

Predictive control for nonlinear stochastic systems: Closed-loop guarantees with unbounded noise

Johannes Köhler, Melanie N. Zeilinger

Abstract—We present a stochastic predictive control framework for nonlinear systems subject to unbounded process noise with closed-loop guarantees. First, we first provide a conceptual shrinking-horizon framework that utilizes general probabilistic reachable sets and minimizes the expected cost. Then, we provide a tractable receding-horizon formulation that uses a nominal state and a simple constraint tightening. Both formulations ensure recursive feasibility, satisfaction of chance constraints, and bounds on the expected cost for the resulting closed-loop system. We provide a constructive design for probabilistic reachable sets of nonlinear systems using stochastic contraction metrics. We demonstrate the practicality of the proposed method through a simulation of a chain of mass-spring-dampers with nonlinear Coulomb friction. Overall, this paper provides a framework for computationally tractable stochastic predictive control approaches with closed-loop guaranteed for nonlinear systems with unbounded noise.

Index Terms—predictive control, chance constraints, nonlinear systems, stochastic systems, constrained control

I. INTRODUCTION

Model predictive control (MPC) is an optimization-based method that yields high-performance control for general nonlinear systems and ensures satisfaction of safety-critical constraints [1]. Robust MPC methods predict over-approximations of the robust reachable set to ensure constraint satisfaction for any admissible bounded noise [2]. However, such worst-case bounds can be overly conservative or simply inadequate if no bound on the noise is available. Stochastic MPC (SMPC) formulations avoid these problems by leveraging distributional information about the noise and allowing for a user-chosen probability of constraint violation [3]. In this paper, we address the design of SMPC schemes that yield suitable closed-loop guarantees for nonlinear systems subject to unbounded noise.

A. Related work

The design of SMPC schemes faces two key challenges:

- 1) Reformulate chance constraints as tractable deterministic conditions;
- 2) Derive a tractable finite-horizon problem that yields system-theoretic properties for the closed-loop system.

Probabilistic reachable sets for nonlinear systems: The reformulation of chance constraints can be equivalently posed as the computation of probabilistic reachable sets (RPS), i.e., sets which contain uncertain future states at least with a specified

probability [4, Def. 4]. For linear stochastic systems, such PRS can be efficiently computed using analytical bounds [4]–[7] or offline sampling [8]–[10]. For nonlinear stochastic systems, there exist many approaches to approximate PRS, such as (generalized) polynomial chaos [11], [12], sampling [13], [14], or linearization [15], see also the overviews [3], [16]. These methods typically trade off computational complexity with approximation errors and thus probabilistic containment is not guaranteed. In case of bounded noise, there exist many methods to compute valid over-approximations of the robust reachable set [17]–[19], such as contraction metrics [20]–[22]. Similarly, valid PRS can be effectively computed for nonlinear stochastic systems if robust bounds on the noise are available [23]–[25]. The computation of valid PRS for nonlinear systems subject to unbounded stochastic noise remains a challenging problem.

Closed-loop properties in SMPC: A key challenge in the design of SMPC schemes is that constraint violations are explicitly permitted with some non-zero probability. Hence, naïve implementations may lose feasibility and thus all closed-loop properties during online operation [26, Sec. IV.D]. Two conceptual SMPC frameworks to address this problem are *robust techniques* and *feasibility-preserving algorithms* (cf. [27, Sec. I]). Robust techniques impose more restrictive constraints to robustly ensure recursive feasibility for the worst-case noise realization. Corresponding linear and nonlinear SMPC schemes can be found in [2], [9], [10], [28], [29] and [24], [30], respectively. Key limitations include the requirement of a known worst-case bound on the noise and conservatism (cf. comparison in [27, Sec. IV]). In contrast, feasibility-preserving algorithms specify the initial condition in the SMPC formulation such that closed-loop properties are preserved independent of the realized noise [4], [5], [7], [31]–[33]. One particularly promising approach is indirect-feedback SMPC [7], which has been the basis for many recent extensions and developments [8], [34]–[36]. This approach leverages linear system dynamics and a nominal state initialization to define stochastic error dynamics that evolve completely independent of the variables optimized by the SMPC. As a result, chance constraints on the closed-loop system can be efficiently formulate as tightened deterministic constraints on the nominal state predicted by the SMPC. However, these developments in [7], [8], [34]–[36] strongly rely on the independence between the error and the nominal trajectory computed by the SMPC, which prohibits application to nonlinear systems. In [33], a feasibility-preserving SMPC for nonlinear systems is proposed that uses online adjustments on the probability level in the constraints to obtain closed-loop guarantees. However,

Institute for Dynamic Systems and Control, ETH Zürich, Zürich CH-8092, Switzerland (email: {jkoehle|mzeilinger}@ethz.ch).

Johannes Köhler was supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation under NCCR Automation (grant agreement 51NF40 180545).

application requires online evaluation of probability levels through sampling, which results in a significant increase in computational complexity and limits application to short finite-horizon problems. Overall, the design of tractable nonlinear SMPC schemes with closed-loop guarantees remains largely unsolved [37].

B. Contribution

We provide a computationally tractable framework for nonlinear SMPC that yields closed-loop guarantees for unbounded noise. This is based on three main technical contributions:

- We extend the indirect-feedback SMPC framework [7] to nonlinear systems by removing the independence assumption and using general RPS;
- We provide a tractable SMPC using a nominal system and tightened constraints;
- We design PRS for nonlinear systems with unbounded noise using stochastic contraction metrics [38], [39].

The resulting nonlinear SMPC scheme has a computational demand comparable to a nominal MPC scheme and ensures the following closed-loop properties:

- P1) Recursive feasibility;
- P2) Chance constraint satisfaction;
- P3) Bound on expected cost.

We demonstrate the practical applicability of these theoretical results with a numerical example involving a chain of mass-spring-dampers with nonlinear Coulomb friction.

Outline: We first present the problem setup (Sec. II) and propose a conceptual framework for SMPC with a shrinking-horizon formulation (Sec. III). Then, we provide a tractable formulation with nominal predictions (Sec. IV) and show how to compute RPS for nonlinear systems using stochastic contraction metrics (Sec. V). Afterwards, we summarize the overall design and provide a discussion (Sec. VI). Finally, we illustrate the results with a numerical example (Sec. VII) and end with a conclusion (Sec. VIII). Additional details regarding the offline design of contraction metrics, tightened constraints, and terminal cost/set can be found in Appendices A–C.

Notation: The set of integers in an interval $[a, b]$ is denoted by $\mathbb{I}_{[a,b]}$. By $u(a : b) \in \mathbb{U}^{b-a+1}$, $a, b \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$, we denote the sequence with elements $u(k) \in \mathbb{U}$, $k \in \mathbb{I}_{[a,b]}$. We denote the prediction for time i computed at time k by $\mathbf{u}_{i|k} \in \mathbb{U}$ and the sequence containing elements $i \in \mathbb{I}_{[a,b]}$ by $\mathbf{u}_{a:b|k} \in \mathbb{U}^{b-a+1}$. Whenever clear from the context, we denote the full predicted sequence by $\mathbf{u}_{\cdot|k}$. By $Q \succ 0$ ($\succeq 0$) we denote that a symmetric matrix Q is positive (semi)-definite and by $Q^{1/2}$ we denote the symmetric matrix square-root, i.e., $Q^{1/2}Q^{1/2} = Q$. We denote the Euclidean norm of a vector x by $\|x\| = \sqrt{x^\top x}$ and the weighted norm w.r.t. a positive definite matrix M by $\|x\|_M := \sqrt{x^\top M x}$. For two sets $\mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, the Minkowski sum is defined as $\mathbb{A} \oplus \mathbb{B} = \{a + b \mid a \in \mathbb{A}, b \in \mathbb{B}\}$ and the Pontryagin difference is $\mathbb{A} \ominus \mathbb{B} = \{c \mid c + b \in \mathbb{A} \forall b \in \mathbb{B}\}$. The probability of an event A is denoted by $\Pr[A]$. The expectation of a function $\delta(w)$ over a random variable w is denoted by $\mathbb{E}_w[\delta(w)]$ and the expectation conditioned on an event A is given by $\mathbb{E}_w[\delta(w) \mid A]$. By \mathcal{K}_∞ , we denote the set

of continuous functions $\alpha : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ that are strictly increasing, unbounded, and satisfy $\alpha(0) = 0$. For a continuously differentiable function $f : \mathbb{R}^a \times \mathbb{R}^b \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^c$, $f(x, u)$, the partial derivative w.r.t. x evaluated at some point $(x, u) = (z, v)$ is defined as $\left. \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right|_{(z,v)} \in \mathbb{R}^{c \times a}$ and the total derivative w.r.t. a variable $w \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is denoted by $\left. \frac{df}{dw} \right|_{(z,v)} \in \mathbb{R}^{c \times d}$.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

We consider a nonlinear stochastic system

$$x(k+1) = f(x(k), u(k), w(k)), \quad x(0) = x_0, \quad (1)$$

with state $x(k) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, input $u(k) \in \mathbb{U} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, process noise $w(k) \in \mathbb{R}^q$, discrete time $k \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$, initial condition $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and input constraint \mathbb{U} . The dynamics f are known and the state $x(k)$ can be measured.

Assumption 1. (*Stochastic noise*) The noise $w(k)$ is independently distributed according to distributions $\mathcal{Q}_w(k)$ with zero mean and a variance bound $\Sigma_w \succ 0$, i.e., $\mathbb{E}_{w(k)}[w(k)] = 0$, $\mathbb{E}_{w(k)}[w(k)w(k)^\top] \preceq \Sigma_w$, $\forall k \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$.

We impose chance constraints of the form

$$\Pr[x(k) \in \mathbb{X}] \geq p \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbb{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is some closed set and $p \in (0, 1)$ is a desired probability level. We define the finite-horizon cost

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_N(x(0 : N), u(0 : N-1)) \\ := \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \ell(x(k), u(k)) + V_f(x(N)), \end{aligned}$$

with a user chosen stage cost $\ell : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, a terminal cost $V_f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and a horizon $N \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 1}$. We assume that f, ℓ, V_f are continuous and \mathbb{U} is compact. Ideally, we would like to solve the following stochastic optimal control problem

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\pi} \lim_{\bar{N} \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\bar{N}} \mathbb{E}_{w(0:\bar{N})} [\mathcal{J}_{\bar{N}}(x(0 : \bar{N}), u(0 : \bar{N}-1))] \quad (3) \\ \text{s.t. (1), (2), } u(k) = \pi_k(w(0 : k-1)) \in \mathbb{U}, k \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}, \end{aligned}$$

where π are causal policies that minimize the infinite-horizon expected cost and ensure satisfaction of the chance constraints (2) $\forall k \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$. Problem (3) is not computationally tractable for multiple reasons: (i) optimization over policies π ; (ii) infinite prediction horizon, and (iii) chance constraints (2). In this paper, we derive a computational tractable SMPC scheme that uses a receding-horizon implementation, optimizes open-loop inputs, and uses PRS to ensure satisfaction of the chance constraints.

Remark 1. (*Probabilistic input constraints*) In SMPC, input constraints $u(k) \in \mathbb{U}$ are often relaxed to probabilistic input constraints $\Pr[u(k) \in \mathbb{U}] \geq p$ [4], [7], [31], [32]. We consider hard input constraints due to their prevalence in practical applications and to simplify the exposition of PRS. However, the presented results can be naturally adjusted to this setup, see Section VI-5 for details.

III. SMPC USING PRS - THE SHRINKING-HORIZON CASE

In this section, we present the theoretical framework for nonlinear SMPC using general PRS. We first consider a shrinking-horizon problem with some finite horizon $N \in \mathbb{I}_{>0}$ and treat the more general receding-horizon problem in Section IV. We focus on how to incorporate the state measurement $x(k)$ in the SMPC and the resulting closed-loop properties. To this end, we consider the following definition of PRS.

Definition 1 (PRS). Consider system (1) in closed loop with any causal policy $u(k) = \pi_k(w(0 : k-1)) \in \mathbb{U}$, $k \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$. A sequence of sets \mathcal{R}_k , $k \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$ are probabilistic reachable sets (PRS) if

$$\Pr [x(k) \in \mathcal{R}_k] \geq p, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}. \quad (4)$$

In this paper, we focus on optimizing open-loop input sequences and consider the following parametrization of PRS.

Assumption 2 (PRS). We know a sequence of closed parametrized sets $\mathcal{R}_k : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{U}^k \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{R}^n}$, $k \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$, such that $\mathcal{R}_k(x_0, u(0 : k-1))$, $k \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$, are PRS (Definition 1).

The constructive design of such PRS is studied in Section V. At each time $k \in \mathbb{I}_{[0, N-1]}$, the proposed shrinking-horizon SMPC considers the following optimization problem:

$$\inf_{\mathbf{u}_{0:N-1|k} \in \mathbb{U}^N} \mathbb{E}_{w(k:N-1)} [\mathcal{J}_{N-k}(\mathbf{x}_{k:N|k}, \mathbf{u}_{k:N-1|k})] \quad (5a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \mathcal{R}_i(x_0, \mathbf{u}_{0:i-1|k}) \subseteq \mathbb{X}, \quad (5b)$$

$$\mathbf{u}_{0:k-1|k} = u(0 : k-1), \quad (5c)$$

$$\mathbf{x}_{k|k} = x(k), \quad (5d)$$

$$\mathbf{x}_{i+1|k} = f(\mathbf{x}_{i|k}, \mathbf{u}_{i|k}, w(i)), \quad (5e)$$

$$w(i) \sim \mathcal{Q}_w(i), \quad (5f)$$

$$i \in \mathbb{I}_{[k, N-1]},$$

which depends on the current state $x(k)$ and the past applied inputs $u(0 : k-1)$. We assume that a minimizing input sequence exists¹, which is denoted by $\mathbf{u}_{k|k}^* \in \mathbb{U}^N$. In closed-loop operation, we solve Problem (5) at each time $k \in \mathbb{I}_{[0, N-1]}$ and apply the optimized input for this point in time, i.e., $u(k) = \mathbf{u}_{k|k}^*$. Similar to the indirect-feedback SMPC framework [7], the state measurement $x(k)$ only appears in the expected cost through the stochastic prediction (5d)–(5f). The chance constraints (2) are enforced through the constraints (5b), which do not directly dependent on the past random noise realizations $w(0 : k-1)$. The constraint (5c) ensures that the optimized inputs are consistent with the already applied inputs. The following theorem formalizes the closed-loop properties of the proposed shrinking-horizon SMPC formulation.

Theorem 1. Let Assumptions 1–2 hold and suppose Problem (5) is feasible at $k = 0$. Then, Problem (5) is feasible and the chance constraints (2) are satisfied for the resulting closed-

¹If f, ℓ, V_f are uniformly continuous, then the expected cost is a well-defined continuous function of $\mathbf{u}_{i|k}$, see [30, Lemma 16]. In this case, compact constraints \mathbb{U} and the closed constraints (5b) ensure that a minimizer exists for each $x(k) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $k \in \mathbb{I}_{[0, N-1]}$, assuming the problem is feasible.

loop system for all $k \in \mathbb{I}_{[0, N-1]}$. Furthermore, the closed-loop cost satisfies the following bound:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{w(0:N-1)} [\mathcal{J}_N(x(0 : N), u(0 : N-1))] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}_{w(0:N-1)} \left[\mathcal{J}_N(\mathbf{x}_{0:N|0}^*, \mathbf{u}_{0:N-1|0}^*) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Proof. Recursive feasibility: Given that an optimal input sequence $\mathbf{u}_{0:N-1|k}^*$ at some time $k \in \mathbb{I}_{[0, N-2]}$, $\mathbf{u}_{0:N-1|k+1} = \mathbf{u}_{0:N-1|k}^*$ is a feasible solution to Problem (5) at time $k+1$. In particular, the constraints (5b) remain unaltered, the added constraint in (5c) remains valid with $\mathbf{u}_{k|k}^* = u(k)$, and the stochastic prediction $\mathbf{x}_{i|k+1}$ (5e) does not affect feasibility.

Closed-loop chance constraint satisfaction: First note that Problem (5) yields a causal policy $u(k) = \pi_k(w(0 : k-1))$, considering also (5c) and independently distributed noise w (Asm. 1). For any $k \in \mathbb{I}_{[0, N-1]}$, feasibility of Problem (5) ensures $\mathcal{R}_k(x_0, u(0 : k-1)) = \mathcal{R}_k(x_0, \mathbf{u}_{0:k-1|k}^*) \subseteq \mathbb{X}$. Assumption 2 with the PRS definition (Def. 1) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr [x(k) \in \mathbb{X}] & \stackrel{(5b)}{\geq} \Pr \left[x(k) \in \mathcal{R}_k(x_0, \mathbf{u}_{0:k-1|k}^*) \right] \\ & \stackrel{(5c)}{=} \Pr [x(k) \in \mathcal{R}_k(x_0, u(0 : k-1))] \stackrel{(4)}{\geq} p, \end{aligned}$$

i.e., the chance constraint (2) holds for the closed-loop system.

Expected cost: Denote $\mathbf{x}_{0:k|k}^* = x(0 : k)$ and by $\mathbf{x}_{k+1:N|k}^*$ the stochastic prediction (5d)–(5f) using $\mathbf{u}_{k:k+N-1|k}^*$. Consider an arbitrary time $k \in \mathbb{I}_{[0, N-1]}$ and note that Problem (5) minimizes the cost

$$\mathbb{E}_{w(k:N-1)} [\mathcal{J}_N(\mathbf{x}_{i:k|k}, \mathbf{u}_{i:k|k}) | w(0 : k-1)],$$

where the first k elements of the cost are constant and the conditioning on $w(0 : k-1)$ uniquely invokes $x(0 : k)$ and $u(0 : k-1)$. For any $k \in \mathbb{I}_{[0, N-2]}$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{w(k:N-1)} [\mathcal{J}_N(\mathbf{x}_{i:k|k}^*, \mathbf{u}_{i:k|k}^*) | w(0 : k-1)] \\ & = \mathbb{E}_{w(k)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{w(k+1:N-1)} [\mathcal{J}_N(\mathbf{x}_{i:k|k}^*, \mathbf{u}_{i:k|k}^*) | w(0 : k)] \right] \\ & \geq \mathbb{E}_{w(k)} \left[\mathbb{E}_{w(k+1:N-1)} [\mathcal{J}_N(\mathbf{x}_{i:k+1|k+1}^*, \mathbf{u}_{i:k+1|k+1}^*) | w(0 : k)] \right], \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where the equality uses the law of iterated expectation. The inequality uses the fact that the optimal solution to Problem (5) at time k is a feasible solution at time $k+1$ and the inner expectation corresponds to the objective of Problem (5) at time $k+1$. Iteratively applying Inequality (7) for $k \in \mathbb{I}_{[0, N-2]}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{w(0:N-1)} [\mathcal{J}_N(x(0 : N), u(0 : N-1))] \\ & \stackrel{(5c)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}_{w(0:N-2)} [\mathbb{E}_{w(N-1)} [\mathcal{J}_N(\mathbf{x}_{i:N-1|N-1}^*, \mathbf{u}_{i:N-1|N-1}^*) | w(0 : N-2)]] \\ & \leq \dots \leq \mathbb{E}_{w(0)} [\mathbb{E}_{w(1:N-1)} [\mathcal{J}_N(\mathbf{x}_{i:1|1}^*, \mathbf{u}_{i:1|1}^*) | w(0)]] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}_{w(0:N-1)} [\mathcal{J}_N(\mathbf{x}_{i:0}^*, \mathbf{u}_{i:0}^*)]. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Inequality (6) ensures that the (expected) closed-loop cost is no larger than the cost of the open-loop optimal input sequence, i.e., re-optimization improves performance. Furthermore, Theorem 1 ensures that the constrained optimization problem (5) is feasible and the chance constraints (2) are satisfied for all $k \in \mathbb{I}_{[0, N-1]}$. Thus, this approach achieves all the desired properties, P1), P2), P3). However, the explicit dependence of Problem (5) on all past inputs limits applicability

to short horizon problems. Furthermore, Problem (5) requires the evaluation of the expected cost (5a) over the stochastic prediction (5d)–(5f), which is computationally expensive to evaluate. The next section addresses both issues by providing a tractable formulation.

IV. TRACTABLE SMPC SCHEME

In this section, we derive a tractable receding-horizon SMPC by introducing a nominal state z and over-approximating the PRS \mathcal{R}_k with a simpler parametrization. We define the nominal dynamics

$$z(k+1) = f(z(k), u(k), 0), \quad z(0) = x_0, \quad (8)$$

which correspond to (1) with $w(\cdot) \equiv 0$. The following condition introduces an over-approximation of the PRS \mathcal{R}_k using the nominal state z and known compact sets $\mathbb{D}_k \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, $k \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$.

Assumption 3. (PRS over-approximation) For any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $k \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$ and any $u(0 : k-1) \in \mathbb{U}^k$, it holds that

$$\mathcal{R}_k(x_0, u(0 : k-1)) \subseteq \{z(k)\} \oplus \mathbb{D}_k, \quad (9)$$

with $z(k)$ according to (8) and \mathcal{R}_k from Assumption 2.

With this more structured over-approximation, we can design a tractable finite-horizon SMPC scheme. At each time $k \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$, we solve the following optimization problem using the measured state $x(k)$ and the nominal state $z(k)$:

$$\min_{\mathbf{u}_{k:k+N-1|k} \in \mathbb{U}^N} \mathcal{J}_N(\mathbf{x}_{k:k+N|k}, \mathbf{u}_{k:k+N-1|k}) \quad (10a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \mathbf{z}_{k|k} = z(k), \quad (10b)$$

$$\mathbf{z}_{i+1|k} = f(\mathbf{z}_{i|k}, \mathbf{u}_{i|k}, 0), \quad (10c)$$

$$\mathbf{x}_{k|k} = x(k), \quad (10d)$$

$$\mathbf{x}_{i+1|k} = f(\mathbf{x}_{i|k}, \mathbf{u}_{i|k}, 0), \quad (10e)$$

$$\mathbf{z}_{i|k} \in \bar{\mathbb{X}}_i := \mathbb{X} \ominus \mathbb{D}_i, \quad (10f)$$

$$\mathbf{z}_{k+N|k} \in \bar{\mathbb{X}}_f, \quad (10g)$$

$$i \in \mathbb{I}_{[k, k+N-1]}. \quad (10h)$$

This problem uses a finite (receding) horizon $N \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 1}$ and a later specified closed terminal set $\bar{\mathbb{X}}_f \subseteq \mathbb{X}$. The closed-loop system is given by applying the minimizer² $u(k) = \mathbf{u}_{k|k}^*$ to the true system (1) and the nominal dynamics (8). Analogous to indirect-feedback SMPC [7], the tightened constraints (10f) and the terminal constraint (10g) are posed on the nominal prediction \mathbf{z} (10c), which is initialized in (10b) independent of the new measured state $x(k)$. The measured state $x(k)$ is used in a separate certainty-equivalent state prediction (10d)–(10e), which determines the cost (10a). The terminal set $\bar{\mathbb{X}}_f \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ and terminal cost V_f need to be chosen appropriately according to the following conditions [1].

Assumption 4. (Terminal set and cost) There exists an input $u_f \in \mathbb{U}$, such that:

- a) (Positive invariance) $f(x, u_f, 0) \in \bar{\mathbb{X}}_f \forall x \in \bar{\mathbb{X}}_f$;
- b) (Constraint satisfaction) $\bar{\mathbb{X}}_f \subseteq \bar{\mathbb{X}}_k = \mathbb{X} \ominus \mathbb{D}_k$, $k \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$;

²For any $x(k), z(k) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, a minimizer exists since the cost is a continuous function of $\mathbf{u}_{k:k+N-1|k} \in \mathbb{U}^N$ and \mathbb{U} is compact.

$$c) \text{ (Lyapunov)} \quad V_f(f(x, u_f, 0)) \leq V_f(x) - \ell(x, u_f) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

In Appendix C, we show how to constructively satisfy Assumption 4. The restriction to a constant terminal input u_f is a consequence of the optimization over open-loop input sequences (cf., e.g., [7, Asm. 3]), see also Section VI-5 for relaxations. In order to derive bounds on the closed-loop cost, we additionally consider the following standard regularity conditions.

Assumption 5. (Regularity conditions) The cost is given by $\ell(x, u) = \|x\|_Q^2 + \|u\|_R^2$, $V_f(x) = \|x\|_P^2$ with $Q, R, P \succ 0$. The origin is an equilibrium, i.e., $f(0, 0, 0) = 0$, and $0 \in \mathbb{U}$. The dynamics f are Lipschitz continuous.

The following theorem derives the closed-loop properties of the proposed SMPC formulation.

Theorem 2. Let Assumptions 1–5 hold and suppose that Problem (10) is feasible at $k = 0$. Then, Problem (10) is feasible and the chance constraints (2) are satisfied for the resulting closed-loop system for all $k \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$. Furthermore, there exists a function $\sigma \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$, such that the closed-loop cost satisfies the following bound:

$$\limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{w(0:T-1)} \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \ell(x(k), u(k)) \right] \leq \sigma(\text{tr}(\Sigma_w)). \quad (11)$$

Proof. Recursive feasibility: Given an optimal input sequence $\mathbf{u}_{k:k+N-1|k}^*$ at some time $k \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$, denote $\mathbf{u}_{k+N|k}^* = u_f \in \mathbb{U}$ and consider the candidate input sequence $\mathbf{u}_{i|k+1} = \mathbf{u}_{i|k}^*$, $i \in \mathbb{I}_{[k+1, k+N]}$. The corresponding nominal state sequence is given by $\mathbf{z}_{i|k+1} = \mathbf{z}_{i|k}^*$, $i \in \mathbb{I}_{[k+1, k+N]}$ using $u(k) = \mathbf{u}_{k|k}^*$, (10b), (10c), and (8). The noise $w(k)$ only affects the state $x(k+1)$ and hence $\mathbf{x}_{\cdot|k+1}$, which is not subject to any constraints. Feasibility of the candidate solution and thus recursive feasibility follows with standard nominal MPC arguments [1] using Assumptions 4 a)–b), $\mathbf{z}_{k+N|k+1} = \mathbf{z}_{k+N|k}^* \in \bar{\mathbb{X}}_f \subseteq \bar{\mathbb{X}}_{k+N}$, and $\mathbf{z}_{k+N+1|k+1} = f(\mathbf{z}_{k+N|k}^*, u_f, 0) \in \bar{\mathbb{X}}_f$.

Closed-loop chance constraint satisfaction: Consider the chance constraint (2) for some $k \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$ and $z(k) = \mathbf{z}_{k|k}^* \in \bar{\mathbb{X}}_k = \mathbb{X} \ominus \mathbb{D}_k$ from Problem (10). Assumption 3 ensures

$$\mathcal{R}_k(x_0, u(0 : k-1)) \stackrel{(9)}{\subseteq} \{z(k)\} \oplus \mathbb{D}_k \stackrel{(10b), (10f)}{\subseteq} \bar{\mathbb{X}}_k \oplus \mathbb{D}_k \stackrel{(10f)}{\subseteq} \mathbb{X}.$$

The inputs $u(0 : k-1)$ generated by the SMPC (10) correspond to a causal policy and hence Assumption 2 yields

$$\Pr[x(k) \in \mathbb{X}] \geq \Pr[x(k) \in \mathcal{R}_k(x_0, u(0 : k-1))] \stackrel{(4)}{\geq} p,$$

i.e., the chance constraint (2) holds.

Cost bound: This proof consistent of three steps: (i) deriving a bound on the one step decrease using the candidate solution; (ii) bounding the optimal cost of Problem (10) for any $x(k) \in \mathbb{R}^n$; (iii) deriving the asymptotic expected cost bound (11). (i): We denote the state sequence satisfying (10d)–(10e) with the candidate input $\mathbf{u}_{\cdot|k+1}$ by $\mathbf{x}_{\cdot|k+1}$ and define $\mathbf{x}_{k+N+1|k}^* = f(\mathbf{x}_{k+N|k}^*, \mathbf{u}_{k+N|k}^*, 0)$. Lipschitz continuity (Asm. 5) of the

dynamics (10d)–(10e) and (1) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{x}_{k+1|k+1} - \mathbf{x}_{k+1|k}^*\| &\leq L_f \|w(k)\|, \\ \|\mathbf{x}_{i|k+1} - \mathbf{x}_{i|k}^*\| &\leq L_f^{i-k} \|w(k)\|, \quad i \in \mathbb{I}_{[k+1, k+N+1]}, \end{aligned}$$

with Lipschitz constant $L_f \geq 0$. For any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, any positive semi-definite matrix $S \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, and any $\epsilon > 0$:

$$\frac{1}{1+\epsilon} \|x+y\|_S^2 \leq \|x\|_S^2 + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \|y\|_S^2. \quad (12)$$

Hence, for any $\epsilon > 0$, the quadratic cost (Asm. 5) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{1+\epsilon} \ell(\mathbf{x}_{i|k+1}, \mathbf{u}_{i|k+1}) &\leq \ell(\mathbf{x}_{i|k}^*, \mathbf{u}_{i|k}^*) + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \bar{Q} L_f^{i-k} \|w(k)\|^2, \\ \frac{1}{1+\epsilon} V_f(\mathbf{x}_{k+N+1|k+1}) &\leq V_f(\mathbf{x}_{k+N+1|k}^*) + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \bar{P} L_f^{N+1} \|w(k)\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{P} \geq \bar{Q} > 0$ are the maximal eigenvalues of P, Q , respectively. Let us denote the optimal cost of Problem (10) at time k by $\mathcal{J}_N^*(k) = \mathcal{J}_N(\mathbf{x}_{k:k+N|k}^*, \mathbf{u}_{k:k+N-1|k}^*)$. The feasible candidate solution implies

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{1+\epsilon} \mathcal{J}_N^*(k+1) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1+\epsilon} \mathcal{J}_N(\mathbf{x}_{k+1:k+N+1|k+1}, \mathbf{u}_{k+1:k+N|k+1}) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=k+1}^{k+N} \ell(\mathbf{x}_{i|k}^*, \mathbf{u}_{i|k}^*) + V_f(\mathbf{x}_{k+N+1|k}^*) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \|w(k)\|^2 \left(\sum_{i=k+1}^{k+N} \bar{Q} L_f^{i-k} + \bar{P} L_f^{N+1} \right) \\ &\stackrel{\text{Asm. 4c)}}{\leq} \sum_{i=k+1}^{k+N-1} \ell(\mathbf{x}_{i|k}^*, \mathbf{u}_{i|k}^*) + V_f(\mathbf{x}_{k+N|k}^*) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \|w(k)\|^2 \underbrace{\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \bar{Q} L_f^i + \bar{P} L_f^{N+1} \right)}_{=: c_{\mathcal{J}}} \\ &= \mathcal{J}_N^*(k) - \ell(x(k), u(k)) + \frac{c_{\mathcal{J}}}{\epsilon} \|w(k)\|^2, \quad (13) \end{aligned}$$

with $x(k) = \mathbf{x}_{k|k}^*$, $u(k) = \mathbf{u}_{k|k}^*$.

(ii): Next, we derive an upper bound on $\mathcal{J}_N^*(k)$ for any $x(k) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, using feasibility of Problem (10). Notably, the feasibility of Problem (10) does not imply a uniform bound on the state $x(k)$, as constraints are only imposed on the nominal prediction \mathbf{z} . This is also the main reason why existing techniques, such as [30], cannot be leveraged to derive bounds on $\mathcal{J}_N^*(k)$. We define an auxiliary input sequence $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{i|k} = u_f \in \mathbb{U}$, $i \in \mathbb{I}_{[k, k+N-1]}$, with the corresponding state sequence $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{i|k}$ according to (10d)–(10e). The cost of this sequence satisfies

$$\mathcal{J}_N(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{\cdot|k}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\cdot|k}) \leq V_f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{0|k}) = \|x(k)\|_P^2 \quad (14)$$

using the global properties of the terminal cost (Asm. 4 c)) recursively. Although this input sequence is not feasible solution to Problem (10), we can leverage it to bound the cost of the optimal solution. Using the bound $\bar{u} = \max_{u \in \mathbb{U}} \|u_f - u\|$

and Lipschitz continuity, we have

$$\|\mathbf{x}_{k+i|k}^* - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{k+i|k}\| \leq \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} L_f^{i-j} \|\mathbf{u}_{k+j|k}^* - u_f\| \leq \bar{u} \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} L_f^{i-j}.$$

Applying (12) with $\epsilon = 1$, we can bound the cost of the optimal sequence by

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(\mathbf{x}_{i|k}^*, \mathbf{u}_{i|k}) &\leq 2\ell(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{i|k}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{i|k}) + 2\bar{Q}\bar{u}^2 \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} L_f^{2(i-j)}, \\ V_f(\mathbf{x}_{k+N|k}^*) &\leq 2V_f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{k+N|k}) + 2\bar{P}\bar{u}^2 \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} L_f^{2(i-j)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the optimal cost satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_N^*(k) &= \mathcal{J}_N(\mathbf{x}_{\cdot|k}^*, \mathbf{u}_{\cdot|k}^*) \\ &\leq 2\mathcal{J}_N(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{\cdot|k}, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\cdot|k}) + 2\bar{u}^2 \max\{\bar{Q}, \bar{P}\} \underbrace{\sum_{i=0}^N \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} L_f^{2(i-j)}}_{=: c_{\mathcal{J},2}} \\ &\stackrel{(14)}{\leq} 2\|x(k)\|_P^2 + c_{\mathcal{J},2} \stackrel{\text{Asm. 5}}{\leq} c_\ell \ell(x(k), u(k)) + c_{\mathcal{J},2}, \quad (15) \end{aligned}$$

with $c_\ell := 2\bar{P}/\bar{Q} > 1$, where $\bar{Q} > 0$ is the smallest eigenvalue of $Q > 0$.

(iii): Inequalities (13) and (15) yield

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{J}_N^*(k+1) - \mathcal{J}_N^*(k) \\ &\stackrel{(13)}{\leq} \epsilon \mathcal{J}_N^*(k) - (1+\epsilon)\ell(x(k), u(k)) + \frac{1+\epsilon}{\epsilon} c_{\mathcal{J}} \|w(k)\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(15)}{\leq} -\ell(x(k), u(k))(1-\epsilon c_\ell) + \epsilon c_{\mathcal{J},2} + \frac{1+\epsilon}{\epsilon} c_{\mathcal{J}} \|w(k)\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Consider $\epsilon = \min\{\sqrt{\text{tr}(\Sigma_w)}, \frac{1}{2c_\ell}\} \in (0, 1)$, which satisfies $(1-\epsilon c_\ell) \geq \frac{1}{2}$, $\epsilon \leq \sqrt{\text{tr}(\Sigma_w)}$, and

$$\frac{1+\epsilon}{\epsilon} \text{tr}(\Sigma_w) \leq \frac{2}{\epsilon} \text{tr}(\Sigma_w) = 2 \max\left\{ \sqrt{\text{tr}(\Sigma_w)}, \frac{\text{tr}(\Sigma_w)}{2c_\ell} \right\}. \quad (17)$$

This yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{w(k)} \left[\mathcal{J}_N^*(k+1) - \mathcal{J}_N^*(k) + \frac{1}{2} \ell(x(k), u(k)) \mid w(0:k-1) \right] \\ &\stackrel{(16)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}_{w(k)} \left[\epsilon c_{\mathcal{J},2} + \frac{1+\epsilon}{\epsilon} c_{\mathcal{J}} \|w(k)\|^2 \mid w(0:k-1) \right] \\ &\stackrel{\text{Asm. 1}}{\leq} \epsilon c_{\mathcal{J},2} + \frac{1+\epsilon}{\epsilon} c_{\mathcal{J}} \text{tr}(\Sigma_w) \\ &\stackrel{(17)}{\leq} c_{\mathcal{J},2} \sqrt{\text{tr}(\Sigma_w)} + 2c_{\mathcal{J}} \max\left\{ \sqrt{\text{tr}(\Sigma_w)}, \frac{\text{tr}(\Sigma_w)}{2c_\ell} \right\} \\ &=: \tilde{\sigma}(\text{tr}(\Sigma_w)), \quad \tilde{\sigma} \in \mathcal{K}_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the law of iterated expectation for $k \in \mathbb{I}_{[0, T-1]}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \mathbb{E}_{w(0:T-1)}[\mathcal{J}_N^*(T)] \\ &\leq \mathcal{J}_N^*(0) + T\tilde{\sigma}(\text{tr}(\Sigma_w)) - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}_{w(0:T-1)} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \ell(x(k), u(k)) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality used non-negativity of the cost. Given $x(0) = z(0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, f Lipschitz continuous, \mathbb{U}

compact, and \mathcal{J}_N quadratic, we have $\mathcal{J}_N^*(0) < \infty$. Thus, dividing by T and taking the limit $T \rightarrow \infty$ yields (11) with $\sigma = 2\bar{\sigma} \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$. \square

Overall, Theorem 2 provides all the desired closed-loop guarantees: recursive feasibility P1), satisfaction of chance constraints P2), and a bound on the expected cost P3). The fact that the asymptotic expected cost scales with the variances mirrors existing results in SMPC [7], [30], see Section VI for a more detailed discussion. In the next section, we discuss how to design the PRS (Asm. 2–3).

V. PROBABILISTIC REACHABLE SETS USING STOCHASTIC CONTRACTION METRICS

In this section, we show how to construct a PRS satisfying Assumptions 2-3 using contraction metrics. First, we use stochastic contraction metrics to bound the expected prediction error (Sec. V-A) and then derive a PRS (Sec. V-B).

A. Stochastic contraction metrics

Contraction metrics utilize conditions on the Jacobian of the nonlinear dynamics f to ensure incremental system properties. Hence, we restrict our attention to continuous differentiable dynamics f that are linear in the (unbounded) noise w .

Assumption 6. *The dynamics are linear in w , i.e., $f(x, u, w) = f(x, u, 0) + Gw$ with some constant matrix $G \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times q}$. Furthermore, f is continuously differentiable.*

We denote the Jacobian of the dynamics f w.r.t. x by $A(x, u) := \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \Big|_{(x, u, 0)}$. The following theorem derives bounds on the expected error using stochastic contraction metrics.

Theorem 3. *Let Assumptions 1 and 6 hold. Consider a state-dependent matrix $M : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, which satisfies*

$$\frac{d}{dw} M(x + Gw) = 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, w \in \mathbb{R}^q. \quad (18a)$$

Suppose there exist positive definite matrices $\underline{M}, \bar{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, a contraction rate $\rho \in [0, 1)$, and a constant $\bar{w} \geq 0$, such that the following conditions hold for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n, u \in \mathbb{U}$:

$$\underline{M} \preceq M(x) \preceq \bar{M}, \quad (18b)$$

$$A(x, u)^\top M(f(x, u, 0)) A(x, u) \preceq \rho M(x), \quad (18c)$$

$$\text{tr}(\Sigma_w G^\top \bar{M} G) \leq \bar{w}. \quad (18d)$$

Then, there exists an incremental Lyapunov function $V_\delta : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, such that for any $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^n, u \in \mathbb{U}, k \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$:

$$\|x - z\|_{\underline{M}}^2 \leq V_\delta(x, z) \leq \|x - z\|_{\bar{M}}^2, \quad (19a)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_{w(k)} [V_\delta(f(x, u, w(k)), f(z, u, 0))] \leq \rho V_\delta(x, z) + \bar{w}. \quad (19b)$$

Proof. We first define V_δ and show the bounds (19a) before deriving the decreases condition (19b).

Part (i): Let us denote the set of piece-wise smooth curves $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ that satisfy $\gamma(0) = z$ and $\gamma(1) = x$ by

$\Gamma(z, x)$. We define the incremental Lyapunov function V_δ as the Riemannian energy corresponding to $M(x)$, i.e.,

$$V_\delta(x, z) := \min_{\gamma \in \Gamma(z, x)} \int_0^1 \frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial s} \Big|_s^\top M(\gamma(s)) \frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial s} \Big|_s ds. \quad (20)$$

A minimizer is called a geodesic γ^* , which exists due to the uniform lower bound (18b), see [40, Lemma 1]. Inequalities (19a) follow from (18b) using standard arguments, see, e.g., [41, Equ. (49)–(51)].

Part (ii): Denote $x^+ = f(x, u, w(k))$, $z^+ = f(z, u, 0)$. We derive a bound on $V_\delta(x^+, z^+)$ using the candidate curve $\gamma^+(s) = f(\gamma^*(s), u, \gamma_w(s))$ with $\gamma_w(s) = s \cdot w(k)$. With some abuse of notation, we abbreviate

$$A(s) = A(\gamma^*(s), u), \quad M(s) = M(\gamma^*(s)), \quad M^+(s) = M(\gamma^+(s)).$$

We denote the derivative of the geodesic by $\gamma_s^*(s) = \frac{\partial \gamma^*}{\partial s} \Big|_s$. The derivative of the candidate curve γ^+ satisfies

$$\gamma_s^+(s) := \frac{\partial \gamma^+}{\partial s} \Big|_s = A(s) \gamma_s^*(s) + Gw(k). \quad (21)$$

Note that $\gamma^* \in \Gamma(z, x)$ implies that $\gamma^+ \in \Gamma(z^+, x^+)$ and hence the energy of the curve γ^+ provides an upper bound to $V_\delta(x^+, z^+)$ according to (20). Thus, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{w(k)} [V_\delta(x^+, z^+)] &\leq \mathbb{E}_{w(k)} \left[\int_0^1 \gamma_s^+(s)^\top M^+(s) \gamma_s^+(s) ds \right] \\ &\stackrel{(21)}{=} \mathbb{E}_{w(k)} \left[\int_0^1 \|A(s) \gamma_s^*(s) + Gw(k)\|_{M^+(s)}^2 ds \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{w(k)} \left[\int_0^1 \|A(s) \gamma_s^*(s)\|_{M^+(s)}^2 + \|Gw(k)\|_{M^+(s)}^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2(A(s) \gamma_s^*(s))^\top M^+(s) Gw(k) ds \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we bound each of the three terms individually. Condition (18a) ensures that $M^+(s)$ is independent of $w(k)$, which will be crucial when taking the expectation later. For the first term, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{w(k)} \left[\int_0^1 \|A(s) \gamma_s^*(s)\|_{M^+(s)}^2 ds \right] \\ \stackrel{(18c)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}_{w(k)} \left[\int_0^1 \rho \|\gamma^*(s)\|_{M(s)}^2 ds \right] \stackrel{(20)}{=} \rho V_\delta(x, z). \end{aligned}$$

For the second term, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{w(k)} \left[\int_0^1 \|Gw(k)\|_{M^+(s)}^2 ds \right] &\stackrel{(18b)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}_{w(k)} \left[\int_0^1 \|Gw(k)\|_{\bar{M}}^2 ds \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{w(k)} \left[\int_0^1 \text{tr}(w(k) w(k)^\top G^\top \bar{M} G) ds \right] \\ &= \int_0^1 \text{tr}(\mathbb{E}_{w(k)} [w(k) w(k)^\top] G^\top \bar{M} G) ds \\ &\stackrel{\text{Asm. 1}}{\leq} \int_0^1 \text{tr}(\Sigma_w G^\top \bar{M} G) ds \stackrel{(18d)}{\leq} \int_0^1 \bar{w} ds = \bar{w}. \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality used the cyclic property of the trace and the second equality used linearity of the trace operator.

For the last term, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{w(k)} \left[\int_0^1 2(A(s)\gamma_s^*(s))^\top M^+(s)Gw(k) \right] ds \\ & \stackrel{(18a)}{=} \int_0^1 2(A(s)\gamma_s^*(s))^\top M^+(s)G\mathbb{E}_{w(k)}[w(k)] ds \stackrel{\text{Assm. 1}}{=} 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality leverages the fact that $M^+(s)$ is independent of $w(k)$ due to (18a). In combination, these three bounds yield (19b). \square

Condition (18a) can be satisfied by choosing a suitable parametrization of $M(x)$. This ensures that the posed conditions (18b)–(18d) are independent of w , which is crucial to enable tractable designs. In Appendix B, we provide additional details on the computation of a suitable contraction metric M satisfying (18) using linear matrix inequalities (LMIs). The following corollary highlights how the result simplifies in the special case of a constant contraction metric M .

Corollary 1. *Let Assumptions 1 and 6 hold. Suppose there exists a positive definite matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, a contraction rate $\rho \in [0, 1)$, and a constant $\bar{w} \geq 0$, such that the following conditions hold for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $u \in \mathbb{U}$:*

$$A(x, u)^\top M A(x, u) \preceq \rho M(x), \quad (22a)$$

$$\text{tr}(\Sigma_w G^\top M G) \leq \bar{w}. \quad (22b)$$

Then, Conditions (19) hold with $V_\delta(x, z) = \|x - z\|_M^2$.

Proof. Conditions (18a) and (18b) hold trivially with $\bar{M} = \underline{M} = M$. Furthermore, Conditions (22) are equivalent to (18c)–(18d) for M constant. Lastly, the constant metric M ensures that the geodesic (shortest path) is a straight line, i.e., $\gamma^*(s) = z + s(x - z)$. Hence, the Riemannian energy (20) reduces to the weighted norm $\|x - z\|_M^2$. \square

Remark 2. *(Related results on contraction metrics) For nonlinear dynamics with bounded model-mismatch, robust contraction metrics can be leveraged to derive robust reachable sets around nominal trajectories z [20]–[22]. Compared to Theorem 3, these conditions leverage worst-case bounds instead of the variance bound Σ_w (cf. (18d) vs. [22, Equ. (A.7)]). The proposed analysis uses a killing condition (18a) to ensure that the posed conditions are independent of the unbounded stochastic noise $w(k)$. Similar killing conditions are leveraged in existing approaches to avoid dependence on the control input u (cf. [20, (C1)]). The key difference in the result is the establishment of deterministic bound for bounded model-mismatch compared to the developed expected bound for unbounded stochastic process noise.*

Considering results for stochastic contraction metrics: For continuous-time systems and state dependent metrics $M(x)$, bounds on the expected error are derived in [42] and [39, Thm. 1]. These results relax (18a) with bounds on the derivative of $M(x)$. These derivations rely on the fact that the continuous-time contraction conditions are linear in w and hence cannot be generalized to the considered discrete-time setting. For discrete-time stochastic systems, [39, Thm. 2] derives a valid expected bound of the form (19) without requiring Condition (18a). However, the result can only ensure

contraction of the nonlinear system if the condition number of M is sufficiently small, thus limiting practical applicability. Discrete-time stochastic contraction metrics are also studied in the preprint [38]. However, the results do not apply to state-dependent metrics $M(x)$ due to the induced correlation with $M(f(x, u, w))$, which we resolved though Condition (18a) and Assumption 6. Overall, results for stochastic contraction metrics in discrete-time comparable to Theorem 3 are lacking in the literature, see also the overview paper [43].

B. Probabilist reachable set

In the following, we derive a PRS (Def. 1) using the expected bounds of the stochastic contraction metrics (Thm. 3). Due to the nonlinear dynamics, the error $x(k) - z(k)$ does not follow any known distribution and is not even zero-mean. Hence, many standard inequalities from the literature on linear SMPC, such as the Chebyshev inequality [5], [7], cannot be applied. The following theorem provides a valid PRS by combining the stochastic contraction metrics (Thm. 3) with the Markov inequality.

Theorem 4. *Suppose the conditions in Theorem 3 hold. Then, Assumptions 2–3 hold with*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{D}_k &= \left\{ x \mid \|x\|_M^2 \leq \sigma_{x,k} \right\}, \quad \sigma_{x,k} := \frac{1 - \rho^k}{1 - \rho} \frac{\bar{w}}{1 - p} \\ \mathcal{R}_k(x_0, u(0 : k - 1)) &= z(k) \oplus \mathbb{D}_k, \quad k \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

with $z(k)$ according to (8).

Proof. Given Definition 1, we consider an arbitrary causal policy $u(k) = \pi_k(w(0 : k - 1)) \in \mathbb{U}$, $k \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$ with the stochastic dynamics (1) and the nominal dynamics (8). Define $\delta(k) := V_\delta(x(k), z(k))$, $k \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$. Given the fixed initial condition $x(0) = x_0$, the noise $w(0 : k - 1)$ uniquely invoke $x(0 : k)$, $z(0 : k)$, $u(0 : k)$, $\delta(0 : k)$ leveraging causality of the policies π_k and the dynamics (1), (8). For any $k \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$, the law of iterated expectation ensures

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{w(0:k)}[\delta(k + 1)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{w(0:k-1)}[\mathbb{E}_{w(k)}[\delta(k + 1) \mid w(0 : k - 1)]] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{w(0:k-1)}[\mathbb{E}_{w(k)}[\delta(k + 1) \mid x(k), z(k)]] \\ & \stackrel{(19b)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}_{w(0:k-1)}[\rho\delta(k) + \bar{w}] \\ & \leq \dots \leq \rho^{k+1}\delta(0) + \sum_{i=0}^k \rho^i \bar{w} = \frac{1 - \rho^{k+1}}{1 - \rho} \bar{w}, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where the last equality uses the geometric series and $\delta(0) = 0$ due to the fixed initialization in (1)/(8). The Markov inequality [44, Thm. 1] with $\delta(k)$ non-negative ensures that

$$\Pr \left[\delta(k) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}_{w(0:k-1)}[\delta(k)]}{1 - p} \right] \geq p, \quad k \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}. \quad (25)$$

Combining (24) and (25) yields

$$\Pr \left[\delta(k) \leq \frac{1 - \rho^k}{1 - \rho} \frac{\bar{w}}{1 - p} \right] \geq p.$$

Furthermore, the lower bound (19a) yields

$$\Pr \left[\|x(k) - z(k)\|_M^2 \leq \frac{1 - \rho^k}{1 - \rho} \frac{\bar{w}}{1 - p} \right] \geq p.$$

Thus, $\mathcal{R}_k(x, u(0 : k - 1))$ in (23) is a PRS according to Definition 1, i.e., Assumption 2 holds. Assumption 3 follows due to the structure of \mathcal{R}_k in (23). \square

Theorem 4 provides a simple recursive formula to compute a probabilistic reachable set using a nominal simulation $z(k)$ and a scaled ellipsoid \mathbb{D}_k . This result is valid for inputs computed by any causal policy and thus also for the inputs generated by the SMPC scheme. We highlight that the shape of the PRS \mathcal{R}_k computed through stochastic contraction metrics is analogous to the robust reachable sets computed through robust contraction metrics in [20]–[22]. The main difference is that \bar{w} is proportional to the variance of the stochastic noise $w(k)$, while these existing works leverage uniform norm bounds on the noise $w(k)$.

VI. DISCUSSION

In this section, we summarize the overall design and discuss: relation to existing work, computation complexity, and closed-loop predictions.

1) *Overall algorithm:* The overall offline design and online implementation are summarized in Algorithm 1. The following corollary demonstrates that this constructively satisfies the posed conditions.

Corollary 2. *Suppose Assumptions 1, 5, and 6 hold, and the state constraints are given by the polytope (27). Consider any feasible solution (W, X, ρ) to Problem (29) in Appendix B with $\text{tr}(X) \leq (1 - \rho)(1 - p)$. Then, $\underline{M} = W^{-1}$, $\bar{w} = \text{tr}(X)$, $u_f = 0$, $V_f = c_f \|x\|_M^2$, $\mathbb{X}_f = \{x \mid \|x\|_M^2 \leq \alpha_f\}$ with $c_f > 0$, $\alpha_f \geq 0$ from Proposition 3 and $\mathcal{R}_k, \mathbb{D}_k$ from Theorem 4 satisfy Assumptions 2, 3, and 4.*

Proof. Proposition 2 with (W, X, ρ) from Problem (29) ensures that the conditions in Corollary 1 hold and thus Assumptions 2 and 3 hold. Furthermore, the posed bound on $\text{tr}(X)$ ensures that $0 \in \bar{\mathbb{X}}_k$, $k \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$. Thus, the conditions in Proposition 3 hold and the resulting terminal cost and set satisfy Assumption 4. \square

Algorithm 1 SMPC: Offline design and online implementation

Specify model f , constraints \mathbb{X}, \mathbb{U} , variance bound Σ_w , cost matrices $Q, R \succ 0$, probability level $p \in (0, 1)$.

Compute contraction metric M, ρ, \bar{w} (App. B).

Compute tightened constraints $\bar{\mathbb{X}}_k$ (App. A).

Design terminal cost V_f and terminal set \mathbb{X}_f (App. C).

Initialize $z(0) = x(0) = x_0$.

for $k \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$ **do**

 Measure the state $x(k)$ from system (1).

 Solve Problem (10) using $x(k), z(k)$.

 Apply the control input $u(k) = u_{k|k}^*$.

 Simulate nominal state $z(k + 1)$ using (8).

end for

2) *Relation to existing SMPC approaches:* The online operation (Alg. 1) and SMPC formulation (Problem (10)) mirror the *indirect-feedback* SMPC paradigm [7], [8], [34]–[36]: The constraints are imposed on the nominal state $z(k)$, while the measured state $x(k)$ is only used in the cost function. However, the technical derivation and analysis of the proposed approach differs significantly. In [7], [8], [34]–[36], linearity of the dynamics is leveraged to define error dynamics which evolve completely independent of the SMPC, thus facilitating the construction of PRS for the error. On the other hand, the presented analysis leverages parametrized PRS that are valid for any causal policy generated by the SMPC and we showed how these PRS can be constructed using stochastic contraction metrics. This relaxation of the independence assumption expands the applicability of this paradigm to more general nonlinear stochastic optimal control problems, while still containing the approach [7] as a trivial special case.

Considering existing *nonlinear* SMPC formulations with closed-loop guarantees: In contrast to [24], [30], the proposed approach does not leverage worst-case bound on the model mismatch, thus reducing conservatism and ensuring applicability to unbounded stochastic noise. Compared to [33], the proposed approach avoids computationally expensive sampling-based approximations of the PRS and ensures computational tractability by adopting a receding-horizon formulation with nominal predictions.

3) *Expected cost bounds:* Theorem 2 shows that the asymptotic expected cost is bounded by a function of the variance, which is comparable to the results in [7] and [30]. The proposed analysis utilizes the specific structure of the quadratic cost and the (global) properties of the terminal cost to derive this expected cost bound. Compared to [30], this analysis does not rely on uniform bounds on the state $x(k)$, nor does it require the optimal cost to be only a function of the state $x(k)$. While [7], [30] minimize the expected cost, the proposed formulation and analysis (Sec. IV) considers a certainty equivalent cost, which avoids computationally intensive sampling-based approximations. As shown in [45], the benefits of minimizing the expected cost compared to a certainty equivalent cost are often negligible.

4) *Computational complexity:* The main offline design concerns the computation of a contraction metric M using LMIs. This is comparable to existing nonlinear robust MPC designs [20]–[22], see Appendix B for details. Considering the online computation complexity, Problem (10) can be equivalently written as a nominal/standard MPC problem with state $(x, z) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ and input $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$.

5) *Closed-loop predictions:* In the following, we discuss the generalization to closed-loop predictions with relaxed probabilistic input constraints $\Pr[u(k) \in \mathbb{U}] \geq p$, $k \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$ (cf. Remark 1). Suppose we have designed a feedback $u = \kappa(x, z, v)$, such that for any $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $v \in \mathbb{U}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{w(k)}[V_\delta(f(x, \kappa(x, z, v), w), f(z, v, 0))] &\leq \rho V_\delta(x, z) + \bar{w}, \\ \|\kappa(x, z, v) - v\|^2 &\leq L_\kappa \|x - z\|_M^2, \quad L_\kappa \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Such a feedback can be jointly synthesized with the contraction metric M by adapting Theorem 3 and Proposition 2 from

Appendix B, see *control* contraction metrics [20]–[22]. Similar to Theorem 4, for any causal policy $v(k) = \pi_k(w(0 : k - 1))$, the closed-loop system

$$\begin{aligned} z(k+1) &= f(z(k), v(k), 0), \quad z(0) = x(0) = x_0, \\ x(k+1) &= f(x(k), u(k), w(k)), \quad u(k) = \kappa(x(k), z(k), v(k)) \end{aligned}$$

satisfies

$$\Pr \left[\|x(k) - z(k)\|_M^2 \leq \sigma_{x,k}, \quad \|u(k) - v(k)\|^2 \leq L_\kappa \sigma_{x,k} \right] \geq p$$

with $\sigma_{x,k}$ from (23). Hence, closed-loop chance constraints on state and input can be efficiently enforced by imposing tightened constraints on the nominal state $z(k)$ and input $v(k)$. Considering for simplicity $\mathbb{X}_f = \{0\}$, $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and Assumption 5. Then, the expected cost bound from (11) also holds by choosing a suitable terminal cost $V_f = c_f \|x\|_M^2$ and leveraging (26). Overall, by including the feedback κ in the prediction, we can deal with unstable systems subject to unbounded stochastic noise and in general reduce the conservatism of the PRS.

VII. NUMERICAL EXAMPLE

This numerical example demonstrates the applicability of the proposed framework to nonlinear stochastic systems. The code is available online.³

A. Setup

We consider a chain of three mass-spring-dampers with nonlinear Coulomb friction, shown in Figure 1. The system has six states $x(x) \in \mathbb{R}^6$, is under-actuated with a scalar control input $u(k) \in \mathbb{R}^1$, has nonlinear dynamics, and process noise $w(k) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ corresponding to unpredictable wind forces. The model constants are mass of 5 [kg], spring constant of 2 [N/m], and damping constant of 1 [N s/m]. The linearized system is under-damped with the slowest mode having a time constant of 50 [s] and fast oscillations at a frequency of about 1 [Hz]. The noise w has a covariance of $\Sigma_w = 10^{-3} \cdot I_3$ with a later specified distribution. The model is discretized using Euler with a sampling time of $dt = 0.25$ [s]. The actuator force is bound by $\mathbb{U} = [-10^2, 10^2]$ [N]. The state constraints \mathbb{X} are a polytope and encode a maximal velocity of 2 [m/s] and a minimal distance between all masses and the wall to avoid undesirable collisions⁴. The chance constraints (2) are enforced with a probability of $p = 95\%$.

Offline design: The offline design is performed according to Corollary 2 with a contraction rate of $\rho \approx \exp(-dt/50)$. Executing the overall offline design (Alg. 1) required about two seconds on a standard laptop, where the LMIs were formulated with YALMIP [46] and solved using SeDuMi.1.3 and Matlab.

B. Probabilistic reachable set

First, we study the proposed PRS design using stochastic contraction metrics (Sec. V), verifying probabilistic contain-

³<https://gitlab.ethz.ch/ics/SMPC-CCM>

⁴The equilibrium $(x, u) = 0$ corresponds to a fixed positive length of the springs and collision avoidance requires that this length is at most compressed by 1 [m], which are linear inequality constraints on the state x .




Fig. 1. Top: Considered system consisting of a chain of three mass-spring-dampers. Each mass is subject to external forces F_i consisting of deterministic Coulomb friction and random process noise w_i . Furthermore, the control input u is an additional force that acts on the last mass. Bottom: Characteristic curve of Coulomb friction is acting on each mass based on its velocity.

ment and studying conservatism. We consider a zero initial condition. Two input signals u are taken into consideration:

- periodic forcing with amplitude 1 [kN] and period 12.5 [s], operating mostly in the saturated region of the Coulomb friction (cf. Fig. 1);
- zero input, operating close to the origin with almost linear dynamics.

We examine five different noise distributions \mathcal{Q}_w with zero mean and covariance Σ_w :

- Gaussian $w \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_w)$;
- discrete-distributions⁵ with $\Pr[w(k) = 0] \in \{99\%, 99.5\%, 99.9\%, 99.95\%, 99.99\%\}$.

Figure 2 shows the resulting prediction error and probabilistic containment compared to the bounds derived in Theorem 4. For the expected squared error, we see a large disparity (factor 50) between the two different input signals, which highlights the significant effect of the nonlinearities. This also implies that naïve tuning of constraint tightening based on offline sampling (cf., e.g., [37, Sec. 5.5]) may not generalize well for nonlinear dynamics. As expected from Theorem 3, the derived results provides a valid bound independent of the specific input u applied to the system or the exact distribution \mathcal{Q}_w . For the containment probability $\Pr[x(k) \in \mathcal{R}_k]$, we only focus on the more critical case of periodic forcing. Here, the exact distribution $w(k) \sim \mathcal{Q}_w$ has also a significant effect. Nevertheless, in accordance with Theorem 4, the empirical containment is always above the set specification of $p = 95\%$, highlighting the distributional robustness of the derived result.

C. Closed-loop simulations

The following closed-loop simulations consider the proposed SMPC formulation with Problem (10) and a prediction

⁵For each coordinate $i = 1, 2, 3$, $w_i \in \{-c, 0, c\}$ with c such that $\mathbb{E}_w[ww^T] = \Sigma_w$. These distribution are the (point-wise) worst-case when applying the Markov inequality to bound $|w|^2$ using only $\mathbb{E}[w^2]$.




Fig. 2. Open-loop simulations with 10^5 random noise realizations. Top: Expected (weighted) squared difference between nominal prediction z and perturbed real state x : derived bound (blue, solid); empirical mean with periodic forcing (green) and without any forcing (red) for normal distributions (solid, thick) and different discrete distributions (dotted). Bottom: Containment probability $\Pr[x(k) \in \mathbf{R}_k]$ with periodic forcing for different distributions $w(k) \sim \mathcal{Q}_w$ and guaranteed lower bound of $p = 95\%$ (black, dashed).

horizon of $N = 15$. The initial condition $x(0)$ is zero, except for the position of last mass, which is moved by 10 [m]. Statistical results are obtained by simulating the closed-loop system for 10^5 different noise realizations following the discrete distribution (iv) from Figure 2. Figure 3 shows the closed-loop results. The expected cost decreases during closed-loop operation and converges to a small constant, in accordance with Theorem 2. The variations in the applied input highlight how the indirect-feedback paradigm generates feedback through re-optimization. Lastly, although we operate close to the constraints, constraint violations are rare and the posed chance constraints (2) are met with

$$\max_k \Pr[x(k) \in \mathbb{X}] = 99.83\% > p = 95\%.$$

Considering the online computational complexity: Solving the proposed nonlinear SMPC formulation (10) with zero warm-start took on average 25 [ms] using IPOPT [47] formulated in CasADi [48] in Matlab on a standard laptop. This is around 37% longer than a nominal MPC ($x = z$), which took 18 [ms] on average.

Summary: Overall, we have applied the proposed stochastic predictive control framework to a nonlinear system subject to unbounded noise. The statistics of the prediction error depend




Fig. 3. Closed-loop system using proposed SMPC: random realizations (red, dotted) and mean (blue, solid). Top: Closed-loop cost ℓ . Middle: Applied actuation u with input constraint (black, dashed). Bottom: Distance between second and third mass with minimal distance constraint of 1 [m] (black, dashed).

strongly on the applied inputs and exact distribution of the noise. The derive theory provides bounds on the expected error and probabilistic containment that hold uniformly for all possible input sequences and all distributions adhering to the assumed covariance bound (Asm. 1). Thus, the closed-loop system satisfies the posed chance constraints (2). Furthermore, the proposed formulation is recursively feasible and the expected cost decreases to a small constant. The online computational complexity of the proposed SMPC scheme is only marginally increased compared to a nominal formulation, which is crucial for implementation on embedded hardware.

VIII. CONCLUSION

We presented a computationally tractable predictive control framework for nonlinear systems subject to unbounded stochastic noise. The resulting closed-loop system ensures recursive feasibility, chance constraint satisfaction, and an expected cost bound. The design leverages stochastic contraction metrics to design probabilistic reachable sets. We demonstrated practical applicability with a numerical example involving nonlinear dynamics and unbounded stochastic noise. Future work aims at designing less conservative probabilistic reachable sets by leveraging more distributional information.

APPENDIX

In this appendix, we provide details regarding the computation of the tightened constraints (App. A); the contraction metric M (App. B), and the terminal set/cost (App. C).

A. Constraint tightening

The following proposition provides a simple formula for the constraint tightening in case of polytopic state constraints of the form:

$$\mathbb{X} = \{x \mid h_j^\top x \leq 1, j \in \mathbb{I}_{[1,p]}\}, h_j \in \mathbb{R}^n, j \in \mathbb{I}_{[1,p]}. \quad (27)$$

Proposition 1. *Suppose the conditions from Theorem 4 hold and the state constraint set is given by (27). Then, for all $k \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$, the tightened constraints (10f) are given by*

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathbb{X}}_k &= \mathbb{X} \ominus \mathbb{D}_k = \{x \mid h_j^\top x \leq 1 - c_j \sqrt{\sigma_{x,k}}, j \in \mathbb{I}_{[1,p]}\}, \\ c_j &= \|\underline{M}^{-1/2} h_j\|, j \in \mathbb{I}_{[1,p]}. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Proof. Recall the shape of the PRS from Theorem 4:

$$\mathbb{D}_k = \{e \mid \|e\|_{\underline{M}}^2 \leq \sigma_{x,k}\} = \{\underline{M}^{-1/2} \tilde{e} \mid \|\tilde{e}\| \leq \sqrt{\sigma_{x,k}}\}.$$

The support function yields $\max_{e \in \mathbb{D}_k} h_j^\top e = \sqrt{\sigma_{x,k}} \|\underline{M}^{-1/2} h_j\|$ and the Pontryagin difference is given by (28). \square

While this construction uses polytopic constraints, similar inner-approximations can be constructed for continuously differentiable constraints following the derivation in [22, Prop. 5].

B. Design of stochastic contraction metric

In the following, we discuss the computation of a contraction metric M satisfying the conditions in Theorem 3. We first pose an optimization problem that minimize the resulting constraint tightening and then discuss how to formulate it as a finite-dimensional semi-definite program (SDP). For ease of exposition, we focus on the constant parametrization $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ from Corollary 1 and comment on addressing state-dependent metrics $M(x)$ at the end.

Minimize constraint tightening: In the following, we formulate LMIs that minimize the constraint tightening resulting from the PRS in Theorem 4. Suppose we have polytopic state

constraints of the form (27), Assumption 6 holds, and consider the following optimization problem:

$$\inf_{W, X, \rho} \frac{1}{1 - \rho} \text{tr}(X) \quad (29a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \begin{pmatrix} W & Wh_j \\ (Wh_j)^\top & 1 \end{pmatrix} \succeq 0, j \in \mathbb{I}_{[1,p]}, \quad (29b)$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \rho W & (A(x, u)W)^\top \\ A(x, u)W & W \end{pmatrix} \succeq 0, \quad (29c)$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} X & (G\Sigma_w^{1/2})^\top \\ G\Sigma_w^{1/2} & W \end{pmatrix} \succeq 0, \quad (29d)$$

$$W \succ 0, \rho \in [0, 1), \quad (29e)$$

$$\forall (x, u) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{U}.$$

Proposition 2. *Let Assumptions 1 and 6 hold. Consider any feasible solution (W, X, ρ) to Problem (29). Then, the conditions in Corollary 1 hold with $M = W^{-1}$, ρ , and $\bar{w} = \text{tr}(X)$. Furthermore, if the state constraint set is given by (27), then for all $k \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$:*

$$\bar{\mathbb{X}}_k \supseteq \left\{ x \mid h_j^\top x \leq 1 - \sqrt{\frac{\text{tr}(X)}{(1 - \rho)(1 - p)}}, j \in \mathbb{I}_{[1,p]} \right\}. \quad (30)$$

Proof. Part I: Applying a Schur complement to Condition (29d) yields

$$X - \Sigma_w^{1/2} G^\top M G \Sigma_w^{1/2} \succeq 0,$$

where we used $M = W^{-1} \succ 0$. Given that $\text{tr}(C_1) \geq \text{tr}(C_2)$ for any matrices $C_1 \succeq C_2 \succeq 0$, this implies

$$\bar{w} = \text{tr}(X) \geq \text{tr}(\Sigma_w^{1/2} G^\top M G \Sigma_w^{1/2}) = \text{tr}(\Sigma_w G^\top M G),$$

i.e., (22b) holds. The Schur complement of (29c) yields

$$\rho W - W A(x, u)^\top M A(x, u) W \succeq 0.$$

Multiplying with $M = W^{-1} \succ 0$ from left and right yields (22a). Thus, the conditions in Corollary 1 hold.

Part II: Applying Schur complement to (29b) yields

$$0 \leq 1 - (Wh_j)^\top W^{-1} Wh_j = 1 - \|W^{1/2} h_j\|^2,$$

which implies $c_j = \|M^{-1/2} h_j\| \leq 1$ with $W^{1/2} = M^{-1/2}$. Hence, the constraint tightening formula (28) from Proposition 1 with $M = \underline{M}$ satisfies

$$c_j \sqrt{\sigma_{x,k}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\bar{w}}{(1 - \rho)(1 - p)}} = \sqrt{\frac{\text{tr}(X)}{(1 - \rho)(1 - p)}},$$

yielding the inner-approximation (30). \square

Inequality (30) shows that the objective in Problem (29) bounds the constraint tightening. Thus, Problem (29) yields contraction metrics that minimize the constraint tightening in the SMPC formulation (10), see also [20], [39] for similar procedures in robust MPC.

Finite-dimensional convex problem: Next, we discuss how to solve Problem (29). For a fixed constant ρ , Problem (29) is an SDP with a linear cost and LMI constraints. Hence, ρ is computed using a line-search or bi-section, as similarly suggested in [20], [39].

As is standard in contraction metrics [20]–[22], Inequality (29c) needs to be verified for all $(x, u) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{U}$, which is not directly computationally tractable. Standard solutions to this problem include heuristic gridding or sums-of-squares programming [20], [21]. However, both approaches are difficult to apply for the considered global discrete-time conditions. Hence, we instead use a convex embedding [49]. In particular, we write the Jacobian as a linear combination of basis-functions $A(x, u) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_\theta} A_{\theta,i} \theta_i(x, u)$, with $A_{\theta,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $\theta(x, u) = [\theta_1(x, u), \dots, \theta_{n_\theta}(x, u)]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\theta}$. Then, we determine a polytope $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_\theta}$, such that $\theta(x, u) \in \Theta \forall (x, u) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{U}$. Thus, we can replace $\forall (x, u) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{U}$ in Inequality (29c) with the sufficient condition $\forall \theta \in \Theta$. Since θ appears linearly in in Problem (29), it suffices to verify the LMIs on the vertices of the set Θ , thus reducing the problem to a finite-dimensional SDP. For further details, see the theoretical derivations in [49, Prop. 1] and the online available code.

State-dependent contraction metric: To address state-dependent contraction metrics $M(x)$ two main steps are needed. First, a finite parametrization is needed, typically of the form $W(x) = \sum_i W_{\theta_{W,i}} \theta_{W,i}(x)$ with basis functions $\theta_{W,i} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Given that uniform bounds (18b) need to hold globally for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the basis functions $\theta_{W,i}(x)$ should be globally bounded, such as sigmoid functions. Condition (18a) restricts the parametrization to only use component of the state x that are not in the image of $G \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times q}$. To ensure satisfaction of (18c) for all $(x, u) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{U}$ extra care is required for the term $M(f(x, u, 0))$. A typical approach is to derive a hyperbox Ω , such that $\theta_W(f(x, u, 0)) \in \{\theta_W(x)\} \oplus \Omega$. Then, the convex embeddings can again be utilized to formulate the problem as a finite-dimensional SDP [49].

C. Design of terminal cost/set

The following proposition shows how to design the terminal set \mathbb{X}_f and the terminal cost V_f .

Proposition 3. *Suppose that Assumptions 5 and 6 hold, the conditions in Corollary 1 are satisfied, and $\mathbb{D}_k \subseteq \mathbb{X}$, $k \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$. Then, there exist constants $\alpha_f \geq 0$, $c_f > 0$, such that Assumption 4 holds with $V_f(x) = \|x\|_P^2$, $P = c_f M$, $\mathbb{X}_f = \{x \mid \|x\|_M^2 \leq \alpha_f\}$, and $u_f = 0$.*

Proof. Analogous to the proof of (19b) in Theorem 3, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|f(x, 0, 0)\|_M^2 &= \|f(x, 0, 0) - f(0, 0, 0)\|_M^2 \\ &\leq \rho \|x - 0\|_M^2 = \rho \|x\|_M^2, \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where we used $f(0, 0, 0) = 0$ (Asm. 5). The positive invariance condition (Asm. 4 a) holds since \mathbb{X}_f is a sublevel set of the Lyapunov function $\|x\|_M^2$.

Constraint satisfaction (Asm. 4 b) holds by choosing $\alpha_f \geq 0$ as the largest constant satisfying $\mathbb{X}_f \subseteq \mathbb{X}_k$, $k \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$, with $\alpha_f \geq 0$ since $0 \in \mathbb{X}_k = \mathbb{X} \ominus \mathbb{D}_k$, $k \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$, by assumption.

Note that $\|x\|_Q^2 \leq \lambda_{\max}(Q, M) \|x\|_M^2$ where $\lambda_{\max}(Q, M) > 0$ is the maximal generalized eigenvalue of Q w.r.t. M . The

terminal cost condition (Asm. 4 c) holds with

$$\begin{aligned} V_f(f(x, 0, 0)) &= c_f \|f(x, 0, 0)\|_M^2 \stackrel{(31)}{\leq} c_f \rho \|x\|_M^2 \\ &\leq c_f \|x\|_M^2 - \frac{(1-\rho)c_f}{\lambda_{\max}(Q, M)} \|x\|_Q^2 = V_f(x) - \ell(x, 0), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality uses $c_f := \frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q, M)}{1-\rho} > 0$. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] J. B. Rawlings, D. Q. Mayne, and M. Diehl, *Model Predictive Control: Theory, Computation, and Design*. Nob Hill Publishing, 2017.
- [2] B. Kouvaritakis and M. Cannon, *Model Predictive Control : Classical, Robust and Stochastic*. Springer International Publishing, 2016.
- [3] A. Mesbah, “Stochastic model predictive control: An overview and perspectives for future research,” *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 30–44, 2016.
- [4] L. Hewing and M. N. Zeilinger, “Stochastic model predictive control for linear systems using probabilistic reachable sets,” in *Proc. 57th IEEE Conf. Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2018, pp. 5182–5188.
- [5] M. Farina, L. Giulioni, and R. Scattolini, “Stochastic linear model predictive control with chance constraints – a review,” *J. Proc. Control*, vol. 44, pp. 53–67, 2016.
- [6] J. A. Paulson, E. A. Buehler, R. D. Braatz, and A. Mesbah, “Stochastic model predictive control with joint chance constraints,” *Int. J. Control*, vol. 93, no. 1, pp. 126–139, 2020.
- [7] L. Hewing, K. P. Wabersich, and M. N. Zeilinger, “Recursively feasible stochastic model predictive control using indirect feedback,” *Automatica*, vol. 119, p. 109095, 2020.
- [8] L. Hewing and M. N. Zeilinger, “Scenario-based probabilistic reachable sets for recursively feasible stochastic model predictive control,” *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 450–455, 2019.
- [9] M. Lorenzen, F. Dabbene, R. Tempo, and F. Allgöwer, “Constraint-tightening and stability in stochastic model predictive control,” *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 62, no. 7, pp. 3165–3177, 2017.
- [10] L. Aolaritei, M. Fochesato, J. Lygeros, and F. Dörfler, “Wasserstein tube MPC with exact uncertainty propagation,” in *Proc. 62nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2023, pp. 2036–2041.
- [11] J. A. Paulson and A. Mesbah, “An efficient method for stochastic optimal control with joint chance constraints for nonlinear systems,” *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, vol. 29, no. 15, pp. 5017–5037, 2019.
- [12] E. Bradford and L. Imsland, “Output feedback stochastic nonlinear model predictive control for batch processes,” *Computers & Chemical Engineering*, vol. 126, pp. 434–450, 2019.
- [13] N. Kantas, J. Maciejowski, and A. Lecchini-Visintini, “Sequential monte carlo for model predictive control,” *Nonlinear model predictive control: Towards new challenging applications*, pp. 263–273, 2009.
- [14] M. A. Sehr and R. R. Bitmead, “Particle model predictive control: Tractable stochastic nonlinear output-feedback MPC,” *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 15361–15366, 2017.
- [15] L. Hewing, J. Kabzan, and M. N. Zeilinger, “Cautious model predictive control using gaussian process regression,” *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 28, no. 6, pp. 2736–2743, 2019.
- [16] D. Landgraf, A. Völz, F. Berkel, K. Schmidt, T. Specker, and K. Graichen, “Probabilistic prediction methods for nonlinear systems with application to stochastic model predictive control,” *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 56, p. 100905, 2023.
- [17] D. Q. Mayne, E. C. Kerrigan, E. Van Wyk, and P. Falugi, “Tube-based robust nonlinear model predictive control,” *International journal of robust and nonlinear control*, vol. 21, no. 11, pp. 1341–1353, 2011.
- [18] M. Cannon, J. Buerger, B. Kouvaritakis, and S. Rakovic, “Robust tubes in nonlinear model predictive control,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 56, no. 8, pp. 1942–1947, 2011.
- [19] B. Houska and M. E. Villanueva, “Robust optimization for MPC,” *Handbook of model predictive control*, pp. 413–443, 2019.
- [20] P. Zhao, A. Lakshmanan, K. Ackerman, A. Gahlawat, M. Pavone, and N. Hovakimyan, “Tube-certified trajectory tracking for nonlinear systems with robust control contraction metrics,” *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 5528–5535, 2022.
- [21] S. Singh, B. Landry, A. Majumdar, J.-J. Slotine, and M. Pavone, “Robust feedback motion planning via contraction theory,” *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 42, no. 9, pp. 655–688, 2023.
- [22] A. Saffi, M. N. Zeilinger, and J. Köhler, “Robust adaptive MPC using control contraction metrics,” *Automatica*, vol. 155, p. 111169, 2023.

- [23] A. D. Bonzanini, T. L. Santos, and A. Mesbah, "Tube-based stochastic nonlinear model predictive control: A comparative study on constraint tightening," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 598–603, 2019.
- [24] H. Schlüter and F. Allgöwer, "A constraint-tightening approach to nonlinear stochastic model predictive control under general bounded disturbances," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 7130–7135, 2020.
- [25] Z. Zhong and J.-J. Zhu, "Nonlinear wasserstein distributionally robust optimal control," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.07415*, 2023.
- [26] J. A. Primbs and C. H. Sung, "Stochastic receding horizon control of constrained linear systems with state and control multiplicative noise," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. 221–230, 2009.
- [27] J. Köhler, F. Geuss, and M. N. Zeilinger, "On stochastic MPC formulations with closed-loop guarantees: Analysis and a unifying framework," in *Proc. 62nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2023, pp. 6692–6699.
- [28] M. Cannon, B. Kouvaritakis, S. V. Raković, and Q. Cheng, "Stochastic tubes in model predictive control with probabilistic constraints," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 194–200, 2010.
- [29] M. Korda, R. Gondhalekar, J. Cigler, and F. Oldewurtel, "Strongly feasible stochastic model predictive control," in *Proc. 50th IEEE Conf. Decision and Control and European Control Conf.*, 2011, pp. 1245–1251.
- [30] R. D. McAllister and J. B. Rawlings, "Nonlinear stochastic model predictive control: Existence, measurability, and stochastic asymptotic stability," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 3, pp. 1524–1536, 2022.
- [31] H. Schlüter and F. Allgöwer, "Stochastic model predictive control using initial state optimization," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 55, no. 30, pp. 454–459, 2022.
- [32] J. Köhler and M. N. Zeilinger, "Recursively feasible stochastic predictive control using an interpolating initial state constraint," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 6, pp. 2743–2748, 2022.
- [33] K. Wang and S. Gros, "Recursive feasibility of stochastic model predictive control with mission-wide probabilistic constraints," in *Proc. 60th IEEE Conf. Decision and Control*, 2021, pp. 2312–2317.
- [34] S. Muntwiler, K. P. Wabersich, R. Miklos, and M. N. Zeilinger, "LQG for constrained linear systems: Indirect feedback stochastic MPC with Kalman filtering," in *Proc. European Control Conf.*, 2023, pp. 2072–2078.
- [35] C. Mark and S. Liu, "Data-driven distributionally robust MPC: An indirect feedback approach," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.09558*, 2021.
- [36] E. Arcari, A. Iannelli, A. Carron, and M. N. Zeilinger, "Stochastic MPC with robustness to bounded parametric uncertainty," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 12, pp. 7601–7615, 2023.
- [37] D. Mayne, "Robust and stochastic model predictive control: Are we going in the right direction?" *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 41, pp. 184–192, 2016.
- [38] Q.-C. Pham and J.-J. Slotine, "Stochastic contraction in Riemannian metrics," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1304.0340*, 2013.
- [39] H. Tsukamoto and S.-J. Chung, "Robust controller design for stochastic nonlinear systems via convex optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 10, pp. 4731–4746, 2020.
- [40] I. R. Manchester and J.-J. E. Slotine, "Control contraction metrics: Convex and intrinsic criteria for nonlinear feedback design," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 62, pp. 3046–3053, 2017.
- [41] J. D. Schiller, S. Muntwiler, J. Köhler, M. N. Zeilinger, and M. A. Müller, "A lyapunov function for robust stability of moving horizon estimation," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 12, pp. 7466–7481, 2023.
- [42] A. P. Dani, S.-J. Chung, and S. Hutchinson, "Observer design for stochastic nonlinear systems via contraction-based incremental stability," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 60, no. 3, pp. 700–714, 2014.
- [43] H. Tsukamoto, S.-J. Chung, and J.-J. E. Slotine, "Contraction theory for nonlinear stability analysis and learning-based control: A tutorial overview," *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 52, pp. 135–169, 2021.
- [44] M. Huber, "Halving the bounds for the Markov, Chebyshev, and Chernoff inequalities using smoothing," *The American Mathematical Monthly*, vol. 126, no. 10, pp. 915–927, 2019.
- [45] F. Messerer, K. Baumgärtner, S. Lucia, and M. Diehl, "Fourth-order suboptimality of nominal model predictive control in the presence of uncertainty," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 8, pp. 508–513, 2024.
- [46] J. Löfberg, "YALMIP: A toolbox for modeling and optimization in MATLAB," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Robotics and Automation*, 2004, pp. 284–289.
- [47] A. Wächter and L. T. Biegler, "On the implementation of an interior-point filter line-search algorithm for large-scale nonlinear programming," *Mathematical programming*, vol. 106, no. 1, pp. 25–57, 2006.
- [48] J. A. Andersson, J. Gillis, G. Horn, J. B. Rawlings, and M. Diehl, "CasADi: A software framework for nonlinear optimization and optimal control," *Mathematical Programming Computation*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 1–36, 2019.
- [49] J. Köhler, M. A. Müller, and F. Allgöwer, "A nonlinear model predictive control framework using reference generic terminal ingredients," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 65, no. 8, pp. 3576–3583, 2020.



Johannes Köhler received the Ph.D. degree from the University of Stuttgart, Germany, in 2021. He is currently a postdoctoral researcher at ETH Zürich, Switzerland. He is the recipient of the 2021 European Systems & Control PhD Thesis Award, the IEEE CSS George S. Axelby Outstanding Paper Award 2022, and the Journal of Process Control Paper Award 2023. His research interests are in the area of model predictive control and control and estimation for nonlinear uncertain systems.



Melanie N. Zeilinger is an Associate Professor at ETH Zürich, Switzerland. She received the Diploma degree in engineering cybernetics from the University of Stuttgart, Germany, in 2006, and the Ph.D. degree with honors in electrical engineering from ETH Zürich, Switzerland, in 2011. From 2011 to 2012 she was a Postdoctoral Fellow with the Ecole Polytechnique Federale de Lausanne (EPFL), Switzerland. She was a Marie Curie Fellow and Postdoctoral Researcher with the Max Planck Institute for Intelligent Systems, Tübingen, Germany until 2015 and with the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences at the University of California at Berkeley, CA, USA, from 2012 to 2014. From 2018 to 2019 she was a professor at the University of Freiburg, Germany. Her current research interests include safe learning-based control, as well as distributed control and optimization, with applications to robotics and human-in-the-loop control.