

Recent advancements on MPC for tracking: periodic and harmonic formulations

Pablo Krupa^[0000-0002-6238-1166] and
Daniel Limon^[0000-0001-9334-7289] and
Teodoro Alamo^[0000-0002-0623-8146]

Abstract The main benefit of model predictive control (MPC) is its ability to steer the system to a given reference without violating the constraints while minimizing some objective. Furthermore, a suitably designed MPC controller guarantees asymptotic stability of the closed-loop system to the given reference as long as its optimization problem is feasible at the initial state of the system. Therefore, one of the limitations of classical MPC is that changing the reference may lead to an unfeasible MPC problem. Furthermore, due to a lack of deep knowledge of the system, it is possible for the user to provide a desired reference that is unfeasible or non-attainable for the MPC controller, leading to the same problem. This chapter summarizes MPC formulations recently proposed that have been designed to address these issues. In particular, thanks to the addition of an artificial reference as decision variable, the formulations achieve asymptotic stability and recursive feasibility guarantees regardless of the reference provided by the user, even if it is changed online or if it violates the system constraints. We show a recent formulation which extends this idea, achieving better performance and larger domains of attraction when working with small prediction horizons. Additional benefits of these formulations, when compared to classical MPC, are also discussed and highlighted with illustrative examples.

Notation: We denote the transpose of $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ or $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p}$ by x^\top and A^\top . Given $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and a positive definite $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, we denote $\|x\|_Q \doteq \sqrt{x^\top Q x}$ and $\|x\| \doteq \sqrt{x^\top x}$. The set of natural numbers (including 0) is denoted by \mathbb{N} . Given $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ with $i \leq j$, $\mathbb{N}_i^j \doteq \{i, i+1, \dots, j\}$. For two vectors $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $x \leq (<) y$ denotes component-wise inequalities. The vector of ones of dimension n is denoted by $\mathbf{1}_n$. Element $i \in \mathbb{N}_1^n$ of a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is denoted by $x_{(i)}$. $\text{diag}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is the diagonal matrix with entries $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $i \in \mathbb{N}_1^n$.

Pablo Krupa
Gran Sasso Science Institute (GSSI), L'Aquila, Italy, e-mail: pablo.krupa@gssi.it

Daniel Limon, Teodoro Alamo
Universidad de Sevilla, Seville, Spain, e-mail: dlm@us.es, talamo@us.es

1 Introduction

Throughout this chapter, we consider the problem of controlling a system described by a controllable linear time-invariant state-space model

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

where $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ and $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ are the state and control input at the discrete time instant t , respectively. We also consider that the system is subject to coupled input-output constraints

$$\underline{y} \leq Ex(t) + Fu(t) \leq \bar{y}, \quad (2)$$

where we assume that the bounds $\underline{y}, \bar{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y}$ satisfy $\underline{y} < \bar{y}$.

Our control objective is to steer (1) to a *desired reference* $(x_r, u_r) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ while satisfying the constraints (2). Model Predictive Control (MPC) [1, 2] is an optimization-based control technique that is particularly suitable for this task. At each sample time, MPC solves a finite-horizon optimal control problem using the prediction model (1) and the current measurement (or estimate) of the system state $x(t)$. The constraints of the system are explicitly considered in the optimal control problem. Thus, under nominal conditions, a suitably designed MPC controller will steer the initial state $x(0)$ to the desired reference x_r while satisfying the system constraints [1], as long as the desired reference is an *admissible steady state* of the system.

Definition 1 (Admissible steady state) A pair $(x, u) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ is said to be an *admissible steady state* of system (1) subject to (2) if it satisfies $x = Ax + Bu$ and $\underline{y} \leq Ex + Fu \leq \bar{y}$. Furthermore, we say that it is *strictly admissible* if it strictly satisfies the previous inequality, i.e., $\underline{y} < Ex + Fu < \bar{y}$.

Let us start by considering a standard MPC with terminal equality constraint:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \|x(k|t) - x_r\|_Q^2 + \|u(k|t) - u_r\|_R^2 \quad (3a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } x(0|t) = x(t), \quad (3b)$$

$$x(k+1|t) = Ax(k|t) + Bu(k|t), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0^{N-1}, \quad (3c)$$

$$\underline{y} \leq Ex(k|t) + Fu(k|t) \leq \bar{y}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0^{N-1}, \quad (3d)$$

$$x(N|t) = x_r, \quad (3e)$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x(0|t), x(1|t), \dots, x(N|t))$ and $\mathbf{u} = (u(0|t), u(1|t), \dots, u(N-1|t))$ are the predicted states and inputs throughout the prediction horizon $N \in \mathbb{N}$; and the cost function matrices $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_x}$ and $R \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u \times n_u}$ are assumed to be positive definite. The use of the terminal equality constraint $x(N|t) = x_r$ provides the MPC controller (3) with stability guarantees under rather mild assumption [1, 2, 3]. The classical alternative to using a terminal equality constraint is to use a *terminal set*, where the terminal state $x(N|t)$ is forced to lie within a suitable invariant set

of the system. The use of a terminal equality constraint has the advantage of not requiring the computation of the terminal set, which can be challenging to obtain for non-trivial systems [4]. Finally, it leads to a simple Quadratic Programming (QP) problem that can be solved online using one of the many available efficient QP solvers [5, 6, 7, 8]. The control law of (3) is $u(t) = u^*(0|t)$, where $u^*(0|t)$ is the value of $u(0|t)$ corresponding to the optimal solution of (3). This is the so-called *receding horizon policy* that characterizes predictive control laws.

Obviously, the MPC controller (3) will only be able to achieve the control objective of steering the system state $x(t)$ to the desired reference (x_r, u_r) if the following two conditions are satisfied:

- (c.i) The initial state $x(0)$ belongs to the *domain of attraction* of the MPC controller, that is, to the set of states for which the MPC control law asymptotically steers the system to x_r . For a well-posed MPC, the domain of attraction coincides with the set of states $x(t)$ for which optimization problem (3) is feasible [1].
- (c.ii) The desired reference (x_r, u_r) is an admissible steady state of the system (see Definition 1). This condition might be limiting in a practical setting, where various reasons may lead to the selection of a non-admissible reference, e.g., a user with insufficient knowledge of the system.

Therefore, in a practical setting, we are interested in reducing the impact of the above conditions (c.i) and (c.ii). In this regard, the MPC formulation (3) is not an ideal choice. Indeed, the main issue with (3) is that its feasibility region tends to be small. Note that, due to (3e), only states $x(t)$ that can reach the reference x_r in N steps may belong to the feasibility region of (3). If the prediction horizon is chosen too small or the constraints are too restrictive, then it is very likely that the feasibility region (and thus the domain of attraction of the controller) is too small for its practical use. This issue becomes even more apparent when considering the possibility of online changes of the reference, since a change of the reference may lead to a loss of feasibility of the MPC controller if it is too far away from the current state of the system. Instead, we are interested in an MPC formulation whose domain of attraction is as large as possible, to mitigate (c.i), and that can inherently deal with non-attainable references, to deal with (c.ii).

2 MPC for tracking piecewise-constant references

An ideal choice to mitigate the issues raised in the previous section is the MPC formulation known as *MPC for Tracking* (MPCT) [3, 9]. MPCT has several variations, including non-linear [10], periodic [11, 12], economic [13] or robust [14, 15]. In this section we focus on a variation of linear MPCT that considers a terminal equality constraint. The reason for this choice is that this formulation is easier to pose, design and understand, providing us an ideal scenario to explain the main ideas and concepts behind the *tracking* MPC formulations. In the following sections we will take a look at two more recent variations of MPCT: periodic MPCT and *harmonic* MPCT.




Fig. 1: Intuitive representation of the MPCT artificial reference. The blue line represents the space of steady states of the system and the red dot the desired reference x_r .

The idea of MPCT is to add an *artificial reference* (x_s, u_s) as new decision variables of the MPC optimization problem, resulting in

$$\min_{\substack{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \\ x_s, u_s}} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \left(\|x(k|t) - x_s\|_Q^2 + \|u(k|t) - u_s\|_R^2 \right) + V_o(x_s, u_s; x_r, u_r) \quad (4a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } x(0|t) = x(t), \quad (4b)$$

$$x(k+1|t) = Ax(k|t) + Bu(k|t), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0^{N-1}, \quad (4c)$$

$$\underline{y} \leq Ex(k|t) + Fu(k|t) \leq \bar{y}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0^{N-1}, \quad (4d)$$

$$x(N|t) = x_s, \quad (4e)$$

$$x_s = Ax_s + Bu_s, \quad (4f)$$

$$\underline{y} + \sigma \mathbf{1}_{n_y} \leq Ex_s + Fu_s \leq \bar{y} - \sigma \mathbf{1}_{n_y}, \quad (4g)$$

where $\sigma > 0$ and $V_o(\cdot)$, known as the *offset cost function*, is assumed to be a convex function such that $(x_r, u_r) = \arg \min_{x_s, u_s} V_o(x_s, u_s; x_r, u_r)$. The typical choice for the offset cost function is to take

$$V_o(x_s, u_s; x_r, u_r) = \|x_s - x_r\|_T^2 + \|u_s - u_r\|_S^2, \quad (5)$$

where $T \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_x}$ and $S \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u \times n_u}$ are positive definite. The offset cost plays the part of a terminal ingredient between the artificial reference and the desired reference, whereas the summation of *stage costs* $\|x(k|t) - x_s\|_Q^2 + \|u(k|t) - u_s\|_R^2$ along the prediction horizon N are the classical terms of the MPC cost function, cf. (3a). Constraint (4e) is imposing the predicted terminal state $x(N|t)$ to be equal to the artificial reference x_s , which by constraints (4f) and (4g) is required to be an admissible steady state of the system. The positive scalar σ is taken arbitrarily small and is included to avoid a possible loss of controllability in the event in which there are active constraints at an equilibrium point [3].

To reiterate, the idea behind MPCT is to introduce a *proxy* of the reference in the form of the decision variables (x_s, u_s) . The cost function penalizes, on one hand, the discrepancy between the predicted states and the artificial reference by means of the stage costs, and on the other, the distance between the artificial reference and the desired reference by means of the offset cost. The idea is that the artificial reference (x_s, u_s) will converge towards the desired reference (x_r, u_r) , and that the predicted

states will, in turn, converge towards the artificial reference. This idea is illustrated in Figure 1.

A first clear advantage of MPCT (4), when compared to (3), is that its feasibility region can be much larger. Intuitively, this is because in the MPCT formulation (4), the current state $x(t)$ only needs to be able to reach *any* admissible steady state of the system in N steps, as illustrated in Figure 1. In contrast, problem (3) is unfeasible if the current state $x(t)$ cannot reach the *desired reference* in N steps. As a result, MPCT (4) typically has a much larger domain of attraction than (3), especially when using small prediction horizons¹.

Another useful feature of the MPCT formulation (4) is that it retains recursive feasibility, under nominal conditions, even in the event of a change of the reference (x_r, u_r) between sample times. That is, if optimization problem (4) is feasible for the current state $x(t)$, then the MPCT controller remains feasible for all future sample times. In fact, recursive feasibility is maintained even if the reference is not an admissible steady state of the system; a useful feature in a practical setting, where the desired reference may be inadmissible, for instance, due to it being set by a higher-level part of the control architecture. The following theorem formalizes the recursive feasibility of the MPCT formulation (4). Its proof can be found in [3, 10].

Theorem 1 (Recursive feasibility of MPCT) *Let $x(t)$ belong to the feasibility region of the MPCT formulation (4). Let \tilde{x} , \tilde{u} , \tilde{x}_s and \tilde{u}_s be any feasible solution of (4) for a given reference $(x_r(t), u_r(t))$. Then, the successor state $Ax(t) + B\tilde{u}(0|t)$ belongs to the feasibility region of (4) for any reference $(x_r(t+1), u_r(t+1))$.*

As in standard MPC, the MPCT controller steers the system to the fixed reference (x_r, u_r) if the reference is an admissible steady state of the system. However, an interesting property of MPCT is that if the reference is non-admissible (i.e., it is not a steady state of the system or it does not satisfy the system constraints), then the closed-loop system asymptotically converges to the *optimal reachable reference* (x_r°, u_r°) , which we formally define in the following definition.

Definition 2 (Optimal reachable reference) Given a reference $(x_r, u_r) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$, we define the *optimal reachable reference* of the MPCT formulation (4) as the unique solution $(x_r^\circ, u_r^\circ) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ of the strongly convex optimization problem

$$(x_r^\circ, u_r^\circ) = \arg \min_{x, u} V_o(x, u; x_r, u_r) \quad (6a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } x = Ax + Bu, \quad (6b)$$

$$\underline{y} + \sigma \mathbb{1}_{n_y} \leq Ex + Fu \leq \bar{y} - \sigma \mathbb{1}_{n_y}. \quad (6c)$$

Note that if the reference (x_r, u_r) is a strictly admissible steady state, then there exists a sufficiently small $\sigma > 0$ such that the optimal reachable reference satisfies $(x_r^\circ, u_r^\circ) = (x_r, u_r)$. In this case, the closed-loop system asymptotically converges to the desired reference. Otherwise, it converges to the closest strictly admissible

¹ For large prediction horizons the feasibility region of both formulations converge to the same maximal stabilizable invariant set.

steady state to the desired reference (*strictly* due to $\sigma > 0$), as measured by the offset cost function $V_o(\cdot)$. The following theorems formalizes the asymptotic stability of the MPCT formulation (4). Its proof can be found in [3, 10].

Theorem 2 (Asymptotic stability of MPCT) *Let (x_r, u_r) be a fixed desired reference. Assume that the initial state $x(0)$ belongs to the feasibility region of (4) and that the prediction horizon N is greater or equal to the controllability index of system (1). Then, system (1) controlled with the control law of the MPCT formulation (4) is stable, fulfills the system constraints for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$, and asymptotically converges to the optimal reachable reference (x_r°, u_r°) given by Definition 2.*

Remark 1 Note that Theorem 2 requires the prediction horizon N to be larger or equal to the controllability index of system (1), i.e., the smallest $j \in \mathbb{N}_1^{n_x}$ for which $[B, AB, A^2B, \dots, A^{j-1}B]$ has rank n_x . In practice, this often means that $N \geq n_x$.

As in standard MPC, the optimization problem of the MPCT formulation (4), when using a quadratic offset cost function (5), is also a simple QP problem that can be solved online using one of the many available efficient QP solvers [5, 6]. However, the inclusion of the artificial reference as decision variables in problem (4) complicates the resulting QP problem when compared to standard MPC formulation such as (3), both in terms of the number of decision variables and of the sparsity pattern of the QP matrices. Even so, problem (4) is still a sparse QP problem that can be efficiently solved using any of the many available QP solvers from the literature, such as [5, 6]. Additionally, sparse solvers that exploit the particular structures of the MPCT formulation (4) have recently been proposed in [16, 17]; the latter based on the ADMM algorithm [18] and the former on the *extended* ADMM algorithm [19]. Both solvers are available in the Spcies toolbox for MATLAB [8]. The results from [16] indicate that the MPCT formulation (4) can be solved in similar computation times to standard MPC formulations such as (3).

2.1 Case study: ball and plate system

In this chapter, we use the ball and plate system from [20, §5.7.2] for the closed-loop results using the different tracking MPC formulations discussed in each section.

The ball and plate system, shown in Figure 2, consists of a plate that is nominally in a horizontal position but whose inclination can be adjusted by applying an angular acceleration to either of its two main axes. The control objective is to control the position of a solid ball that moves on the surface of the plate as a consequence of its inclination. We assume that the ball is always in contact with the plate and that it does not slip when moving over its surface. Under this assumption, the non-linear equations of the system are given by [21]

$$\ddot{p}_1 = \frac{m}{m + I_b/r^2} \left(p_1 \dot{\theta}_1^2 + p_2 \dot{\theta}_1 \dot{\theta}_2 + g \sin \theta_1 \right), \quad (7a)$$

$$\ddot{p}_2 = \frac{m}{m + I_b/r^2} \left(p_2 \dot{\theta}_2^2 + p_1 \dot{\theta}_1 \dot{\theta}_2 + g \sin \theta_2 \right), \quad (7b)$$




Fig. 2: Ball and plate system.

where p_1 and p_2 are the coordinates of the ball on each of the axes of the plate², \dot{p}_1 , \dot{p}_2 , \ddot{p}_1 and \ddot{p}_2 the corresponding velocity and acceleration of the ball, θ_1 , $\dot{\theta}_1$, θ_2 and $\dot{\theta}_2$ are the angle and angular velocity of the plate in each of its axes, $m = 0.05\text{Kg}$ is the mass of the ball, $r = 0.01\text{m}$ its radius, $I_b = (2/5)mr^2 = 2 \cdot 10^{-6}\text{Kg}\cdot\text{m}^2$ its mass moment of inertia, and $g = 9.81\text{m/s}^2$ is the gravitational constant.

The state of the system is given by $x = (p_1, \dot{p}_1, \theta_1, \dot{\theta}_1, p_2, \dot{p}_2, \theta_2, \dot{\theta}_2)$ and the control input by $u = (\ddot{\theta}_1, \ddot{\theta}_2)$, that is, by the angular acceleration of each of the axes of the plate. The constraints of the system are given by

$$|p_i| \leq 0.3 \text{ m}, |\dot{p}_i| \leq 0.1 \text{ m/s}, |\theta_i| \leq \frac{\pi}{4} \text{ rad}, |\dot{\theta}_i| \leq 0.1 \text{ rad/s}^2, i \in \mathbb{N}_1^2. \quad (8)$$

No constraint is imposed on $\dot{\theta}_i$, $i \in \mathbb{N}_1^2$. The box constraints (8) can be easily written as coupled input-state constraints (2). A linear model (1) is obtained by linearizing (7) around the operating point $(x, u) = (0, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^8 \times \mathbb{R}^2$, assuming a zero-order hold on the control inputs and taking a sample time of 0.2 seconds.

Figure 3 shows the closed-loop results of the ball and plate system controlled using MPCT (4) taking $N = 15$, $Q = \text{diag}(10, 0.05, 0.05, 0.05, 10, 0.05, 0.05, 0.05)$, $R = \text{diag}(0.5, 0.5)$, $T = NQ$ and $S = NR$. Figures 3a and 3b show the trajectory of the position of the ball over time and the trajectory of the ball on the plate, respectively, for an admissible desired reference. Figures 3c and 3d show the same results, but for a non-admissible reference. Figures 3a and 3c include the trajectory of the artificial reference for the position p_1 of the ball. The results show how the MPCT formulation (4) steers the system to the optimal reachable reference when the desired reference is non-admissible. In this case, since T and S are diagonal, the optimal reachable reference is the admissible steady state with the smallest weighted Euclidean distance to the desired reference.

Remark 2 This chapter does not focus on the computational aspects of solving the tracking MPC formulations. However, for completeness, we note that the results shown in Figure 3 are obtained using the solvers available in version v0.3.11 of the Species toolbox for MATLAB [8]. In particular, the MPCT formulation was solved using the ADMM solver [17] for MPCT from the toolbox.

² The center of the plate is considered the origin.




Fig. 3: Closed-loop results of the ball and plate system using MPCT (4).

3 MPC for tracking periodic references

This section presents an extension of MPCT for tracking periodic references [11, 12]. That is, we now consider the control objective of following a desired *periodic* reference trajectory $(x_r(t), u_r(t))$ with period $T_p \in \mathbb{N}$, i.e., a trajectory satisfying $x_r(t + T_p) = x_r(t)$ and $u_r(t + T_p) = u_r(t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$. As in Definition 1, we define the notion of admissibility, but in this case for a trajectory.

Definition 3 (Admissible trajectory) A trajectory $(x(t), u(t))$, with $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ and $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$, is said to be *admissible* for system (1) subject to (2) if it satisfies $x(t+1) = Ax(t) + Bu(t)$ and $\underline{y} \leq Ex(t) + Fu(t) \leq \bar{y}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$. Furthermore, we say that it is *strictly admissible* if it satisfies $\underline{y} < Ex(t) + Fu(t) < \bar{y}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$.

As in the case of the MPCT formulation (4) for tracking piecewise-constant references, periodic MPCT can be seen as an extension of the classical periodic MPC formulations, which are often related to economic MPC [22, 23, 24]. These formulations can also suffer from the same issues discussed in Section 1, i.e., insufficiently large domain of attraction and loss of feasibility if the periodic reference is changed online. That is, the periodic reference at time $t+1$ is not the shifted reference of the previous sample time, but some new periodic reference instead. The periodic MPCT formulation mitigates both of these issues using the same idea as MPCT (4): by introducing an artificial reference. In this case, however, instead of a steady state artificial reference, the periodic MPCT formulation uses a periodic artificial reference whose period coincides with the period of the desired reference. That is, to add a periodic admissible reference trajectory $(x_s(k|t), u_s(k|t))$ as decision variable of

the optimization problem, resulting in:

$$\min_{\substack{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \\ \mathbf{x}_s, \mathbf{u}_s}} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \left(\|x(k|t) - x_s(k|t)\|_Q^2 + \|u(k|t) - u_s(k|t)\|_R^2 \right) + V_p(\mathbf{x}_s, \mathbf{u}_s; x_r(t), u_r(t)) \quad (9a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } x(0|t) = x(t), \quad (9b)$$

$$x(k+1|t) = Ax(k|t) + Bu(k|t), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0^{N-1}, \quad (9c)$$

$$\underline{y} \leq Ex(k|t) + Fu(k|t) \leq \bar{y}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0^{N-1}, \quad (9d)$$

$$x(N|t) = x_s(N|t), \quad (9e)$$

$$x_s(0|t) = Ax_s(T_p - 1|t) + Bu_s(T_p - 1|t), \quad (9f)$$

$$x_s(k+1|t) = Ax_s(k|t) + Bu_s(k|t), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0^{T_p-2}, \quad (9g)$$

$$\underline{y} + \sigma \mathbf{1}_{n_y} \leq Ex_s(k|t) + Fu_s(k|t) \leq \bar{y} - \sigma \mathbf{1}_{n_y}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0^{T_p-1}, \quad (9h)$$

where $\mathbf{x}_s \doteq (x_s(0|t), \dots, x_s(T_p - 1|t))$ and $\mathbf{u}_s \doteq (u_s(0|t), \dots, u_s(T_p - 1|t))$, with $x_s(k|t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ and $u_s(k|t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0^{T_p-1}$. Constraint (9f) forces the artificial reference to be a periodic trajectory with period T_p . The offset cost function $V_p(\cdot)$ penalizes the distance between the periodic artificial reference and the desired periodic reference along the length of their periods; the typical choice is

$$V_p(\mathbf{x}_s, \mathbf{u}_s; x_r(t), u_r(t)) = \sum_{k=0}^{T_p-1} \|x_s(k|t) - x_r(k+t)\|_T^2 + \|u_s(k|t) - u_r(k+t)\|_S^2,$$

where $T \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_x}$ and $S \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u \times n_u}$ are positive definite. The stage cost term of the cost function and the other constraints of (9) resemble the ones from the MPCT (4). Indeed, both formulations force the terminal state $x(N|t)$ to reach the artificial reference, cf. (4e) and (9e), and both impose the artificial reference to be admissible, cf. (4f), (4g), (9g) and (9h).

The periodic MPCT (9) shares the same two main properties of MPCT (4), namely, recursive feasibility and asymptotic stability. The following theorems formally state these two properties. Proofs can be found in [11].

Theorem 3 (Recursive feasibility of periodic MPCT) *Let $x(t)$ belong to the feasibility region of the periodic MPCT formulation (9). Let $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_s$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_s$ be any feasible solution of (9) for a given periodic reference trajectory $(x_r(t), u_r(t))$ with period T_p . Then, at time $t+1$, the successor state $x(t+1) = Ax(t) + B\tilde{\mathbf{u}}(0|t)$ belongs to the feasibility region of (9) for any periodic reference trajectory with period T_p , not necessarily equal to $(x_r(t), u_r(t))$.*

Note that the periodic reference can be changed between sample times, but not the period of the reference. In the periodic case, the MPCT formulation asymptotically steers the system to the optimal reachable *periodic* reference, which is a unique periodic trajectory determined by the offset cost function $V_p(\cdot)$.

Definition 4 (Optimal reachable periodic reference) Given a periodic reference trajectory $(x_r(t), u_r(t))$ with period T_p , we define the *optimal reachable periodic reference* of the MPCT formulation (9) as the unique solution $(\mathbf{x}_r^\circ, \mathbf{u}_r^\circ)$ of the strongly convex optimization problem

$$(\mathbf{x}_r^\circ, \mathbf{u}_r^\circ) = \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}} V_p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}; x_r(0), u_r(0)) \quad (10a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } x(0) = Ax(T_p - 1) + Bu(T_p - 1) \quad (10b)$$

$$x(k+1) = Ax(k) + Bu(k), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0^{T_p-2} \quad (10c)$$

$$\underline{y} + \sigma \mathbf{1}_{n_y} \leq Ex(t) + Fu(t) \leq \bar{y} - \sigma \mathbf{1}_{n_y}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0^{T_p-1}, \quad (10d)$$

where for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0^{T_p-1}$, $x_r^\circ(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$, $u_r^\circ(i) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$, $\mathbf{x}_r^\circ \doteq (x_r^\circ(0), x_r^\circ(1), \dots, x_r^\circ(T_p - 1))$, and $\mathbf{u}_r^\circ \doteq (u_r^\circ(0), u_r^\circ(1), \dots, u_r^\circ(T_p - 1))$. The optimal solution $(\mathbf{x}_r^\circ, \mathbf{u}_r^\circ)$ defines a periodic trajectory $(x_r^\circ(t), u_r^\circ(t))$ with period T_p .

Theorem 4 (Asymptotic stability of periodic MPCT) Let $(x_r(t), u_r(t))$ be the desired periodic reference trajectory. Assume that the initial state $x(0)$ belongs to the feasibility region of (9) and that the prediction horizon N is greater or equal to the controllability index of system (1). Then, system (1) controlled with the control law of the periodic MPCT formulation (9) is stable, fulfills the system constraints for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$, and asymptotically converges to the optimal reachable periodic reference $(x_r^\circ(t), u_r^\circ(t))$ given by Definition 4.

Remark 3 As with the MPCT formulation (4), the periodic MPCT formulation (9) will steer the system to the desired periodic reference trajectory if it is strictly admissible³ (see Definition 3). Otherwise, it will steer the system to the “closest” admissible trajectory of the system, i.e., to the optimal reachable periodic reference $(x_r^\circ(t), u_r^\circ(t))$ given by Definition 4.

The periodic MPCT formulation (9) is a QP problem, and can thus be solved using any of the many available QP solvers from the literature [5, 6]. However, we note that one of its drawbacks is that the number of decision variables and constraints of its optimization problem grows with the length of the period T_p . Indeed, constraints (9g) and (9h) impose the dynamics and constraints of the system on the artificial periodic reference throughout its period T_p . Note that a requirement of (9) is that the artificial periodic reference has the same period as the desired periodic reference. Therefore, the complexity of the optimization problem depends on the period of the reference to be tracked. This may lead to non-viable computation times and memory requirements for its online implementation if the prediction horizon is too large, especially when considering its implementation in embedded systems.

³ For some sufficiently small $\sigma > 0$.




Fig. 4: Closed-loop results of the ball and plate system using periodic MPCT (9).

3.1 Applying periodic MPCT to the ball and plate system

We now present results applying the periodic MPCT formulation (9) to the ball and plate system presented in Section 2.1. As in Section 2.1, we show closed-loop results for both an admissible and a non-admissible periodic reference trajectory, both with $T_p = 25$. The ingredients of the periodic MPCT formulation (9) are taken as $N = 15$, $Q = \text{diag}(10, 0.05, 0.05, 0.05, 10, 0.05, 0.05, 0.05)$, $R = \text{diag}(0.5, 0.5)$, $T = Q$ and $S = R$. Note that we take the same N , Q and R used in Section 2.1 for the MPCT formulation (4). We take the period of the artificial reference as $T_p = 25$.

Figure 4 shows the closed-loop results. Again, note that the periodic MPCT formulation (9) steers the system to the desired periodic reference when it is admissible. Otherwise, it steers it to the optimal reachable periodic reference. The non-admissible periodic reference used in Figures 4c and 4d is in fact only partially non-admissible. Note how the periodic MPCT controller tracks the reference when it is admissible, and tries to be as close as possible to it when it violates the constraints. Closeness in this case is also given by Euclidean distance, since matrices T and S are diagonal, although other measured of distance can be considered by taking non-diagonal positive definite matrices instead.

Remark 4 For the closed-loop results shown in Figure 4, periodic MPCT (9) is solved using the MATLAB interface of version v0.6.2 of the OSQP solver [5].

4 Harmonic MPC for tracking

This section presents a recent tracking MPC formulation that is inspired by both the MPCT (4) and periodic MPCT (9) formulations. The idea of this formulation is to use a parametrized harmonic signal as the artificial reference, i.e., to use a particular type of periodic trajectory as the artificial reference, instead of the generic trajectory used in (9). However, its control objective is to track a steady state, as in MPCT (4), instead of a periodic reference.


This new formulation, originally presented in [25, 26] and which we call *harmonic MPC* (HMPC) for obvious reasons, has advantages and disadvantages when compared to the classical MPCT formulation (4) and its periodic extension (9). Let us start by taking a look at an example that highlights a drawback of MPCT (4) that motivates the HMPC formulation.

Example 1 (Performance of MPCT with small prediction horizons) Let us consider the ball and plate system and MPCT controller presented in Section 2.1. Figure 5a shows the closed-loop trajectory of the system using different prediction horizons, including the prediction horizon $N = 15$ used in Section 2.1. Note that the performance degrades significantly as the prediction horizon decreases, in that the convergence towards the desired reference is much slower. The reason why this happens can be seen in Figure 5b, which shows a snapshot of sample time 20 of the simulation in Figure 5a for the prediction horizon $N = 8$. What we observe is that the velocity of the ball is not increasing much beyond the value of 0.05, in spite of its upper bound being 0.1. The reason for this is the presence of the terminal equality constraints (4e) along with the other constraints of the system (in particular the input constraints). It is easy to see that all steady states of the ball and plate system have a velocity equal to 0, i.e., $\dot{p}_1 = \dot{p}_2 = 0$. Thus, only states $x(t)$ that can reach a resting position in N sample times may belong to the feasibility region of problem (4). Therefore, the reason why the speed of the ball is so small in Figure 5b, is that the velocity cannot be any higher due to the input constraints, or else there would be no feasible way of reaching a steady state in $N = 8$ sample times. This issue is even more noticeable for smaller prediction horizons.

Obviously, the issue highlighted in Example 1 becomes less prevalent as the prediction horizon is increased. Indeed, after $N = 15$ there is no noticeable performance improvement⁴. Still, it shows that the MPCT formulation can suffer from performance issues if the prediction horizon is too small. In fact, we find that this issue is rather prevalent when dealing with systems with integral states and/or slew-rate constraints on the inputs⁵. The problem comes from the fact that the MPCT formulation (4) requires the artificial reference (x_s, u_s) to be a steady state. This, along with the system constraints (4d) and use of a terminal equality constraint (4e), may restrict the feasibility region if the prediction horizon is too small. Therefore, an immediate idea to solve this issue is to relax either the terminal equality constraint (4e)

⁴ Which is the reason why this prediction horizon was chosen in the first place.


⁵ That is, constraints on the rate of change of the inputs.



(a) Trajectory of position of ball on axis 1 using MPCT (4) with different prediction horizons.

(b) Sample time 20 using MPCT (4) with a prediction horizon of $N = 8$.

Fig. 5: Example 1: performance issue of MPCT with small prediction horizons.



(a) Trajectory of position of ball on axis 1.

(b) Trajectory of velocity of ball on axis 1.

Fig. 6: Applying the periodic MPCT (9) with $N = 8$ and $T_p = 15$ to Example 1.

or the steady state requirement on the artificial reference (4f). The terminal equality constraint (4e) could be substituted by a more general terminal ingredient in the form of a classical terminal positive invariant set centered at x_s . However, this would require the computation of a positive invariant set of the system and the addition of the constraints required to impose it in the optimization problem.

The other solution is to relax the steady state requirement of the artificial reference. A first idea would be to use the periodic MPCT formulation (9), since a steady state reference (x_r, u_r) can be interpreted as a *constant* periodic reference $(x_r(t), u_r(t))$ with any period T_p . Figure 6 shows the application of the periodic MPCT formulation (9) with $N = 8$ and $T_p = 15$ to track the steady state of Figure 5. The results show that the periodic MPCT formulation with $N = 8$ has a similar performance to the MPCT formulation (4) with a prediction horizon $N = 15$, cf. Figure 5a. Figure 6b shows that in this case the velocity of the ball reaches its upper bound. However, the issue with this solution is that, as discussed in Section 3, the complexity of the periodic MPCT formulation (9) increases with the size of the period T_p . Thus, the use of the periodic MPCT formulation, as an alternative to MPCT (4), has little-to-no advantage over simply increasing the prediction horizon N of (4). Instead, we are interested in a tracking MPCT formulation that has a larger domain of attraction and better performance than the MPCT (4), when working with small prediction horizons, but without requiring a significantly larger computational cost. This objective is achieved by the HMPC formulation.

4.1 The harmonic MPC formulation

Let us start by formally defining a *harmonic signal* evolving in discrete time t .

Definition 5 (Harmonic signal) A discrete-time trajectory $v(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$, with $t \in \mathbb{N}$, is a *harmonic signal* if it satisfies

$$v(t) = v_e + v_s \sin(\omega t) + v_c \cos(\omega t), \quad (11)$$

for some parameters $v_e, v_s, v_c \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and *base frequency* $\omega > 0$.

A harmonic signal $v(t)$ is determined by three parameters: v_e , which determines the *bias* (or *center*) of the signal, and v_s, v_c , which determine the magnitude of its *sine* and *cosine* terms, respectively. Additionally, the period of the harmonic signal is determined by the choice of its *base frequency* ω . For convenience, in the following we define the Cartesian product of the three parameters describing a harmonic signal $v(t)$ using the bold font \mathbf{v} , i.e., $\mathbf{v} \doteq (v_e, v_s, v_c) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^m$.

The idea behind the HMPC formulation is to use a harmonic signal as its artificial reference. Recall that the artificial references used in the previous sections are required to satisfy the system dynamics (1) and constraints (2). The same applies to the artificial reference of the HMPC formulation. Therefore, before proceeding with the formulation itself, we first present some additional definitions and properties related to the satisfaction of system dynamics and constraint by a harmonic signal.

Definition 6 (Admissible harmonic signals) The harmonic signals $\hat{x}(t)$ and $\hat{u}(t)$ with frequency $\omega > 0$, parametrized by $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \doteq (\hat{x}_e, \hat{x}_s, \hat{x}_c)$ and $\hat{\mathbf{u}} \doteq (\hat{u}_e, \hat{u}_s, \hat{u}_c)$, are said to be *admissible* for system (1) subject to (2) if they satisfy $\hat{x}(t+1) = A\hat{x}(t) + B\hat{u}(t)$ and $\underline{y} \leq E\hat{x}(t) + F\hat{u}(t) \leq \bar{y}$, $\forall t \in \mathbb{N}$. Furthermore, we say that they are *strictly admissible* if they satisfy $\underline{y} < E\hat{x}(t) + F\hat{u}(t) < \bar{y}$, $\forall t \in \mathbb{N}$.

The following two propositions provide sufficient conditions for a harmonic signal to be admissible. The reader can find their proofs in [25]. For clarity of presentation, in the following we use the notation

$$\hat{y}_e \doteq E\hat{x}_e + F\hat{u}_e, \quad \hat{y}_s \doteq E\hat{x}_s + F\hat{u}_s, \quad \hat{y}_c \doteq E\hat{x}_c + F\hat{u}_c.$$

Proposition 1 (Satisfaction of system dynamics) Let $\hat{x}(t)$ and $\hat{u}(t)$ be harmonic signals with the same frequency ω parametrized by $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \doteq (\hat{x}_e, \hat{x}_s, \hat{x}_c)$ and $\hat{\mathbf{u}} \doteq (\hat{u}_e, \hat{u}_s, \hat{u}_c)$. Consider the set

$$\mathcal{D} \doteq \left\{ (\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}) : \begin{array}{l} \hat{x}_e = A\hat{x}_e + B\hat{u}_e \\ \hat{x}_s \cos(\omega) - \hat{x}_c \sin(\omega) = A\hat{x}_s + B\hat{u}_s \\ \hat{x}_s \sin(\omega) + \hat{x}_c \cos(\omega) = A\hat{x}_c + B\hat{u}_c \end{array} \right\}.$$

Then, $(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}}) \in \mathcal{D}$ implies $\hat{x}(t+1) = A\hat{x}(t) + B\hat{u}(t)$, $\forall t \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proposition 2 (Satisfaction of the system constraints) Let $\hat{x}(t)$ and $\hat{u}(t)$ be harmonic signals with the same frequency ω parametrized by $\hat{\mathbf{x}} \doteq (\hat{x}_e, \hat{x}_s, \hat{x}_c)$ and $\hat{\mathbf{u}} \doteq (\hat{u}_e, \hat{u}_s, \hat{u}_c)$. For $\sigma \geq 0$, consider the set

$$C_\sigma \doteq \left\{ (\hat{x}, \hat{u}) : (\hat{y}_{e(i)}, \hat{y}_{s(i)}, \hat{y}_{c(i)}) \in \overline{\mathcal{Y}}_i \cap \underline{\mathcal{Y}}_i, i \in \mathbb{N}_1^{n_y} \right\},$$

where sets $\overline{\mathcal{Y}}_i$ and $\underline{\mathcal{Y}}_i$ are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\mathcal{Y}}_i &= \{y = (y_0, y_1) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^2 : \|y_1\| \leq \bar{y}_{(i)} - \sigma - y_0\}, \\ \underline{\mathcal{Y}}_i &= \{y = (y_0, y_1) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^2 : \|y_1\| \leq y_0 - \underline{y}_{(i)} - \sigma\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, $(\hat{x}, \hat{u}) \in C_\sigma$ implies $\underline{y} \leq E\hat{x}(t) + F\hat{u}(t) \leq \bar{y}, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}$. Furthermore, the constraints are strictly satisfied if $\sigma > 0$.

Corollary 1 *A harmonic signal satisfying Propositions 1 and 2 is an admissible harmonic signal of system (1) subject to the constraints (2). Furthermore, it is strictly admissible if Propositions 2 is satisfied for some $\sigma > 0$.*

The artificial reference of HMPC is taken as the harmonic signals

$$x_h(k) = x_e + x_s \sin(wk) + x_c \cos(wk), \quad (12a)$$

$$u_h(k) = u_e + u_s \sin(wk) + u_c \cos(wk), \quad (12b)$$

with $x_h \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$, $u_h \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$, and where $\mathbf{x}_h \doteq (x_e, x_s, x_c)$ and $\mathbf{u}_h \doteq (u_e, u_s, u_c)$ are decision variables of the HMPC optimization problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}_h, \mathbf{u}_h} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \left(\|x(k|t) - x_h(k)\|_Q^2 + \|u(k|t) - u_h(k)\|_R^2 \right) + V_h(\mathbf{x}_h, \mathbf{u}_h; x_r, u_r) \quad (13a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } x(k+1|t) = Ax(k|t) + Bu(k|t), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0^{N-1}, \quad (13b)$$

$$\underline{y} \leq Ex(k|t) + Fu(k|t) \leq \bar{y}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0^{N-1}, \quad (13c)$$

$$x(0|t) = x(t), \quad (13d)$$

$$x(N|t) = x_e + x_s \sin(wN) + x_c \cos(wN), \quad (13e)$$

$$(\mathbf{x}_h, \mathbf{u}_h) \in \mathcal{D}, \quad (13f)$$

$$(\mathbf{x}_h, \mathbf{u}_h) \in C_\sigma, \quad (13g)$$

with offset cost function

$$V_h(\mathbf{x}_h, \mathbf{u}_h; x_r, u_r) = \|x_e - x_r\|_{T_e}^2 + \|u_e - u_r\|_{S_e}^2 + \|x_s\|_{T_h}^2 + \|x_c\|_{T_h}^2 + \|u_s\|_{S_h}^2 + \|u_c\|_{S_h}^2, \quad (14)$$

and where $\mathbf{x} = (x(0|t), \dots, x(N|t))$, $\mathbf{u} = (u(0|t), \dots, u(N-1|t))$ and $\sigma \geq 0$ plays the same role as in the MPCT formulation (4). We assume that Q , R , T_e and S_e are positive definite matrices and that T_h and S_h are diagonal positive definite matrices.

Constraints (13b), (13c) and (13d) impose the typical MPC constraints; namely the imposition of the system dynamics, system constraints and current system state. Constraint (13e) is imposing the value of the terminal state $x(N|t)$ to be equal to $x_h(N)$, c.f., (12). That is, the terminal state is required to reach the artificial reference,

as in MPCT (4) and periodic MPCT (9). Finally, (13f) and (13g) are imposing that the artificial harmonic reference satisfies the system dynamics and constraints, as shown in Propositions 1 and 2.

Note that the design parameter w of the HMPC formulation (13) determines the period of its artificial harmonic reference (x_h, u_h) . However, the complexity of optimization problem (13) is independent of the value of w , since the number of constraints (13f) and (13g) required to impose the system dynamics and constraints on the artificial harmonic reference is fixed. Thus, parameter w can be freely chosen to increase the performance of the closed-loop system controlled with the HMPC formulation. This provides the main benefit of HMPC w.r.t. using the periodic MPCT formulation (9) to track a steady state desired reference. A detailed discussion of how to choose w is not included here due to space considerations. Instead, the reader is referred to [25, §VI.B] for discussion on how to select it.

Note that the stage cost in (13a) is no different from the one used in the tracking MPC formulations presented in previous sections. That is, it penalizes the discrepancy between the predicted states and inputs with the value of the artificial reference along the prediction horizon. On the other hand, the offset cost function is conceptually different to the ones used in the previous MPC for tracking formulations, although the overall idea is the same. The offset cost (14) penalizes, on one hand, the discrepancy between the *center* (x_e, u_e) of the artificial harmonic reference (12) with the desired reference (x_r, u_r) , and on the other, the magnitude of the sine and cosine terms x_s, x_c, u_s, u_c of the artificial harmonic reference. The end result of this is that as time t increases, $(x_e(t), u_e(t))$ will converge towards (x_r, u_r) and $x_s(t), x_c(t), u_s(t), u_c(t)$ will all converge to 0. The latter is always true, as we will formally state in what follows. That is, $x_s(t), x_c(t), u_s(t), u_c(t)$ all asymptotically converge to 0 as $t \rightarrow \infty$. The former, however, is only true if (x_r, u_r) is an admissible steady state of the system. Otherwise, as in the classical MPCT formulation (4), the HMPC formulation will converge to the admissible steady state that is closest to (x_r, u_r) , as measured by the offset cost function (14). Additionally, HMPC also guarantees recursive feasibility even if the desired reference is changed online. The following two theorems formalize the recursive feasibility and asymptotic stability properties of the HMPC formulation. Their proofs can be found in [25].

Theorem 5 (Recursive feasibility of the HMPC formulation) *Let $x(t)$ belong to the feasibility region of the HMPC formulation (13). Let $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}_h, \mathbf{u}_h$ be any feasible solution of (13) for a given reference $(x_r(t), u_r(t))$. Then, the successor state $Ax(t) + B\tilde{u}(0|t)$ belongs to the feasibility region of (13) for any reference $(x_r(t+1), u_r(t+1))$.*

The HMPC formulation asymptotically stabilizes the system to the *optimal reachable reference* determined by its offset cost function.

Definition 7 (Optimal reachable reference of HMPC (13)) Given a reference $(x_r, u_r) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$, we define the *optimal reachable reference* of the HMPC formulation (13) as the harmonic sequences $\{x_h^\circ(k)\}, \{u_h^\circ(k)\}, k \in \mathbb{N}$, parameterized by the unique solution $(\mathbf{x}_h^\circ, \mathbf{u}_h^\circ)$ of the strongly convex optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbf{x}_h^\circ, \mathbf{u}_h^\circ) &= \arg \min_{\mathbf{x}_h, \mathbf{u}_h} V_h(\mathbf{x}_h, \mathbf{u}_h; x_r, u_r) \\
\text{s.t. } (\mathbf{x}_h, \mathbf{u}_h) &\in \mathcal{D}, \\
(\mathbf{x}_h, \mathbf{u}_h) &\in C_\sigma.
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

The following proposition shows that, even though the HMPC formulation uses a *harmonic* artificial reference, its optimal reachable reference is always given by a admissible steady state of the system. Its proof can also be found in [25].

Proposition 3 (Characterization of $(\mathbf{x}_h^\circ, \mathbf{u}_h^\circ)$ for the HMPC formulation (13)) Consider the HMPC formulation (13). Then, for any $(x_r, u_r) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$, the optimal solution $(\mathbf{x}_h^\circ, \mathbf{u}_h^\circ)$ of problem (15) is given by $\mathbf{x}_h^\circ = (x_e^\circ, 0, 0)$ and $\mathbf{u}_h^\circ = (u_e^\circ, 0, 0)$, where $(x_e^\circ, u_e^\circ) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ is the steady state of (1) satisfying

$$\underline{y} + \sigma \mathbf{1}_{n_y} \leq E x_e^\circ + F u_e^\circ \leq \bar{y} - \sigma \mathbf{1}_{n_y} \tag{16}$$

that minimizes the cost $\|x_e^\circ - x_r\|_{T_e}^2 + \|u_e^\circ - u_r\|_{S_e}^2$.

Remark 5 The optimal reachable references of the HMPC formulation (13) and the MPCT formulation (4) coincide if $T_e = T$, $S_e = S$ and both formulations consider the same σ , cf. Proposition 3 and Definition 2.

Theorem 6 (Asymptotic stability of the HMPC formulation) Let (x_r, u_r) be a fixed desired reference. Assume that the initial state $x(0)$ belongs to the feasibility region of (13) and that the prediction horizon N is greater or equal to the controllability index of system (1). Then, system (1) controlled with the control law of the HMPC formulation (13) is stable, fulfills the system constraints for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$, and asymptotically converges to the optimal reachable reference $(x_e^\circ, u_e^\circ) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ given by Proposition 3.

The user may identify an apparent downside of the HMPC formulation (13): its optimization problem (13) is not a QP problem, as is the case in the MPCT formulation (4). This is due to the inclusion of the constraints (13g), which are second order cone (SOC) constraints. Therefore, problem (13) is a SOC programming problem, which in general is a class of optimization problem that is more difficult to solve than the well-studied class of QP problems. However, there are several efficient state-of-the-art solvers for SOC programming problems in the literature [6, 27]. Furthermore, in [28] the authors presented a solver for the HMPC formulation that is designed to efficiently deal with the SOC constraints (13g). The results in [28] show that the HMPC formulation (13) can be solved in computation times comparable to solving the MPCT formulation (4) using state-of-the-art QP solvers.

Remark 6 As a final remark, the authors would like to point out that the HMPC formulation (13) has been recently extended in [29] to the problem of tracking harmonic reference trajectories (11).




Fig. 7: Applying HMPC (13) with $N = 8$ to Example 1.

4.2 Performance benefits of the HMPC formulation: case study on the ball and plate system

As discussed in the introduction of this section, one of the main benefits of HMPC is its increased performance w.r.t. the MPCT formulation (4) when working with small prediction horizons. Indeed, Figure 7 shows the application of the HMPC formulation (13) to Example 1. As seen in Figure 7a, HMPC with $N = 8$ has a very similar behavior (and performance) to MPCT with $N = 15$. To see why, compare Figures 5b and 7b. As seen in Figure 7b, the speed of the ball reaches its maximum bound when using the HMPC formulation, even though the prediction horizon is $N = 8$. The reason why this is possible is that HMPC does not require the terminal state $x(N|t)$ to reach a steady state of the system. Instead, it requires it to reach some harmonic trajectory of the system. In terms of the position of the ball on the plate, this translates into a periodic trajectory of the ball on its surface.

Regarding the benefits of HMPC in terms of domain of attraction, we refer the reader to [26] for some numerical results highlighting the difference between MPCT (4) and HMPC (13) on an academic example. The argument for the larger domain of attraction of HMPC is simple: it is a generalization of the MPCT formulation (4)⁶ with more degrees of freedom. In other words, the terminal state $x(N|t)$ only needs to be able to reach *any* admissible harmonic signal of the system, instead of a steady state.

Finally, Figure 8 shows closed-loop results on the ball and plate system presented in Section 2.1 using the HMPC formulation (13). The figure considers the same setup and steady state references used in Section 2.1 (cf. Figure 3), taking the HMPC ingredients as $N = 8$, $Q = \text{diag}(10, 0.05, 0.05, 0.05, 10, 0.05, 0.05, 0.05)$, $R = \text{diag}(0.5, 0.5)$, $T_e = NQ$, $S_e = NR$, $T_h = T_e$, $S_h = S_e$ and $w = 0.3254$. Note that we take the same N , Q , R used in Section 2.1 for the MPCT formulation (4). Furthermore, T_e and S_e are taken as the ingredients T and S used for the MPCT formulation (4) in Section 2.1. Figures 8a and 8c show the trajectory of the element of x_e corresponding to the position p_1 of the ball. Note that its evolution is very similar to the artificial reference x_s of the MPCT formulation shown in Figure 3. In

⁶ Note that HMPC (13) is equivalent to MPCT (4) if $w = 0$ or any multiple of 2π .




Fig. 8: Closed-loop results of the ball and plate system using HMPC (13).

fact, the closed-loop results shown in Figure 8 are very similar to the ones obtained in Figure 3, i.e., to the ones obtained using the MPCT formulation (4) with the same ingredients but with a prediction horizon $N = 15$ (as also seen in Figure 7). The results highlight the performance advantage of the HMPC formulation when working with small prediction horizons, since the MPCT formulation (4) with a prediction horizon $N = 8$ performs much worse, as shown in Example 1 and Figure 5. Finally, note that the HMPC formulation steers the system to a steady state, even though its artificial reference is a harmonic signal, as stated in Proposition 3.

Remark 7 The closed-loop results for the HMPC formulation are obtained using version `v0.3.11` of the `Species` toolbox for MATLAB [8]. For comparisons between HMPC and MPCT in terms of their computation times, we refer the reader to [28].

5 Concluding remarks

This chapter has presented a light introduction to the classical *tracking* MPC formulation for piecewise-constant references, illustrating its benefits w.r.t. classical MPC formulations. Then, it has presented its extension for tracking periodic references as well as a recent extension, known as *harmonic* MPC, which draws inspiration from the periodic *tracking* MPC formulation. We have shown that *harmonic* MPC is designed to provide a very good performance and a large domain of attraction when working with very small prediction horizons.

Acknowledgements The authors acknowledge support from Grant PID2022-141159OB-I00 funded by MICIU/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and by ERDF/EU; Grant PDC2021-121120-C21 funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and by the “European Union NextGeneration EU/PRTR”; the MUR-PRO3 project on Software Quality; and the MUR-PRIN project DREAM (20228FT78M).

References

1. J. B. Rawlings, D. Q. Mayne, and M. Diehl, *Model predictive control: theory, computation, and design*. Nob Hill Publishing Madison, WI, 2017, vol. 2.
2. E. F. Camacho and C. B. Alba, *Model Predictive Control*, 2nd ed. London, UK: Springer-Verlag, 2007.
3. D. Limon, I. Alvarado, T. Alamo, and E. F. Camacho, “MPC for tracking piecewise constant references for constrained linear systems,” *Automatica*, vol. 44, no. 9, p. 2382–2387, 2008.
4. F. Blanchini, “Set invariance in control,” *Automatica*, vol. 35, no. 11, p. 1747–1767, 1999.
5. B. Stellato, G. Banjac, P. Goulart, A. Bemporad, and S. Boyd, “OSQP: An operator splitting solver for quadratic programs,” *Mathematical Programming Computation*, vol. 12, no. 4, p. 637–672, 2020.
6. B. O’Donoghue, “Operator splitting for a homogeneous embedding of the linear complementarity problem,” *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 31, p. 1999–2023, August 2021.
7. P. Krupa, D. Limon, and T. Alamo, “Implementation of model predictive control in programmable logic controllers,” *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 29, no. 3, p. 1117–1130, 2021.
8. P. Krupa, V. Gracia, D. Limon, and T. Alamo, “Spices: Suite of predictive controllers for industrial embedded systems,” <https://github.com/GepocUS/Spices>, Dec 2020.
9. A. Ferramosca, D. Limon, I. Alvarado, T. Alamo, and E. Camacho, “MPC for tracking with optimal closed-loop performance,” *Automatica*, vol. 45, no. 8, p. 1975–1978, 2009.
10. D. Limon, A. Ferramosca, I. Alvarado, and T. Alamo, “Nonlinear MPC for tracking piecewise constant reference signals,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 63, no. 11, p. 3735–3750, 2018.
11. D. Limon, M. Pereira, D. M. de la Peña, T. Alamo, C. N. Jones, and M. N. Zeilinger, “MPC for tracking periodic references,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 61, no. 4, p. 1123–1128, 2016.
12. D. Limon, T. Alamo, D. M. de la Peña, M. N. Zeilinger, C. Jones, and M. Pereira, “MPC for tracking periodic reference signals,” *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 45, no. 17, pp. 490–495, 2012.
13. D. Limon, M. Pereira, D. M. de la Peña, T. Alamo, and J. Grosso, “Single-layer economic model predictive control for periodic operation,” *Journal of Process Control*, vol. 24, no. 8, p. 1207–1224, 2014.
14. D. Limon, I. Alvarado, T. Alamo, and E. F. Camacho, “Robust tube-based MPC for tracking of constrained linear systems with additive disturbances,” *Journal of Process Control*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 248–260, 2010.
15. M. Pereira, D. M. de la Peña, D. Limon, I. Alvarado, and T. Alamo, “Robust model predictive controller for tracking changing periodic signals,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, no. 10, pp. 5343–5350, 2016.
16. P. Krupa, I. Alvarado, D. Limon, and T. Alamo, “Implementation of model predictive control for tracking in embedded systems using a sparse extended ADMM algorithm,” *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 1798–1805, 2021.
17. V. Gracia, P. Krupa, D. Limon, and T. Alamo, “Efficient implementation of MPC for tracking using ADMM by decoupling its semi-banded structure,” in *22nd European Control Conference (ECC)*, 2024, arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.09912.

18. S. Boyd, N. Parikh, E. Chu, B. Peleato, and J. Eckstein, "Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers," *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, vol. 3, no. 1, p. 1–122, 2011.
19. X. Cai, D. Han, and X. Yuan, "On the convergence of the direct extension of ADMM for three-block separable convex minimization models with one strongly convex function," *Computational Optimization and Applications*, vol. 66, pp. 39–73, 2017.
20. P. Krupa, "Implementation of MPC in embedded systems using first order methods," Ph.D. dissertation, Universidad de Sevilla, 2021, available at arXiv:2109.02140.
21. Y. Wang, M. Sun, Z. Wang, Z. Liu, and Z. Chen, "A novel disturbance-observer based friction compensation scheme for ball and plate system," *ISA transactions*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 671–678, 2014.
22. M. Zanon, S. Gros, and M. Diehl, "A Lyapunov function for periodic economic optimizing model predictive control," in *52nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 5107–5112.
23. ———, "A periodic tracking MPC that is locally equivalent to periodic economic MPC," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 10 711–10 716, 2017.
24. M. A. Müller and L. Grüne, "Economic model predictive control without terminal constraints for optimal periodic behavior," *Automatica*, vol. 70, pp. 128–139, 2016.
25. P. Krupa, D. Limon, and T. Alamo, "Harmonic based model predictive control for set-point tracking," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 67, no. 1, pp. 48–62, 2022.
26. P. Krupa, M. Pereira, D. Limon, and T. Alamo, "Single harmonic based model predictive control for tracking," in *58th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 151–156.
27. M. Garstka, M. Cannon, and P. Goulart, "COSMO: A conic operator splitting method for convex conic problems," *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, vol. 190, no. 3, p. 779–810, 2021.
28. P. Krupa, D. Limon, A. Bemporad, and T. Alamo, "Efficiently solving the harmonic model predictive control formulation," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 9, p. 5568–5575, 2023.
29. ———, "Harmonic model predictive control for tracking periodic references," *arXiv:2310.16723*, 2023.