

Adaptive Economic Model Predictive Control: Performance Guarantees for Nonlinear Systems

Maximilian Degner^{1,2}, Raffaele Soloperto¹, Melanie N. Zeilinger², John Lygeros¹, Johannes Köhler²

Abstract—We consider the problem of optimizing the economic performance of nonlinear constrained systems subject to uncertain time-varying parameters and bounded disturbances. In particular, we propose an adaptive economic model predictive control (MPC) framework that: (i) directly minimizes transient economic costs, (ii) addresses parametric uncertainty through online model adaptation, (iii) determines optimal setpoints online, and (iv) ensures robustness by using a tube-based approach. The proposed design ensures recursive feasibility, robust constraint satisfaction, and a transient performance bound. In case the disturbances have a finite energy and the parameter variations have a finite path length, the asymptotic average performance is (approximately) not worse than the performance obtained when operating at the best reachable steady-state. We highlight performance benefits in a numerical example involving a chemical reactor with unknown time-invariant and time-varying parameters.

Index Terms—NL predictive control, economic MPC, robust adaptive control, optimal control, constrained control

I. INTRODUCTION

Model Predictive Control (MPC) is an optimization-based control technique that can ensure constraint satisfaction for general nonlinear systems [1]. The performance of MPC schemes relies on the accuracy of the model, which is typically identified offline [2]. However, the system dynamics often change during online operation. Thus, online model adaptation is required to ensure consistent performance [3], [4].

In addition, the performance of a plant is usually characterized by some economic cost, such as the yield of chemical plants [5]–[7] or the energy cost in building temperature control [8], and power grids [9]. However, most MPC implementations consider this economic cost indirectly by stabilizing an optimal setpoint. In this work, we address both limitations by minimizing the transient economic cost directly and adapting the prediction model online.

Related Work

Adaptive MPC schemes deal with online changes in the system dynamics by adapting the model parameters during closed-loop operation. While empirical results demonstrating performance enhancement through adaptive MPC are well documented [3], [10]–[12], theoretical developments have




Fig. 1. We minimize the economic cost and adapt the prediction model during online operation. Utilizing existing robust MPC designs guarantees constraint satisfaction and thanks to artificial references, optimize setpoints online, leveraging the adapted model.

been lacking until recently [13]. *Robust adaptive MPC* approaches for linear and nonlinear uncertain systems are proposed in [14], [15] and [16]–[21], respectively. These approaches ensure robust constraint satisfaction while leveraging online adaptation of the model uncertainty to reduce the conservatism. In [22] the optimized cost leveraged a separate prediction with an online learned model to enhance performance. By adapting such a model with a least-mean square parameter estimator, adaptive MPC schemes have shown \mathcal{L}_2 stability of the closed-loop system despite parametric uncertainty [14], [15], [18]. However, all these approaches rely on a cost that is positive definite compared to fixed equilibrium. Hence, these approaches cannot directly optimize economic costs or consider online changes in the optimal setpoint. In [23] and [24, Chap. 3], also economic cost functions have been investigated in an adaptive MPC scheme. However, worst-case costs are optimized and no guarantees regarding closed-loop performance are established.

Economic MPC formulations directly minimize the predicted economic cost, thereby enhancing the overall performance [5]–[7]. In the nominal case, i.e., perfect model knowledge and no disturbances, economic MPC theory ensures that the asymptotic average performance of the closed-loop system is not worse than the performance of operating at the optimal steady-state [25], [26]. In case the optimal steady-state is subject to online changes, artificial references can be included in the economic MPC formulation to optimize setpoints online [27]–[32]. In particular, such approaches can ensure

¹Automatic Control Laboratory, ETH Zürich

²Institute for Dynamic Systems and Control, ETH Zürich
mdegner(at)ieee(dot)org, {soloperr|mzeilinger|lygeros|jkoehle}(at)ethz(dot)ch
Johannes Köhler was supported as a part of NCCR Automation, a National Centre of Competence in Research, funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation (grant number 51NF40_225155).
Raffaele Soloperto is supported by the European Research Council under the H2020 Advanced Grant no. 787845 (OCAL).

that the asymptotic average performance is (approximately) not worse than the performance at the best reachable steady-state [28]–[30]. Although these economic MPC schemes yield strong performance guarantees, the results rely on a perfect prediction model and are thus not applicable to uncertain systems. In case of model mismatch, *robust* economic MPC schemes address this issue by optimizing for the worst-case cost [33]. While this provides robust bounds on the closed-loop performance, it can also lead conservative operation.

Recently, we proposed an *adaptive economic* MPC scheme that uses least-mean squares parameter adaptation and provides strong asymptotic and transient performance guarantees [34]. However, the approach is limited to open-loop stable linear systems, soft state constraints, and it assumes that the optimal steady-state is independent of the unknown model parameters.

Contribution

In this paper, we propose a robust adaptive economic MPC scheme that provides suitable bounds on the closed-loop cost. We consider nonlinear systems that are subject to state and input constraints, time-varying uncertain parameters, and bounded disturbances. We have the following main contributions:

- We derive a transient performance guarantee relative to the optimized steady-state of the certainty-equivalent prediction model (Theorem 1).
- In case of finite-energy disturbances and finite parameter variations, we show that the asymptotic average closed-loop cost is (approximately) not worse than the cost at the optimal achievable steady-state (Corollaries 1 and 2).
- We show how to design an economic terminal cost that can deal with online changing model parameters and setpoints and does not rely on a sufficiently small terminal set (Proposition 2).

Figure 1 depicts the main components of the adaptive economic MPC formulation: The model parameters are adapted online using least-mean square parameter adaptation. The MPC directly minimizes the predicted economic cost using a certainty-equivalent prediction with the online parameter estimates. As the optimal steady-state is unknown a priori, the terminal cost and set are formulated using online optimized artificial references. We utilize a tube-based MPC scheme to guarantee constraint satisfaction for all admissible disturbances and parameters. Based on simulations of a chemical reactor, we demonstrate the performance benefits of the proposed adaptive economic MPC scheme.

Outline: In Section II, we describe the control problem and discuss preliminaries. In Section III, we present the proposed adaptive economic MPC approach, while the theoretical analysis and discussion can be found in Section IV. We illustrate the performance benefits of the proposed approach with a numerical example in Section V and conclude in Section VI. Appendices A and B contain the proofs of our main results and of auxiliary results, respectively. In Appendix C, we provide details regarding the offline design.

Notation

For any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote $\mathbb{I}_{[a,b]} = \{n \in \mathbb{N} | a \leq n \leq b\}$, where \mathbb{N} signifies the non-negative integers. A positive semidefinite matrix R is denoted by $R \succeq 0$ and a positive definite matrix Q is denoted by $Q \succ 0$. We denote the 1-norm and 2-norm of a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ by $\|x\|_1$ and $\|x\|$, respectively. For a matrix $Q \succ 0$, we denote the weighted norm by $\|x\|_Q^2 = x^\top Q x$. A sequence $w_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $k \in \mathbb{I}_{[0,T]}$ is denoted by $w_{[0,T]}$, and its \mathcal{L}_2 -norm by $|w_{[0,T]}|_{\mathcal{L}_2}^2 := \sum_{k=0}^T \|w_k\|^2$. The spectral norm of a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ is given by $\|A\| = \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(A^\top A)}$, where λ_{\max} denoted the maximal eigenvalue. The identity matrix of size $n \times n$ is signified by I_n . The i -th element of a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is represented by $[x]_i$. A function α is of class \mathcal{K}_∞ , if $\alpha : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $\alpha(0) = 0$, $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \alpha(s) = \infty$, and α is strictly increasing and continuous.

II. PROBLEM SETUP AND PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we first discuss the problem setup (Section II-A). Then, we introduce preliminaries regarding robust MPC (Section II-B) and least-mean square parameter adaptation (Section II-C). Lastly, we introduce regularity conditions on the system (Section II-D).

A. Problem Setup

The system dynamics are given by

$$\begin{aligned} x_{k+1} &= f_0(x_k, u_k) + G(x_k, u_k)\theta_k + E(x_k, u_k)d_k, \\ &=: f_w(x_k, u_k, \theta_k, d_k) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where the states, control inputs, disturbances, the parameters, and the time are denoted by $x_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$, $u_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$, $d_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_d}$, $\theta_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\theta}$, and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, respectively. The dynamics f_w are assumed to be continuous, while the time-varying parameters θ_k is assumed to be unknown. We denote the nominal dynamics, i.e., neglecting disturbances d , by

$$f(x, u, \theta) := f_0(x, u) + G(x, u)\theta. \quad (2)$$

Assumption 1 (Bounded disturbances and parameters). *The disturbances and parameters are contained in known sets \mathbb{D} , Θ , i.e., $d_k \in \mathbb{D}$ and $\theta_k \in \Theta$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Furthermore, \mathbb{D} is compact and includes the origin, and Θ is compact and convex.*

The goal is to minimize the economic cost $\ell : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the closed-loop system while satisfying compact state and input constraints

$$(x_k, u_k) \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (3)$$

The proposed approach addresses this problem by incorporating online parameter adaptation and a robust design in the economic MPC formulation. Thus, in the following, we introduce preliminaries regarding robust MPC and parameter adaptation.

B. Robust MPC framework

In the following, we introduce a general robust MPC formulation, analogous to [18]. This formulation will also be employed in Section III to design the proposed MPC approach.

The considered robust MPC formulation predicts the evolution of a nominal trajectory $(z_{j|k}, v_{j|k})$ using the nominal model (2) with some nominal parameters $\bar{\theta} \in \Theta$. Here, $z_{j|k}$ denotes the prediction of z for time $k+j$ computed at time k . In addition, the MPC predicts a tube \mathbb{X} that incorporates all possible trajectories resulting from the parametric uncertainty and disturbances affecting the system, i.e., $x \in \mathbb{X} \forall d \in \mathbb{D}, \theta \in \Theta$. Furthermore, we make use of an auxiliary feedback $u = \kappa(x, z, v)$ that drives the state x to the nominal prediction z , and therefore reduces the size of the predicted tube. Without loss of generality, we consider $\kappa(z, z, v) = v, \forall (z, v) \in \mathbb{Z}$. Formally, the tube \mathbb{X} is propagated is propagated a general mapping $\mathbb{X}_{k+1} \supseteq \Phi(\mathbb{X}_k, z_k, v_k)$ that satisfies the following assumption.

Assumption 2 (Tube propagation). *For any $\mathbb{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$, any $x, z \in \mathbb{X}$, any $(x, \kappa(x, z, v)) \in \mathbb{Z}$, $(z, v) \in \mathbb{Z}$, any $\theta \in \Theta$, and any $d \in \mathbb{D}$, the tube propagation mapping Φ satisfies*

$$f_w(x, \kappa(x, z, v), \theta, d) \in \Phi(\mathbb{X}, z, v). \quad (4)$$

Property (4) enables efficient implementations by sequentially propagating a set containing all possible state trajectories, see also Figure 2 for an illustration.

Remark 1 (Tube designs). *The simplest design is a linear feedback $\kappa(x, z, v) = K(x - z) + v$ with a rigid tube centered around the nominal prediction z , i.e., $\mathbb{X}_{j|k} = \{z_{j|k}\} \oplus \mathbb{E}$. For example, $\mathbb{E} \ni 0$ can be a robust positive invariant ellipsoidal or polytopic set. In the considered setup, the model mismatch depends on the state and input, and hence, homothetic tubes, e.g., of the form $\mathbb{X}_{j|k} = \{z_{j|k}\} \oplus s_{j|k} \mathbb{E}$, $s_{j|k} \geq 0$, are typically deployed [16]–[18], [20]. In Appendix C, we make use of ideas from [20], [35] to design a nonlinear tube formulation that satisfies Assumption 2.*

Given Assumption 2, we can formulate a general robust MPC problem as follows:

$$\min_{\substack{z_{\cdot|k}, v_{\cdot|k}, \\ v_k^s, \mathbb{X}_{\cdot|k}}} \text{cost} \quad (5a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } z_{j+1|k} = f(z_{j|k}, v_{j|k}, \bar{\theta}), \quad (5b)$$

$$\mathbb{X}_{j+1|k} \supseteq \Phi(\mathbb{X}_{j|k}, z_{j|k}, v_{j|k}), \quad (5c)$$

$$\{(x, \kappa(x, z_{j|k}, v_{j|k})) : x \in \mathbb{X}_{j|k}\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}, \quad (5d)$$

$$z_{0|k}, x_k \in \mathbb{X}_{0|k}, \quad (5e)$$

$$\mathbb{X}_{N|k} \supseteq \Phi(\mathbb{X}_{N|k}, z_{N|k}, v_k^s), \quad (5f)$$

$$\{(x, \kappa(x, z_{N|k}, v_k^s)) : x \in \mathbb{X}_{N|k}\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}, \quad (5g)$$

$$z_{N|k} = f(z_{N|k}, v_k^s, \bar{\theta}), \quad (5h)$$

$$\forall j \in \mathbb{I}_{[0, N-1]}.$$

We minimize some suitable cost function (5a), while propagating the nominal system dynamics (5b), propagating the tube (5c), and ensuring robust constraint satisfaction (5d). The set $\mathbb{X}_{j|k}$ can be finitely parameterized (e.g., ellipsoid or polytope). The constraint (5e) ensures that the initial tube $\mathbb{X}_{0|k}$




Fig. 2. For each $x \in \mathbb{X}_k$, we can predict future states for different disturbances $d \in \mathbb{D}$ and parameters $\theta \in \Theta$. All of these predictions are contained in the robust one-step reachable set $\Phi(\mathbb{X}_k, z_k, v_k)$.

contains the measured state x_k and the optimized nominal initial state $z_{0|k}$. The nominal trajectory is constrained to end at a steady-state with some input v_k^s (5h). The constraint (5f) ensures that the terminal set $\mathbb{X}_{N|k}$ is robust positive invariant and (5g) ensures that it also satisfies the constraints.

We denote the solution of Problem (5) by $z_{j|k}^*$, $v_{j|k}^*$, and $\mathbb{X}_{\cdot|k}^*$.

Lemma 1 (Robust MPC properties [18, Theorem 1]). *Let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. If Problem (5) is feasible at time $k = 0$, then it is recursively feasible and the closed-loop system $x_{k+1} = f_w(x_k, u_k, \theta_k, d_k)$ with $u_k = \kappa(x_k, z_{0|k}^*, v_{0|k}^*)$ satisfies the constraints (3).*

C. Least-Mean Squares Parameter Estimation

In the following, we recall the projected least-mean squares (LMS) estimator from [14]. This parameter estimation method iteratively computes an estimate $\hat{\theta}_k \in \Theta$ starting from the initial estimate $\hat{\theta}_0 \in \Theta$. The estimate $\hat{\theta}_k$ will be used in our proposed adaptive economic MPC formulation.

To shorten the notation, we define $w_k := E(x_k, u_k)d_k$ and $\Delta\theta_k := \theta_{k+1} - \theta_k$. We define the one-step prediction $\hat{x}_{1|k}$ and the corresponding prediction error $\tilde{x}_{1|k}$ as

$$\hat{x}_{1|k} := f_0(x_k, u_k) + G(x_k, u_k) \cdot \hat{\theta}_k, \quad (6a)$$

$$\tilde{x}_{1|k} := G(x_k, u_k) \cdot (\theta_k - \hat{\theta}_k). \quad (6b)$$

Note that the one-step prediction error satisfies $\tilde{x}_{1|k} + w_k = x_{k+1} - \hat{x}_{1|k}$.

The update equations of the projected LMS estimator are

$$\tilde{\theta}_{k+1} = \hat{\theta}_k + \mu G(x_k, u_k)^\top \cdot (x_{k+1} - \hat{x}_{1|k}), \quad (7a)$$

$$\hat{\theta}_{k+1} = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\theta - \tilde{\theta}_{k+1}\|, \quad (7b)$$

where $\mu > 0$ is the parameter update gain and satisfies

$$\frac{1}{\mu} \geq \max_{(x, u) \in \mathbb{Z}} \|G(x, u)\|^2. \quad (8)$$

Equation (7a) corresponds to a gradient step on the instantaneous squared prediction error, while (7b) projects the intermediate result onto the convex set Θ to guarantee $\hat{\theta}_{k+1} \in \Theta$. Since G is continuous and \mathbb{Z} compact (cf. Section II-A), the maximum in (8) is bounded.

Proposition 1 (LMS bounds). *Let Assumption 1 hold. If $(x_k, u_k) \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}$, then, for all $T \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds that*

$$\sum_{k=0}^T \|\tilde{x}_{1|k}\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{\mu} \|\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0\|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^T \left[\|w_k\|^2 + \frac{2c_\theta}{\mu} \|\Delta\theta_k\| \right], \quad (9)$$

where $c_\theta := \max_{\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta} \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|$. Furthermore, the difference between successive parameter estimates satisfies

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu}} \|\hat{\theta}_{k+1} - \hat{\theta}_k\| \leq \|\tilde{x}_{1|k} + w_k\|. \quad (10)$$

Proof. The proof follows the steps in [14, Lemma 5] and is provided in Appendix A. \square

D. Regularity Conditions

We impose mild regularity conditions on the system dynamics, the cost, and the auxiliary feedback law. To leverage convex design principles even when dealing with non-convex constraints, we define the convex and compact sets \mathbb{Z}_x and \mathbb{Z}_u such that

$$(x, v) \in \mathbb{Z} \Rightarrow x \in \mathbb{Z}_x, v \in \mathbb{Z}_u. \quad (11)$$

In case \mathbb{Z} is convex, these two sets can simply be the projection of \mathbb{Z} on the state and input space.

Assumption 3 (Regularity). *The dynamics f_w , the cost ℓ , and the stabilizing feedback κ are Lipschitz continuous, i.e., there exist constants $L_{\text{dyn}}, L_\ell, L_\kappa \geq 0$, such that the inequalities*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|f_w(x, u, \theta, d) - f_w(x', u', \theta', d')\| \\ & \leq L_{\text{dyn}} (\|x - x'\| + \|u - u'\| + \|\theta - \theta'\| + \|d - d'\|), \end{aligned} \quad (12a)$$

$$\|\ell(x, u) - \ell(x', u')\| \leq L_\ell (\|x - x'\| + \|u - u'\|), \quad (12b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\kappa(x, z, v) - \kappa(x', z', v')\| \\ & \leq L_\kappa (\|x - x'\| + \|z - z'\| + \|v - v'\|), \end{aligned} \quad (12c)$$

hold for all $(x, u), (x', u'), (z, v), (z', v') \in \mathbb{Z}_x \times \mathbb{Z}_u$, and all $(\theta, d), (\theta', d') \in \Theta \times \mathbb{D}$.

Furthermore, we impose a regularity condition on the equilibrium manifold of system (2).

Assumption 4 (Steady-state manifold). *There exists a function $h : \mathbb{Z}_u \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ such that for any $\theta \in \Theta$, $v \in \mathbb{Z}_u$, the states $x = h(v, \theta)$, $z = h(v, \bar{\theta})$ satisfy*

$$f(x, \kappa(x, z^s, v), \theta) = x, \quad f(z^s, v, \bar{\theta}) = z^s.$$

Furthermore, h is Lipschitz continuous, i.e., there exists a constant $L_h \geq 0$, such that

$$\|h(v, \theta) - h(v', \theta')\| \leq L_h (\|v - v'\| + \|\theta - \theta'\|), \quad (13)$$

holds for any $v, v' \in \mathbb{Z}_u$, $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$.

Note that the true parameters θ_k is not known, and Assumption 4 ensures that, for each parameter, at least one equilibrium exists. Such mapping h exists naturally due to the implicit function theorem if the feedback κ ensures exponential stability, see [36, Remark 1].

III. PROPOSED MPC DESIGN

In this section, we present our proposed adaptive economic MPC scheme. First, we discuss the elements of the MPC formulation (Section III-A) and then show how to design the terminal cost (Section III-B).

A. MPC Design

Our proposed robust adaptive economic MPC approach consists of three elements:

- We use the parameter estimate $\hat{\theta}_k$ from the projected LMS (7) to obtain a certainty-equivalent prediction of the system's behavior $\hat{x}_{\cdot|k}$. The MPC minimizes the finite-horizon economic cost of this trajectory, consisting of the economic costs ℓ and the terminal cost ℓ_f .
- We separately minimize the economic cost at an artificial equilibrium $(\hat{x}_k^s, \hat{u}_k^s)$ with some weighting $\beta \geq 0$.
- To capture the effects of the parametric uncertainty and disturbances, we employ the robust MPC formulation from Section II-B.

The robust adaptive economic MPC problem is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\substack{\hat{x}_{\cdot|k}, z_{\cdot|k}, \\ v_{\cdot|k}, v_k^s, \\ \mathbb{X}_{\cdot|k}}} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \ell(\hat{x}_{j|k}, \hat{u}_{j|k}) + \ell_f(\hat{x}_{N|k}, \hat{x}_k^s, v_k^s, \hat{\theta}_k) \\ + \beta \ell(\hat{x}_k^s, \hat{u}_k^s) \end{aligned} \quad (14a)$$

s.t. (5b)–(5g),

$$\hat{x}_{j+1|k} = f(\hat{x}_{j|k}, \hat{u}_{j|k}, \hat{\theta}_k), \quad (14b)$$

$$\hat{u}_{j|k} = \kappa(\hat{x}_{j|k}, z_{j|k}, v_{j|k}), \quad (14c)$$

$$\hat{x}_{0|k} = x_k, \quad (14d)$$

$$\hat{x}_k^s = f(\hat{x}_k^s, \hat{u}_k^s, \hat{\theta}_k), \quad \hat{u}_k^s = \kappa(\hat{x}_k^s, z_{N|k}, v_k^s), \quad (14e)$$

$$\ell(\hat{x}_k^s, \hat{u}_k^s) \leq \lambda_k, \quad (14f)$$

$$\forall j \in \mathbb{I}_{[0, N-1]}.$$

The solution of (14) is denoted by $\hat{x}_{\cdot|k}^*, \mathbb{X}_{\cdot|k}^*, z_{\cdot|k}^*, v_{\cdot|k}^*, v_k^{s*}, \hat{x}_k^{s*}, \hat{u}_k^{s*}$, and the corresponding value of the cost function (14a) by $\mathcal{J}_N^*(x_k, \hat{\theta}_k, \lambda_k)$. The closed-loop system is obtained by applying the control input

$$u_k = \kappa(x_k, z_{0|k}^*, v_{0|k}^*) \quad (15)$$

to the system (1).

Similar to the robust MPC formulation (5), we predict a nominal trajectory (5d) with the nominal parameters $\bar{\theta}$ and a prediction tube (5b) that satisfies the constraints for all parameters and disturbances (5c). In contrast to the robust MPC scheme (5), minimize a certainty-equivalent economic cost. The corresponding trajectory $\hat{x}_{j|k}$ is the prediction of the state evolution for parameters $\hat{\theta}_k$ without disturbances. Furthermore, we account for the estimated parameters by also minimizing the cost at the artificial reference $(\hat{x}_k^s, \hat{u}_k^s)$ and for the long-term costs with a terminal cost ℓ_f . The terminal cost ℓ_f should capture the infinite-horizon cost of applying the feedback $\hat{u}_{j|k} = \kappa(\hat{x}_{j|k}, z_{N|k}, v_k^s)$, $j \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq N}$ after the prediction horizon. The constant $\beta > 0$ in the cost function (14a) weighs the artificial reference cost relative to the stage and terminal cost.

The function h from Assumption 4 provides a mapping from the parameter estimate $\hat{\theta}_k$ and the *previous* steady-input v_{k-1}^{s*} to a candidate steady-state $\hat{x}_k^s = h(v_{k-1}^{s*}, \hat{\theta}_k)$ with the corresponding input $\hat{u}_k^s = \kappa(\hat{x}_k^s, z_{N|k-1}^*, v_{k-1}^{s*})$. We use this to update the value of λ_k at each time step $k \in \mathbb{N}$ according to

$$\lambda_k := \ell(h(v_{k-1}^{s*}, \hat{\theta}_k), \hat{u}_k^s). \quad (16)$$

In combination with (14f), this ensures that the cost at the artificial steady-state is not increased compared to the candidate solution.

B. Offline Design

In this section, we show how to design the terminal cost and then summarize the offline and online computations of the proposed MPC formulation. In contrast to standard economic MPC designs, we do not enforce a terminal set constraint that ensures that the prediction $\hat{x}_{N|k}$ is in a small neighborhood of the steady-state \hat{x}_k^s [26, Assumption 6]. Instead, we design a terminal cost that is valid on the full constraint set. We further denote $\kappa_s(v, \theta) := \kappa(h(v, \theta), h(v, \bar{\theta}), v)$ and $\ell^s(v, \theta) := \ell(h(v, \theta), \kappa_s(v, \theta))$ to simplify the notation.

Assumption 5 (Terminal cost). *There exists a uniform constant $L_f \geq 0$ such that for any $x, \tilde{x}, x^s, \tilde{x}^s \in \mathbb{Z}_x$, $v, \tilde{v} \in \mathbb{Z}_u$, and any $\theta, \bar{\theta} \in \Theta$, it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_f(f(x, \kappa(x, z^s, v), \theta), \hat{x}^s, v, \theta) - \ell_f(x, \hat{x}^s, v, \theta) \\ \leq -\ell(x, \kappa(x, z^s, v)) + \ell^s(v, \theta), \end{aligned} \quad (17a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\ell_f(x, x^s, v, \theta) - \ell_f(\tilde{x}, \tilde{x}^s, \tilde{v}, \bar{\theta})\| \\ \leq L_f \left(\|x - \tilde{x}\| + \|x^s - \tilde{x}^s\| + \|v - \tilde{v}\| + \|\theta - \bar{\theta}\| \right), \end{aligned} \quad (17b)$$

with $z^s = h(v, \bar{\theta})$ and $\hat{x}^s = h(v, \theta)$.

Inequality (17a) corresponds to the standard inequality posed on terminal costs in economic MPC (cf. [26, Assumption 6]), but needs to be valid for all parameters $\theta \in \Theta$ and setpoints x^s to uncertain parameters. Furthermore, ℓ_f is Lipschitz-continuous (17b).

Constructing ℓ_f : Next, we show how to construct a terminal cost ℓ_f that satisfies Assumption 5. In particular, we use a linear-quadratic terminal cost

$$\ell_f(x, \hat{x}^s, v^s, \theta) := \|x - \hat{x}^s\|_{P_f}^2 + p(\theta, \hat{x}^s, v^s)^\top (x - \hat{x}^s), \quad (18)$$

with $P_f \succ 0$. The matrix P_f is computed offline, whereas the linear term $p(\theta, \hat{x}^s, v^s)$ has an analytical formula and can be included in Problem (14).

In order to compute P_f and p such that ℓ_f satisfies Assumption 5, we introduce four quantities: First, we define the *shifted cost* as

$$\bar{\ell}(x, v^s, \theta) := \ell(x, \kappa(x, h(v^s, \bar{\theta}), v^s)) - \ell^s(v^s, \theta). \quad (19)$$

Second, the Jacobian of the closed-loop system $f_\kappa(x, v, \theta) := f(x, \kappa(x, h(v, \bar{\theta}), v), \theta)$ is given by

$$A_K(x, v, \theta) := \left. \frac{\partial f_\kappa}{\partial x} \right|_{(x, v, \theta)} \quad (20)$$

Third, based on the shifted cost $\bar{\ell}$ and the Jacobian A_K , we can define the vector p as

$$p(\theta, \hat{x}^s, v^s) := \left[(I_{n_x} - A_K(\hat{x}^s, v^s, \theta))^{-1} \right]^\top \cdot \left. \frac{\partial \bar{\ell}}{\partial x} \right|_{(\hat{x}^s, v^s, \theta)}. \quad (21)$$

Fourth, we use $H \geq 0$ to denote an upper bound on the maximum eigenvalue of the Hessian of the closed-loop dynamics $\frac{\partial^2 [f_\kappa]_i}{\partial x^2}$, i.e.,

$$H := \max_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{Z}_x, v^s \in \mathbb{Z}_u, \\ \theta \in \Theta, i \in \mathbb{I}_{[1, n_x]}}} \left\{ \lambda_{\max} \left(\left. \frac{\partial^2 [f_\kappa]_i}{\partial x^2} \right|_{(x, v^s, \theta)} \right); 0 \right\}. \quad (22)$$

The following proposition computes a matrix P_f such that the terminal cost (18) satisfies Assumption 5.

Proposition 2 (Terminal cost). *Let Assumptions 1, 3, and 4 hold and suppose that the dynamics f_w , the stage cost ℓ , and the feedback κ are twice continuously differentiable. Consider any $Q \succeq 0$ and $\alpha \geq 0$ satisfying*

$$Q \succeq \left. \frac{\partial^2 \bar{\ell}}{\partial x^2} \right|_{(x, v^s, \theta)} + \alpha I_{n_x}, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{Z}_x, v^s \in \mathbb{Z}_u, \theta \in \Theta, \quad (23a)$$

$$\alpha \geq \sqrt{n_x} \cdot \frac{H}{2} \cdot \max_{\hat{x}^s, v^s \in \mathbb{Z}_x, \theta \in \Theta} \|p(\theta, \hat{x}^s, v^s)\|, \quad (23b)$$

and $P_f \succ 0$ satisfying

$$A_K(x, v^s, \theta)^\top P_f A_K(x, v^s, \theta) - P_f \preceq -Q, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{Z}_x, v^s \in \mathbb{Z}_u, \theta \in \Theta. \quad (23c)$$

Then, the terminal cost (18) satisfies Assumption 5.

Proof. The proof is provided in Appendix A. \square

Compared to the standard design procedure for the economic terminal cost ℓ_f from [26], we provide a terminal cost that depends on θ and \hat{x}^s . More importantly, we guarantee that ℓ_f satisfies (17) for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}_x$, not just in a small enough terminal set. To obtain the terminal cost, the constant α needs to be computed to obtain the matrix Q . Thereby, we compute a global upper bound on the Hessian of the shifted cost. Solving the linear matrix inequality (23c) yields the matrix P_f . The vector p must be evaluated online.

Remark 2 (State-dependent matrices $P_f(x)$). *Proposition 2 considers a constant matrix P_f for simplicity of exposition. We conjecture that a state-dependent matrix $P_f(x)$ can also be used, similar to [37, Lemma 1], [32, Corollary 2].*

A summary of the offline design and the online operation is provided by Algorithm 1.

IV. THEORETICAL ANALYSIS

First, we present our main result, a general transient performance bound (Section IV-A). Subsequently, we consider disturbances with finite energy and parameter variations with finite path length to derive intuitive bounds on the asymptotic average performance (Section IV-B), including a suboptimality bound (Section IV-C). Lastly, we relate the obtained results to the state-of-the-art (Section IV-D).

Algorithm 1 Robust Adaptive Economic MPC

Compute μ according to (8).
 Choose a tube scheme (i.e., Φ and $\mathbb{X}_{|k}$) and corresponding auxiliary feedback κ in agreement with Assumption 2.
 Compute terminal cost ℓ_f (e.g., Proposition 2).
 Set $\lambda_0 = \infty$.
for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ **do**
 Measure the state x_k .
 Update $\hat{\theta}_k \in \Theta$ using the LMS estimator (7).
 Update λ_k using (16).
 Solve the optimization problem (14).
 Apply the control input (15).
end for

A. Transient Performance

We are now ready to state the main result, the transient performance guarantee for the closed-loop system.

Theorem 1 (Transient performance bound). *Let Assumptions 1–5 hold and suppose that Problem (14) is feasible at time $k = 0$. Then, Problem (14) is recursively feasible and the constraints (3) are robustly satisfied for the closed-loop system resulting from Algorithm 1. Furthermore, there exist uniform constants $C_{\mathcal{J}}, C_A, L_s \geq 0$ such that, for all $T \in \mathbb{N}$, the closed-loop cost satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} [\ell(x_k, u_k) - \ell(\hat{x}_k^{s*}, \hat{u}_k^{s*})] \\
 & \leq (C_A + \sqrt{\mu}\beta L_s) \cdot \left(2\sqrt{T}|w_{[0, T-1]}|_{\mathcal{L}_2} + \sqrt{\frac{T}{\mu}}\|\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0\| \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \sqrt{\frac{2Tc_{\theta}}{\mu}} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \sqrt{\|\Delta\theta_k\|} \right) + C_{\mathcal{J}}. \tag{24}
 \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof is provided in Appendix A. \square

Theorem 1 relates the transient performance of the closed-loop system from Algorithm 1 to the performance at the artificial steady-state (\hat{x}_k^s, u_k^s) . The performance bound scales linearly with the \mathcal{L}_2 -norm of the realized disturbances $|w_{[0, T-1]}|_{\mathcal{L}_2}$, linearly with the initial parameter estimation error $\|\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0\|$, and with the variation of the true parameters $\Delta\theta_k$. Assumption 1 implies that $|w_{[0, T-1]}|_{\mathcal{L}_2} \leq \hat{w}\sqrt{T}$ with $\hat{w} = \max_{d \in \mathbb{D}, (x, u) \in \mathbb{Z}} \|E(x, u)d\|$. Thus, the asymptotic average performance scales linearly with \hat{w} .

B. Asymptotic Average Performance

In the following, we derive a more intuitive asymptotic performance bound for the special case of finite-energy disturbances w_k and finite path length variations of the parameters θ_k .

Assumption 6 (Finite-energy disturbances, finite parameter path length). *There exist constants $S_w, S_{\theta} < \infty$ such that*

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} |w_{[0, T]}|_{\mathcal{L}_2}^2 = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^T \|w_k\|^2 \leq S_w, \tag{25a}$$

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^T \|\theta_{k+1} - \theta_k\| \leq S_{\theta}. \tag{25b}$$

This assumption implies that the averaged prediction error tends to zero.

Lemma 2 (Asymptotic average of one-step prediction error). *Let Assumptions 1 and 6 hold and let $(x_k, u_k) \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, the asymptotic average prediction error is zero, i.e.,*

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \frac{\|\tilde{x}_{1|k}\| + \|w_k\|}{T} = 0. \tag{26}$$

Proof. The proof is provided in Appendix B. \square

Using Lemma 2, we can bound the asymptotic average performance of the closed-loop system.

Corollary 1 (Asymptotic average performance). *Suppose the conditions in Theorem 1 are fulfilled and also Assumption 6 holds. Then, the closed-loop performance satisfies*

$$\limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \frac{\ell(\hat{x}_k, \hat{u}_k)}{T} \leq \lambda_{\infty}, \tag{27}$$

where $\lambda_{\infty} := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_k = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \ell(\hat{x}_k^{s*}, \hat{u}_k^{s*})$.

Proof. The proof is provided in Appendix A. \square

This corollary shows that, on average, the closed-loop performance is not worse than the performance at the optimized steady-state \hat{x}^{s*} .

C. Suboptimality Guarantee

In the following, we strengthen Corollary 1 to provide guarantees with respect to the best achievable equilibrium. The optimal achievable equilibrium cost $\underline{\ell}$ is defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
 \underline{\ell}(x, \theta, \lambda) & := \min_{v \in \mathbb{V}_s(x, \theta, \lambda)} \ell^s(v, \theta), \\
 \mathbb{V}_s(x, \theta, \lambda) & = \{v^s : v^s \text{ feasible in (14)} \\
 & \quad \text{with } x_k = x, \hat{\theta}_k = \theta, \lambda_k = \lambda\}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Condition (28) yields the smallest cost that the artificial setpoint (\hat{x}^s, v^s) can attain for any feasible solution of Problem (14). In [28], it was shown that we can approximately achieve this level of performance by increasing the weighting β of the artificial setpoint term in (14a). The following corollary extends this result to the considered adaptive economic MPC formulation.

Corollary 2 (Approximate optimality). *Suppose the conditions in Corollary 1 are fulfilled. Then, there exists a function*

$\beta(\varepsilon) : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, choosing $\beta \geq \underline{\beta}(\varepsilon)$ ensures

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \frac{\ell(x_k, u_k)}{T} &\leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \ell(\hat{x}_k^s, v_k^s) \\ &\leq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \underline{\ell}(x_k, \hat{\theta}_k) + \varepsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Proof. The proof is provided in Appendix A. \square

Corollary 2 guarantees that the average performance of the closed-loop system to be at least ε -close to the best achievable equilibrium cost. By choosing β sufficiently large, the guaranteed asymptotic average performance is *arbitrarily close* to the best achievable steady-state performance.

D. Discussion

In the following, we discuss the derived performance bounds and relate our results to the state-of-the-art for economic and adaptive MPC formulations.

a) Performance bounds: Theorem 1 provides a general transient bound on the closed-loop performance when applying the proposed adaptive economic MPC scheme to uncertain nonlinear systems. In particular, it bounds the suboptimality of the closed-loop operation relative to operating the system at the optimized setpoint \hat{x}^{s*} . This bound depends on the initial error in the parameter estimate, the energy of the disturbances, and the variation of the unknown parameters. If we consider long-term operation $T \rightarrow \infty$ and bounded variations in the unknown parameters, then the bound on the average scales linearly with $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|w_{[0, T-1]}|_{\mathcal{L}_2}}{\sqrt{T}} \leq \max_{k \in \mathbb{I}_{[0, T]}} \|w_k\|$. Thus, the asymptotic average closed-loop cost is smaller or equal to the cost at the optimized steady-state if the disturbances decay, independent of the initial error in the parameter estimate. This is formalized in Corollaries 1-2, ensuring that the average cost is at least ε -close to the best achievable setpoint if we use a large penalty β and the disturbance energy and parameter variations are finite (Assumption 1). Notably, in general the closed loop system may also outperform operation at the (unknown) optimal steady-state, see also the numerical example in Section V. According to (24), a large penalty β may also increase the impact of disturbances and parameter variations and hence, a trade-off should be considered when choosing β in practical applications.

b) Adaptive MPC: Adaptive MPC schemes using LMS adaptation are investigated in [14], [15], [18]. These formulations all address the problem of stabilizing a fixed steady-state and ensure finite-gain \mathcal{L}_2 -stability, i.e., a linear bound between the tracking error and the disturbance energy. Notably, all of these designs assume that some optimal setpoint satisfies the dynamics for all possible parameters $\theta \in \Theta$. This can be very restrictive. The proposed design removes this limitation by using artificial references and a generalized terminal constraint in the design.

c) Online optimized setpoints in Economic MPC: The proposed approach optimizes an artificial reference to determine the optimal operating regime online, while also accounting for the updated model parameters. Existing results

for economic MPC with artificial references can be found in [28]–[30], [32]. These results all study the nominal case, i.e., there are no disturbances and the parameters θ are known and constant. In [30, Theorem 3], it is proposed to increase the weighting β during online operation, ensuring that the asymptotic average performance is no worse than operation at the optimal achievable steady-state. Closer to the proposed approach, [28] shows that the asymptotic average closed-loop performance is almost as good as the performance at the optimal achievable steady-state by choosing a large constant weight β . In particular, Corollary 2 generalizes [28, Theorem 2], ensuring the same performance bound but for uncertain systems subject to disturbances and time-varying uncertain parameters. This is made possible by including a robust tube and online model adaptation in the design.

d) Terminal ingredients: Another important contribution is the design of the terminal cost in Proposition 2. While designs of economic terminal costs are available [26], the application of these designs to online optimized setpoints is non-trivial [30, Sec. 4.1], let alone to uncertain system with online adaptation. In particular, existing designs use a local Taylor expansion around a fixed setpoint to ensure Inequality (17) holds in a sufficiently small neighborhood. However, due to the uncertainty in the system dynamics (1), it is not feasible to force all uncertain predictions to end in a small terminal set around a fixed equilibrium. Proposition 2 addresses this issue by providing a design that is valid for any setpoint x^s , any model parameters θ , and for all states $x \in \mathbb{Z}_x$, without requiring the explicit restriction to a small terminal set.

e) Prior work: In our conference paper [34], we derived similar performance guarantees for an adaptive economic MPC scheme. This approach was restricted to open-loop stable linear systems with a linear-quadratic economic cost function and soft-constraints. In contrast, Algorithm 1 ensures robust constraint satisfaction, is applicable to time-varying parameters, and a broad class of nonlinear systems and nonlinear economic costs ℓ . More importantly, the proposed method explicitly deals with the fact that the optimal steady-states \hat{x}_k^s depend on the parameter estimates $\hat{\theta}_k$, while [34] assumes that the optimal steady-state is independent of the parameter estimates $\hat{\theta}_k$.

V. NUMERICAL EXAMPLE

In this section, we demonstrate improved performance of the proposed adaptive economic MPC (AE-MPC) scheme compared to economic MPC (E-MPC) with perfect parameter knowledge and highlight reliable performance under time-varying parameters.

The simulations are performed using MATLAB: The offline computations use YALMIP [38] and MOSEK [39], and the online computations use CasADi [40] and IPOPT [41]. The code is available online.¹

¹<https://github.com/maximiliandegner/AEMPC.git>

A. System description

We consider a continuous stirred-tank reactor (CSTR) model from [42], which is a standard benchmark for economic MPC [7], [32]. The continuous-time dynamics are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dx}{dt} = & \begin{bmatrix} 1 - [x]_1 \\ -[x]_2 \\ -[x]_3 + u \end{bmatrix} \\ & + \begin{bmatrix} -[x]_1^2 \exp(-\frac{1}{[x]_3}) & -[x]_1 \exp(-\frac{\delta}{[x]_3}) \\ [x]_1^2 \exp(-\frac{1}{[x]_3}) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} [\theta]_1 \cdot 10^5 \\ [\theta]_2 \cdot 400 \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where $\delta = 0.55$. The states $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ are given by the concentration of reactant, the concentration of the desired product, and the temperature of the mixture. The input $u \in \mathbb{R}$ represents the heat flux through the cooling jacket of the reactor. The parameter set is $\Theta = [0.985, 1.015] \cdot [\bar{\theta}]_1 \times [0.985, 1.015] \cdot [\bar{\theta}]_2$ with the nominal parameters $\bar{\theta} = [0.0995, 1.0050]^\top$. The state and input constraints are given by

$$[x]_i \in [0.03, 0.25] \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{I}_{[1,3]}, \quad u \in [0.049, 0.449]. \quad (31)$$

We use the Euler discretization with a sampling step of $T_s = 0.025$. We consider additive disturbances d , i.e., $E = I_{n_x}$, that are sampled uniformly with $d_k \in \mathbb{D} = 5 \cdot 10^{-4} \cdot [-1, 1]^3$. The economic cost function is $\ell(x, u) = -[x]_2$, which corresponds to the maximization of the yields in the desired product through maximizing its concentration $[x]_2$. Notably, the optimal operation of this CSTR includes large (quasi-periodic) oscillations, while operation at the optimal steady-state is suboptimal [7, Section 3.4].

B. Offline design

The tube propagation (Assumption 2) is implemented with the homothetic tube formulation from [35], i.e., we parametrize the tube as $\mathbb{X}_{j|k} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x} : \|x - z_{j|k}\|_P \leq s_{j|k}\}$ where $s_{j|k}$ is an online propagated scaling of the tube. The auxiliary feedback law takes the form $\kappa(x, z, v) = K(x - z) + v$. We compute the matrices P , K , and a contraction rate ρ offline using linear matrix inequalities, see Appendix C for details. The propagation of the tube size takes the parametric uncertainty into account using

$$s_{j+1|k} = (\rho + L_w) \cdot s_{j|k} \quad (32)$$

$$+ \max_{\substack{\theta \in \Theta, \\ d \in \mathbb{D}}} \|G(z_{j|k}, v_{j|k}) \cdot \theta + Ed\|_P, \quad (33)$$

with a Lipschitz bound L_w given by

$$L_w := \max_{\substack{(x,u) \in \mathbb{Z}, \\ \theta \in \Theta}} \left\| P^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{i=0}^{n_\theta} \frac{\partial [G]_{:,i}}{\partial x} \Big|_{(x,u)} \cdot [\theta - \bar{\theta}]_i \cdot P^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|. \quad (34)$$

The invariance condition (5f) reduces to $(1 - \rho - L_w) s_{N|k} \geq \max_{\theta \in \Theta, d \in \mathbb{D}} \|G(z_{N|k}, v_k^s) \cdot \theta + E(z_{N|k}, v_k^s) \cdot d\|_P$. The set inclusion (5c) reduces to tightening the constraints on the nominal trajectory $z_{j|k}$ proportional to the scaling $s_{j|k}$. Additional details on the formulation of the offline computation of this homothetic tube MPC can be found in Appendix C and in [35].

The terminal cost is designed according to Proposition 2 and all MPC schemes are implemented with horizon $N = 25$.

The offline computations were performed on a ThinkPad T14 Gen2i (Intel Core i5-1135G7, 16GB RAM) running Windows 11 and took 0.9 seconds in total.

C. Simulation results

First, we consider the case of *time-invariant* parameters. Then, we show that for *time-varying* parameters, the AE-MPC's performance approaches that of economic MPC with perfect model knowledge.

Time-invariant parameters: We consider $\theta_k = [0.1, 1]^\top \forall k \geq 0$ and the initial parameter estimate $\hat{\theta}_0 = [0.0980, 1.0200]^\top$. We compare three different controllers.

- The proposed AE-MPC scheme, with the LMS switched on at time step 200,
- an E-MPC scheme with $\hat{\theta}_k = \theta_k$ (known parameters), and
- an E-MPC scheme with $\hat{\theta}_k = \hat{\theta}_0, \forall k \geq 0$ (no adaptation).

In Figure 3, we depict the simulation results. At the beginning, the AE-MPC and the E-MPC (no adaptation) show the same behavior until the LMS is switched on (vertical grey dashed line). Afterwards, the AE-MPC controlled system achieves a higher average concentration $[x]_2$ and thus, a smaller cost. AE-MPC first performs similar to E-MPC (no adaptation) and then the performance improves through adaptation and converges to the performance of E-MPC (known parameters). Furthermore, While Theorem 1 provides a bound on the transient performance compared to the optimal setpoint, Figure 3 shows that the proposed AE-MPC scheme incurs an even smaller cost than the optimal steady-state operation. The parameter estimates $\hat{\theta}_k$ gradually approaches the true parameters, and after $2 \cdot 10^3$ time steps, the estimate remains close to the true parameters.

Time-varying parameters: In the second simulation, we use a ramp to mimic a drift of the system parameters over 3000 time steps. The evolution of the LMS parameter estimates in this case are shown in Figure 4 together with the averaged transient performance. The results indicate that the LMS parameter estimator can follow drifting parameters which in turn leads to an improvement of the average performance. After $2.5 \cdot 10^3$ time steps, the performance of AE-MPC and E-MPC (known parameters) are almost identical and significantly better than the performance of E-MPC without adaptation.

In summary, the numerical comparison demonstrated that the adaptative economic MPC scheme yields a performance that is significantly better than that of E-MPC (no adaptation) and in fact closely approximates the performance of E-MPC (known parameters).

VI. CONCLUSION

We provided a Model Predictive Control (MPC) scheme for directly minimizing the economic transient cost of uncertain nonlinear systems. The proposed MPC formulation utilizes least-mean squares parameter adaptation, minimizes a certainty-equivalent economic cost, employs artificial references to optimize the unknown optimal steady-states online, and uses a robust formulation to ensure constraint satisfaction




Fig. 3. Performance comparison of AE-MPC and E-MPC (no adaptation). First plot: Closed-loop evolution of the state $[x]_2$. Second plot: Averaged transient performance for AE-MPC (blue, solid), E-MPC (no adaptation) with constant parameter estimate $\hat{\theta}_0$ (red, dashed), E-MPC (known parameters) with knowledge of θ_k (green, dotted), and optimal steady-state cost for θ_k (grey, dash-dotted). Third and fourth plot: Evolution of the parameter estimates of AE-MPC. The LMS is activated at time step 200 (vertical grey dashed line).




Fig. 4. Performance comparison of AE-MPC and E-MPC for time-varying parameters θ_k . First plot: Averaged transient performance for AE-MPC (blue, solid), E-MPC (no adaptation) with constant $\hat{\theta}_0$ (red, dashed), and E-MPC (known parameters) with knowledge of θ_k (green, dotted). Second and third plot: Evolution of the parameter estimates of AE-MPC. The LMS is activated at time step 200 (vertical grey dashed line).

for all possible parameters and disturbances. Our theoretical results show that the transient closed-loop cost is bounded by the cost at the optimized setpoint and a penalty that scales linearly with the disturbances and the initial parameter mismatch and increases with the parameter variations. Furthermore, for finite-energy disturbances and finite variations of the parameters, the asymptotic average cost is (approximately) not worse than the cost at the best reachable steady-state. Applying the proposed MPC scheme to a continuous stirred-tank reactor in simulation showed that the controller recovered the performance of economic MPC with knowledge of the true parameters for both time-invariant and time-varying parameters.

APPENDIX

First, we provide the proofs of the main results, i.e., Propositions 1 and 2, Theorem 1, and Corollaries 1 and 2 (Appendix A). Second, we provide the proofs of the auxiliary lemmas (Appendix B). Lastly, we describe the offline computations for the robust MPC used in the numerical example (Appendix C).

A. Proofs of the Main Results

1) *Proof of Proposition 1:* The proof follows the arguments in [14, Lemma 5] and extends them to time-varying parameters. We abbreviate $G_k := G(x_k, u_k)$. Non-expansiveness of the projection (7b) on the convex set Θ implies

$$\|\hat{\theta}_{k+1} - \hat{\theta}_k\| \leq \|\tilde{\theta}_{k+1} - \hat{\theta}_k\| \stackrel{(7a)}{\leq} \mu \|G_k\| \cdot \|\tilde{x}_{1|k} + w_k\|. \quad (35)$$

Applying (8) yields (10).

To prove (9), we complete the square and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\hat{\theta}_{k+1} - \theta_{k+1}\|^2 \\ &= \|\hat{\theta}_{k+1} - \theta_k\|^2 + 2\Delta\theta_k^\top (\theta_{k+1} - \Delta\theta_k - \hat{\theta}_{k+1}) + \|\Delta\theta_k\|^2 \\ &= \|\hat{\theta}_{k+1} - \theta_k\|^2 + 2\Delta\theta_k^\top (\theta_{k+1} - \hat{\theta}_{k+1}) - \|\Delta\theta_k\|^2 \\ &\leq \|\hat{\theta}_{k+1} - \theta_k\|^2 + 2c_\theta \|\Delta\theta_k\|, \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where $c_\theta \geq \|\theta_{k+1} - \hat{\theta}_{k+1}\|$. By using the system dynamics (1) and the definition of $\hat{x}_{1|k}$, we can rewrite the update equation (7a) as

$$\tilde{\theta}_{k+1} \stackrel{(1),(6a),(7a)}{=} \hat{\theta}_k + \mu G_k^\top \cdot \left(G_k \cdot (\theta_k - \hat{\theta}_k) + w_k \right).$$

Following the proof of [14, Lemma 5], we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\mu} \|\tilde{\theta}_{k+1} - \theta_k\|^2 - \frac{1}{\mu} \|\hat{\theta}_k - \theta_k\|^2 \\ & \stackrel{(7a)}{\leq} \frac{1}{\mu} \left(\|\mu G_k^\top (\tilde{x}_{1|k} + w_k)\|^2 + 2(\tilde{x}_{1|k} + w_k)^\top G_k (\hat{\theta}_k - \theta_k) \right) \\ &= (\mu \|G_k\|^2 - 1) \|\tilde{x}_{1|k} + w_k\|^2 - 2(\tilde{x}_{1|k} + w_k)^\top \tilde{x}_{1|k} \\ & \stackrel{(8)}{\leq} -\|\tilde{x}_{1|k}\|^2 + \|w_k\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

where the last inequality holds thanks to completing the square. Combining (36) and (37) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\mu} \|\hat{\theta}_{k+1} - \theta_{k+1}\|^2 - \frac{1}{\mu} \|\hat{\theta}_k - \theta_k\|^2 \\ & \leq -\|\tilde{x}_{1|k}\|^2 + \|w_k\|^2 + \frac{2c_\theta}{\mu} \|\Delta\theta_k\|. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Taking the sum from $k = 0$ to $k = T$ on both sides, rearranging the terms, and using $0 \leq \|\hat{\theta}_T - \theta_T\|^2$ yields (9). \square

2) *Proof of Proposition 2:* This proof consists of three parts: First, we construct a linear-quadratic bound on the stage cost. Then, we show that the terminal cost (18) satisfies (17a) using (23c). Lastly, we show that the terminal cost (18) is Lipschitz continuous, i.e., satisfies (17b). To improve the readability, we use the shorthand notation

$$q(x, v^s, \theta) := \left. \frac{\partial \bar{\ell}}{\partial x} \right|_{(x, v^s, \theta)}^\top.$$

Recall from (19) that the shifted cost is defined as

$$\bar{\ell}(x, v^s, \theta) := \ell(x, \kappa(x, h(v^s, \bar{\theta}), v^s)) - \ell^s(v^s, \theta).$$

Furthermore, recall from (11) that \mathbb{Z}_x and \mathbb{Z}_u are convex and satisfy $(x, u) \in \mathbb{Z} \implies x \in \mathbb{Z}_x, u \in \mathbb{Z}_u$.

Linear-quadratic stage cost bound: First, we construct a linear-quadratic over-approximation ℓ_q of $\bar{\ell}$, similar to [32, Lemma 3]. In particular, we show that

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_q(x, v^s, \theta) & := q(x, v^s, \theta) \cdot (x - \hat{x}^s) + \frac{1}{2} \|x - \hat{x}^s\|_Q^2 \\ & \geq \bar{\ell}(x, v^s, \theta) + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|x - \hat{x}^s\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

with Q from (23a) and $\hat{x}^s = h(v^s, \theta)$. Following the idea of [26, Lemma 23], we use the mean value theorem for vector functions [1, Proposition A.11] to prove (39): Concretely, we apply it to the functional $\ell_q(x, v^s, \theta) - \bar{\ell}(x, v^s, \theta)$, which is zero for $x = \hat{x}^s$ by definition, to relate the shifted cost at some point x to that at the equilibrium \hat{x}^s . This gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \ell_q(x, v^s, \theta) - \bar{\ell}(x, v^s, \theta) \\ & = \left[q(x, v^s, \theta) - \left. \frac{\partial \bar{\ell}}{\partial x} \right|_{(x, v^s, \theta)}^\top \right] \Delta x + \int_0^1 (1-s) \\ & \quad \cdot \Delta x^\top \left(Q - \left. \frac{\partial^2 \bar{\ell}}{\partial x^2} \right|_{(\hat{x}^s + s\Delta x, v^s, \theta)} \right) \Delta x \, ds \\ & \stackrel{(23a), (39)}{\geq} \int_0^1 (1-s) \Delta x^\top \alpha I_{n_x} \Delta x \, ds \\ & = \frac{\alpha}{2} \|x - \hat{x}^s\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta x := x - \hat{x}^s$, $x \in \mathbb{Z}_x$. The inequality leveraged the fact that $\hat{x}^s + s\Delta x \in \mathbb{Z}_x$ for $s \in [0, 1]$, since \mathbb{Z}_x is convex. Consequently, the condition (39) holds for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}_x$.

Terminal cost decrease: Next, we show that the cost decrease (17a) holds.

Consider the first-order Taylor approximation of the dynamics $f_\kappa(x, v^s, \theta) = f(x, \kappa(x, h(v^s, \bar{\theta}), v^s), \theta)$ with the param-

eters θ around the steady-state $\hat{x}^s = h(v^s, \theta)$, which yields

$$\begin{aligned} & f_\kappa(x, v^s, \hat{\theta}) - f_\kappa(\hat{x}^s, v^s, \hat{\theta}) \\ & = A_K(\hat{x}^s, v^s, \hat{\theta}) \cdot (x - \hat{x}^s) + r(x, \hat{x}^s, v^s, \hat{\theta}), \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where $r(x, \hat{x}^s, v^s, \hat{\theta})$ is the remainder term and A_K defined in (20). By using the Lagrange form of the approximation error, we can upper bound its components quadratically

$$|[r(x, \hat{x}^s, v^s, \theta)]_i| \leq \frac{H}{2} \|x - \hat{x}^s\|^2, \quad (41)$$

where H according to (22) is an upper bound on the maximum eigenvalue of the Hessian of the closed-loop dynamics $\frac{\partial^2 [f_\kappa]_i}{\partial x^2}$.

In the following, we abbreviate $x^+ := f_\kappa(x, v^s, \theta)$, $\tilde{A}_K := A_K(\hat{x}^s, v^s, \theta)$, and $\tilde{q} := q(\hat{x}^s, v^s, \theta)$. For the linear terms of the cost function, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & p(\theta, \hat{x}^s, v^s)^\top [(x^+ - \hat{x}^s) - (x - \hat{x}^s)] \\ & = p(\theta, \hat{x}^s, v^s)^\top \left[(x^+ - \hat{x}^s) - (\tilde{A}_K \cdot (x - \hat{x}^s)) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + (\tilde{A}_K \cdot (x - \hat{x}^s)) - (x - \hat{x}^s) \right] \\ & \stackrel{(40)}{=} p(\theta, \hat{x}^s, v^s)^\top \left(r(x, \hat{x}^s, v^s, \theta) + (\tilde{A}_K - I_{n_x}) \cdot (x - \hat{x}^s) \right) \\ & \stackrel{(21)}{=} p(\theta, \hat{x}^s, v^s)^\top r(x, \hat{x}^s, v^s, \theta) - \tilde{q}^\top (x - \hat{x}^s) \\ & \stackrel{(41)}{\leq} \frac{\sqrt{n_x} H}{2} \|p(\theta, \hat{x}^s, v^s)\| \cdot \|x - \hat{x}^s\|^2 - \tilde{q}^\top (x - \hat{x}^s), \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

where the last inequality also used $\|r\| \leq \sqrt{n_x} \|r\|_\infty$. Furthermore, the quadratic terms of the terminal cost satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & \|x^+ - \hat{x}^s\|_{P_f}^2 - \|x - \hat{x}^s\|_{P_f}^2 \\ & = \|f_\kappa(x, v^s, \theta) - \hat{x}^s\|_{P_f}^2 - \|x - \hat{x}^s\|_{P_f}^2 \\ & \stackrel{(23c)}{\leq} -\|x - \hat{x}^s\|_Q^2, \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

where the inequality holds by using contraction theory [43, Theorem 2.8] and that \mathbb{Z}_x is convex. Combining the results from (42) and (43), yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \ell_f(x^+, \hat{x}^s, v^s, \theta) - \ell_f(x, \hat{x}^s, v^s, \theta) \\ & \stackrel{(42), (43)}{\leq} -\|x - \hat{x}^s\|_Q^2 + \frac{\sqrt{n_x} H}{2} \|p(\theta, \hat{x}^s, v^s)\| \cdot \|x - \hat{x}^s\|^2 \\ & \quad - \tilde{q}^\top (x - \hat{x}^s) \\ & \stackrel{(39), (23b)}{\leq} -\bar{\ell}(x, v^s, \theta) \\ & \stackrel{(19)}{=} -\ell(x, \kappa(x, h(v^s, \bar{\theta}), v^s)) + \ell^s(v^s, \theta). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the cost decrease property (17a) holds.

Lipschitz-continuity of ℓ_f : The vector p is uniformly bounded since \tilde{A}_K is Schur stable with a uniform bound and the gradient of $\bar{\ell}$ is bounded thanks to the Lipschitz continuity of f_w , κ , and ℓ . Together with the compact parameter set Θ and the compact constraints \mathbb{Z} , this implies that the terminal cost (18) is Lipschitz-continuous, i.e., (17b) holds.

Consequently, Assumption 5 holds. \square

3) *Proof of Theorem 1:* This proof consists of three parts: First, we prove that Problem (14) is recursively feasible. Second, we relate the change of the cost function to the change of parameter estimates. Lastly, we make use of the LMS parameter estimator's properties (Lemma 3) to obtain

our performance bound.

Recursive feasibility: We show recursive feasibility by constructing a feasible candidate solution to Problem (14) at time $k + 1$, given a feasible solution at time k . Let us denote

$$\begin{aligned} z_{N+1|k}^* &= z_{N|k}^*, & v_{N|k}^* &:= v_k^{s*}, \\ \mathbb{X}_{N+1|k}^* &:= \mathbb{X}_{N|k}^*, & \hat{x}_{0|k+1} &= x_{k+1} \\ \hat{x}_{N+1|k}^* &= f(\hat{x}_{N|k}^*, \kappa(\hat{x}_{N|k}^*, z_{N|k}^*, v_{N|k}^*), \hat{\theta}_k). \end{aligned}$$

The considered candidate solution is given by

$$v_{j|k+1} = v_{j+1|k}^*, \quad j \in \mathbb{I}_{[0, N-1]} \quad (45a)$$

$$v_{k+1}^s = v_k^{s*}, \quad v_{N|k+1} = v_{k+1}^s, \quad (45b)$$

$$\mathbb{X}_{j|k+1} = \mathbb{X}_{j+1|k}^*, \quad z_{j|k+1} = z_{j+1|k}^*, \quad j \in \mathbb{I}_{[1, N]} \quad (45c)$$

$$\hat{x}_{j+1|k+1} = f(\hat{x}_{j|k+1}, \hat{u}_{j|k+1}, \hat{\theta}_k), \quad j \in \mathbb{I}_{[0, N]} \quad (45d)$$

$$\hat{u}_{j|k+1} = \kappa(\hat{x}_{j|k+1}, z_{j|k+1}, v_{j|k+1}), \quad j \in \mathbb{I}_{[0, N]}. \quad (45e)$$

We shift the nominal trajectory $(z_{\cdot|k}^*, v_{\cdot|k}^*)$ and the prediction tubes $\mathbb{X}_{\cdot|k}^*$ in (45a)–(45c) and choose $\mathbb{X}_{N|k+1} = \mathbb{X}_{N|k}^*$, which guarantees that the nominal candidate trajectory satisfies the constraints (5b), (5c), and (5d) at time $k + 1$. The satisfaction of (14d) is guaranteed by shifting the tube with (45c) and thanks to the tube propagation property (4), i.e., $x_{k+1}, z_{1|k}^* \in \mathbb{X}_{1|k}^*$ due to $\theta_k, \hat{\theta} \in \Theta$.

The constraints (14b) and (14c) are satisfied by definition (45d)–(45e). As the last nominal state is $z_{N|k+1} = z_{N|k}^*$ and the steady-input is $v_{k+1}^s = v_k^{s*}$, constraint (5g) holds. The constraint (5f) ensures that the last predicted tube is robust positive invariant and choosing $\mathbb{X}_{N|k+1} = \mathbb{X}_{N|k}^*$ guarantees satisfaction of (5f) and (5g) at the next time step. Inequality (14f) holds with equality for the candidate solution due to (16).

In the following, we abbreviate

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_{j|k+1} &:= \ell(\hat{x}_{j|k+1}, \hat{u}_{j|k+1}), & \ell_{j|k}^* &:= \ell(\hat{x}_{j|k}^*, \hat{u}_{j|k}^*), \\ \Delta \hat{\theta}_k &:= \hat{\theta}_{k+1} - \hat{\theta}_k, \end{aligned}$$

for $j \in \mathbb{I}_{[0, N]}$, and note that $\ell_{0|k}^* = \ell(x_k, u_k)$. Recall from Section II-C that $\tilde{x}_{1|k} + w_k = x_{k+1} - \hat{x}_{1|k}^*$ and $\Delta \theta_k = \theta_{k+1} - \theta_k$.

Bounding the change of the cost function: Based on the feasible candidate (45), the optimal cost \mathcal{J}_N^* satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{J}_N^*(x_{k+1}, \hat{\theta}_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}) - \mathcal{J}_N^*(x_k, \hat{\theta}_k, \lambda_k) + \ell_{0|k}^* \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \left(\ell_{j-1|k+1} - \ell_{j|k}^* \right) - \ell_f(\hat{x}_{N|k}^*, \hat{x}_k^{s*}, v_k^{s*}, \hat{\theta}_k) \\ &\quad + \ell_{N-1|k+1} + \ell_f(\hat{x}_{N|k+1}, \hat{x}_{k+1}^s, v_{k+1}^s, \hat{\theta}_{k+1}) \\ &\quad + \beta \ell^s(v_{k+1}^s, \hat{\theta}_{k+1}) - \beta \ell^s(v_k^{s*}, \hat{\theta}_k). \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

By using the terminal cost's property (17a) and the Lipschitz continuity of ℓ_f and h , we can bound the terminal cost terms as follows

$$\begin{aligned} &\ell_f(\hat{x}_{N|k+1}, \hat{x}_{k+1}^s, v_{k+1}^s, \hat{\theta}_{k+1}) - \ell_f(\hat{x}_{N|k}^*, \hat{x}_k^{s*}, v_k^{s*}, \hat{\theta}_k) \\ &\stackrel{(17a)}{\leq} -\ell_{N|k}^* - \ell_f(\hat{x}_{N+1|k}^*, \hat{x}_k^{s*}, v_k^{s*}, \hat{\theta}_k) \\ &\quad + \ell_f(\hat{x}_{N|k+1}, \hat{x}_{k+1}^s, v_{k+1}^s, \hat{\theta}_{k+1}) + \ell^s(v_k^{s*}, \hat{\theta}_k) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\stackrel{(17b)}{\leq} -\ell_{N|k}^* + L_f \left(\|\hat{x}_{N|k+1} - \hat{x}_{N+1|k}^*\| + \|v_{k+1}^s - v_k^{s*}\| \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \|h(v_{k+1}^s, \hat{\theta}_{k+1}) - h(v_k^{s*}, \hat{\theta}_k)\| + \|\Delta \hat{\theta}_k\| \right) + \ell^s(v_k^{s*}, \hat{\theta}_k) \\ &\stackrel{(13), (45b)}{\leq} -\ell(\hat{x}_{N|k}^*, \kappa(\hat{x}_{N|k}^*, z_{N|k}^*, v_k^{s*})) + \ell^s(v_k^{s*}, \hat{\theta}_k) \\ &\quad + L_f(1 + L_h) \|\Delta \hat{\theta}_k\| + L_f \|\hat{x}_{N|k+1} - \hat{x}_{N+1|k}^*\|. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Combination with LMS properties: Recall that $\ell^s(v, \theta) = \ell(h(v, \theta), \kappa_s(v, \theta))$. For any $v \in \mathbb{Z}_u$ and any $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \ell^s(v, \theta) - \ell^s(v, \theta') &\stackrel{(12b)}{\leq} L_\ell \|h(v, \theta) - h(v, \theta')\| \\ &\stackrel{(13)}{\leq} L_h L_\ell \|\theta - \theta'\| =: L_s \|\theta - \theta'\|, \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

where $L_s \geq 0$. The inequality

$$\|\hat{x}_{j-1|k+1} - \hat{x}_{j|k}^*\| \leq C_{\text{dyn}, \kappa} \|\tilde{x}_{1|k} + w_k\| \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{I}_{[1, N+1]}, \quad (49)$$

holds with a uniform constant $C_{\text{dyn}, \kappa} \geq 0$ thanks to the Lipschitz continuity of the dynamics (12a) and the feedback κ (12c), see Proposition 3 in Appendix B. Combining the intermediate results (46)–(49) yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{J}_N^*(x_{k+1}, \hat{\theta}_{k+1}, \lambda_{k+1}) - \mathcal{J}_N^*(x_k, \hat{\theta}_k, \lambda_k) + \ell_{0|k}^* \\ &\stackrel{(46)-(48)}{\leq} \sum_{j=1}^N \left(\ell_{j-1|k+1} - \ell_{j|k}^* \right) + L_f(1 + L_h) \|\Delta \hat{\theta}_k\| \\ &\quad + L_f \|\hat{x}_{N|k+1} - \hat{x}_{N+1|k}^*\| + (1 - \beta) \ell^s(v_k^{s*}, \hat{\theta}_k) \\ &\quad + \beta \cdot \left(L_s \|\Delta \hat{\theta}_k\| + \ell^s(v_k^{s*}, \hat{\theta}_k) \right) \\ &\stackrel{(49), (12b)}{\leq} C_{\text{dyn}, \kappa} (L_\ell(N - 1) + L_f) \|\tilde{x}_{1|k} + w_k\| \\ &\quad + (L_f(1 + L_h) + \beta L_s) \|\Delta \hat{\theta}_k\| + \ell^s(v_k^{s*}, \hat{\theta}_k) \\ &\stackrel{(8), (35)}{\leq} (C_A + \sqrt{\mu} \beta L_s) \|\tilde{x}_{1|k} + w_k\| + \ell^s(v_k^{s*}, \hat{\theta}_k), \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

with

$$C_A := C_{\text{dyn}, \kappa} (L_\ell(N - 1) + L_f) + \sqrt{\mu} L_f (1 + L_h).$$

Thus, taking a telescopic sum of (50) and using the bounds on the cumulative prediction error and disturbances from Lemma 3 yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{J}_N^*(x_T, \hat{\theta}_T, \lambda_T) - \mathcal{J}_N^*(x_0, \hat{\theta}_0, \lambda_0) + \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \ell(x_k, u_k) \\ &\stackrel{(50)}{\leq} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \left[\ell^s(v_k^s, \hat{\theta}_k) + (C_A + \sqrt{\mu} \beta L_s) \|\tilde{x}_{1|k} + w_k\| \right] \\ &\stackrel{(57), (58)}{\leq} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \left[\ell^s(v_k^s, \hat{\theta}_k) \right] + \sqrt{T} (C_A + \sqrt{\mu} \beta L_s) \cdot \left[2|w_{[0, T-1]}|_{\mathcal{L}_2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sqrt{\frac{1}{\mu}} \|\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0\| + \sqrt{\frac{2c_\theta}{\mu}} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \sqrt{\|\Delta \theta_k\|} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

A uniform constant $-C_{\mathcal{J}} \leq \mathcal{J}_N^*(x_T, \hat{\theta}_T, \lambda_T) - \mathcal{J}_N^*(x_0, \hat{\theta}_0, \lambda_0)$ exists due to the boundedness of $\ell(x, u)$ and $\ell_f(x, z_k^s, \theta)$ on the compact set \mathbb{Z} and due to $\beta < \infty$. Reordering the terms in the last inequality and using the constant $C_{\mathcal{J}}$ results in (24). \square

4) *Proof of Corollary 1:* The LMS update equations (7) are driven by $\tilde{x}_{1|k} + w_k$, which vanishes in the limit $k \rightarrow \infty$ thanks to Lemma 2, i.e., $\hat{\theta}_k$ converges to some constant $\hat{\theta}_\infty$. Furthermore, note that $\lambda_{k+1} \leq \lambda_k + L_s \|\Delta\hat{\theta}_k\|$ using Conditions (14f) and (16) and Lipschitz continuity (48). Thus, the limit $\lambda_\infty = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_k$ exists because λ_k is bounded, due to compact \mathbb{Z} , and, for $k \rightarrow \infty$, λ_k is non-increasing with k .

Similar to [29, Theorem 1], we define the auxiliary variable $\zeta_k := -\lambda_\infty + \ell^s(v_k^{s*}, \hat{\theta}_k)$ and note that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \zeta_k = -\lambda_\infty + \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \ell^s(v_k^{s*}, \hat{\theta}_k) = 0$. The properties of the LMS adaptation (Lemma 2, (10)) and $|\zeta_{k+1} - \zeta_k| \leq L_s \|\hat{\theta}_k\|$ imply

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \zeta_k = 0, \quad (51)$$

with the Cauchy convergence test. Thus, the intermediate result (50) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{J}_N^*(x_T, \hat{\theta}_T, \lambda_T) - \mathcal{J}_N^*(x_0, \hat{\theta}_0, \lambda_0) - \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \ell_{0|k}^*}{T} \right\} \\ & \stackrel{(50)}{\leq} \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \left[(C_A + \sqrt{\mu} \beta L_s) \|\tilde{x}_{1|k} + w_k\| + \ell^s(v_k^{s*}, \hat{\theta}_k) \right] \\ & \stackrel{(26)}{=} \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \left[T \lambda_\infty + \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \zeta_k \right] \stackrel{(51)}{=} \lambda_\infty. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

The cost function (14a) is uniformly bounded on \mathbb{Z} . Thus, $\mathcal{J}_N^*(x_k, \hat{\theta}_k, \lambda_k)$ is also bounded and

$$\limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mathcal{J}_N^*(x_0, \hat{\theta}_0, \lambda_0) - \mathcal{J}_N^*(x_T, \hat{\theta}_T, \lambda_T)}{T} = 0. \quad (53)$$

By reordering the terms in (52) and using (53), we obtain the desired performance bound (27). \square

5) *Proof of Corollary 2:* The first inequality in (29) is equivalent to (27) in Corollary 1. In the following, we prove the second inequality by adapting the proof from [28].

Denote the optimal solution to Problem (14) at time k by $v_{\cdot|k}^*$ with $\ell^* := \ell(\hat{x}_k^{s*}, v_k^{s*})$, which exists due to recursive feasibility. By definition (28), there also exists a feasible sequence $\tilde{v}_{\cdot|k}$ with a setpoint $\ell(\hat{x}_k^s, \tilde{v}_k^s) = \underline{\ell}(x_k, \hat{\theta}_k, \lambda_k) =: \underline{\ell}$. Assume for contradiction that

$$\ell^* > \underline{\ell} + \varepsilon. \quad (54)$$

Let us denote the cost of the feasible candidate solution and the optimal solution by $\tilde{\mathcal{J}} + \beta \underline{\ell}$ and $\mathcal{J}^* + \beta \ell^*$, respectively. Given \mathbb{Z} compact and Lipschitz-continuity of the dynamics, cost, and feedback (Assumptions 3 and 5), the difference of the feasible open-loop costs is bounded by some uniform constant $\eta > 0$, i.e., $|\tilde{\mathcal{J}} - \mathcal{J}^*| \leq \eta$. Thus, we arrive at the following contradiction

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}^* + \beta \ell^* & \leq \tilde{\mathcal{J}} + \beta \underline{\ell} \leq \eta + \mathcal{J}^* + \beta \underline{\ell} < \eta + \mathcal{J}^* + \beta(\ell^* - \varepsilon) \\ & \leq \mathcal{J}^* + \beta \ell^*. \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality holds because $v_{\cdot|k}^*$ is the optimal solution of the MPC problem and thus cannot have a larger cost than the feasible candidate $\tilde{v}_{\cdot|k}$. The last inequality holds by setting $\beta \geq \underline{\beta}(\varepsilon) := \eta/\varepsilon$. Given this contradiction, (54) cannot hold.

Thus $\ell^* \leq \underline{\ell} + \varepsilon$, i.e., Inequality (29) holds. \square

B. Auxiliary Lemmas

Proof of Lemma 2: We use Lemma 4 from Appendix B with $a_k = \|w_k\|^2$ and $\alpha(s) = \sqrt{s}$, $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ to get

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \frac{\sqrt{\|w_k\|^2}}{T} = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \frac{\|w_k\|}{T} = 0. \quad (55)$$

Furthermore, Θ compact implies $\frac{1}{\mu} \|\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0\|^2 < \infty$. Together with Assumption 6 and Proposition 1 this implies

$$\sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \|\tilde{x}_{1|k}\|^2 \stackrel{(9)}{\leq} S_w + \frac{1}{\mu} \|\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0\|^2 + \frac{2c_\theta}{\mu} S_\theta < \infty.$$

Applying Lemma 4 with $a_k = \|\tilde{x}_{1|k}\|^2$ yields

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \frac{\sqrt{\|\tilde{x}_{1|k}\|^2}}{T} = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \frac{\|\tilde{x}_{1|k}\|}{T} = 0. \quad (56)$$

Adding (55) and (56) yields the desired inequality. \square

Lemma 3 (Accumulated disturbance and prediction error). *Let Assumption 1 hold. Suppose $(x_k, u_k) \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, for all $T \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds that*

$$\sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \|w_k\| \leq \sqrt{T} |w_{[0, T-1]}|_{\mathcal{L}_2}, \quad (57)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \|\tilde{x}_{1|k}\| & \leq \sqrt{T} |w_{[0, T-1]}|_{\mathcal{L}_2} + \sqrt{\frac{T}{\mu}} \|\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0\| \\ & \quad + \sqrt{\frac{2Tc_\theta}{\mu}} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \sqrt{\|\Delta\theta_k\|}. \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

Proof. Using the equivalence of norms, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \|w_k\| & \leq \sqrt{T} \sqrt{\sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \|w_k\|^2} \\ & = \sqrt{T} \sqrt{|w_{[0, T-1]}|_{\mathcal{L}_2}^2} = \sqrt{T} |w_{[0, T-1]}|_{\mathcal{L}_2}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\|W\|_1 \leq \sqrt{T} \|W\|$ with $[W]_i = \|w_i\|$. Similarly, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \|\tilde{x}_{1|k}\| & \leq \sqrt{T} \sqrt{\sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \|\tilde{x}_{1|k}\|^2} \\ & \stackrel{(9)}{\leq} \sqrt{T} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\mu} \|\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0\|^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \left[\|w_k\|^2 + \frac{2c_\theta}{\mu} \|\Delta\theta_k\| \right]} \\ & \stackrel{(57)}{\leq} \sqrt{T} |w_{[0, T-1]}|_{\mathcal{L}_2} + \sqrt{\frac{T}{\mu}} \left(\|\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0\| + \sqrt{2c_\theta \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \|\Delta\theta_k\|} \right) \\ & \leq \sqrt{T} |w_{[0, T-1]}|_{\mathcal{L}_2} + \sqrt{\frac{T}{\mu}} \left(\|\hat{\theta}_0 - \theta_0\| + \sqrt{2c_\theta} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \sqrt{\|\Delta\theta_k\|} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we used $\sqrt{a+b} \leq \sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b}$ in the last inequality. \square

Proposition 3 (Distance of consecutive state predictions). *Suppose the conditions in Theorem 1 hold. Then, for any time $k \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 0}$, the candidate (45) solution satisfies for all $j \in \mathbb{I}_{[1, N+1]}$*

$$\|\hat{x}_{j-1|k+1} - \hat{x}_{j|k}\| \leq C_{\text{dyn}, \kappa} \cdot \|\tilde{x}_{1|k} + w_k\|, \quad (59)$$

with $C_{\text{dyn}, \kappa} := \sum_{i=0}^N [L_{\text{dyn}}(1 + L_{\kappa})]^i > 0$.

Proof. We use induction to show

$$\|\hat{x}_{j-1|k+1} - \hat{x}_{j|k}^*\| \leq C(j) \cdot \|\tilde{x}_{1|k} + w_k\|, \quad j \in \mathbb{I}_{[1, N+1]}$$

with $C(j) := \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} [L_{\text{dyn}}(1 + L_{\kappa})]^i$.

Base case ($j = 1$): The base case holds by definition with equality for $C(1) = 1$ since

$$\|\hat{x}_{0|k+1} - \hat{x}_{1|k}^*\| = \|x_{k+1} - \hat{x}_{1|k}^*\| \stackrel{(59)}{=} 1 \cdot \|\tilde{x}_{1|k} + w_k\|.$$

Induction step ($j = \lambda \rightarrow j = \lambda + 1$): Suppose that for some $j = \lambda \in \mathbb{I}_{\geq 1}$ the inequality

$$\|\hat{x}_{\lambda-1|k+1} - \hat{x}_{\lambda|k}^*\| \leq C(\lambda) \|\tilde{x}_{1|k} + w_k\| \quad (60)$$

holds. Recall from (10) that

$$\|\Delta \hat{\theta}_k\| := \|\hat{\theta}_{k+1} - \hat{\theta}_k\| \leq \sqrt{\mu} \cdot \|\tilde{x}_{1|k} + w_k\|.$$

Then, for $j = \lambda + 1$, inequality (60) holds with

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\hat{x}_{\lambda|k+1} - \hat{x}_{\lambda+1|k}^*\| \\ & \stackrel{(14b)}{\leq} \|f_{\hat{\theta}_k}(\hat{x}_{\lambda-1|k+1}, \hat{u}_{\lambda-1|k+1}) - f_{\hat{\theta}_k}(\hat{x}_{\lambda|k}^*, \hat{u}_{\lambda|k})\| \\ & \quad + \|G(\hat{x}_{\lambda-1|k+1}, \hat{u}_{\lambda-1|k+1}) \Delta \hat{\theta}_k\| \\ & \stackrel{(12a), (12c)}{\leq} L_{\text{dyn}}(1 + L_{\kappa}) \|\hat{x}_{\lambda-1|k+1} - \hat{x}_{\lambda|k}^*\| \\ & \quad + \|G(\hat{x}_{\lambda-1|k+1}, \hat{u}_{\lambda-1|k+1}) \Delta \hat{\theta}_k\| \\ & \stackrel{(10), (60)}{\leq} L_{\text{dyn}}(1 + L_{\kappa}) \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\lambda-1} [L_{\text{dyn}}(1 + L_{\kappa})]^i \|\tilde{x}_{1|k} + w_k\| \right) \\ & \quad + \|G(\hat{x}_{\lambda-1|k+1}, \hat{u}_{\lambda-1|k+1})\| \cdot \sqrt{\mu} \|\tilde{x}_{1|k} + w_k\| \\ & \stackrel{(8)}{\leq} \sum_{i=1}^{\lambda} [L_{\text{dyn}}(1 + L_{\kappa})]^i \|\tilde{x}_{1|k} + w_k\| + \|\tilde{x}_{1|k} + w_k\| \\ & = \sum_{i=0}^{\lambda} [L_{\text{dyn}}(1 + L_{\kappa})]^i \cdot \|\tilde{x}_{1|k} + w_k\|. \end{aligned}$$

Uniform constant: Lastly, $C_{\text{dyn}, \kappa} = C(N + 1) \geq C(j)$, $j \in \mathbb{I}_{[1, N+1]}$ yields (59). \square

Lemma 4 (Limits of series [21, Lemma 1]). *For any sequence (a_k) that satisfies $0 \leq a_k \leq a_{\max} < \infty \forall k \in \mathbb{N}$ and any function $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}_{\infty}$, the following implication holds:*

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} a_k \leq S < \infty \Rightarrow \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} \frac{\alpha(a_k)}{T} = 0. \quad (61)$$

C. Offline design

In the following, we provide details on the offline computations in Algorithm 1. First, we discuss an optimization problem to compute a tube formulation with auxiliary feedback κ such

that Assumption 2 is satisfied. Then, we show how P_f from Proposition 2 can be computed with a semidefinite program.

Homothetic tube and feedback κ : We use the homothetic tubes from [35] with ellipsoidal tubes and use ideas from [20] for the propagation of the tube size in (32). The tube shape and the auxiliary feedback $\kappa(x, z, v) = K(x - z) + v$ are obtained offline by computing the matrices P and K . Suppose that the constraint set consists of n_c constraints and given as $\mathbb{Z} = \{(x, u) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u} : g_i(x, u) \leq 0, i \in \mathbb{I}_{[1, n_c]}\}$. In the following, we show how to design P, K using linear matrix inequalities.

$$\min_{c, X, Y, L_w, \bar{w}, \rho} \sum_{i=0}^{n_c} \left(\frac{[c]_i \bar{w}}{(1 - \rho - L_w)} \cdot \frac{1}{-[g(z^s, v^s)]_i} \right)^2 \quad (62a)$$

s.t.

$$\begin{bmatrix} \rho^2 X & (A(z, v, \theta)X + B(z, v, \theta)Y)^\top \\ * & X \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0 \quad (62b)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} X & (G(z, v)[\theta - \bar{\theta}] + E(z, v)d) \\ * & \bar{w}^2 \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0 \quad (62c)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} L_w^2 & G_x(z, v, \theta) + E_x(z, v, d) \\ * & X \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0 \quad (62d)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} [c]_i^2 & \left(\frac{\partial g_i}{\partial x} \Big|_{(z, v)} X + \frac{\partial g_i}{\partial u} \Big|_{(z, v)} Y \right) \\ * & X \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0 \quad (62e)$$

$$\frac{[c]_i \bar{w}}{1 - \rho - L_w} \cdot \frac{1}{-[g(z^s, v^s)]_i} \leq 1, \quad (62f)$$

$$(z, v) \in \mathbb{Z}, \theta \in \Theta, d \in \mathbb{D}, i \in \mathbb{I}_{1, n_c},$$

where $P := X^{-1}$, $K := Y \cdot P$, $\rho \in [0, 1)$ as a contraction rate, $z^s = h(v^s, \bar{\theta})$ is an equilibrium for the nominal parameters $\bar{\theta}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} G_x(z, v, \theta) &:= \sum_{j=1}^{n_\theta} \frac{\partial [G]_{:,j}}{\partial x} \Big|_{(z, v)} \cdot [\theta - \bar{\theta}]_j, \\ E_x(z, v, d) &:= \sum_{j=1}^{n_d} \frac{\partial [E]_{:,j}}{\partial x} \Big|_{(z, v)} \cdot [d]_j, \end{aligned}$$

The Jacobians of the dynamics are given by

$$A(x, u, \theta) := \frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \Big|_{(x, u, \theta)}, \quad B(x, u, \theta) := \frac{\partial f}{\partial u} \Big|_{(x, u, \theta)}.$$

The linear matrix inequality (LMI) (62b) is an equivalent reformulation of (23c), the LMI (62c) ensures that $\bar{w} \geq \max_{\theta^i + \bar{\theta} \in \Theta, d^i \in \mathbb{D}} \|G(z, v) \cdot [\theta^i - \bar{\theta}] + d^i\|_P \forall (z, v) \in \mathcal{Z}$ (see (32)), and similarly (62d) ensures (34). The LMI (62e) defines the tightening $[c]_j$ of each constraint g_j . LMI (62f) checks that the tube around around (z^s, v^s) lies inside the constraint set for any size $s_{j|k} \leq \frac{\bar{w}}{1 - \rho - L_w}$, which is needed for initial feasibility of the terminal conditions (5f)–(5g) in the MPC. The constraint (62f) only holds with admissible values of ρ, L_w, \bar{w} . To find suitable values, we can check the feasibility of the Problem (62) for a range of values of \bar{w} , L_w , and ρ with standard solvers for semidefinite programs (SDP), like MOSEK [39]. The objective (62a) minimizes the constraint tightening at the steady-state (z^s, v^s) directly.

Remark 3 (Polytopic constraints). For polytopic constraints, i.e., $\mathbb{Z} = \{H_x x + H_u u \leq h_{xu}\}$, the LMI (62e) simplifies to

$$\begin{bmatrix} [c]_j^2 & [H_x]_j X + [H_u]_j Y \\ * & X \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0.$$

In summary, this SDP and the propagation formula (32) ensure that the tube satisfies Assumption 2. Furthermore, the LMIs (62e) and (62f) guarantee that the largest possible tube (with size $\frac{\bar{w}}{1-\rho-L_w}$) centered around the steady-state (z^s, v^s) also satisfies constraints \mathbb{Z} .

Terminal cost: To obtain the terminal cost ℓ_f from Proposition 2, and thus satisfying Assumption (5), we first solve Problem (62) to determine the feedback K . Second, we compute the constant α and the matrix Q according to (23b) and (23a), respectively. Then, with the fixed matrix K , we obtain P_f from the following SDP

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{P_f} \quad & \text{tr}(P_f) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & A_K(x, v^s, \theta)^\top P_f A_K(x, v^s, \theta) - P_f \\ & \preceq -Q, \\ & \forall x \in \mathbb{Z}_x, v^s \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}, \theta \in \Theta, \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

where $\text{tr}(P_f)$ denotes the trace of P_f , A_K is defined in (20), $\mathbb{O}_{n_x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_x}$ is the zero matrix.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. B. Rawlings, D. Q. Mayne, and M. Diehl, *Model Predictive Control: Theory, Computation and Design*, 2nd ed. Santa Barbara: Nob Hill Publishing, LLC, 2020.
- [2] M. L. Darby and M. Nikolaou, "MPC: Current practice and challenges," *Control Engineering Practice*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 328–342, 2012.
- [3] T. W. Yoon and D. W. Clarke, "Adaptive predictive control of the benchmark plant," *Automatica*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 621–628, Apr. 1994.
- [4] K. J. Åström and B. Wittenmark, *Adaptive Control*, 2nd ed. Mineola, N.Y: Dover Publ, 2008.
- [5] J. B. Rawlings, D. Angeli, and C. N. Bates, "Fundamentals of economic model predictive control," in *Proc. 51st IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 3851–3861.
- [6] M. Ellis, J. Liu, and P. D. Christofides, *Economic Model Predictive Control*, ser. Advances in Industrial Control. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2017.
- [7] T. Faulwasser, L. Grüne, and M. A. Müller, "Economic Nonlinear Model Predictive Control," *Foundations and Trends® in Systems and Control*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 224–409, 2018.
- [8] J. Ma, S. J. Qin, and T. Salsbury, "Application of economic MPC to the energy and demand minimization of a commercial building," *Journal of Process Control*, vol. 24, no. 8, pp. 1282–1291, Aug. 2014.
- [9] J. Hu, Y. Shan, Y. Yang, A. Parisio, Y. Li, N. Amjady, S. Islam, K. W. Cheng, J. M. Guerrero, and J. Rodríguez, "Economic model predictive control for microgrid optimization: A review," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 472–484, 2023.
- [10] P. Bouffard, A. Aswani, and C. Tomlin, "Learning-based model predictive control on a quadrotor: Onboard implementation and experimental results," in *Proc. IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 279–284.
- [11] K. Kumar, T. A. N. Heirung, S. C. Patwardhan, and B. Foss, "Experimental Evaluation of a MIMO Adaptive Dual MPC," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 48, no. 8, pp. 545–550, 2015.
- [12] A. Didier, A. Parsi, J. Coulson, and R. S. Smith, "Robust Adaptive Model Predictive Control of Quadrotors," in *Proc. European Control Conference (ECC)*, Jun. 2021, pp. 657–662.
- [13] D. Q. Mayne, "Model predictive control: Recent developments and future promise," *Automatica*, vol. 50, no. 12, pp. 2967–2986, 2014.
- [14] M. Lorenzen, M. Cannon, and F. Allgöwer, "Robust MPC with recursive model update," *Automatica*, vol. 103, pp. 461–471, May 2019.
- [15] J. Köhler, E. Andina, R. Soloperto, M. A. Müller, and F. Allgöwer, "Linear robust adaptive model predictive control: Computational complexity and conservatism," in *Proc. 58th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, Dec. 2019, pp. 1383–1388.
- [16] V. Adetola and M. Guay, "Robust adaptive MPC for constrained uncertain nonlinear systems," *International Journal of Adaptive Control and Signal Processing*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 155–167, 2011.
- [17] B. T. Lopez, "Adaptive robust model predictive control for nonlinear systems," Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2019.
- [18] J. Köhler, P. Kötting, R. Soloperto, F. Allgöwer, and M. A. Müller, "A robust adaptive model predictive control framework for nonlinear uncertain systems," *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, vol. 31, no. 18, pp. 8725–8749, 2021.
- [19] R. Sinha, J. Harrison, S. M. Richards, and M. Pavone, "Adaptive robust model predictive control via uncertainty cancellation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.01371*, 2022.
- [20] A. Sasfi, M. N. Zeilinger, and J. Köhler, "Robust adaptive MPC using control contraction metrics," *Automatica*, vol. 155, p. 111169, Sep. 2023.
- [21] R. Soloperto, M. A. Müller, and F. Allgöwer, "Guaranteed Closed-Loop Learning in Model Predictive Control," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 2, pp. 991–1006, Feb. 2023.
- [22] A. Aswani, H. Gonzalez, S. S. Sastry, and C. Tomlin, "Provably safe and robust learning-based model predictive control," *Automatica*, vol. 49, no. 5, pp. 1216–1226, 2013.
- [23] M. Guay and V. Adetola, "Adaptive economic optimising model predictive control of uncertain nonlinear systems," *International Journal of Control*, vol. 86, no. 8, pp. 1425–1437, Aug. 2013.
- [24] M. J. Wu, "Learning-Based Economic Control for Repetitive Systems," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 2023.
- [25] D. Angeli, R. Amrit, and J. B. Rawlings, "On Average Performance and Stability of Economic Model Predictive Control," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 57, no. 7, pp. 1615–1626, 2012.
- [26] R. Amrit, J. B. Rawlings, and D. Angeli, "Economic optimization using model predictive control with a terminal cost," *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 178–186, 2011.
- [27] P. Krupa, J. Köhler, A. Ferramosca, I. Alvarado, M. N. Zeilinger, T. Alamo, and D. Limon, "Model predictive control for tracking using artificial references: Fundamentals, recent results and practical implementation," in *Proc. 63rd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE, 2024, in print.
- [28] L. Fagiano and A. R. Teel, "On generalized terminal state constraints for model predictive control," *Automatica*, vol. 49, no. 9, pp. 2622–2631, Sep. 2013.
- [29] M. A. Müller, D. Angeli, and F. Allgöwer, "Economic model predictive control with self-tuning terminal cost," *European Journal of Control*, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 408–416, Sep. 2013.
- [30] —, "On the performance of economic model predictive control with self-tuning terminal cost," *Journal of Process Control*, vol. 24, no. 8, pp. 1179–1186, Aug. 2014.
- [31] A. Ferramosca, D. Limon, and E. F. Camacho, "Economic MPC for a Changing Economic Criterion for Linear Systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 59, no. 10, pp. 2657–2667, Oct. 2014.
- [32] J. Köhler, M. A. Müller, and F. Allgöwer, "Periodic optimal control of nonlinear constrained systems using economic model predictive control," *Journal of Process Control*, vol. 92, pp. 185–201, 2020.
- [33] F. A. Bayer, M. A. Müller, and F. Allgöwer, "On optimal system operation in robust economic MPC," *Automatica*, vol. 88, pp. 98–106, Feb. 2018.
- [34] M. Degner, R. Soloperto, M. N. Zeilinger, J. Lygeros, and J. Köhler, "Adaptive Economic Model Predictive Control for linear systems with performance guarantees," in *Proc. 63rd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE, 2024, in print.
- [35] J. Köhler, R. Soloperto, M. A. Müller, and F. Allgöwer, "A Computationally Efficient Robust Model Predictive Control Framework for Uncertain Nonlinear Systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66, no. 2, pp. 794–801, Feb. 2021.
- [36] D. Limon, A. Ferramosca, I. Alvarado, and T. Alamo, "Nonlinear MPC for Tracking Piece-Wise Constant Reference Signals," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 63, no. 11, pp. 3735–3750, Nov. 2018.
- [37] 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, Aug. 2020.
- [38] J. Löfberg, "Yalmip : A toolbox for modeling and optimization in matlab," in *In Proceedings of the CACSD Conference*, Taipei, Taiwan, 2004, version 20230622.
- [39] MOSEK ApS, *The MOSEK optimization toolbox for MATLAB manual. Version 10.1.21*, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.mosek.com/downloads/10.1.21/>

- [40] J. A. E. 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, CasADi Version 3.6.6.
- [41] 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, Mar. 2006, IPOPT Version 3.14.11, provided with CasADi 3.6.6.
- [42] J. E. Bailey, F. J. M. Horn, and R. C. Lin, “Cyclic operation of reaction systems: Effects of heat and mass transfer resistance,” *AIChE Journal*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 818–825, 1971.
- [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, Jan. 2021.



Maximilian Degner received his B.Sc. and his M.Sc. with distinction in mechanical engineering from ETH Zürich, Switzerland, in 2022 and 2024, respectively. During his studies, he focused on optimization-based control methods. His research interests lie at the intersection of online learning and control.



Raffaele Soloperto received his Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees in Automation Engineering from the University of Bologna, Italy, in 2014 and 2016, respectively. He earned his Ph.D. in 2022 from the University of Stuttgart, Germany, in collaboration with the International Max Planck Research School (IMPRS). Since 2022, he has been a Postdoctoral Researcher at the Automatic Control Laboratory, ETH Zürich, Switzerland. His research interests include model predictive control and game theory.



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 École Polytechnique Fédérale 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.



John Lygeros completed a B.Eng. degree in electrical engineering in 1990 and an M.Sc. degree in Systems Control in 1991, both at Imperial College of Science Technology and Medicine, London, U.K. In 1996 he obtained a Ph.D. degree from the Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences Department, University of California, Berkeley. During the period 1996–2000 he held a series of research appointments at the National Automated Highway Systems Consortium, Berkeley, the Laboratory for Computer Science, M.I.T., and the Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences Department at U.C. Berkeley. Between 2000 and 2003 he was a University Lecturer at the Department of Engineering, University of Cambridge, U.K., and a Fellow of Churchill College. Between 2003 and 2006 he was an Assistant Professor at the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Patras, Greece. In July 2006 he joined the Automatic Control Laboratory at ETH Zürich, first as an Associate Professor, and since January 2010 as a Full Professor; he is currently serving as the Head of the laboratory and the head of the Department of Information Technology and Electrical Engineering. His research interests include modeling, analysis, and control of hierarchical, hybrid, and stochastic systems, with applications to biochemical networks, transportation systems, energy systems, and industrial processes. John Lygeros is a Fellow of the IEEE, and a member of the IET and the Technical Chamber of Greece; between 2013 and 2023 he served as the Vice President for Finances and a Council Member of the International Federation of Automatic Control (IFAC), as well as the Board of the IFAC Foundation.



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.