcal{F}_N(\Phi^e)$ being computed for auxiliary system (8) with only additive uncertainty \bar{w} . Therefore, we propose a new set of terminal constraints that only rely on sets computed for auxiliary system (8). The key idea is to exploit the separation $x = z + e$ and formulate a separate terminal control law for both the nominal and error states, ensuring that both only depend on \bar{w} . The resulting new terminal set \mathcal{X}_f is then used to constrain the terminal state $x_N \in \mathcal{X}_f$ in the proposed MPC scheme.

For this we first define an auxiliary RPI set \mathcal{Z}_f for a simplified version of (8) with $p_i = 0$, $\Sigma_{i+1,i} = \mathbb{I}_n$, $\Sigma_{i+1,j} = 0$ for all i and $j = 0, \dots, i-1$, i.e.,

$$x(k+1) = Ax(k) + Bu(k) + \bar{w}(k). \quad (25)$$

Definition 4 (RPI set for (25)) *The set $\mathcal{Z}_f \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ is a robust positively invariant (RPI) set for system (25) with control law $u = K_f x \in \mathcal{U}$ for all $x \in \mathcal{Z}_f$, if $x \in \mathcal{Z}_f \implies x^+ \in \mathcal{Z}_f$ for all $\bar{w}(k) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}$.*

We then use the control law K_f of RPI set \mathcal{Z}_f to construct the terminal control law as

$$\kappa_f(x) = \kappa_f^z(z) + \kappa_f^e(e) = K_f z + \nu = K_f z + \sum_{j=0}^N \Phi_{N,j}^\nu \bar{w}_{N-j}, \quad (26)$$

where $\Phi_{N,j}^\nu$, i.e. the last block row of Φ^ν , can be freely optimized since it is not constrained by (15). Before constructing the RPI set corresponding to control law (26), we first overapproximate the terminal uncertainty η_N with a terminal disturbance tube similar to (7),⁴ i.e.,

$$\eta_N \in \mathcal{F}_N(\Xi) := \bigoplus_{j=0}^{N-1} \Xi_j \bar{\mathcal{W}} \oplus \sigma_N \bar{\mathcal{W}}, \quad (27)$$

where $\Xi = [\Xi_0 \dots \Xi_{N-1}]$ are additional disturbance filter parameters. Similar to Section 3, there always exists a sequence of $\bar{w}_j \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}$, $j = 0, \dots, N$, such that $\eta_N = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \Xi_j \bar{w}_j + \sigma_N \bar{w}_N$. With this, we define RPI set \mathcal{X}_f for control law (26) in the following lemma.

Lemma 2 *The set $\mathcal{X}_f := \alpha \mathcal{Z}_f \oplus \mathcal{F}_N(\Phi^e)$, with $\alpha \geq 0$, is an RPI set for system $x_{N+1} = Ax_N + BK_f(x_N) + \eta_N$ with control law $\kappa_f(\cdot)$ defined in (26) and $\eta_N \in \mathcal{F}_N(\Xi)$, if the following two conditions hold:*

- (a) $\alpha(A + BK_f)\mathcal{Z}_f \oplus \Gamma\bar{\mathcal{W}} \subseteq \alpha\mathcal{Z}_f$ with \mathcal{Z}_f RPI according to Definition 4 and $\Gamma = A\Phi_{N,0}^e + B\Phi_{N,0}^\nu + \Xi_0$,
- (b) $\Phi_{N,j-1}^e = A\Phi_{N,j}^e + B\Phi_{N,j}^\nu + \Xi_j$, $\forall j = 1, \dots, N-1$.

It holds that if $x_N \in \mathcal{X}_f \implies x_{N+1} \in \mathcal{X}_f \forall \eta_N \in \mathcal{F}_N(\Xi)$.

⁴ Note that $i = N$ is not included in (7), hence we need to define this case separately.

PROOF. We start by analyzing the dynamics under control law (26), i.e.,

$$x_{N+1} = (A + BK_f)z_N + Ae_N + B\nu_N + \eta_N.$$

Next, we insert the definitions of e_N , ν_N , and η_N to get

$$\begin{aligned} Ae_N + B\nu_N + \eta_N &= \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} (A\Phi_{N,j}^e + B\Phi_{N,j}^\nu + \Xi_j)\bar{w}_j + \sigma_N \bar{w}_N \\ &= (A\Phi_{N,0}^e + B\Phi_{N,0}^\nu + \Xi_0)\bar{w}_0 \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} (A\Phi_{N,j}^e + B\Phi_{N,j}^\nu + \Xi_j)\bar{w}_j + \sigma_N \bar{w}_N. \end{aligned}$$

Using $\Phi_{N,N-1}^e = \Sigma_{N,N-1} = \sigma_N \cdot \mathbb{I}_n$ due to (15), $\Gamma = A\Phi_{N,0}^e + B\Phi_{N,0}^\nu + \Xi_0$ from (a), and (b) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} Ae_N + B\nu_N + \eta_N &= \Gamma \bar{w}_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \Phi_{N,j-1}^e \bar{w}_j + \Phi_{N,N-1}^e \bar{w}_N \\ &= \Gamma \bar{w}_0 + \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \Phi_{N,j}^e \bar{w}_{j+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the dynamics under control law (26) are

$$x_{N+1} = \underbrace{(A + BK_f)z_N + \Gamma \bar{w}_0}_{:=z_{N+1}} + \underbrace{\sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \Phi_{N,j}^e \bar{w}_{j+1}}_{:=e_{N+1}}.$$

Now, if $x_N = z_N + e_N \in \alpha\mathcal{Z}_f \oplus \mathcal{F}_N(\Phi^e) = \mathcal{X}_f$, then $z_{N+1} \in \alpha\mathcal{Z}_f$ is guaranteed by (a) and $e_{N+1} \in \mathcal{F}_N(\Phi^e)$ holds by construction. Therefore, $x_{N+1} \in \mathcal{X}_f$. \square

Intuitively, (a) in Lemma 2 ensures that $\alpha\mathcal{Z}_f$ is RPI with respect to control law K_f and optimized disturbance $\Gamma\bar{w}$, while (b) constrains the error states to the same tube $\mathcal{F}_N(\Phi^e)$ after N timesteps, which is less restrictive but similar to the FIR constraint in [10]. To use \mathcal{X}_f as the terminal set in the proposed MPC, \mathcal{X}_f needs to satisfy the state constraints, i.e. $\mathcal{X}_f \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, and control law (26) needs to satisfy the input constraints, i.e. $\kappa_f(x) \in \mathcal{U}$, for all $x \in \mathcal{X}_f$. This can be enforced by

$$\alpha\mathcal{Z}_f \subseteq \mathcal{X} \ominus \mathcal{F}_N(\Phi^e), \quad (28)$$

$$\alpha K_f \mathcal{Z}_f \subseteq \mathcal{U} \ominus \mathcal{F}_N(\Phi^\nu), \quad (29)$$

where (28) follows from $\mathcal{X}_f = \alpha\mathcal{Z}_f \oplus \mathcal{F}_N(\Phi^e)$ and (29) follows from

$$\kappa_f(x_N) = K_f \underbrace{z_N}_{\in \alpha\mathcal{Z}_f} + \underbrace{\sum_{j=0}^N \Phi_{N,j}^\nu \bar{w}_{N-j}}_{\in \mathcal{F}_N(\Phi^\nu)} \in \mathcal{U}.$$

Note that constraints (28), (29), and (a) in Lemma 2 are the same constraints as those used in [28] to scale the terminal set. The main idea is that the online scaling preserves invariance, since we simultaneously optimize the scaling of the set α and the disturbance $\Gamma\bar{w}$ for which the set is RPI. Therefore, we can use the results in [28] to linearly embed these constraints into the MPC formulation as shown in Appendix A.1.

Finally, we reformulate the inclusion of the terminal disturbance (27) similar to Section 3. We enforce inclusion (27) on the combined disturbance (6) with

$$\begin{aligned} &\underbrace{\{(\Delta_A^d + \Delta_B^d K_f)z_N\}}_{:=\Delta_{K_f}^d} \oplus \bigoplus_{j=0}^{N-1} (\Delta_A^d \Phi_{N,j}^e + \Delta_B^d \Phi_{N,j}^\nu) \bar{\mathcal{W}} \oplus \mathcal{W} \\ &\subseteq \bigoplus_{j=0}^{N-1} \Xi_j \bar{\mathcal{W}} \oplus \sigma_N \bar{\mathcal{W}} = \mathcal{F}_N(\Xi), \quad d = 1, \dots, n_D. \quad (30) \end{aligned}$$

Using the terminal constraint $z_N \in \alpha\mathcal{Z}_f$ and Lemma 1, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha \Delta_{K_f}^d \mathcal{Z}_f \oplus \bigoplus_{j=0}^{N-1} (\Delta_A^d \Phi_{N,j}^e + \Delta_B^d \Phi_{N,j}^\nu - \Xi_j) \bar{\mathcal{W}} \oplus \mathcal{W} \\ &\subseteq \sigma_N \bar{\mathcal{W}}, \quad d = 1, \dots, n_D, \end{aligned}$$

or in compact notation using $\Psi_{N,j}^d = \Delta_A^d \Phi_{N,j}^e + \Delta_B^d \Phi_{N,j}^\nu - \Xi_j$:

$$\alpha \Delta_{K_f}^d \mathcal{Z}_f \oplus \bigoplus_{j=0}^{N-1} \Psi_{N,j}^d \bar{\mathcal{W}} \oplus \mathcal{W} \subseteq \sigma_N \bar{\mathcal{W}}, \quad d = 1, \dots, n_D. \quad (31)$$

Remark 2 Since we derived terminal disturbance inclusion (31) similar to (22) in Section 3, Remark 1 also applies to (31) and thus allows to replace σ_N with $\text{diag}(\sigma_{N,1}, \dots, \sigma_{N,n})$ if $\bar{\mathcal{W}}$ is designed as a hyperrectangle. Such a choice for $\bar{\mathcal{W}}$ thus increases the flexibility of the SLTMPC problem proposed below. However, depending on the disturbance sets \mathcal{W} , \mathcal{D} , choosing $\bar{\mathcal{W}}$ as a hyperrectangle might be conservative.

Before formulating the proposed filter-based SLTMPC problem, we state some standard assumptions on the nominal cost function.

Assumption 1 The stage cost function $l(x, u)$ is convex, satisfies $l(0, 0) = 0$, is uniformly continuous for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $u \in \mathcal{U}$, and there exists a \mathcal{K} -function $\gamma_1(\cdot)$ satisfying $l(x, u) \geq \gamma_1(\|x\|)$, $\forall x \in \mathcal{X}$, $u \in \mathcal{U}$. The terminal cost $l_f(x)$ is convex, positive definite, uniformly continuous for all $x \in \mathcal{X}_f$, there exists a \mathcal{K} -function $\gamma_2(\cdot)$ satisfying $l_f(x) \leq \gamma_2(\|x\|)$, $\forall x \in \mathcal{X}_f$, and it holds that $l_f(x^+) - l_f(x) \leq -l(x, K_f x)$ with $x^+ = Ax + BK_f x$, $\forall x \in \mathcal{X}_f$ and $K_f x \in \mathcal{U}$.

The recursively feasible version of the filter-based SLTMPC problem is then formulated as

$$\min_{\substack{\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{p}, \alpha \geq 0, \\ \Phi^e, \Phi^\nu, \Sigma, \Xi}} l_f(z_N) + \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} l(z_i, v_i), \quad (32a)$$

s.t. $\forall i = 0, \dots, N-1$:

$$z_0 = x(k), \quad (32b)$$

$$z_{i+1} = Az_i + Bv_i + p_i, \quad (32c)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{I}_{Nn} - \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{A}_N & -\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{B}_N \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Phi^e \\ \Phi^\nu \end{bmatrix} = \Sigma, \quad (32d)$$

$$\Phi_{N,j-1}^e = A\Phi_{N,j}^e + B\Phi_{N,j}^\nu + \Xi_j, \quad (32e)$$

$$z_i \in \mathcal{X} \ominus \mathcal{F}_i(\Phi^e), \quad (32f)$$

$$v_i \in \mathcal{U} \ominus \mathcal{F}_i(\Phi^\nu), \quad (32g)$$

$$z_N \in \alpha \mathcal{Z}_f \subseteq \mathcal{X} \ominus \mathcal{F}_N(\Phi^e), \quad (32h)$$

$$\alpha K_f \mathcal{Z}_f \subseteq \mathcal{U} \ominus \mathcal{F}_N(\Phi^\nu), \quad (32i)$$

$$\alpha A_{K_f} \mathcal{Z}_f \subseteq \alpha \mathcal{Z}_f \ominus \Gamma \bar{\mathcal{W}}, \quad (32j)$$

$\forall d = 1, \dots, n_D$:

$$\{\psi_i^d\} \oplus \bigoplus_{j=0}^{i-1} \Psi_{i,j}^d \bar{\mathcal{W}} \oplus \mathcal{W} \subseteq \sigma_{i+1} \bar{\mathcal{W}}, \quad (32k)$$

$$\alpha \Delta_{K_f}^d \mathcal{Z}_f \oplus \bigoplus_{j=0}^{N-1} \Psi_{N,j}^d \bar{\mathcal{W}} \oplus \mathcal{W} \subseteq \sigma_N \bar{\mathcal{W}}, \quad (32l)$$

where $l(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $l_f(\cdot)$ are stage and terminal costs according to Assumption 1, ψ_i^d and $\Psi_{i,j}^d$ are defined as in (18), $\Psi_{N,j}^d = \Delta_A^d \Phi_{N,j}^e + \Delta_B^d \Phi_{N,j}^\nu - \Xi_j$, \mathcal{Z}_f is an RPI set according to Definition 4, and the resulting MPC control law is given by

$$\kappa_{\text{MPC}}(x(k)) = v_0^*, \quad (33)$$

where v_0^* is the first element of the optimal solution \mathbf{v}^* of (32).

4.1 Theoretical Guarantees

In the following, we prove recursive feasibility and input-to-state stability (ISS) of the proposed filter-based SLTMPC scheme (32). To do this, we first discuss the equivalence of (1) and (8) by considering dynamics (1) with the filter-based SLTMPC controller (33). The auxiliary disturbance $\bar{w}(k)$ can be computed from the states measured at timesteps $k, k+1$, the applied control input, and the disturbance filter variables p_0^*, σ_1^* as

$$\bar{w}(k) = \frac{1}{\sigma_1^*} (x(k+1) - Ax(k) - B\kappa_{\text{MPC}}(x(k)) - p_0^*). \quad (34)$$

Therefore, dynamics (1) can be equivalently rewritten as

$$x(k+1) = Ax(k) + B\kappa_{\text{MPC}}(x(k)) + p_0^* + \sigma_1^* \bar{w}(k). \quad (35)$$

Using this equivalence, we show recursive feasibility of (32) in the following theorem.

Theorem 3 *Optimization problem (32) is recursively feasible for system (1) under controller (33), i.e., the feasible set of (32) is RPI.*

PROOF. We prove the theorem using a standard argument [3], constructing a feasible candidate sequence based on the shifted previous solution, which is possible contrary to [25] because of the novel terminal constraints. We start the proof by stating constraint (32d) in elementwise fashion, i.e.,

$$\Phi_{i,i-1}^e = \Sigma_{i,i-1} = \sigma_i \cdot \mathbb{I}_n, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad (36a)$$

$$\Phi_{i+1,j}^e = A\Phi_{i,j}^e + B\Phi_{i,j}^\nu + \Sigma_{i+1,j}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N-1, \quad (36b)$$

$$j = 0, \dots, i-1.$$

With these and the computed auxiliary disturbance $\bar{w}(k)$ given by (34), we define the scalar-valued candidate as $\hat{\alpha} = \alpha^*$, the vector-valued candidates as

$$\hat{z}_i = z_{i+1}^* + \Phi_{i+1,0}^{e*} \bar{w}(k), \quad i = 0, \dots, N-1, \quad (37a)$$

$$\hat{z}_N = A_{K_f} z_N^* + \Gamma^* \bar{w}(k), \quad (37b)$$

$$\hat{v}_i = v_{i+1}^* + \Phi_{i+1,0}^{\nu*} \bar{w}(k), \quad i = 0, \dots, N-2, \quad (37c)$$

$$\hat{v}_{N-1} = K_f z_N^* + \Phi_{N,0}^{\nu*} \bar{w}(k), \quad (37d)$$

$$\hat{p}_i = p_{i+1}^* + \Sigma_{i+2,0}^* \bar{w}(k), \quad i = 0, \dots, N-2, \quad (37e)$$

$$\hat{p}_{N-1} = \Xi_0^* \bar{w}(k), \quad (37f)$$

and the matrix-valued candidates as

$$\hat{\Phi}^e = \text{shift}(\Phi^{e*}, \Phi_{N,:}^{e*}), \quad (38a)$$

$$\hat{\Phi}^\nu = \text{shift}(\Phi^{\nu*}, \Phi_{N,:}^{\nu*}), \quad (38b)$$

$$\hat{\Sigma} = \text{shift}(\Sigma^*, [\Xi_1^*; \sigma_N^* \cdot \mathbb{I}_n]), \quad (38c)$$

$$\hat{\Xi} = \Xi^*, \quad (38d)$$

where the $\text{shift}(\cdot, \cdot)$ operator is defined in Section 2.1, $\Phi_{N,:}$ denotes the last block row of Φ^e and Φ^ν , and $\Xi_1^* = [\Xi_1^* \dots \Xi_{N-1}^*]$. The matrix-valued candidates are thus constructed by shifting the optimal solutions up and left by one block row and block column, respectively, and by appending the last block row of Φ^e , Φ^ν , and $[\Xi_1^* \dots \Xi_{N-1}^* \sigma_N^* \cdot \mathbb{I}_n]$, respectively. Note that due to the choice of these candidates, we get $\hat{\sigma}_i = \sigma_{i+1}^*$, $i = 0, \dots, N-1$, $\hat{\sigma}_N = \sigma_N^*$, and $\hat{\Gamma} = \Gamma^* = A\Phi_{N,0}^{e*} + B\Phi_{N,0}^{\nu*} + \Xi_0^*$ by definition. Next, we show that candidates (37) fulfill nominal dynamics (32c), error dynamics (32d), and the system response constraint (32e). Using (37a) with $i = 0$, the state candidate sequence is initialized with

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{z}_0 &= z_1^* + \Phi_{1,0}^{e*} \bar{w}(k) = Az_0^* + Bv_0^* + p_0^* + \sigma_1^* \bar{w}(k) \\ &= Ax(k) + B\kappa_{\text{MPC}}(x(k)) + \eta(k) = x(k+1), \end{aligned}$$

where we used $\Phi_{1,0}^{e*} = \sigma_1^* \cdot \mathbb{I}_n$ by (36a), nominal dynamics (32c), and (35). For the remainder of the state candidate sequence, i.e., $i = 1, \dots, N-1$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{z}_i &= z_{i+1}^* + \Phi_{i+1,0}^{e*} \bar{w}(k) \\ &\stackrel{(32c)}{=} Az_i^* + Bv_i^* + p_i^* + (A\Phi_{i,0}^{e*} + B\Phi_{i,0}^{\nu*} + \Sigma_{i+1,0}^*) \bar{w}(k) \\ &\stackrel{(36b)}{=} A\hat{z}_{i-1} + B\hat{v}_{i-1} + \hat{p}_{i-1}, \end{aligned}$$

and for the last state in the candidate sequence, i.e. $i = N$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{z}_N &= A_{K_f} z_N^* + \Gamma^* \bar{w}(k) \\ &= A_{K_f} z_N^* + (A\Phi_{N,0}^{e*} + B\Phi_{N,0}^{\nu*} + \Xi_0^*) \bar{w}(k) \\ &= A(z_N^* + \Phi_{N,0}^{e*} \bar{w}(k)) + B(K_f z_N^* + \Phi_{N,0}^{\nu*} \bar{w}(k)) + \Xi_0^* \bar{w}(k) \\ &= A\hat{z}_{N-1} + B\hat{v}_{N-1} + \hat{p}_{N-1}, \end{aligned}$$

by definition of Γ^* and candidate sequences (37), which shows that the candidate sequences fulfill the nominal dynamics. For the error dynamics, the block diagonal of $\hat{\Phi}^e$ is initialized for $i = 1, \dots, N-1$ as

$$\hat{\Phi}_{i,i-1}^e = \Phi_{i+1,i}^{e*} = \sigma_{i+1}^* \cdot \mathbb{I}_n = \hat{\sigma}_i \cdot \mathbb{I}_n,$$

and for $i = N$ as

$$\hat{\Phi}_{N,N-1}^e = \Phi_{N,N-1}^{e*} = \sigma_N^* \cdot \mathbb{I}_n = \hat{\sigma}_N \cdot \mathbb{I}_n.$$

Then, for $i = 2, \dots, N-1$ and $j = 0, \dots, i-2$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Phi}_{i,j}^e &= \Phi_{i+1,j+1}^{e*} \stackrel{(36b)}{=} A\Phi_{i,j+1}^{e*} + B\Phi_{i,j+1}^{\nu*} + \Sigma_{i+1,j+1}^* \\ &= A\hat{\Phi}_{i-1,j}^e + B\hat{\Phi}_{i-1,j}^{\nu*} + \hat{\Sigma}_{i,j}, \end{aligned}$$

and for $i = N$ and $j = 0, \dots, N-2$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Phi}_{N,j}^e &= \Phi_{N,j}^{e*} \stackrel{(32e)}{=} A\Phi_{N,j+1}^{e*} + B\Phi_{N,j+1}^{\nu*} + \Xi_{j+1}^* \\ &= A\hat{\Phi}_{N-1,j}^e + B\hat{\Phi}_{N-1,j}^{\nu*} + \hat{\Sigma}_{N,j}. \end{aligned}$$

Constraint (32e) is trivially fulfilled, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Phi}_{N,j-1}^e &= \Phi_{N,j-1}^{e*} = A\Phi_{N,j}^{e*} + B\Phi_{N,j}^{\nu*} + \Xi_j^* \\ &= A\hat{\Phi}_{N,j}^e + B\hat{\Phi}_{N,j}^{\nu*} + \hat{\Xi}_j. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we need to show that candidate sequences (37) fulfill the inclusions (32f) and (32g). For this, we first define the tube sequences via the candidate matrices, i.e., for $i = 0, \dots, N-1$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_i(\hat{\Phi}^e) &= \bigoplus_{j=0}^{i-1} \hat{\Phi}_{i,j}^e \bar{\mathcal{W}} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^i \Phi_{i+1,j}^{e*} \bar{\mathcal{W}}, \\ \mathcal{F}_i(\hat{\Phi}^\nu) &= \bigoplus_{j=0}^{i-1} \hat{\Phi}_{i,j}^{\nu*} \bar{\mathcal{W}} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^i \Phi_{i+1,j}^{\nu*} \bar{\mathcal{W}}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that above set definitions together with (24) yield the following relations

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{i+1}(\Phi^{e*}) &= \mathcal{F}_i(\hat{\Phi}^e) \oplus \Phi_{i+1,0}^{e*} \bar{\mathcal{W}}, \\ \mathcal{F}_{i+1}(\Phi^{\nu*}) &= \mathcal{F}_i(\hat{\Phi}^\nu) \oplus \Phi_{i+1,0}^{\nu*} \bar{\mathcal{W}}. \end{aligned}$$

To prove that the inclusion constraints are fulfilled, we need to show that for $i = 0, \dots, N-1$

$$\hat{z}_i = z_{i+1}^* + \Phi_{i+1,0}^{e*} \bar{w}(k) \in \mathcal{X} \ominus \mathcal{F}_i(\hat{\Phi}^e), \quad (39a)$$

$$\hat{v}_i = v_{i+1}^* + \Phi_{i+1,0}^{\nu*} \bar{w}(k) \in \mathcal{U} \ominus \mathcal{F}_i(\hat{\Phi}^\nu). \quad (39b)$$

Given that $z_{i+1}^* \in \mathcal{X} \ominus \mathcal{F}_{i+1}(\Phi^{e*})$ and $\Phi_{i+1,0}^{e*} \bar{w}(k) \in \Phi_{i+1,0}^{e*} \bar{\mathcal{W}}$, inclusion (39a) holds for $i = 0, \dots, N-2$ with

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathcal{X} \ominus \mathcal{F}_{i+1}(\Phi^{e*})) \oplus \Phi_{i+1,0}^{e*} \bar{\mathcal{W}} \\ &= (\mathcal{X} \ominus \mathcal{F}_i(\hat{\Phi}^e) \ominus \Phi_{i+1,0}^{e*} \bar{\mathcal{W}}) \oplus \Phi_{i+1,0}^{e*} \bar{\mathcal{W}} \subseteq \mathcal{X} \ominus \mathcal{F}_i(\hat{\Phi}^e), \end{aligned}$$

where we used [31, Theorem 2.1 (ii), (v)] and similarly inclusion (39b) holds for $i = 0, \dots, N-2$ with

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathcal{U} \ominus \mathcal{F}_{i+1}(\Phi^{\nu*})) \oplus \Phi_{i+1,0}^{\nu*} \bar{\mathcal{W}} \\ &= (\mathcal{U} \ominus \mathcal{F}_i(\hat{\Phi}^\nu) \ominus \Phi_{i+1,0}^{\nu*} \bar{\mathcal{W}}) \oplus \Phi_{i+1,0}^{\nu*} \bar{\mathcal{W}} \subseteq \mathcal{U} \ominus \mathcal{F}_i(\hat{\Phi}^\nu). \end{aligned}$$

For the last candidate state and input, we need to show

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{z}_{N-1} &= z_N^* + \Phi_{N,0}^{e*} \bar{w}(k) \in \mathcal{X} \ominus \mathcal{F}_{N-1}(\hat{\Phi}^e), \\ \hat{v}_{N-1} &= K_f z_N^* + \Phi_{N,0}^{\nu*} \bar{w}(k) \in \mathcal{U} \ominus \mathcal{F}_{N-1}(\hat{\Phi}^\nu). \end{aligned}$$

Given that $z_N^* \in \alpha^* \mathcal{Z}_f \subseteq \mathcal{X} \ominus \mathcal{F}_N(\Phi^{e*})$, $\Phi_{N,0}^{e*} \bar{w}(k) \in \Phi_{N,0}^{e*} \bar{\mathcal{W}}$, $K_f z_N^* \in \alpha^* K_f \mathcal{Z}_f \subseteq \mathcal{U} \ominus \mathcal{F}_N(\Phi^{\nu*})$, and $\Phi_{N,0}^{\nu*} \bar{w}(k) \in \Phi_{N,0}^{\nu*} \bar{\mathcal{W}}$, we can confirm that

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathcal{X} \ominus \mathcal{F}_N(\Phi^{e*})) \oplus \Phi_{N,0}^{e*} \bar{\mathcal{W}} \subseteq \mathcal{X} \ominus \mathcal{F}_{N-1}(\hat{\Phi}^e), \\ &(\mathcal{U} \ominus \mathcal{F}_N(\Phi^{\nu*})) \oplus \Phi_{N,0}^{\nu*} \bar{\mathcal{W}} \subseteq \mathcal{U} \ominus \mathcal{F}_{N-1}(\hat{\Phi}^\nu). \end{aligned}$$

The terminal set constraints (32h)-(32j) are trivially fulfilled, since the last block row of all candidate matrices is equal to the last block row of the previous optimal solution (see (38)) and $\hat{\alpha} = \alpha^*$, therefore we get

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\alpha} A_{K_f} \mathcal{Z}_f &\subseteq \hat{\alpha} \mathcal{Z}_f \ominus \hat{\Gamma} \bar{\mathcal{W}} \Leftrightarrow \alpha^* A_{K_f} \mathcal{Z}_f \subseteq \alpha^* \mathcal{Z}_f \ominus \Gamma^* \bar{\mathcal{W}}, \\ \hat{\alpha} \mathcal{Z}_f &\subseteq \mathcal{X} \ominus \mathcal{F}_N(\hat{\Phi}^e) \Leftrightarrow \alpha^* \mathcal{Z}_f \subseteq \mathcal{X} \ominus \mathcal{F}_N(\Phi^{e*}), \\ \hat{\alpha} K_f \mathcal{Z}_f &\subseteq \mathcal{U} \ominus \mathcal{F}_N(\hat{\Phi}^\nu) \Leftrightarrow \alpha^* K_f \mathcal{Z}_f \subseteq \mathcal{U} \ominus \mathcal{F}_N(\Phi^{\nu*}). \end{aligned}$$

The terminal constraint $\hat{z}_N \in \hat{\alpha} \mathcal{Z}_f$ in (32h) is also trivially fulfilled since

$$\hat{z}_N = A_{K_f} z_N^* + \Gamma^* \bar{w}(k) \in \alpha^* A_{K_f} \mathcal{Z}_f \oplus \Gamma^* \bar{\mathcal{W}} \stackrel{(32j)}{\subseteq} \alpha^* \mathcal{Z}_f = \hat{\alpha} \mathcal{Z}_f.$$

To show that (32k) and (32l) hold, we first define the candidates of auxiliary variables $\psi_i^d, \Psi_{i,j}^d$ for a single vertex \mathcal{D}^d , i.e., for $i = 0, \dots, N-2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\psi}_i^d &= \Delta_A^d \hat{z}_i + \Delta_B^d \hat{v}_i - \hat{p}_i \\ &= \Delta_A^d z_{i+1}^* + \Delta_B^d v_{i+1}^* - p_{i+1}^* \\ &\quad + (\Delta_A^d \Phi_{i+1,0}^{e*} + \Delta_B^d \Phi_{i+1,0}^{\nu*} - \Sigma_{i+2,0}^*) \bar{w}(k) \\ &= \psi_{i+1}^{d*} + \Psi_{i+1,0}^{d*} \bar{w}(k), \\ \hat{\Psi}_{i,j}^d &= \Delta_A^d \hat{\Phi}_{i,j}^e + \Delta_B^d \hat{\Phi}_{i,j}^\nu - \hat{\Sigma}_{i+1,j} \\ &= \Delta_A^d \Phi_{i+1,j+1}^{e*} + \Delta_B^d \Phi_{i+1,j+1}^{\nu*} - \Sigma_{i+2,j+1}^* \\ &= \Psi_{i+1,j+1}^{d*},\end{aligned}$$

and for the last timesteps, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\psi}_{N-1}^d &= \Delta_A^d \hat{z}_{N-1} + \Delta_B^d \hat{v}_{N-1} - \hat{p}_{N-1} \\ &= \Delta_A^d z_N^* + \Delta_B^d K_f z_N^* \\ &\quad + (\Delta_A^d \Phi_{N,0}^{e*} + \Delta_B^d \Phi_{N,0}^{\nu*} - \Xi_0^*) \bar{w}(k) \\ &= \Delta_{K_f}^d z_N^* + \Psi_{N,0}^{d*} \bar{w}(k), \\ \hat{\Psi}_{N-1,j}^d &= \Delta_A^d \hat{\Phi}_{N-1,j}^e + \Delta_B^d \hat{\Phi}_{N-1,j}^\nu - \hat{\Sigma}_{N,j} \\ &= \Delta_A^d \Phi_{N,j+1}^{e*} + \Delta_B^d \Phi_{N,j+1}^{\nu*} - \Xi_{j+1}^* = \Psi_{N,j+1}^{d*}, \\ \hat{\Psi}_{N,j}^d &= \Delta_A^d \hat{\Phi}_{N,j}^e + \Delta_B^d \hat{\Phi}_{N,j}^\nu - \hat{\Sigma}_j \\ &= \Delta_A^d \Phi_{N,j}^{e*} + \Delta_B^d \Phi_{N,j}^{\nu*} - \Xi_j^* = \Psi_{N,j}^{d*}.\end{aligned}$$

Using these candidates, we then check the inclusions (32k) and (32l), i.e., for $i = 0, \dots, N-2$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}\{\hat{\psi}_i^d\} \oplus \bigoplus_{j=0}^{i-1} \hat{\Psi}_{i,j}^d \bar{\mathcal{W}} \oplus \mathcal{W} \\ = \{\psi_{i+1}^{d*} + \Psi_{i+1,0}^{d*} \bar{w}(k)\} \oplus \bigoplus_{j=1}^i \Psi_{i+1,j}^{d*} \bar{\mathcal{W}} \oplus \mathcal{W} \\ \subseteq \{\psi_{i+1}^{d*}\} \oplus \bigoplus_{j=0}^i \Psi_{i+1,j}^{d*} \bar{\mathcal{W}} \oplus \mathcal{W} \stackrel{(32k)}{\subseteq} \sigma_{i+2}^* \bar{\mathcal{W}} = \hat{\sigma}_{i+1} \bar{\mathcal{W}},\end{aligned}$$

and for $i = N-1$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}\{\hat{\psi}_{N-1}^d\} \oplus \bigoplus_{j=0}^{N-2} \hat{\Psi}_{N-1,j}^d \bar{\mathcal{W}} \oplus \mathcal{W} \\ = \{\Delta_{K_f}^d z_N^* + \Psi_{N,0}^{d*} \bar{w}(k)\} \oplus \bigoplus_{j=1}^{N-1} \Psi_{N,j}^{d*} \bar{\mathcal{W}} \oplus \mathcal{W} \\ \subseteq \alpha^* \Delta_{K_f}^d \mathcal{Z}_f \oplus \bigoplus_{j=0}^{N-1} \Psi_{N,j}^{d*} \bar{\mathcal{W}} \oplus \mathcal{W} \stackrel{(32l)}{\subseteq} \sigma_N^* \bar{\mathcal{W}} = \hat{\sigma}_N \bar{\mathcal{W}},\end{aligned}$$

both of which satisfy (32k). Finally, (32l) is trivially fulfilled

by the candidate solution, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\alpha} \Delta_{K_f}^d \mathcal{Z}_f \oplus \bigoplus_{j=0}^{N-1} \hat{\Psi}_{N,j}^d \bar{\mathcal{W}} \oplus \mathcal{W} \\ = \alpha^* \Delta_{K_f}^d \mathcal{Z}_f \oplus \bigoplus_{j=0}^{N-1} \Psi_{N,j}^{d*} \bar{\mathcal{W}} \oplus \mathcal{W} \stackrel{(32l)}{\subseteq} \sigma_N^* \bar{\mathcal{W}} = \hat{\sigma}_N \bar{\mathcal{W}}.\end{aligned}$$

Since we impose (32k) and (32l) for each vertex \mathcal{D}^d individually, the argument holds for all vertices of \mathcal{D} . Therefore, we have shown that the candidate solutions (37), (38) satisfy all constraints in (32), which proves recursive feasibility. \square

Next, we show that the closed-loop system is input-to-state stable (ISS), where ISS is formally defined in [3, Definition B.42]. For the ISS proof, we rely on an ISS-Lyapunov function [3, Appendix B.6], which we define in the following definition. Note that due to the equivalence of (1) and (35), we only need to check the stability of (35) to conclude ISS of the original system.

Definition 5 (ISS-Lyapunov function) Consider an RPI set $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with the origin in its interior. A function $V : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is called an ISS-Lyapunov function in \mathcal{S} for system (35) with $u = \kappa_{MPC}(x)$ and $\bar{w} \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}$, if there exist \mathcal{K} -functions $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$, and γ_4 , such that for all $x \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\bar{w} \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}$:

$$\gamma_1(\|x\|) \leq V(x) \leq \gamma_2(\|x\|), \quad (40a)$$

$$V(x^+) - V(x) \leq -\gamma_3(\|x\|) + \gamma_4(\|\bar{w}\|), \quad (40b)$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is any vector norm on \mathbb{R}^n .

Theorem 4 Given that Assumption 1 holds, system (1) subject to constraints (3) and in closed-loop with (33), is input-to-state stable (ISS) in \mathcal{X}_{feas} for any admissible sequence of combined disturbances $\boldsymbol{\eta}$, where \mathcal{X}_{feas} is the set of all initial states $x(k)$ for which (32) is feasible.

PROOF. Due to Theorem 3, we know that (32) is recursively feasible for all $x(k) \in \mathcal{X}_{feas}$. Therefore, we can prove ISS by showing that the optimal value function of (32) is an ISS-Lyapunov function in \mathcal{X}_{feas} according to Definition 5 [3, Lemma B.44]. Denote (32a) as $V_N(x(k); \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v})$ and the optimal value function of (32) as $V_N^*(x(k))$, i.e., $V_N(\cdot)$ evaluated at the optimal solution $\mathbf{z}^*, \mathbf{v}^*$. Using the candidate sequences $\hat{\mathbf{z}}, \hat{\mathbf{v}}$ defined in (37), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}V_N^*(x(k+1)) - V_N^*(x(k)) &\leq V_N(x(k+1); \hat{\mathbf{z}}, \hat{\mathbf{v}}) - V_N^*(x(k)) \\ &= l_f(\hat{z}_N) - l_f(z_N^*) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} l(\hat{z}_i, \hat{v}_i) - l(z_i^*, v_i^*).\end{aligned}$$

We then use the candidate sequences (37) and uniform continuity of $l_f(\cdot)$ with corresponding \mathcal{K} -function $\beta_f(\cdot)$ to obtain the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} l_f(\hat{z}_N) - l_f(z_N^*) &= l_f(A_{K_f} z_N^* + \Gamma^* \bar{w}(k)) - l_f(z_N^*) \\ &\quad + l_f(A_{K_f} z_N^*) - l_f(A_{K_f} z_N^*) \\ &\leq l_f(A_{K_f} z_N^*) - l_f(z_N^*) \\ &\quad + \|l_f(A_{K_f} z_N^* + \Gamma^* \bar{w}(k)) - l_f(A_{K_f} z_N^*)\| \\ &\leq l_f(A_{K_f} z_N^*) - l_f(z_N^*) + \beta_f(\|\Gamma^* \bar{w}(k)\|). \end{aligned}$$

We rewrite the sum of the cost differences as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} l(\hat{z}_i, \hat{v}_i) - l(z_i^*, v_i^*) &= -l(z_0^*, v_0^*) + l(\hat{z}_{N-1}, \hat{v}_{N-1}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} l(\hat{z}_{i-1}, \hat{v}_{i-1}) - l(z_i^*, v_i^*), \end{aligned}$$

and use the candidate sequences (37) and uniform continuity of $l(\cdot, \cdot)$ with $\beta_x(\cdot)$, $\beta_u(\cdot)$ the respective \mathcal{K} -functions to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} l(\hat{z}_{i-1}, \hat{v}_{i-1}) - l(z_i^*, v_i^*) &= l(z_i^* + \Phi_{i,0}^{e*} \bar{w}(k), v_i^* + \Phi_{i,0}^{\nu*} \bar{w}(k)) \\ &\quad - l(z_i^*, v_i^*) \\ &= l(z_i^* + \Phi_{i,0}^{e*} \bar{w}(k), v_i^* + \Phi_{i,0}^{\nu*} \bar{w}(k)) \\ &\quad - l(z_i^*, v_i^* + \Phi_{i,0}^{\nu*} \bar{w}(k)) \\ &\quad + l(z_i^*, v_i^* + \Phi_{i,0}^{\nu*} \bar{w}(k)) - l(z_i^*, v_i^*) \\ &\leq \beta_x(\|\Phi_{i,0}^{e*} \bar{w}(k)\|) + \beta_u(\|\Phi_{i,0}^{\nu*} \bar{w}(k)\|). \end{aligned}$$

Additionally, we rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} l(\hat{z}_{N-1}, \hat{v}_{N-1}) &= l(z_N^* + \Phi_{N,0}^{e*} \bar{w}(k), K_f z_N^* + \Phi_{N,0}^{\nu*} \bar{w}(k)) \\ &= l(z_N^* + \Phi_{N,0}^{e*} \bar{w}(k), K_f z_N^* + \Phi_{N,0}^{\nu*} \bar{w}(k)) \\ &\quad - l(z_N^*, K_f z_N^* + \Phi_{N,0}^{\nu*} \bar{w}(k)) \\ &\quad + l(z_N^*, K_f z_N^* + \Phi_{N,0}^{\nu*} \bar{w}(k)) \\ &\quad - l(z_N^*, K_f z_N^*) + l(z_N^*, K_f z_N^*) \\ &\leq \beta_x(\|\Phi_{N,0}^{e*} \bar{w}(k)\|) + \beta_u(\|\Phi_{N,0}^{\nu*} \bar{w}(k)\|) \\ &\quad + l(z_N^*, K_f z_N^*), \end{aligned}$$

and by combining the above, we get the value function decrease

$$\begin{aligned} V_N^*(x(k+1)) - V_N^*(x(k)) &\leq -l(z_0^*, v_0^*) + l(z_N^*, K_f z_N^*) \\ &\quad + l_f(A_{K_f} z_N^*) - l_f(z_N^*) \\ &\quad + \beta_{\text{tot}}(\|\bar{w}(k)\|), \end{aligned}$$

where we collected all \mathcal{K} -functions in

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{\text{tot}}(\|\bar{w}(k)\|) &= \beta_f(\|\Gamma^* \bar{w}(k)\|) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^N \beta_x(\|\Phi_{i,0}^{e*} \bar{w}(k)\|) + \beta_u(\|\Phi_{i,0}^{\nu*} \bar{w}(k)\|). \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Due to compactness of \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{U} , the variables $\Phi_{i,0}^{e*}$, $\Phi_{i,0}^{\nu*}$, and Γ^* are bounded. Therefore, (41) is a sum of compositions of \mathcal{K} -functions, e.g. $\beta_f(\|\Gamma^* \bar{w}(k)\|) \leq \beta_f(\|\Gamma^*\| \|\bar{w}(k)\|)$, which we can rewrite as a single \mathcal{K} -function $\beta_{\text{tot}}(\cdot)$. Finally, we notice that $-l(z_0^*, v_0^*) = -l(x(k), \kappa_{\text{MPC}}(x(k))) \leq -\gamma_1(\|x(k)\|)$ and $l_f(A_{K_f} z_N^*) - l_f(z_N^*) \leq -l(z_N^*, K_f z_N^*)$ due to Assumption 1 and therefore obtain

$$V_N^*(x(k+1)) - V_N^*(x(k)) \leq -\gamma_1(\|x(k)\|) + \beta_{\text{tot}}(\|\bar{w}(k)\|).$$

Since $\beta_{\text{tot}}(\cdot)$ is a \mathcal{K} -function, $V_N^*(\cdot)$ fulfills decrease condition (40b) and because $V_N^*(x) \geq l(x, \kappa_{\text{MPC}}(x)) \forall x \in \mathcal{X}_{\text{feas}}$, the optimal value function is lower bounded by the \mathcal{K} -function $\gamma_1(\cdot)$ by assumption, i.e., $V_N^*(x) \geq \gamma_1(\|x\|) \forall x \in \mathcal{X}_{\text{feas}}$. Using the facts that $l_f(\cdot)$ is upper bounded, the state and input constraints are compact, and monotonicity of $V_N^*(\cdot)$, we can conclude that $V_N^*(\cdot)$ is upper bounded by a \mathcal{K} -function $\gamma_2(\cdot)$ in $\mathcal{X}_{\text{feas}}$ due to [3, Propositions 2.15 - 2.16]. Therefore, $V_N^*(\cdot)$ also fulfills (40a) and is thus an ISS-Lyapunov function in $\mathcal{X}_{\text{feas}}$ (Definition 5). Hence, we have shown ISS of system (35) in closed-loop with (33), which implies ISS of the original system (1) with SLTMPC controller (33). \square

Remark 3 *Contrary to [29,32], we do not treat the components of the combined uncertainty $\eta = d + w$ separately, where the state dependent model uncertainty d is assumed to have a stability margin that is incorporated in $-\gamma_1(\|x\|)$ [32, Remark 3]. Instead we use (35) with a single disturbance and the standard ISS proof technique [3, Appendix B.6]. Intuitively, we treat (35) as*

$$x^+ = Ax + \begin{bmatrix} B & I_n \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} v_0^* \\ p_0^* \end{bmatrix} + \sigma_1^* w(k)$$

in the proof, where $[v_0^{*\top} p_0^{*\top}]^\top$ is an extended input and σ_1^* is an optimized but bounded disturbance gain. Also note that $\Phi_{i,0}^{e*}$, $\Phi_{i,0}^{\nu*}$, and Γ^* in (41) are optimization variables that vary each time (32) is solved. Therefore, they affect the size of the region around the origin where the closed-loop system converges to. Adding a regularizer on these variables to (32a) thus allows tuning of this convergence region.

5 SLTMPC with Asynchronous Updates

Both, the proposed filter-based SLTMPC scheme (32) and the method presented in [25] are computationally demanding due to the concurrent optimization of nominal trajectories \mathbf{z} , \mathbf{v} , \mathbf{p} , error dynamics (15) parameterized by error system responses Φ^e , Φ^ν and disturbance filter Σ , Ξ , and terminal set scaling α . This renders both methods unsuitable for practical applications with fast sampling times and limited computational resources. To alleviate some of the computational burden,

we extend the asynchronous computation scheme introduced in [28] for the proposed filter-based SLTMPC. To reduce the complexity of (32), we remove error dynamics parameters Φ^e , Φ^ν , Σ , Ξ , and terminal scaling α as optimization variables and instead use values that are computed at a lower frequency. The asynchronous computation scheme uses this idea to split the optimization of (32) into two separate processes - the primary and the secondary process. The secondary process computes the error dynamics parameters and the terminal set scaling, before passing them to the primary process, which only optimizes the nominal trajectories \mathbf{z} , \mathbf{v} , \mathbf{p} . The asynchronous computation scheme therefore enables running the primary process in closed-loop with system (1) at a high frequency. The computationally expensive secondary process then runs concurrently at a lower frequency and reduces conservatism by periodically providing new error dynamics parameters and terminal set scalings. Apart from limited computational resources, practical applications also impose memory constraints, i.e., we can only store a limited number of error dynamics parameters and terminal set scalings, which we handle by specific memory update rules. Figure 1 provides an overview of this scheme.

5.1 Secondary Process: Tube Optimization

The main objective of the secondary process is to compute error dynamics parameters Φ^e , Φ^ν , Σ , Ξ , and terminal set scaling α , which define the state, input, and disturbance tubes, and the terminal set. Therefore, we can choose the cost function of the secondary process according to any criterion the tubes and the terminal set should fulfill, e.g. a cost on Φ^e promotes more aggressive tube controllers, thus leading to smaller error bounds on the state trajectories. For more details on possible cost functions and their effect on the tubes we refer to [28, Section 3.2]. We formulate the secondary process similarly to (32) but with a modified objective, i.e.,

$$\min_{\Phi^e, \Phi^\nu, \Sigma, \Xi, \alpha \geq 0} L(\Phi^e, \Phi^\nu, \Sigma, \Xi), \quad (42a)$$

$$\text{s.t. (32b) - (32l)}, \quad (42b)$$

where $L(\cdot)$ is the chosen cost function. After termination of (42), we use the optimized error system responses Φ^e , Φ^ν to compute the tightened state and input constraints for $i = 0, \dots, N$ as

$$\mathcal{Z}_i = \mathcal{X} \ominus \mathcal{F}_i(\Phi^e), \quad \mathcal{V}_i = \mathcal{U} \ominus \mathcal{F}_i(\Phi^\nu). \quad (43)$$

Additionally, we use the optimized disturbance filter Σ , Ξ to compute the disturbance tubes for $d = 1, \dots, n_D$ and $i = 0, \dots, N-1$ as

$$\mathcal{Q}_i^d = \sigma_{i+1} \bar{\mathcal{W}} \ominus \mathcal{F}_i(\Psi^d), \quad (44)$$




Fig. 1. Visualization of the asynchronous computation scheme for filter-based SLTMPC: the secondary process computes error system responses Φ^e , Φ^ν , disturbance filter Σ , Ξ , and terminal set scaling α , which are then passed to the primary process and stored in memory \mathbb{M} .

where

$$\mathcal{F}_i(\Psi^d) := \mathcal{W} \oplus \bigoplus_{j=0}^{i-1} \Psi_{i,j}^d \bar{\mathcal{W}},$$

and $\Psi_{i,j}^d$ defined in (18). For $i = N$, the disturbance tubes are computed as

$$\mathcal{Q}_N^d = \sigma_N \bar{\mathcal{W}} \ominus \mathcal{F}_N(\Psi^d). \quad (45)$$

These sets are then passed to the primary process together with the error system responses, the disturbance filter, and the terminal set scaling as $\mathbb{M}_{\text{new}} = (\mathcal{Z}_i, \mathcal{V}_i, \mathcal{Q}_i^d, \alpha, \Phi^e, \Phi^\nu, \Sigma, \Xi)$. Since the memory $\mathbb{M} = \{\mathbb{M}_m \mid m = 0, \dots, M-1\}$ - where we denote the m^{th} memory entry as \mathbb{M}_m - is finite, we need to define a procedure that updates the memory whenever the secondary process has computed a new \mathbb{M}_{new} , thus rendering the memory time-varying. In case the memory is full, the proposed update procedure in Algorithm 1 selects a memory slot \mathbb{M}_m to store \mathbb{M}_{new} according to a heuristic $F(\mathbb{M}(k))$. For example, $F(\mathbb{M}(k))$ can choose the slot with the least importance to the solution of the primary process or assign a score to each memory slot based on its historical importance and then choose the slot with the lowest score.

Algorithm 1 Update memory \mathbb{M} (Secondary Process)

Input: $\mathbb{M}_{\text{new}}, \mathbb{M}(k-1), \lambda(k-1)$

Output: $\mathbb{M}(k)$

- 1: **procedure** UPDATEMEMORY(\mathbb{M}_{new})
 - 2: ▷ runs every time the secondary process terminates
 - 3: $\mathbb{M}(k) \leftarrow \mathbb{M}(k-1)$
 - 4: **if** $\mathbb{M}(k)$ not full **then**
 - 5: $m \leftarrow$ index of first empty memory slot
 - 6: $\mathbb{M}_m(k) \leftarrow \mathbb{M}_{\text{new}}$
 - 7: **else**
 - 8: ▷ determine a memory slot (except $m = 0$)
 - 9: $m \leftarrow F(\mathbb{M}(k))$
 - 10: $\mathbb{M}_m(k) \leftarrow \mathbb{M}_{\text{new}}$
-

5.2 Primary Process: Nominal Trajectory Optimization

Since a selection of tightened state and input constraints, disturbance tubes, and terminal sets is stored in mem-

ory \mathbf{M} , the primary process can use this information to optimize the nominal trajectories. However, rather than using a single memory entry \mathbf{M}_m , all entries are *fused* using a convex combination similar to [28,33], ensuring all available information is optimally used. The primary process is formulated as

$$\min_{\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{p}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}} \quad l_f(z_N) + \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} l(z_i, v_i), \quad (46a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \forall i = 0, \dots, N-1: \quad (46b)$$

$$z_0 = x(k), \quad (46b)$$

$$z_{i+1} = Az_i + Bv_i + p_i, \quad (46c)$$

$$z_i \in \bigoplus_{m=0}^{M-1} \lambda_m \mathcal{Z}_i^m, \quad (46d)$$

$$v_i \in \bigoplus_{m=0}^{M-1} \lambda_m \mathcal{V}_i^m, \quad (46e)$$

$$z_N \in \bigoplus_{m=0}^{M-1} \lambda_m \alpha^m \mathcal{Z}_f, \quad (46f)$$

$$\psi_i^d \in \bigoplus_{m=0}^{M-1} \lambda_m \mathcal{Q}_i^{d,m}, \quad \forall d = 1, \dots, n_D, \quad (46g)$$

$$\lambda_m \geq 0, \quad \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} \lambda_m = 1, \quad (46h)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = [\lambda_0 \dots \lambda_{M-1}]$ are the convex combination variables, the costs $l_f(\cdot)$, $l(\cdot, \cdot)$ fulfill Assumption 1, ψ_i^d is defined as in (18), and \mathcal{Z}_i^m , \mathcal{V}_i^m , $\mathcal{Q}_i^{d,m}$, α^m are retrieved from memory slot \mathbf{M}_m . The resulting MPC control law is given by

$$\kappa_{\text{primary}}(x(k)) = v_0^*, \quad (47)$$

where v_0^* is the first element of the optimal solution \mathbf{v}^* of (46).

Since the tubes computed by the secondary process are more general than those used in [28], we cannot use the proof in [28] to show recursive feasibility of the primary process. Therefore, we additionally store the previous solution of (46) in memory slot \mathbf{M}_0 as a fallback solution. Specifically, we store the shifted convex combination of tubes after the primary process terminates, i.e., for all $d = 1, \dots, n_D$ and $i = 0, \dots, N-1$ we compute

$$\mathcal{Z}_i^{\text{prev}} = \bigoplus_{m=0}^{M-1} \lambda_m^* (\mathcal{X} \ominus \mathcal{F}_i(\Phi_{\text{shift}}^{\mathbf{e},m})), \quad (48a)$$

$$\mathcal{V}_i^{\text{prev}} = \bigoplus_{m=0}^{M-1} \lambda_m^* (\mathcal{U} \ominus \mathcal{F}_i(\Phi_{\text{shift}}^{\nu,m})), \quad (48b)$$

$$\mathcal{Q}_i^{d,\text{prev}} = \bigoplus_{m=0}^{M-1} \lambda_m^* (\sigma_{i+2}^m \bar{\mathcal{W}} \ominus \mathcal{F}_i(\Psi_{\text{shift}}^{d,m})), \quad (48c)$$

where the shifted system responses are computed as

$$\Phi_{\text{shift}}^{\mathbf{e},m} = \text{shift}(\Phi^{\mathbf{e},m}, \Phi_{N,:}^{\mathbf{e},m}), \quad (49a)$$

$$\Phi_{\text{shift}}^{\nu,m} = \text{shift}(\Phi^{\nu,m}, \Phi_{N,:}^{\nu,m}), \quad (49b)$$

with the $\text{shift}(\cdot, \cdot)$ operator defined in Section 2.1 and $\Phi_{N,:}$ denoting the last block row of $\Phi^{\mathbf{e},m}$ and $\Phi^{\nu,m}$. The shifted auxiliary variable $\Psi_{\text{shift}}^{d,m}$ is computed with (18) using the shifted system responses and the shifted disturbance filter, i.e.,

$$\Sigma_{\text{shift}}^m = \text{shift}(\Sigma^m, [\Xi_1^m; \sigma_N^m \cdot \mathbb{I}_n]), \quad (50a)$$

$$\Xi_{\text{shift}}^m = \Xi^m, \quad (50b)$$

where $\Xi_1^m = [\Xi_1^m \dots \Xi_{N-1}^m]$ and the σ_i are obtained from either $\Phi^{\mathbf{e},m}$ or Σ^m using (36a). Additionally, we compute the tubes for $i = N$ as

$$\mathcal{Z}_N^{\text{prev}} = \bigoplus_{m=0}^{M-1} \lambda_m^* \mathcal{Z}_N^m, \quad \mathcal{V}_N^{\text{prev}} = \bigoplus_{m=0}^{M-1} \lambda_m^* \mathcal{V}_N^m,$$

$$\mathcal{Q}_N^{d,\text{prev}} = \bigoplus_{m=0}^{M-1} \lambda_m^* \mathcal{Q}_N^{d,m}.$$

Apart from the tubes, we also store the fused terminal set scaling, the shifted error system responses, and the shifted disturbance filter, since they are needed to recompute (48) in case $\lambda_0^* \neq 0$ in the next solution of (46). Therefore, we compute

$$\alpha^{\text{prev}} = \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} \lambda_m^* \alpha^m,$$

$$\Phi^{\mathbf{e},\text{prev}} = \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} \lambda_m^* \Phi_{\text{shift}}^{\mathbf{e},m}, \quad \Phi^{\nu,\text{prev}} = \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} \lambda_m^* \Phi_{\text{shift}}^{\nu,m},$$

$$\Sigma^{\text{prev}} = \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} \lambda_m^* \Sigma_{\text{shift}}^m, \quad \Xi^{\text{prev}} = \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} \lambda_m^* \Xi_{\text{shift}}^m,$$

before collecting all computed sets and parameters in memory entry

$$\mathbf{M}_{\text{prev}} = (\mathcal{Z}_i^{\text{prev}}, \mathcal{V}_i^{\text{prev}}, \mathcal{Q}_i^{d,\text{prev}}, \alpha^{\text{prev}}, \Phi^{\mathbf{e},\text{prev}}, \Phi^{\nu,\text{prev}}, \Sigma^{\text{prev}}, \Xi^{\text{prev}}), \quad (51)$$

and updating the memory according to Algorithm 2.

Remark 4 *In practice, shifting operations (49), (50) can be performed by the secondary process after computing new $\Phi^{\mathbf{e}}$, Φ^{ν} , Σ , Ξ . Due to the specific shifting operation, these computations only need to be performed N times. Therefore, also the tightened sets in (48), e.g. $\mathcal{X} \ominus \mathcal{F}_i(\Phi_{\text{shift}}^{\mathbf{e},m})$, can be computed by the secondary process. The primary process then just performs the convex combination in (48), which only slightly increases the computational complexity of the primary process.*

Algorithm 2 Update memory \mathbf{M} (Primary Process)

Input: $\mathbf{M}_{\text{prev}}, \mathbf{M}(k-1)$
Output: $\mathbf{M}(k)$

- 1: **procedure** UPDATEMEMORY(\mathbf{M}_{prev})
 - 2: \triangleright runs every time the primary process terminates
 - 3: $\mathbf{M}(k) \leftarrow \mathbf{M}(k-1)$
 - 4: $\mathbf{M}_0(k) \leftarrow \mathbf{M}_{\text{prev}}$ where \mathbf{M}_{prev} is given by (51)
-

5.3 Theoretical Guarantees

In the following, we provide theoretical guarantees for the proposed asynchronous computation scheme applied to (1), i.e., we prove recursive feasibility and ISS of primary process (46) for any state of the memory, including the case in which the memory is updated. For the proofs, we make use of the following assumption.

Assumption 2 *At the start of the control task, memory \mathbf{M} contains at least one memory entry \mathbf{M}_0 for which the primary process is feasible, i.e., (46) is feasible for $\mathbf{M}_0 = (\mathcal{Z}_i^0, \mathcal{V}_i^0, \mathcal{Q}_i^{d,0}, \alpha^0, \Phi^{e,0}, \Phi^{\nu,0}, \Sigma^0, \Xi^0)$ with $\lambda_0 = 1$.*

Note that Assumption 2 is satisfied if for example the secondary process is once run offline and the memory is initialized with the computed memory entry \mathbf{M}_{new} .

Proposition 5 *Let Assumption 2 hold. Then, primary process (46) is recursively feasible for any state of memory $\mathbf{M}(k)$ and any memory updates according to Algorithms 1 and 2.*

PROOF. We prove the proposition using the standard shifting argument [3] and relying on the proof of Theorem 3. We construct the candidate sequences specifically for the case in which we only use memory slot \mathbf{M}_0 that contains the shifted previous tubes (51). This allows us to show recursive feasibility for any state of the memory, including the case in which the memory is updated, since we can always fallback to the tubes in \mathbf{M}_0 . Due to Assumption 2, the primary process is then guaranteed to be recursively feasible.

Let $\mathbf{z}^* = [z_0^{*\top}, \dots, z_N^{*\top}]^\top$, $\mathbf{v}^* = [v_0^{*\top}, \dots, v_{N-1}^{*\top}]^\top$, $\mathbf{p}^* = [p_0^{*\top}, \dots, p_{N-1}^{*\top}]^\top$, and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^* = [\lambda_0^*, \dots, \lambda_{M-1}^*]^\top$ denote the optimal solution of (46) for initial state $x(k)$. We then use the candidate $\hat{\lambda}_0 = 1$, $\hat{\lambda}_m = 0$, $m = 1, \dots, M-1$ for the convex combination variables, which trivially fulfills constraint (46h), and construct the remaining candidate sequences as

$$\hat{z}_i = z_{i+1}^* + \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} \lambda_m^* \Phi_{i+1,0}^{e,m} \bar{w}(k), \quad i=0, \dots, N-1, \quad (52a)$$

$$\hat{z}_N = A_{K_f} z_N^* + \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} \lambda_m^* \Gamma^m \bar{w}(k), \quad (52b)$$

$$\hat{v}_i = v_{i+1}^* + \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} \lambda_m^* \Phi_{i+1,0}^{\nu,m} \bar{w}(k), \quad i=0, \dots, N-2, \quad (52c)$$

$$\hat{v}_{N-1} = K_f z_N^* + \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} \lambda_m^* \Phi_{N,0}^{\nu,m} \bar{w}(k), \quad (52d)$$

$$\hat{p}_i = p_{i+1}^* + \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} \lambda_m^* \Sigma_{i+2,0}^m \bar{w}(k), \quad i=0, \dots, N-2, \quad (52e)$$

$$\hat{p}_{N-1} = \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} \lambda_m^* \Xi_0^m \bar{w}(k), \quad (52f)$$

with $\Gamma^m = A\Phi_{N,0}^{e,m} + B\Phi_{N,0}^{\nu,m} + \Xi_0^m$. Next, we show that candidates (52) satisfy all constraints using the proof of Theorem 3. Note that (52) are equivalent to the vector-valued candidates in (37) and the tubes stored in \mathbf{M}_0 are constructed equivalently to (38), apart from the convex combination of the system responses and disturbance filters. However, since the candidates and the tubes use the same convex combination, we can treat each contribution to the convex combination individually. For example, to show $\hat{z}_i \in \mathcal{Z}_i^0$, $i = 0, \dots, N-1$, we get

$$\sum_{m=0}^{M-1} \lambda_m^* (z_{i+1}^* + \Phi_{i+1,0}^{e,m} \bar{w}(k)) \in \bigoplus_{m=0}^{M-1} \lambda_m^* (\mathcal{X} \ominus \mathcal{F}_i(\Phi_{\text{shift}}^{e,m})),$$

and we can show $z_{i+1}^* + \Phi_{i+1,0}^{e,m} \bar{w}(k) \in \mathcal{X} \ominus \mathcal{F}_i(\Phi_{\text{shift}}^{e,m})$ for each m individually. As shown in the proof of Theorem 3, tubes (48) satisfy this inclusion by construction. The same argument holds for the other constraints and thus we have shown that candidate (52) satisfies all constraints in (46), which proves recursive feasibility. \square

For robust stability, we note that costs $l(\cdot)$, $l_f(\cdot)$ in (46a) are only functions of the nominal trajectories and independent of the convex combination variables. Therefore, the following stability result is a direct consequence of Theorem 4 and Proposition 5.

Corollary 6 *Given that Assumption 1 holds, system (1) subject to constraints (3) and in closed-loop with (47), is ISS in $\mathcal{X}_{\text{feas}}$ for any admissible sequence of combined disturbances $\boldsymbol{\eta}$, where $\mathcal{X}_{\text{feas}}$ is the set of all states $x(k)$ for which (46) is feasible.*

Remark 5 *In case heuristic $F(\mathbf{M}(k))$ enters the cost of (46), e.g. as a regularizer, ISS as in Corollary 6 cannot be proven. However, we can prove input-to-state practical stability (ISpS) [29], since the regularization term will be constant with respect to the state and disturbance.*

6 Numerical Results

We first compare the recursively feasible SLTMPC (32) to the method presented in [25] on a two dimensional




Fig. 2. Region of attraction (RoA) of [25] and our method (32) relative to the maximal RCI set in percent, where we vary the uncertainty in the dynamics matrix A , i.e. ϵ_A , (left) and the additive disturbance, i.e. σ_w , (right). The other uncertainty parameters are fixed to $\epsilon_B = 0.1$, $\sigma_w = 0.1$ and $\epsilon_A = 0.1$, $\epsilon_B = 0.1$, respectively, and the horizon is $N = \{5, 10\}$.

double integrator example, before showing the benefits of the asynchronous computation scheme on a more complex example. All examples are implemented in Python using CVXPY [34] and are solved using MOSEK [35]. The examples were run on a machine equipped with an Intel i9-7940X (3.1 GHz) CPU and 32 GB of RAM.

6.1 Double Integrator

In the first example, we use the same system as in [25], i.e., uncertain LTI system (1) with discrete-time dynamic matrices

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0.15 \\ 0.1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 0.1 \\ 1.1 \end{bmatrix},$$

subject to polytopic constraints and disturbance

$$\begin{bmatrix} -8 \\ -8 \end{bmatrix} \leq \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} \leq \begin{bmatrix} 8 \\ 8 \end{bmatrix}, \quad -4 \leq u \leq 4, \quad \begin{bmatrix} -\sigma_w \\ -\sigma_w \end{bmatrix} \leq \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \end{bmatrix} \leq \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_w \\ \sigma_w \end{bmatrix},$$

with polytopic model uncertainty

$$\Delta_A \in \text{co} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon_A & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} -\epsilon_A & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\}, \quad \Delta_B \in \text{co} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \epsilon_B \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -\epsilon_B \end{bmatrix} \right\},$$

where the uncertainty parameters σ_w , ϵ_A , and ϵ_B are varied. Additionally, we use the cost function $l(z, v) = z^T Q z + v^T R v$ with $Q = 10 \cdot \mathbb{I}_2$ and $R = 1$, and horizon $N \in \{5, 10\}$. As the terminal sets, we use the maximal robust control invariant (RCI) set of dynamics (1) for [25] and the maximal RPI set (Definition 4) - with K_f the LQR controller - for (32). We design the auxiliary disturbance set $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}$ to be equivalent to \mathcal{W} for both methods and since all uncertainty sets are hyperrectangles we use Remark 2 to modify (32). This setup allows a direct comparison of (32) to the method proposed in [25, Section 5] and therefore also a comparison to the other methods compared against in [25, Section 6].

Table 1
Computation times for RoA computations in double integrator example.

	Horizon	Comp. Time [ms]		
	N	Min.	Median	Rel. Diff.
Chen et al. [25]	5	29.9	50.1	-
	10	90.5	144.2	-
Ours (32)	5	37.6	59.2	18.2 %
	10	113.3	165.1	14.5 %

Figure 2 shows the region of attraction (RoA), i.e., the set of initial states for which the MPC method is feasible, for both methods as a fraction of the maximal RCI set for dynamics (1). In Figure 2 (left) we vary the parametric uncertainty $\epsilon_A \in [0.0, 0.5]$, while fixing $\epsilon_B = \sigma_w = 0.1$ and in Figure 2 (right) we vary the additive disturbance $\sigma_w \in [0.0, 0.6]$, while fixing $\epsilon_A = \epsilon_B = 0.1$. We notice that in general the method in [25] is less conservative than (32), i.e., its RoA covers a larger part of the maximal RCI set. This is due to the additional constraints in (32) needed for recursive feasibility and the use of an RCI terminal set compared to the RPI terminal set in (32). However, with increasing horizon N the RoAs of the two methods become more similar, with the RoA of (32) increasing and the RoA of the method in [25] decreasing for larger horizons. This is because the method in [25] tightens the RCI terminal set with the disturbance overapproximation, which becomes more conservative for larger horizons, thus reducing the RoA. In contrast, the RoA of (32) increases with the horizon, since the MPC controller is enhancing the terminal RPI set, thus reducing conservativeness with larger horizons. Given that [25, Section 6] shows filter-based SLTMPC outperforming all other investigated methods, we can conclude that (32) also outperforms these methods. Table 1 shows the computation times of the two methods for the RoA computations, where we notice that (32) is slightly slower than the method in [25] due to the additional constraints needed for recursive feasibility.




Fig. 3. Closed-loop trajectories of length 25 for [25] and (32). The average costs are 2143.7 for [25] and 1951.1 for (32).

Even though (32) is slightly more conservative than the method in [25], the latter has significant limitations, i.e., it requires a shrinking horizon implementation and a RPI set for dynamics (1), both of which we highlight in the following. First, we compare the closed-loop performance of the two methods. Figure 3 shows 200 closed-loop state and input trajectories starting in $x(0) = [-7, 0]^T$ for both methods. The average cost of the closed-loop trajectories are 2143.7 for [25] and 1951.1 for (32), which is a 9% improvement. This behavior is expected since (32) is applied in receding horizon, while the method in [25] is applied for a shrinking horizon. This is most evident in the first 5 timesteps, where the method in [25] exhibits jerky behavior in both the state and input trajectories.

6.2 Vertical Take-off and Landing (VTOL) vehicle

Next, we show-case the proposed filter-based SLTMPC on a VTOL vehicle model. We use [36] to derive the dynamics of a VTOL vehicle - inspired by the RockETH [37] - moving in a two-dimensional plane as depicted in Figure 4. We obtain the discrete-time dynamics

$$p_{i+1}^x = p_i^x + \Delta_t v_i^x, \quad p_{i+1}^z = p_i^z + \Delta_t v_i^z, \quad (53a)$$

$$v_{i+1}^x = v_i^x + \Delta_t k_1 \theta_i, \quad v_{i+1}^z = v_i^z + \Delta_t u_i^z, \quad (53b)$$

$$\theta_{i+1} = \theta_i + \Delta_t \omega_i, \quad \omega_{i+1} = \Delta_t k_2 \theta_i + \omega_i + \frac{\Delta_t}{I} u_i^\theta, \quad (53c)$$




Fig. 4. Visualization of the setup for the VTOL vehicle.

where $p^{x/z}$ and $v^{x/z}$ denote the position and velocity of the VTOL vehicle in x and z direction, respectively, θ and ω are the angle and angular velocity of the vehicle with respect to the upright position, u^z , u^θ denote the control inputs, the parameters k_1 , k_2 define the interaction between the translational and rotational dynamics, I is the inertia, and Δ_t is the discretization time. We choose all parameters such that they mimic the RockETH [37] and constrain its position to $[-15 \text{ m}, 15 \text{ m}]$ and $[0 \text{ m}, 15 \text{ m}]$ in the x and z direction, respectively, as depicted in Figure 4. The control inputs are constrained to $[-5 \text{ N}, 5 \text{ N}]$ and $[-0.5 \text{ Nm}, 0.5 \text{ Nm}]$ for u^z and u^θ , respectively. For all details of the experimental setup see Appendix B.

The interaction parameters k_1 , k_2 are uncertain and we assume a $\pm 5\%$ modelling error on each of these parameters, which we model as the parametric uncertainty Δ_A . Additionally, we assume wind gusts of $\pm 2 \text{ m/s}$ in x direction, which we model as the additive disturbance w . We assume no uncertainty in the input matrix B nor any uncertainty affecting the z direction. For the given uncertainties, it is not possible to compute a polytopic RPI set for dynamics (1), therefore rendering both (23) and the method in [25] inapplicable. However, we can compute an RPI set for auxiliary dynamics (8) with only the additive disturbance set $\mathcal{W} = \{\bar{w} \in \mathbb{R}^6 \mid \|\bar{w}\|_\infty \leq 0.075\}$. In the following, we apply (32) and the asynchronous computation scheme (46), (42) with memory size $M = 4$ to the VTOL vehicle for a horizon of $N = 10$. We show the closed-loop trajectories in the x - z plane for (32) in Figure 5 and for the primary process (46) in Figure 6. We notice that both the SLTMPC (32) and the primary process with asynchronously computed tubes (46) are able to steer the vehicle to the origin. Due to the secondary process (42) only updating the tubes every 10^{th} timestep, the SLTMPC with asynchronous computation has a higher average closed-loop cost of 5163.6 compared to 4799.4 for (32). However, the asynchronous computation is significantly faster than (32), as shown in Table 2. Figure 6 also shows the convex combination parameters λ_m for the closed-loop simulations. The memory slots M_0 and M_1 are both initialized with the




Fig. 5. Closed-loop trajectories in the x - z plane of the VTOL vehicle with SLTMPC (32), starting in $[x, z]^T = [10, 12.5]^T$.

tubes computed by (42) for initial condition $[x, z]^T = [10, 12.5]^T$, memory slot M_3 is initialized with tubes computed by (42) for initial condition $[x, z]^T = [0, 0]^T$, and memory slot M_2 is left empty. The memory is then updated by Algorithm 2 in every timestep and by Algorithm 1 every ten timesteps, where the new tubes are stored in M_1 and the previous ones are copied to M_2 . In Figure 6, these updates are clearly visible by the spikes in the convex combination variables. The spikes occur because we copy the previous tubes to M_2 , i.e., when the tubes in M_1 (blue lines) are updated, it is beneficial to fuse them with the previous ones in M_2 (green lines). However, after a few timesteps it is preferable to mainly use the new tubes, which is evident by increasing λ_1 (blue) and decreasing λ_2 (green) towards the next tube update. For $k \geq 50$, the trajectories are approaching the origin and the tubes in M_3 (yellow lines) are increasingly used, which is expected since they are optimized for a region around the origin. Finally, we discourage the use of the fallback tubes in M_0 (red lines) with a regularization cost on λ_0 , which is evident by their low usage, i.e., these tubes are only used if necessary to retain feasibility.

7 Conclusions

This paper introduced filter-based system level tube-MPC (SLTMPC) for constrained discrete-time linear systems with additive disturbances and model uncertainties. We detailed a generalization of the filter-based SLTMPC method introduced in [25] and proposed a modified version, which admits closed-loop guarantees in receding horizon. By introducing a new terminal controller combined with an online optimized terminal set, we proved recursive feasibility and input-to-state stability of the proposed method. Additionally, we introduced a new asynchronous computation scheme for filter-based SLTMPC, which significantly reduces its computational demand by separating the tube and nominal trajectory optimizations into different processes. Finally, we showed the benefits and effectiveness of the proposed methods on two numerical examples.





Fig. 6. Closed-loop trajectories in the x - z plane of the VTOL vehicle with the primary process (46), starting in $[x, z]^T = [10, 12.5]^T$ (top) and the corresponding convex combination parameters λ_m , $m = 0, \dots, M-1$ (bottom).

Table 2

Computation times for the VTOL vehicle example with horizon $N = 10$.

	Comp. Time [ms]	
	Min.	Median
SLTMPC (32)	490.75	719.76
Asynchronous computation		
Primary Process (46)	7.79	16.59
Secondary Process (42)	473.5	685.3

References

- [1] M. V. Kothare, V. Balakrishnan, and M. Morari, “Robust constrained model predictive control using linear matrix inequalities,” *Automatica*, vol. 32, no. 10, pp. 1361–1379, 1996.
- [2] B. Kouvaritakis, J. Rossiter, and J. Schuurmans, “Efficient robust predictive control,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 45, no. 8, pp. 1545–1549, 2000.
- [3] J. B. Rawlings, D. Q. Mayne, and M. Diehl, *Model Predictive Control: Theory, Computation, and Design*. Nob Hill Publishing, 2 ed., 2019.

- [4] B. Kouvaritakis and M. Cannon, *Model Predictive Control: Classical, Robust and Stochastic*. Springer, 1 ed., 2016.
- [5] 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.
- [6] 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.
- [7] M. Zanon and S. Gros, “On the Similarity Between Two Popular Tube MPC Formulations,” in *2021 European Control Conference (ECC)*, pp. 651–656, 2021.
- [8] S. V. Raković, B. Kouvaritakis, R. Findeisen, and M. Cannon, “Homothetic tube model predictive control,” *Automatica*, vol. 48, no. 8, pp. 1631–1638, 2012.
- [9] S. V. Raković, W. S. Levine, and B. Açikmese, “Elastic tube model predictive control,” in *Proc. of American Control Conference (ACC)*, pp. 3594–3599, 2016.
- [10] J. Sieber, A. Zanelli, S. Bennani, and M. N. Zeilinger, “System level disturbance reachable sets and their application to tube-based MPC,” *European Journal of Control*, p. 100680, 2022.
- [11] J. Löfberg, “Approximations of closed-loop minimax MPC,” in *Proc. 42nd IEEE Conf. Decis. Control*, vol. 2, pp. 1438–1442, 2003.
- [12] P. J. Goulart, E. C. Kerrigan, and J. M. Maciejowski, “Optimization over state feedback policies for robust control with constraints,” *Automatica*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 523–533, 2006.
- [13] J. Sieber, S. Bennani, and M. N. Zeilinger, “A System Level Approach to Tube-Based Model Predictive Control,” *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 6, pp. 776–781, 2022.
- [14] J. Anderson, J. C. Doyle, S. H. Low, and N. Matni, “System level synthesis,” *Annu. Rev. Control*, vol. 47, pp. 364–393, 2019.
- [15] M. Bujarbaruah, U. Rosolia, Y. R. Stürz, and F. Borrelli, “A Simple Robust MPC for Linear Systems with Parametric and Additive Uncertainty,” in *2021 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pp. 2108–2113, 2021.
- [16] M. Bujarbaruah, U. Rosolia, Y. R. Stürz, X. Zhang, and F. Borrelli, “Robust MPC for LPV systems via a novel optimization-based constraint tightening,” *Automatica*, vol. 143, p. 110459, 2022.
- [17] W. Langson, I. Chrysochoos, S. Raković, and D. Q. Mayne, “Robust model predictive control using tubes,” *Automatica*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 125–133, 2004.
- [18] M. Lorenzen, M. Cannon, and F. Allgöwer, “Robust MPC with recursive model update,” *Automatica*, vol. 103, pp. 461–471, 2019.
- [19] J. Köhler, E. Andina, R. Soloperto, M. A. Müller, and F. Allgöwer, “Linear robust adaptive model predictive control: Computational complexity and conservatism,” in *2019 IEEE 58th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pp. 1383–1388, 2019.
- [20] J. Fleming, B. Kouvaritakis, and M. Cannon, “Robust Tube MPC for Linear Systems With Multiplicative Uncertainty,” *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 60, no. 4, pp. 1087–1092, 2015.
- [21] X. Lu and M. Cannon, “Robust Adaptive Tube Model Predictive Control,” in *2019 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pp. 3695–3701, 2019.
- [22] M. Milanese and A. Vicino, “Optimal estimation theory for dynamic systems with set membership uncertainty: An overview,” *Automatica*, vol. 27, no. 6, pp. 997–1009, 1991.
- [23] M. E. Villanueva, M. A. Müller, and B. Houska, “Configuration-Constrained Tube MPC,” 2022.
- [24] A. Parsi, A. Iannelli, and R. S. Smith, “Scalable tube model predictive control of uncertain linear systems using ellipsoidal sets,” *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, 2022.
- [25] S. Chen, V. M. Preciado, M. Morari, and N. Matni, “Robust model predictive control with polytopic model uncertainty through System Level Synthesis,” *Automatica*, vol. 162, p. 111431, 2024.
- [26] C. A. Alonso and S.-H. Tseng, “Effective GPU Parallelization of Distributed and Localized Model Predictive Control,” in *2022 IEEE 17th International Conference on Control & Automation (ICCA)*, pp. 199–206, 2022.
- [27] A. P. Leeman, J. Köhler, F. Messerer, A. Lahr, M. Diehl, and M. N. Zeilinger, “Fast System Level Synthesis: Robust Model Predictive Control using Riccati Recursions,” 2024.
- [28] J. Sieber, A. Zanelli, A. P. Leeman, S. Bennani, and M. N. Zeilinger, “Asynchronous Computation of Tube-based Model Predictive Control,” *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 8432–8438, 2023. 22nd IFAC World Congress.
- [29] D. Limon, T. Alamo, D. M. Raimondo, D. Muñoz De La Peña, J. M. Bravo, A. Ferramosca, and E. F. Camacho, “Input-to-State Stability: A Unifying Framework for Robust Model Predictive Control,” in *Lect. Notes Control Inf. Sci.*, vol. 384, pp. 1–26, 2009.
- [30] S. Sadraddini and R. Tedrake, “Linear Encodings for Polytope Containment Problems,” in *2019 IEEE 58th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pp. 4367–4372, 2019.
- [31] I. Kolmanovskiy and E. G. Gilbert, “Theory and computation of disturbance invariant sets for discrete-time linear systems,” *Mathematical problems in engineering*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 317–367, 1998.
- [32] D. M. Raimondo, D. Limon, M. Lazar, L. Magni, and E. F. Camacho, “Min-max Model Predictive Control of Nonlinear Systems: A Unifying Overview on Stability,” *European Journal of Control*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 5–21, 2009.
- [33] M. Kögel and R. Findeisen, “Fusing multiple time varying tubes for robust MPC,” *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 7055–7062, 2020. 21st IFAC World Congress.
- [34] S. Diamond and S. Boyd, “CVXPY: A Python-Embedded Modeling Language for Convex Optimization,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 17, no. 83, pp. 1–5, 2016.
- [35] MOSEK ApS, *MOSEK Optimizer API for Python. Version 9.2.*, 2021.
- [36] P. Bouffard, A. Aswani, and C. Tomlin, “Learning-based model predictive control on a quadrotor: Onboard implementation and experimental results,” in *2012 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pp. 279–284, 2012.
- [37] L. Spannagl, E. Hampp, A. Carron, J. Sieber, C. A. Pascucci, A. U. Zraggen, A. Domahidi, and M. N. Zeilinger, “Design, Optimal Guidance and Control of a Low-cost Re-usable Electric Model Rocket,” in *2021 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pp. 6344–6351, 2021.

A Implementation Details

In this appendix, we discuss how the inclusion constraints in filter-based SLTMP (32) and in the primary process (46) can be implemented as linear constraints. Before that, we formally define a support function [31].

Definition 6 (Support function) *The support function of a non-empty compact convex set $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, evaluated at $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is given by $h_{\mathcal{A}}(\xi) = \sup_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \xi^\top a$.*

The support function of a polytopic set $\mathcal{A} = \{a \mid H_A a \leq h_a\}$ is then given by the linear program $\max_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \xi^\top a$.

A.1 Implementation of (32)

While the state and input constraints (32f), (32g) can be implemented using standard techniques from disturbance feedback literature [12], the other inclusion constraints (32h) - (32j) are all of the form (A.1) and thus we can use the following lemma from [28] to implement them as linear constraints.

Lemma 7 (Lemma 1 in [28]) *Consider scalars $\alpha \geq 0$, $\beta \geq 0$, matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $\Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, polytopic sets $\mathcal{X} = \{x \mid H_x x \leq h_x\}$ with $H_x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_x}$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \{y \mid H_y y \leq h_y\}$ with $H_y \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y \times n_y}$, and a compact convex set $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, then the following conditions are sufficient and necessary for*

$$\alpha \mathcal{A} \mathcal{X} \subseteq \beta \mathcal{Y} \ominus \Gamma \mathcal{Z} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

to hold:

$$\exists \Lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y \times n_x}, \Lambda \geq 0, \quad (\text{A.2a})$$

$$\Lambda H_x = \alpha H_y A, \quad (\text{A.2b})$$

$$\Lambda h_x \leq \beta h_y - h_{\mathcal{Z}}(\Gamma^\top H_y^\top), \quad (\text{A.2c})$$

where $h_{\mathcal{Z}}(\Gamma^\top H_y^\top) = \left[h_{\mathcal{Z}}(\Gamma^\top H_y^{1,\cdot\top}) \dots h_{\mathcal{Z}}(\Gamma^\top H_y^{n_y,\cdot\top}) \right]^\top$ denotes the stacked support functions individually evaluated at the rows of H_y .

PROOF. The proof can be found in [28, Lemma 1]. \square

The disturbance inclusion constraints (32k), (32l) can both be rewritten in the form (A.3) by applying [31, Theorem 2.1] and thus can be implemented as linear constraints using Lemma 8.

Lemma 8 *Consider a scalar $\beta \geq 0$, a vector $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$, matrices $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y \times n_x}$, $\Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, polytopic sets $\mathcal{X}_i = \{x \mid H_{x,i} x \leq h_{x,i}\}$ with $H_{x,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_x}$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \{y \mid H_y y \leq h_y\}$ with $H_y \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y \times n_y}$, and a compact convex set $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$,*

then the following conditions are sufficient and necessary for

$$\{a\} \oplus \bigoplus_{i=0}^{N-1} A_i \mathcal{X}_i \subseteq \beta \mathcal{Y} \ominus \Gamma \mathcal{Z} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

to hold:

$$\exists \Lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y \times n_x}, \Lambda_i \geq 0, \quad i = 0, \dots, N-1, \quad (\text{A.4a})$$

$$\Lambda_i H_{x,i} = H_y A_i, \quad i = 0, \dots, N-1, \quad (\text{A.4b})$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \Lambda_i h_{x,i} \leq \beta h_y - h_{\mathcal{Z}}(\Gamma^\top H_y^\top) - H_y a, \quad (\text{A.4c})$$

where $h_{\mathcal{Z}}(\Gamma^\top H_y^\top) = \left[h_{\mathcal{Z}}(\Gamma^\top H_y^{1,\cdot\top}) \dots h_{\mathcal{Z}}(\Gamma^\top H_y^{n_y,\cdot\top}) \right]^\top$ denotes the stacked support functions individually evaluated at the rows of H_y .

PROOF. Using standard properties of polytopic sets, we define the scaled polytope $\beta \mathcal{Y} = \{y \mid H_y y \leq \beta h_y\}$. Then, using Theorem 2.3 in [31], we get

$$\beta \mathcal{Y} \ominus \Gamma \mathcal{Z} = \{y \mid H_y y \leq \beta h_y - h_{\mathcal{Z}}(\Gamma^\top H_y^\top)\}.$$

Therefore, (A.3) is a polytope containment problem, which can be restated as (A.4) using [30, Prop. 1]. \square

If the set \mathcal{Y} in Lemma 8 is restricted to a hyperrectangle, then it can be specialized to β being a diagonal matrix, i.e., $\beta = \text{diag}(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{n_y})$. This is due to the fact that for hyperrectangle \mathcal{Y} and diagonal matrix β the representation $\beta \mathcal{Y} = \{y \mid H_y y \leq \hat{\beta} h_y\}$ with $\hat{\beta} = \text{diag}(\beta_1 \mathbb{I}_n, \dots, \beta_{n_y} \mathbb{I}_n)$ avoids inverting β and thus still allows optimization over β . We can use this to relax the structural constraint $\Sigma_{i+1,i} = \sigma \cdot \mathbb{I}_n$ to $\Sigma_{i+1,i} = \text{diag}(\sigma_{i,1}, \dots, \sigma_{i,n})$ as discussed in Remarks 1 & 2. Additionally, if \mathcal{W} is a hyperrectangle, we recover the disturbance tube parameterization in [25] as a special case.

A.2 Implementation of (46)

Since the sets \mathcal{Z}_i , \mathcal{V}_i , and \mathcal{Q}_i^d in (46) are all computed via the Pontryagin difference of a constant polytopic and a variable polytopic set (see (43), (44)), they share the same shape [31, Theorem 2.3]. For example, the sets $\mathcal{Z}_i^m = \{z \mid H_x z \leq h_z^m\}$ all have the shape of state constraint \mathcal{X} but differ in their sizes h_z^m for different memory entries. Using this observation, constraints (46d) - (46g) can be implemented using the following lemma.

Lemma 9 *Consider scalars $a_m \geq 0$ and polytopic sets $\mathcal{X}_m = \{x \mid H_x x \leq h_x^m\}$ with $H_x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_x}$ for $m = 0, \dots, M-1$, then the following set description holds*

$$\bigoplus_{m=0}^{M-1} a_m \mathcal{X}_m = \{x \mid H_x x \leq \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} a_m h_x^m\}. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

PROOF. Using standard properties of polytopic sets, we get the scaled polytope $a_m \mathcal{X}_m = \{x \mid H_x x \leq a_m h_x^m\}$. Then, using the definition of the Minkowski sum, we get

$$a_1 \mathcal{X}_1 \oplus a_2 \mathcal{X}_2 = \{x_1 + x_2 \mid H_x x_1 \leq a_1 h_x^1, H_x x_2 \leq a_2 h_x^2\}.$$

Substituting $x = x_1 + x_2$, we get the halfspace representation of $\mathcal{X} = a_1 \mathcal{X}_1 \oplus a_2 \mathcal{X}_2$ as

$$\mathcal{X} = \{x \mid H_x x = H_x(x_1 + x_2) \leq a_1 h_x^1 + a_2 h_x^2\}.$$

Applying this recursively for all $m = 0, \dots, M-1$ then yields (A.5). \square

B Experimental Details

The dynamics of the VTOL vehicle (53) are written in matrix form for state $x = [p^x, v^x, p^z, v^z, \theta, \omega]^\top$ and input $u = [u^z, u^\theta]^\top$ as

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \Delta_t & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \Delta_t k_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \Delta_t & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & \Delta_t \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \Delta_t k_2 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ \Delta_t & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\Delta_t}{I} \end{bmatrix},$$

where we use $\Delta_t = 0.075$ and $I = 0.144$ for the discretization time and inertia, respectively. The interaction parameters k_1, k_2 are assumed to lie in $[k_1^{\min}, k_1^{\max}] = [3.33, 4.67]$ and $[k_2^{\min}, k_2^{\max}] = [4.33, 5.67]$, respectively, yielding the polytopic model uncertainty description

$$\Delta_A \in \text{co} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \Delta_t k_1^{\min} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \Delta_t k_2^{\min} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \Delta_t k_1^{\max} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \Delta_t k_2^{\max} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\}.$$

The additive disturbance description is given by

$$\mathcal{W} = \text{co} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -\sigma_w \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -\sigma_w \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \sigma_w \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \sigma_w \end{bmatrix} \right\},$$

where $\sigma_w = 0.05$ and the state and input constraints are given by

$$\mathcal{X} = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} -15 \\ -6 \\ 0 \\ -6 \\ -20 \\ -10 \end{bmatrix} \leq x \leq \begin{bmatrix} 15 \\ 6 \\ 15 \\ 6 \\ 20 \\ 10 \end{bmatrix} \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{U} = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} -5 \\ -25 \end{bmatrix} \leq u \leq \begin{bmatrix} 5 \\ 25 \end{bmatrix} \right\}.$$