

# Robust Adaptive Data-Driven Control of Positive Systems with Application to Learning in SSP Problems

**Fethi Bencherki**

**Anders Rantzer**

*Department of Automatic Control - LTH  
Lund University, Box 118, SE-221 00, Sweden*

FETHI.BENCHERKI@CONTROL.LTH.SE

ANDERS.RANTZER@CONTROL.LTH.SE

## Abstract

An adaptive data-driven controller is proposed and analysed for the class of infinite-horizon optimal control of positive linear system problems presented in (Ohlin et al. (2024b)). This controller is synthesized from the solution of a “data-driven algebraic equation” constructed from the model-free Bellman equation used in Q-learning. This algebraic equation is driven by data correlation matrices that does not scale in the number of data points, making for an efficient online implementation. As a result, a sufficient condition that ensures stability and robustness against unmodeled dynamics in the plant is extracted. The derived results also allows for a quantitative characterization of the interplay between explorations and robustness to unmodeled dynamics. The class of optimal control problems considered here bears equivalence to Stochastic Shortest Path (SSP) problems, allowing for a performance comparison between the proposed adaptive policy and model-free algorithms for learning the stochastic shortest path, as presented in the numerical experiment.

**Keywords:** Robust adaptive Control, Data-Driven Control, Positive Systems.

## 1. Introduction

Positive systems characterises a class of systems for which the state never goes negative when starting from a positive initial state. A lot of physical quantities such as concentrations, buffer sizes, queue lengths, charge levels, prices, etc are intrinsically positive, giving rise to positive mathematical models incorporating this sign constraint. Such models have seen much success in many application areas such us biology and pharmacology (Carson and Cobelli (2013); Blanchini and Giordano (2014)), thermodynamics (Haddad et al. (2010)), traffic and congestion modelling (Shorten et al. (2006)) and epidemiology (Hernandez-Vargas and Middleton (2013)). This therefore motivated and led to a plethora of works in regard to this class of systems focusing both on analysis and controller design, see the works (De Leenheer and Aeyels (2001); Rami and Tadeo (2007); Blanchini et al. (2015); Rantzer (2015); Ebihara et al. (2016); Gurpegui et al. (2023); Ohlin et al. (2024b)) and the comprehensive tutorial (Rantzer and Valcher (2018)).

Despite the rich literature on the optimal control of positive systems, most of it is still offline model-based. The current work is motivated by the recent advances/interest in statistical machine learning (Tsiamis et al. (2023)) and finite-time analysis, working towards an online data-driven (adaptive) approach to the problem. This direction has received increasing interest lately, see the works (De Persis and Tesi (2019); Dörfler et al. (2023); Zhao et al. (2024)) that treats the linear quadratic regulator (LQR) case and the works (Shafai et al. (2022); Miller et al. (2023); Padoan et al.

(2023); Iwata et al. (2024); Makdah and Pasqualetti; Wang and Shafai (2024)) targeted towards the positive systems class.

In the current manuscript, we adopt a worst-case approach in terms of the type of disturbances and uncertain plant parameters, in line with the works presented in (Rantzer (2021); Kjellqvist and Rantzer (2022b,a); Bencherki and Rantzer (2023); Renganathan et al. (2023)). However, the disturbances in this paper are subject to a bound constraint in terms of past states and inputs in a similar fashion to the work presented in (Rantzer (2024)), where the linear quadratic optimal control problem in the presence of non-stochastic process disturbances is addressed. This constraint brings forward a different flavor as compared to the above mentioned works.

### 1.1. Contributions and outline of the paper

**Contributions** The paper proposes and analyzes a robust data-driven adaptive control scheme for the class of positive systems presented in (Ohlin et al. (2024b)). A data-driven algebraic equation is constructed from the model-free counterpart of the Bellman optimality equation. This equation allows for a direct extraction of the adaptive policy bypassing an explicit system identification step. The data-driven algebraic equation is constructed using data correlation matrices that assumes the availability of state measurements contaminated with additive process noise. To tolerate uncertainties in regard to unmodelled dynamics and time-variations in the plant, we avoid putting stochastic assumptions on the noise. This equips the proposed approach with robustness guarantees. The proposed approach could also be readily extended to cover the problems classes reported in (Gurpegui et al. (2023, 2024)), which are natural extensions to the problem class tackled here.

**Applications** The considered problem class could capture various network routing problem settings. A special instance of this appeared in (Bencherki and Rantzer (2024)), where the authors considered the problem of learning the optimal processing rate in a multi-unit processing network in the presence of disturbances. Another interesting instance is the Stochastic Shortest Path (SSP) problem class, by virtue of the work in (Ohlin et al. (2024a)) where the authors show the equivalence between the two problems classes. This equivalence motivates considering a numerical study comparing the performance of the model-free policy presented here to the existing parameter-free algorithms for SSP.

**Outline** The outline of this paper is as follows: In section 2, we give a detailed problem setup description. In particular, we touch on several aspects of the problem in an attempt to provide a comprehensive treatment. This is achieved by following a natural build up starting from presenting the model-based optimal control problem as laid out originally in (Ohlin et al. (2024b)), its solution, how to solve it and ending up in formulating its model-free counterpart. This gives rise to the so called *model-free algebraic equation*, based on which we construct the data-driven adaptive policy. Section 3 is opened by first presenting a set of supporting lemmas that plays an essential role in paving the way to a comprehensive formal performance analysis of the proposed online adaptive policy that appears later in the section. Section 4 compares the numerical performance of the adaptive policy to that of the  $Q$ -learning algorithm presented in (Yu and Bertsekas (2013)) in learning the stochastic shortest path. Lastly, Section 5 concludes the paper and provides potential future directions. For the sake of neatness of presentation, all the proofs are kept in the appendix.

## 1.2. Notation

Inequalities are applied element-wise for both matrices and vectors. Furthermore, the notation  $\mathbb{R}_+^n$  is used to denote the closed positive orthant of dimension  $n$ .  $|X|$  means the element-wise absolute value of the entries of the matrix (or vector)  $X$ . The operator  $\min\{A, 0\}$  extracts the minimum element of  $A$ , yielding zero if  $A$  contains no negative elements. The expressions  $\mathbf{1}_{n \times m}$  and  $\mathbf{0}_{n \times m}$  signify a matrix of ones or zeros, respectively, of the indicated dimension, with subscript omitted when the size is clear from the considered context. The operation  $\otimes$  is the Kronecker product.  $U(a, b)$  is the random uniform distribution between  $a$  and  $b$ .

## 2. Problem setup

We consider the infinite-horizon optimal control problems class presented in (Ohlin et al. (2024b))

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Minimize} && \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} [s^\top x(t) + r^\top u(t)] \text{ over } \{u(t)\}_{t=0}^{\infty} \\
& \text{subject to} && x(t+1) = Ax(t) + Bu(t) \\
& && u(t) \geq 0, \quad x(0) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \\
& && \mathbf{1}^\top u_1(t) \leq E_1^\top x(t) \\
& && \vdots \\
& && \mathbf{1}^\top u_M(t) \leq E_M^\top x(t)
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  and  $B = [B_1 \cdots B_M] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  with  $B_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m_i}$  defining the linear dynamics. The input signal  $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$  is partitioned into  $M$  subvectors  $u_i$ , each containing  $m_i$  elements, so that  $m = \sum_{i=1}^M m_i$ . The cost vectors connected to the states and actions are  $s \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$  and  $r \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$  with  $r_i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$  following the partition of  $u$ . The constraints on the input signal  $u$  are given by  $E = [E_1 \cdots E_M]^\top \in \mathbb{R}_+^{M \times n}$ . Furthermore, we define the extended constraint matrix  $\bar{E} \triangleq [\mathbf{1}_{m_1}^\top \otimes E_1 \cdots \mathbf{1}_{m_M}^\top \otimes E_M]^\top \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m \times n}$  and the set of indices  $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Let  $K = [K_1^\top \cdots K_M^\top]^\top$  be a feedback matrix with  $K_i \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m_i \times n}$  and define the set of feasible gains

$$\mathcal{K}(E) \triangleq \{K : (\forall i \in \mathcal{V}) \mathbf{1}_{m_i}^\top K_i = E_i^\top \text{ or } \mathbf{1}_{m_i}^\top K_i = \mathbf{0}_n\} \tag{2}$$

and correspondingly the state feedback law of the  $i$ -th control subvector  $u_i = K_i x$ . The set  $\mathcal{K}(E)$  characterizes all feedback gain matrices that either grants full or no actuation of the control inputs  $u_i, i \in \mathcal{V}$ . We impose the following two assumptions on the sextuplets  $(A, B, E, \bar{E}, s, r)$ .

**Assumption 1 (Ohlin et al. (2024a))** *The matrices  $A, B$  and the set  $\mathcal{K}(E)$  satisfy*

$$(A + BK)x \geq 0$$

for all  $K \in \mathcal{K}(E)$  and all reachable states  $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ .

**Assumption 2** *The triplet  $(s, \bar{E}, r)$  satisfies  $s > \bar{E}^\top r$ .*

**Remark 1** Assumption 1 warrants the positivity the closed loop dynamics. Assumption 2, on the other hand, will prove useful in establishing the main results as shall be seen in later.

## 2.1. Solution to problem 1

Under Assumption 1 and via dynamic programming (Bellman (1966)), it was shown in [Ohlin et al. (2024b), Theorem 1] that if problem (1) has a finite value for every  $x(0) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ , then the optimal cost would be  $p^\top x(0)$ , where  $p \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$  is the solution to the following model-based algebraic equation

$$p = s + A^\top p + \sum_{i=1}^M \min\{r_i + B_i^\top p, 0\} E_i. \quad (3)$$

Furthermore, the optimal policy is a linear state feedback law  $u(t) = Kx(t)$  where  $K = [K_1^\top \dots K_M^\top]^\top$  and

$$K_i \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{j-1 \times n} \\ E_i^\top \\ \mathbf{0}_{m_i-j \times n} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i \times n}, \quad (4)$$

where the vector  $E_i^\top$  enters at the  $j$ -th row with  $j$  being the index of the minimal element of  $r_i + B_i^\top p$ , provided it is negative. If all elements are nonnegative, then  $K_i = \mathbf{0}_{m_i \times n}$ . The solution to (3) could for instance be found via value iteration (VI), i.e. performing the following fixed point iteration in the  $p$ -parameter until convergence

$$p^{k+1} = s + A^\top p^k + \sum_{i=1}^M \min\{r_i + B_i^\top p^k, 0\} E_i, \quad p^0 = 0. \quad (5)$$

## 2.2. Model-free optimal control of positive systems via $Q$ -factor

The cost-to-go function from time  $t$  for the optimization problem in (1) for a control policy  $u$  beginning at time  $t$  from an initial state  $x(t)$  is

$$J(x(t)) \triangleq \min_u \sum_{k=t}^{\infty} s^\top x(k) + r^\top u(k),$$

where the stage cost given by  $c(x(k), u(k)) \triangleq s^\top x(k) + r^\top u(k)$  for  $k \geq t$ . This optimization problem gives the objective value  $J(x(t)) = p^\top x(t)$  where  $p$  is solved for from (3), which requires the knowledge of the system model  $(A, B)$ . The optimal  $Q$ -function was defined in (Bradtke et al. (1994)) to be

$$Q(x(t), u(t)) \triangleq c(x(t), u(t)) + J(x(t+1)), \quad (6)$$

which represents the cost of taking action an action  $u(t)$  starting at some state  $x(t)$  and following by the optimal policy  $u^*$  after that for all time. The optimal  $Q$ -function then takes the form

$$Q^*(x(t), u(t)) = [s^\top + p^\top A \quad r^\top + p^\top B] \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ u(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} q^x \\ q^u \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ u(t) \end{bmatrix} = q^\top \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ u(t) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

where  $q \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} q^x \\ q^u \end{bmatrix} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} s + A^\top p \\ r + B^\top p \end{bmatrix}$ . Note that the following also holds

$$J(x(t)) = \min_{u(t) \in \mathcal{U}(x(t))} [c(x(t), u(t)) + J(x(t+1))] = \min_{u(t) \in \mathcal{U}(x(t))} Q(x(t), u(t)),$$

where we denote the set of inputs satisfying the constraints in (1) at time  $t$  as  $\mathcal{U}(x(t))$ . Plugging this in the right hand side of (6) yields

$$Q(x(t), u(t)) = c(x(t), u(t)) + \min_{u(t+1) \in \mathcal{U}(x(t+1))} Q(x(t+1), u(t+1)), \quad (8)$$

and the optimal policy could be found via  $u^*(t) = \operatorname{argmin}_{u(t) \in \mathcal{U}(x(t))} Q(x(t), u(t))$ . One can think of (8) as the Bellman equation in the  $Q$ -factor (Sutton and Barto (2018)). Replacing (7) in (8) yields

$$\begin{bmatrix} q^x \\ q^u \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ u(t) \end{bmatrix} = s^\top x(t) + r^\top u(t) + \min_{u(t+1) \in \mathcal{U}(x(t+1))} \begin{bmatrix} q^x \\ q^u \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} x(t+1) \\ u(t+1) \end{bmatrix},$$

which by the virtue of the definition of  $\mathcal{K}(E)$  in (2) is equivalent to

$$\begin{bmatrix} q^x \\ q^u \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} x(t) \\ u(t) \end{bmatrix} = s^\top x(t) + r^\top u(t) + \min_{K \in \mathcal{K}(E)} \begin{bmatrix} q^x \\ q^u \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} I \\ K \end{bmatrix} x(t+1). \quad (9)$$

In the absence of the knowledge of the dynamics  $(A, B)$ , (9) makes it possible to get information about the true  $q$ -parameter by collecting triplets  $(x(t), u(t), x(t+1))$ . In fact, collecting  $t$  consecutive data points leads to the equation

$$\left( q - \begin{bmatrix} s \\ r \end{bmatrix} \right)^\top \begin{bmatrix} x(0) & \cdots & x(t-1) \\ u(0) & \cdots & u(t-1) \end{bmatrix} = \min_{K \in \mathcal{K}(E)} q^\top \begin{bmatrix} I \\ K \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x(1) & \cdots & x(t) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (10)$$

Let's define  $Z(t, \lambda) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \lambda^{t-1}x(0) & \lambda^{t-2}x(1) & \cdots & x(t-1) \\ \lambda^{t-1}u(0) & \lambda^{t-2}u(1) & \cdots & u(t-1) \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+m) \times t}$  for a forgetting factor  $\lambda \in (0, 1]$ . Multiply (10) by  $Z^\top(t, \lambda)$  from the right and define the data correlation matrices

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma(t) &\triangleq \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \lambda^{t-1-k} \begin{bmatrix} x(k) \\ u(k) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x(k) \\ u(k) \end{bmatrix}^\top + \lambda^t \Sigma(0) \\ \bar{\Sigma}(t) &\triangleq \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \lambda^{t-1-k} x(k+1) \begin{bmatrix} x(k) \\ u(k) \end{bmatrix}^\top, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

gives the data-driven algebraic equation in the  $q(t)$ -parameter

$$\left( q(t) - \begin{bmatrix} s \\ r \end{bmatrix} \right)^\top \Sigma(t) = \min_{K(t) \in \mathcal{K}(E)} q^\top(t) \begin{bmatrix} I \\ K(t) \end{bmatrix} \bar{\Sigma}(t), \quad (12)$$

where we denote the data-based solution as  $(q(t), K(t))$  in contrast to the model-based (or ground truth) solution  $(q, K)$ . Equation (12) is at the center of the proposed controller construction as shall be seen next.

### 2.3. Problem Formulation

Inspired by the constructed data-driven algebraic equation in (12), for the linear system

$$x(t+1) = Ax(t) + Bu(t) + w(t), \quad (13)$$

we consider data-driven policies of the type

$$\begin{cases} \Sigma_t = \lambda \Sigma_{t-1} + \begin{bmatrix} x^\top(t-1) & u^\top(t-1) \end{bmatrix}^\top \begin{bmatrix} x^\top(t-1) & u^\top(t-1) \end{bmatrix}, & \Sigma(0) \succ 0, \\ \bar{\Sigma}_t = \lambda \bar{\Sigma}_{t-1} + x(t) \begin{bmatrix} x^\top(t-1) & u^\top(t-1) \end{bmatrix}, & \bar{\Sigma}(0) = 0, \\ u(t) = K(t)x(t) + \epsilon(t). \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

The controller states  $\Sigma(t)$  and  $\bar{\Sigma}(t)$  collect correlation data with a forgetting factor  $\lambda$ . Given  $\Sigma(t)$  and  $\bar{\Sigma}(t)$ , the controller  $K(t)$  is obtained as the minimizing argument in (12) and  $\epsilon_t$  is added to provide explorations towards learning the true dynamics  $(A, B)$ .

**Remark 2** The introduction of the term  $\Sigma(0) \succ 0$  guarantees the invertibility of  $\Sigma_t$  for all  $t$ , which makes it possible to deploy the policy (14) immediately. However, it introduces an initial bias in the model estimate  $[\hat{A}_t \ \hat{B}_t]$ , which is diminishing as more data is collected. This explains why the derived results, such as in Theorems 1, 2 and Corollary 1 present guarantees which are only valid after some initial time  $t_0$  has elapsed.

The following definition constrain the considered model set.

**Definition 1** Let the model parameter set  $\mathcal{M}_\beta$  be the set of plants  $(A, B, E)$  pertaining to assumptions 1 and 2 such that the algebraic equation in (3) has a solution  $p$  satisfying  $s \leq p \leq (\beta \min_{i, s_i \neq 0} s_i) \mathbf{1} \leq \beta s$ .

$\beta$  reflects on the degree of stabilizability of the system. Larger values of  $\beta$  corresponds to systems that are harder to stabilize or less stabilizable for that matter. Different than the type of assumption in Definition 1, the work in (Mania et al. (2019)) extracted regret bounds in terms of the degree of controllability, a stronger requirement than stabilizability. On the other hand, the work in (Simchowitz and Foster (2020)), presents regret bounds that scales in the positive definite matrix solution  $P$  to the discrete algebraic Riccati equation (DARE) of the system, making it more aligned with the work presented here, however, and differently from that work we consider a non-stochastic setting.

**Remark 3** Controllers taking the form (14) are denoted by *adaptive certainty equivalence controllers* in the adaptive control literature (Åström and Wittenmark (1995)), since  $u_t$  is extracted using the model estimate  $[\hat{A}_t \ \hat{B}_t] \triangleq \bar{\Sigma}(t)\Sigma^{-1}(t)$  in (12) with a complete disregard for estimation errors.

Definition 1 imposes prior constraints on the model. Under such constraints, we shall establish guarantees for stability and robustness of the closed loop system under the policy in (14) given assumptions on the disturbance  $w$ , but we first provide ways to obtain the solution of the algebraic data-driven equation in (12), since its solution lies at the heart of the controller construction and implementation.

#### 2.4. Solution to Data-driven algebraic equation in the $q(t)$ -parameter

Similarly to the  $p$ -parameter based algebraic equation in (3), (12) could be solved via either value iteration, policy iteration or linear programming.

- (i) **Value iteration.** This achieved by performing the following fixed point iteration in the  $q(t)$ -parameter starting at  $q^0(t) = 0$  until convergence

$$q^{k+1}(t) = \Sigma^{-1}(t)\bar{\Sigma}^\top(t) \left[ I \quad (K^k(t))^\top \right] q^k(t) + \begin{bmatrix} s \\ r \end{bmatrix}, \quad q^0(t) = 0, \quad (15)$$

$$K_i^k(t) = \begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{j-1 \times n} \\ E_i^\top \\ \mathbf{0}_{m_k-j \times n} \end{bmatrix}, & \min \left\{ (q_i^u)^k(t), 0 \right\} < 0 \\ \mathbf{0}_{m_i \times n}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad i = 1, \dots, M,$$

and  $K^k(t) = \left[ (K_1^k(t))^\top \dots (K_M^k(t))^\top \right]^\top$ ,  $j$  being the index of the minimal negative entry of  $(q_i^u)^k(t)$ .

- (ii) **Policy iteration.** This assumes the existence of an initial stabilizing policy  $K^0(t) \in \mathcal{K}(E)$  and performs the following updates until convergence

$$q^{k+1}(t) = \left( I - \Sigma^{-1}(t)\bar{\Sigma}^\top(t) \begin{bmatrix} I \\ K^k(t) \end{bmatrix}^\top \right)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} s \\ r \end{bmatrix}, \quad (16)$$

$$K_i^{k+1}(t) = \begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{j-1 \times n} \\ E_i^\top \\ \mathbf{0}_{m_k-j \times n} \end{bmatrix}, & \min \left( (q_i^u)^{k+1}(t) \right) < 0 \\ \mathbf{0}_{m_i \times n}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad i = 1, \dots, M.$$

where  $K^{k+1}(t) = \left[ (K_1^{k+1}(t))^\top \dots (K_M^{k+1}(t))^\top \right]^\top$  and  $j$  is the index of the minimal element of  $(q_i^u)^{k+1}(t)$ .

- (iii) **Linear programming.** Instead of a fixed point iteration, the solution could be obtained via linear programming. To this end, define  $z \triangleq \left[ (z^x)^\top \quad (z^u)^\top \right]^\top$  where  $z^x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$  and  $z^u \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ . We propose the following optimization problem to solve for  $q(t)$ .

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Maximize} \quad \mathbf{1}^\top [I \quad -E^\top] z \quad \text{over } z \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n+m}, q(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m} \\ & \text{subject to} \quad \Sigma^{-1}(t)\bar{\Sigma}^\top(t) [I \quad -E^\top] z = q(t) - \begin{bmatrix} s \\ r \end{bmatrix} \\ & \quad \quad \quad z^x = q^x(t), z^u \geq q^u(t), z^u \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

When the plant  $(A, B)$  is known,  $\Sigma^{-1}(t)\bar{\Sigma}^\top(t)$  is replaced by  $[A \ B]^\top$  and a model-based counterpart to (15) is

$$q^{k+1} = [A \ B]^\top \left[ I \ (K^k)^\top \right] q^k + \begin{bmatrix} s \\ r \end{bmatrix}, \quad q^0 = 0, \quad (17)$$

$$K_i^k = \begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{j-1 \times n} \\ E_i^\top \\ \mathbf{0}_{m_k-j \times n} \end{bmatrix}, & \min \left\{ (q_i^u)^k, 0 \right\} < 0 \\ 0_{m_i \times n}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad i = 1, \dots, M,$$

where  $K^k = \left[ (K_1^k)^\top \ \dots \ (K_M^k)^\top \right]^\top$  and  $j$  is the index of the minimal negative element of  $(q_i^u)^k$ , and  $q_t$  was replaced by the optimal  $q$ -parameter since the two coincide in this scenario.

### 3. Main results

Before stating the main results of the paper, we first establish important supporting lemmata.

**Lemma 1** *Iterating on  $q$  in (17) is algebraically equivalent to iterating on  $p$  in (5).*

*Proof.* See Appendix A.1. ■

A similar result to that of Lemma 1 was also exploited in (Al-Tamimi et al. (2007)) to establish the convergence of a model-free  $Q$ -learning based algorithm for the  $\mathcal{H}$ -infinity optimal control problem formulated as a zero-sum game.

**Remark 4** We extract two key observations from Lemma 1:

- (i) Lemma 1 asserts that value iteration in the  $q$ -parameter is algebraically equivalent to value iteration in the  $p$ -parameter.
- (ii) According to Lemma 1, given  $(q(t), K(t))$ , the solution to the the data-driven algebraic equation in (12), if we define  $p(t) \triangleq \left[ I \ (K(t))^\top \right] q(t)$ , then  $p(t)$  satisfies the following model-based algebraic equation in the estimated dynamics  $(\hat{A}(t), \hat{B}(t))$

$$p(t) - s = \hat{A}^\top(t)p(t) + \sum_{i=1}^M \min \left\{ r_i + \hat{B}_i^\top p(t), 0 \right\} E_i, \quad [\hat{A}(t) \ \hat{B}(t)] \triangleq \bar{\Sigma}(t)\Sigma^{-1}(t). \quad (18)$$

This is key to establishing proofs to the main results of the paper as shall be seen in Section 3.1.



**Lemma 2** Let  $p \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$  and  $\hat{p} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$  be such that they satisfy the algebraic equation and inequality respectively, i.e. they satisfy

$$p = s + A^\top p + \sum_{i=1}^M \min \left\{ r_i + B_i^\top p, 0 \right\} E_i,$$

$$\hat{p} \geq s + A^\top \hat{p} + \sum_{i=1}^M \min \left\{ r_i + B_i^\top \hat{p}, 0 \right\} E_i.$$

Then, it holds that  $\hat{p} \geq p$ .

*Proof.* See Appendix A.2. ■

### 3.1. Performance analysis

Prior to presenting our first main result, we define

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_t \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma^{wx}(t) & \Sigma^{wu}(t) \end{bmatrix} \triangleq \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} w(k) \begin{bmatrix} x^\top(k) & u^\top(k) \end{bmatrix},$$

implying that  $\bar{\Sigma}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} A & B \end{bmatrix} \Sigma(t) + \tilde{\Sigma}(t)$  and therefore

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{A} & \hat{B} \end{bmatrix} = \bar{\Sigma}(t) \Sigma^{-1}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} A & B \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{A}(t) & \tilde{B}(t) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (19)$$

where  $\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{A}(t) & \tilde{B}(t) \end{bmatrix} \triangleq \tilde{\Sigma}(t) \Sigma^{-1}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma^{wx}(t) \Sigma^{-1}(t) & \Sigma^{wu}(t) \Sigma^{-1}(t) \end{bmatrix}$  is the model misspecification. The first main result of the paper is stated next.

**Theorem 1** Consider  $\beta, \rho \in \mathbb{R}_+$  satisfying  $\rho\beta < 1$ ,  $\Sigma(t)$  and  $\bar{\Sigma}(t)$  as in (11). Let  $(A, B) \in \mathcal{M}_\beta$ . Additionally, suppose that

$$\left\| E^\top \right\|_\infty \left\| A^\top - \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \end{bmatrix} \Sigma^{-1}(t) \bar{\Sigma}^\top(t) \right\|_\infty + \left\| B^\top - \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \Sigma^{-1}(t) \bar{\Sigma}^\top(t) \right\|_\infty \leq \rho, \quad \forall t \geq t_0. \quad (20)$$

Let  $p \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$  be the solution to the model-based algebraic equation in (3), and let  $q(t)$  be the solution of the data-based algebraic equation in (12) with  $K(t)$  being the minimizing argument. Define  $p(t) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} I & K^\top(t) \end{bmatrix} q(t)$ . Then, it holds that

$$\hat{\alpha} p \leq p(t) \leq \check{\alpha}^{-1} p \quad (21)$$

for positive constants satisfying  $\check{\alpha} = 1 - \rho\beta$  and  $\hat{\alpha} = 1 - \check{\alpha}^{-1}\rho\beta$ .

*Proof.* The proof is given in Appendix A.3. ■

**Remark 5** The result in theorem 1 is obtained from a perturbation analysis to the solution of the algebraic equations in (3) and (18). Perturbation analysis of algebraic Riccati equations is a well studied problem in the literature, see the works (Sun (1998); Konstantinov et al. (1993, 2003)).

Assumption (20) could be written as

$$\left\| E^\top \right\|_\infty \left\| \Sigma^{-1}(t) (\Sigma^{wx}(t))^\top \right\|_\infty + \left\| \Sigma^{-1}(t) (\Sigma^{wu}(t))^\top \right\|_\infty \leq \rho,$$

and will be valid as long as two conditions are met:

- (i) The condition number of the matrix  $\Sigma(t)$  must not be too large. This is conditioned on choosing proper explorations  $\epsilon(t)$ .
- (ii) The disturbance sequence  $w(t)$  must be sufficiently small compared to  $x(t)$ . If  $w(t)$  is taken to represent unmodelled dynamics, this means that such dynamics are subject to a gain bound from state to disturbance.

Furthermore, If one impose stochastic assumptions on  $w$  instead, larger values of  $t_0$  typically will make it possible to satisfy (20) with a smaller value of  $\rho$ . However, if faced with adversarial disturbances, the true dynamics may never be learned since the adversary  $w$  could play a policy that fool the controller forever.

**Theorem 2** Consider  $\beta, \rho \in \mathbb{R}_+$  satisfying  $\rho\beta < 1$ ,  $\Sigma(t)$  and  $\bar{\Sigma}(t)$  as in (11). Let  $(A, B) \in \mathcal{M}_\beta$  with  $p \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$  the solution to the model-based algebraic equation in (3). Suppose that (20) holds for all  $t \geq t_0$  and let  $K(t)$  be the minimizer in (12). Then, it holds that

$$\check{\alpha}^{-1} (1 + \rho\beta (1 + \beta \|A + |B| \bar{E}\|_1)) p - s \geq A^\top p + K^\top(t) (r + B^\top p). \quad (22)$$

where the constant  $\check{\alpha}$  is as in Theorem 1.

*Proof.* See Appendix A.4. ■

**Remark 6** Theorem 1 aims at demonstrating how the storage function  $p^\top x$  is influenced when deploying the data-driven gain  $K(t)$  instead of the optimal gain  $K$ . Note that as  $\rho \rightarrow 0$ , we get that  $\check{\alpha} \rightarrow 1$  and the right hand side of (22) goes to 1 and with that closing the suboptimality gap. Larger values of  $\beta$  corresponds to systems that are harder to stabilize, mandating  $\rho$  to be smaller to satisfy the condition  $\rho\beta < 1$ , which characterizes the need for more accurate data.

**Corollary 1** Consider  $(A, B) \in \mathcal{M}_\beta$  with  $p$  being the positive solution to the algebraic equation (3), while  $\beta, \rho$  are positive numbers satisfying  $\rho\beta < 1$ . Let

$$x(t+1) = Ax(t) + Bu(t) + w(t), \quad u(t) = K(t)x(t) + \epsilon(t),$$

where  $\Sigma(t)$  and  $\bar{\Sigma}(t)$  are defined as in (11) while (20) is assumed to hold for all  $t \geq t_0$ . let  $q(t)$  be the solution of the data-based algebraic equation in (12) with  $K(t)$  being its minimizing argument. Then, it holds that

$$\sum_{t=t_0}^{T-1} s^\top x(t) + r^\top K(t)x(t) \leq \gamma^{-1} \left( p^\top x_{t_0} + \sum_{t=t_0}^{T-1} \beta s^\top |B\epsilon(t) + w(t)| \right)$$

where  $0 < \gamma \leq 1$  satisfies  $\gamma (s - \bar{E}^\top |r|) \leq s - \bar{E}^\top |r| - (\check{\alpha}^{-1} - 1 + \rho\beta (1 + \beta \|A + |B| \bar{E}\|_1)) \beta s$  and the constant  $\check{\alpha}$  is as in Theorem 1.

*Proof.* See Appendix A.5. ■

**Remark 7** Corollary 1 gives a quantification of the suboptimality incurred in the total cost due to deploying the data-driven controller instead of the optimal controller. The constant  $\gamma$  captures the effect of model misspecification and  $\gamma \rightarrow 1$  if  $\rho \rightarrow 0$ , and with it tightening the suboptimality gap. The last term on the right hand side captures the cost incurred due to disturbances  $w(t)$  and explorations  $\epsilon(t)$ .

#### 4. Numerical experiment

We consider the problem of learning the following stochastic shortest path

##### Stochastic Shortest Path (SSP) problem

$$\mathcal{T}(1) = \begin{bmatrix} 0.4 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.4 \\ 0.4 & 0.4 \\ 0.2 & 0.2 \end{bmatrix}, \mathcal{T}(2) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0.3 & 0 \\ 0.6 & 0 & 0.1 \\ 0.4 & 0.7 & 0.4 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.5 \end{bmatrix}, \mathcal{T}(3) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0.2 \\ 0 & 0.2 \\ 0.4 & 0 \\ 0.6 & 0.6 \end{bmatrix}, \mathcal{T}(4) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$c(1) = [1.5 \ 2], c(2) = [1.5 \ 2 \ 2], c(3) = [1.5 \ 2] c(4) = 0, i_{\text{init}} = 1$$

↓ Conversion according to  
(Ohlin et al. (2024a))

##### Reformulation as problem 1

$$n = 3, m = 4, x_0 = [1 \ 0 \ 0]^\top, E = I, m_1 = 1, m_2 = 2, m_3 = 1 \text{ and dynamics}$$

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0.4 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.6 & 0 \\ 0.4 & 0.4 & 0.4 \end{bmatrix}, B = \begin{bmatrix} -0.4 & 0.3 & 0 & 0.2 \\ 0.4 & -0.6 & -0.5 & 0.2 \\ 0 & 0.3 & 0 & -0.4 \end{bmatrix}$$

with associated cost vectors


$$s = [1.5 \ 1.5 \ 1.5]^\top, r = [0.5 \ 0.5 \ 0.5 \ 0.5]^\top$$

where  $\mathcal{T}(i)$  for  $i \in \mathcal{V} \cup \{v_g\}$ ,  $v_g = 4$  being the fictitious goal state, are transition probabilities from state  $i$  to other states, with different columns corresponding to different actions.  $c(i)$  is the expected stage cost vector of the transition from state  $i$  to other states for different actions. Note that both Assumptions 1 and 2 holds true for our system. We compare the performance of the adaptive policy to the that of the  $Q$ -learning algorithm in (Yu and Bertsekas (2013)) while employing  $\epsilon$ -decreasing as an exploration strategy where  $\epsilon = 0.05\alpha^h$  with  $\alpha = 0.99$  and  $h$  corresponding to the episode number. In the context of problem 1,  $\epsilon$ -greedy means picking a random gain  $K \in \mathcal{K}(E)$  with probability  $\epsilon$  and picking the estimated optimal gain  $K_t$  according to the solution of the data-driven algebraic equation (12) with probability  $1 - \epsilon$ . For the policy (14), we pick  $\lambda = 1$  and initialize  $\Sigma(0) = 10^{-6}I$ . We contaminate the state measurements with additive positive disturbances drawn


according to  $w_t \sim U(0, 0.01)$  for all  $t$  to render the learning task more difficult. The comparison between the two algorithms is conducted by considering the regret defined as

$$R(H) = \left( \sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \sum_{t=0}^{T_h-1} s^\top x(t) + r^\top u(t) \right) - HJ(x_0)$$

where  $H$  indicates the number of episodes and  $T_h$  is the time length of episode  $h$ .  $J(x_0)$  is the optimal cumulative cost due to applying the optimal policy to the system subject to disturbances  $w$ . In the SSP domain, an episode terminates if the goal state ( $i = 4$ ) is reached whereas in problem 1 the state vector becomes sufficiently small indicating that the measurements are purely noise. After an episode is concluded, we re-initialize the states in both problems domain and run the algorithms again while keeping the last estimates of the  $Q$ -factor in the  $Q$ -learning algorithm and the  $q(t)$ -parameter and  $\Sigma_t$  for policy (14). The achieved regrets are plotted in Figure 1(a). Note that both algorithms exhibit sublinear regret and that our algorithm outperforms the  $Q$ -learning algorithm. Figure 1(b), on the other hand, plots a test of the condition in (20) while selecting  $\rho = 0.3$ . Note that the condition holds true after sufficient number of episodes have elapsed indicating that better estimates of the system as attained as more data is collected.



(a) Accumulated regret of each algorithm with  $\epsilon$ -decreasing explorations where  $\epsilon = 0.05\alpha^h$  for  $\alpha = 0.99$  and  $h$  the episode number.



(b) The condition in (20) for  $\rho = 0.3$  in the presence of disturbances. for this example,  $\|E^\top\|_\infty = 1$ .

Figure 1: Each plot is the average of 100 repeated runs, and the shaded area is 95% confidence interval.

## 5. Conclusion

The paper presented a robust adaptive data-driven control framework for the optimal control of positive system problems class presented in (Ohlin et al. (2024b)). This was achieved via the construction of a data-driven algebraic equation in the  $Q$ -factor, based on which the controller policy is updated in an online fashion. The designed policy proved to robustly stabilize the set  $\mathcal{M}_\beta$  with

robustness meant to be tolerance to a certain degree of unmodeled dynamics. The considered class witnesses applications in network routing problems among which are the Stochastic Shortest Path problems, allowing for performance comparison with the existing model-free methods of finding the stochastic shortest path. Future work concerns exploring better exploration strategies than  $\epsilon$ -greedy, and the possibility of adapting efficient exploration methods from the SSP literature into our control setup.

## Acknowledgments

We would like to thank David Ohlin at Lund university for providing insightful feedback that helped improve the paper. The authors are members of the ELLIIT Strategic Research Area at Lund University. This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under grant agreement No 834142 (ScalableControl). It was also partially supported by the Wallenberg AI, Autonomous Systems and Software Program (WASP) funded by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation.

## References

- Asma Al-Tamimi, Frank L Lewis, and Murad Abu-Khalaf. Model-free q-learning designs for linear discrete-time zero-sum games with application to h-infinity control. *Automatica*, 43(3):473–481, 2007.
- Karl Johan Åström and Björn Wittenmark. *Adaptive Control (2 ed.)*. Addison-Wesley, 1995. ISBN 0-201-55866-1. doi: 10.2307/1269433.
- Richard Bellman. Dynamic programming. *science*, 153(3731):34–37, 1966.
- Fethi Bencherki and Anders Rantzer. Robust simultaneous stabilization via minimax adaptive control. In *2023 62nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 2503–2508. IEEE, 2023.
- Fethi Bencherki and Anders Rantzer. Data-driven adaptive dispatching policies for processing networks. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 2024.
- Franco Blanchini and Giulia Giordano. Piecewise-linear lyapunov functions for structural stability of biochemical networks. *Automatica*, 50(10):2482–2493, 2014.
- Franco Blanchini, Patrizio Colaneri, Maria Elena Valcher, et al. Switched positive linear systems. *Foundations and Trends® in Systems and Control*, 2(2):101–273, 2015.
- Steven J Bradtke, B Erik Ydstie, and Andrew G Barto. Adaptive linear quadratic control using policy iteration. In *Proceedings of 1994 American Control Conference-ACC'94*, volume 3, pages 3475–3479. IEEE, 1994.
- Ewart Carson and Claudio Cobelli. *Modelling methodology for physiology and medicine*. Newnes, 2013.
- Patrick De Leenheer and Dirk Aeyels. Stabilization of positive linear systems. *Systems & control letters*, 44(4):259–271, 2001.

- Claudio De Persis and Pietro Tesi. Formulas for data-driven control: Stabilization, optimality, and robustness. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 65(3):909–924, 2019.
- Florian Dörfler, Pietro Tesi, and Claudio De Persis. On the certainty-equivalence approach to direct data-driven lqr design. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 68(12):7989–7996, 2023.
- Yoshio Ebihara, Dimitri Peaucelle, and Denis Arzelier. Analysis and synthesis of interconnected positive systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 62(2):652–667, 2016.
- Alba Gurpegui, Emma Tegling, and Anders Rantzer. Minimax linear optimal control of positive systems. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 2023.
- Alba Gurpegui, Mark Jeeninga, Emma Tegling, and Anders Rantzer. Minimax linear regulator problems for positive systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.04809*, 2024.
- Wassim M Haddad, VijaySekhar Chellaboina, and Qing Hui. *Nonnegative and compartmental dynamical systems*. Princeton University Press, 2010.
- Esteban A Hernandez-Vargas and Richard H Middleton. Modeling the three stages in hiv infection. *Journal of theoretical biology*, 320:33–40, 2013.
- Takumi Iwata, Shun-ichi Azuma, Ryo Ariizumi, and Toru Asai. Data informativity for distributed positive stabilization. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 2024.
- Olle Kjellqvist and Anders Rantzer. Learning-enabled robust control with noisy measurements. In *Learning for Dynamics and Control Conference*, pages 86–96. PMLR, 2022a.
- Olle Kjellqvist and Anders Rantzer. Minimax adaptive estimation for finite sets of linear systems. In *2022 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pages 260–265. IEEE, 2022b.
- Michail M Konstantinov, P Hr Petkov, and Nikolai D Christov. Perturbation analysis of the discrete riccati equation. *Kybernetika*, 29(1):18–29, 1993.
- Mihail Konstantinov, D Wei Gu, Volker Mehrmann, and Petko Petkov. *Perturbation theory for matrix equations*. Gulf Professional Publishing, 2003.
- Yuchao Li and Anders Rantzer. Exact dynamic programming for positive systems with linear optimal cost. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2024.
- Abed AlRahman Al Makdah and Fabio Pasqualetti. Model-based and data-based dynamic output feedback for externally positive systems.
- Horia Mania, Stephen Tu, and Benjamin Recht. Certainty equivalence is efficient for linear quadratic control. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- Jared Miller, Tianyu Dai, Mario Sznaier, and Bahram Shafai. Data-driven control of positive linear systems using linear programming. In *2023 62nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 1588–1594. IEEE, 2023.
- David Ohlin, Anders Rantzer, and Emma Tegling. Heuristic search for linear positive systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.17220*, 2024a.

- David Ohlin, Emma Tegling, and Anders Rantzer. Optimal control of linear cost networks. *European Journal of Control*, page 101068, 2024b.
- Alberto Padoan, Florian Dörfler, and John Lygeros. Data-driven representations of conical, convex, and affine behaviors. In *2023 62nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 596–601. IEEE, 2023.
- M Ait Rami and Fernando Tadeo. Controller synthesis for positive linear systems with bounded controls. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems II: Express Briefs*, 54(2):151–155, 2007.
- Anders Rantzer. On the kalman-yakubovich-popov lemma for positive systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 61(5):1346–1349, 2015.
- Anders Rantzer. Minimax adaptive control for a finite set of linear systems. In *Learning for Dynamics and Control*, pages 893–904. PMLR, 2021.
- Anders Rantzer. A data-driven riccati equation. In *6th Annual Learning for Dynamics & Control Conference*, pages 504–513. PMLR, 2024.
- Anders Rantzer and Maria Elena Valcher. A tutorial on positive systems and large scale control. In *2018 IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 3686–3697. IEEE, 2018.
- Venkatraman Renganathan, Andrea Iannelli, and Anders Rantzer. An online learning analysis of minimax adaptive control. In *2023 62nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 1034–1039. IEEE, 2023.
- Bahram Shafai, Anahita Moradmand, and Milad Siami. Data-driven positive stabilization of linear systems. In *2022 8th International Conference on Control, Decision and Information Technologies (CoDIT)*, volume 1, pages 1031–1036. IEEE, 2022.
- Robert Shorten, Fabian Wirth, and Douglas Leith. A positive systems model of tcp-like congestion control: asymptotic results. *IEEE/ACM transactions on networking*, 14(3):616–629, 2006.
- Max Simchowitz and Dylan Foster. Naive exploration is optimal for online lqr. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8937–8948. PMLR, 2020.
- Ji-Guang Sun. Perturbation theory for algebraic riccati equations. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 19(1):39–65, 1998.
- Richard S Sutton and Andrew G Barto. *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press, 2018.
- Anastasios Tsiamis, Ingvar Ziemann, Nikolai Matni, and George J Pappas. Statistical learning theory for control: A finite-sample perspective. *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, 43(6):67–97, 2023.
- Yueyang Wang and Bahram Shafai. Data-driven identification and control of positive systems. In *Integrated Systems: Data Driven Engineering*, pages 289–307. Springer, 2024.
- Huizhen Yu and Dimitri P Bertsekas. On boundedness of q-learning iterates for stochastic shortest path problems. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 38(2):209–227, 2013.
- Feiran Zhao, Florian Dörfler, Alessandro Chiuso, and Keyou You. Data-enabled policy optimization for direct adaptive learning of the lqr. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14871*, 2024.

## Appendix A. Proofs

### A.1. Proof of Lemma 1

Consider the iteration in (17) and define  $p^k \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} I & (K^k(t))^\top \end{bmatrix} q^k$ . This then gives

$$q^{k+1} = \begin{bmatrix} A^\top \\ B^\top \end{bmatrix} p^k + \begin{bmatrix} s \\ r \end{bmatrix}, \quad (23)$$

and also

$$p^{k+1} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} I & (K^{k+1})^\top \end{bmatrix} q^{k+1}. \quad (24)$$

where

$$K_i^{k+1} = \begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{j-1 \times n} \\ E_i^\top \\ \mathbf{0}_{m_k-j \times n} \end{bmatrix}, \min \left\{ (q_i^u)^{k+1}, 0 \right\} \stackrel{(23)}{=} \min \{ r_i + B_i^\top p^{k+1}, 0 \} < 0 \\ \mathbf{0}_{m_i \times n}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad i = 1, \dots, M. \quad (25)$$

Plugging (23) and (25) in (24) yields the desired result, which is

$$p^{k+1} = s + A^\top p^k + \sum_{i=1}^M \min \{ r_i + B_i^\top p^k, 0 \} E_i.$$

### A.2. Proof of lemma 2

Start by defining the value functions  $J(x) \triangleq p^\top x$  and  $\hat{J}(x) \triangleq \hat{p}^\top x$  that solves the Bellman equation and inequality correspondingly, i.e., they satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} J(x) &= \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}(x)} [s^\top x + r^\top u + J(Ax + Bu)], \\ \hat{J}(x) &\geq \min_{\hat{u} \in \mathcal{U}(x)} [s^\top x + r^\top \hat{u} + \hat{J}(Ax + B\hat{u})], \end{aligned}$$

for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ . Taking the minimizers  $u = [u_1^\top \dots u_M^\top]^\top$  with  $u_i = -K_i x$  and  $\hat{u} = [\hat{u}_1^\top \dots \hat{u}_M^\top]^\top$  with  $\hat{u}_i = -\hat{K}_i x$  for  $i = 1, \dots, M$ , where  $K_i$  is as in (4) and  $\hat{K}_i$  is defined analogously leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \left( p - s - A^\top p - \sum_{i=1}^M \min \{ r_i + B_i^\top p, 0 \} E_i \right)^\top x &= 0, \\ \left( \hat{p} - s - A^\top \hat{p} + \sum_{i=1}^M \min \{ r_i + B_i^\top \hat{p}, 0 \} E_i \right)^\top x &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

These last equation and inequality are guaranteed to hold if the equation and inequality in the statement of the Lemma hold and  $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ . Then, it holds that  $\hat{J} \geq J$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ , see Proposition 1.(a) in (Li and Rantzer (2024)). In consequence, the element wise ordering  $\hat{p} \geq p$  holds.  $\blacksquare$



### A.3. Proof of Theorem 1

First, and according to Remark 4, we associate to the solution of the noisy (noiseless) data-driven algebraic equation in (12) the following model-based algebraic equations in the estimated (true) model

$$p(t) - s = \hat{A}^\top(t)p + \sum_{i=1}^M \min\{r_i + \hat{B}_i^\top(t)p, 0\}E_i \quad (26)$$

$$p - s = A^\top p + \sum_{i=1}^M \min\{r_i + B_i^\top p, 0\}E_i. \quad (27)$$

The two coincides when the uncertainty vanishes, i.e., when  $\rho = 0$ .

(i) Consider the algebraic equation in (27). Plug in

$$[A \ B] = [\hat{A}(t) \ \hat{B}(t)] - [\tilde{A}(t) \ \tilde{B}(t)],$$

yields

$$\begin{aligned} p - s &= (\hat{A}(t) - \tilde{A}(t))^\top p + \sum_{i=1}^M \min\left\{r_i + (\hat{B}_i(t) - \tilde{B}_i(t))^\top p, 0\right\} E_i \\ &= (\hat{A}(t) - \tilde{A}(t))^\top p + \sum_{i=1}^M \min\left\{r_i + \hat{B}_i^\top(t)p - \tilde{B}_i^\top(t)p, 0\right\} E_i. \end{aligned}$$

since  $\min\left\{r_i + \hat{B}_i^\top(t)p - \tilde{B}_i^\top(t)p, 0\right\} \geq \min\left\{r_i + \hat{B}_i^\top(t)p, 0\right\} - \left\|\tilde{B}_i^\top(t)p\right\|_\infty$ , using the fact that the  $\infty$  norm is sub-multiplicative and applying the triangle inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} p - s &\geq \hat{A}^\top(t)p + \sum_{i=1}^M \min\{r_i + \hat{B}_i^\top(t)p, 0\}E_i - \sum_{i=1}^M \left\|\tilde{B}_i^\top(t)p\right\|_\infty E_i - \left|\tilde{A}^\top(t)p\right| \\ &\geq \hat{A}^\top(t)p + \sum_{i=1}^M \min\{r_i + \hat{B}_i^\top(t)p, 0\}E_i - \|p\|_\infty \sum_{i=1}^M \left\|\tilde{B}_i^\top(t)\right\|_\infty E_i - \left|\tilde{A}^\top(t)\right| |p|. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we have  $\sum_{i=1}^M \left\|\tilde{B}_i^\top(t)\right\|_\infty E_i \leq E^\top \mathbf{1}_M \max_i \left\|\tilde{B}_i^\top(t)\right\|_\infty \leq \|E^\top\|_\infty \left\|\tilde{B}^\top(t)\right\|_\infty \mathbf{1}_n$  and  $\left\|\left|\tilde{A}^\top(t)\right| |p|\right\|_\infty \leq \left\|\tilde{A}^\top(t)\right\|_\infty \|p\|_\infty$ , which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|p\|_\infty \sum_{i=1}^M \left\|\tilde{B}_i^\top(t)\right\|_\infty E_i + \left|\tilde{A}^\top(t)\right| |p| &\leq \left(\|E^\top\|_\infty \left\|\tilde{B}^\top(t)\right\|_\infty + \left\|\tilde{A}^\top(t)\right\|_\infty\right) \|p\|_\infty \mathbf{1} \\ &\leq \left(\|E^\top\|_\infty \left\|\tilde{B}^\top(t)\right\|_\infty + \left\|\tilde{A}^\top(t)\right\|_\infty\right) \beta \min_{i, s_i \neq 0} s_i \mathbf{1} \leq \left(\|E^\top\|_\infty \left\|\tilde{B}^\top(t)\right\|_\infty + \left\|\tilde{A}^\top(t)\right\|_\infty\right) \beta s, \end{aligned}$$

and in consequence it holds from (20) and by defining  $\check{\alpha} \triangleq 1 - \rho\beta$  that

$$p - \check{\alpha}s \geq \hat{A}^\top(t)p + \sum_{i=1}^M \min\{r_i + \hat{B}_i^\top(t)p, 0\}E_i.$$

Divide both sides by  $\check{\alpha}$  and since  $r_i \geq 0$  this yields

$$\begin{aligned} \check{\alpha}^{-1}p - s &\geq \hat{A}^\top(t)\check{\alpha}^{-1}p + \sum_{i=1}^M \min \left\{ \check{\alpha}^{-1} \left( r_i + \hat{B}_i^\top(t)p \right), 0 \right\} E_i \\ &\geq \hat{A}^\top(t)\check{\alpha}^{-1}p + \sum_{i=1}^M \min \left\{ r_i + \hat{B}_i^\top(t)\check{\alpha}^{-1}p, 0 \right\} E_i. \end{aligned}$$

An application of lemma 3 by taking  $\hat{p} = \check{\alpha}^{-1}p$  reveals that

$$p(t) \leq \check{\alpha}^{-1}p. \quad (28)$$

(ii) Now we consider the algebraic equation in (26). Plug in

$$[\hat{A}(t) \quad \hat{B}(t)] = [A \quad B] + [\tilde{A}(t) \quad \tilde{B}(t)]$$

yields

$$\begin{aligned} p(t) - s &= \left( A + \tilde{A}(t) \right)^\top p + \sum_{i=1}^M \min \left\{ r_i + \left( B_i + \tilde{B}_i(t) \right)^\top p(t), 0 \right\} E_i \\ &= \left( A + \tilde{A}(t) \right)^\top p(t) + \sum_{i=1}^M \min \left\{ r_i + B_i^\top p(t) + \tilde{B}_i^\top(t)p(t), 0 \right\} E_i \\ &\geq A^\top p(t) + \sum_{i=1}^M \min \{ r_i + B_i^\top p(t), 0 \} E_i - \|p(t)\|_\infty \sum_{i=1}^M \left\| \tilde{B}_i^\top(t) \right\|_\infty E_i - \left| \tilde{A}^\top(t) \right| |p(t)| \\ &\geq A^\top p(t) + \sum_{i=1}^M \min \{ r_i + B_i^\top p(t), 0 \} E_i - \left( \left\| E^\top \right\|_\infty \left\| \tilde{B}^\top(t) \right\|_\infty + \left\| \tilde{A}^\top(t) \right\|_\infty \right) \|p(t)\|_\infty \mathbf{1}. \end{aligned}$$

Employing (28) and (20) we get that

$$p(t) - (1 - \rho\beta\check{\alpha}^{-1})s \geq A^\top p(t) + \sum_{i=1}^M \min \{ r_i + B_i^\top p(t), 0 \} E_i.$$

Define  $\hat{\alpha} = 1 - \rho\beta\check{\alpha}^{-1}$  and divide both sides by  $\hat{\alpha}$  leads to

$$\hat{\alpha}^{-1}p(t) - s \geq A^\top \hat{\alpha}^{-1}p(t) + \sum_{i=1}^M \min \{ r_i + B_i^\top \hat{\alpha}^{-1}p(t), 0 \} E_i.$$

Applying lemma 3 by picking  $\hat{p} = \hat{\alpha}^{-1}p(t)$  yields

$$p \leq \hat{\alpha}^{-1}p(t).$$

In consequence we get that

$$\hat{\alpha}p \leq p(t) \leq \check{\alpha}^{-1}p,$$

for positive constants  $\check{\alpha} = 1 - \rho\beta$  and  $\hat{\alpha} = 1 - \rho\beta\check{\alpha}^{-1}$ . ■

#### A.4. Proof of Theorem 2

The following holds by letting  $\hat{B}(t) = B + \tilde{B}(t)$ ,  $\hat{A}(t) = A + \tilde{A}(t)$  in (18) and  $K^\top(t)$  as in (15)

$$\begin{aligned} p(t) - s &= \left( A + \tilde{A}(t) \right)^\top p(t) + K^\top(t) \left( r + \left( B + \tilde{B}(t) \right)^\top p(t) \right) \\ &= A^\top p(t) + K^\top(t) \left( r + B^\top p(t) \right) + \tilde{A}^\top(t) p(t) + K^\top(t) \tilde{B}^\top(t) p(t) \\ &= A^\top p + K^\top(t) \left( r + B^\top p \right) + \left( \tilde{A}^\top(t) + K^\top(t) \tilde{B}^\top(t) \right) p(t) + \left( A^\top + K^\top(t) B^\top \right) (p(t) - p) \\ &\geq A^\top p + K^\top(t) \left( r + B^\top p \right) + \left( \tilde{A}^\top(t) + K^\top(t) \tilde{B}^\top(t) \right) p(t) - \left( |A^\top| + \bar{E}^\top |B^\top| \right) |p(t) - p|, \end{aligned}$$

since  $|K| \leq \bar{E}$  and  $A^\top + K^\top(t) B^\top \leq A^\top + \bar{E}^\top |B^\top|$ . (21) gives  $|p(t) - p| \leq (1 - \hat{\alpha}) p$  since  $\check{\alpha}^{-1} - 1 = 1 - \hat{\alpha}$ . Then, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left( A^\top + \bar{E}^\top |B^\top| \right) |p(t) - p| &\leq (1 - \hat{\alpha}) \left\| A^\top + \bar{E}^\top |B^\top| \right\|_\infty \|p\|_\infty \mathbf{1} \\ &\leq (1 - \hat{\alpha}) \left\| A^\top + \bar{E}^\top |B^\top| \right\|_\infty \beta s \leq (1 - \hat{\alpha}) \|A + |B| \bar{E}\|_1 \beta p \end{aligned}$$

and using (20) we have

$$\left( \tilde{A}^\top(t) + K^\top(t) \tilde{B}^\top(t) \right) p(t) \leq \rho \check{\alpha}^{-1} \beta s \leq \rho \beta \check{\alpha}^{-1} p,$$

yielding consequently

$$p(t) - s \geq A^\top p + K^\top(t) \left( r + B^\top p \right) - \rho \beta \check{\alpha}^{-1} p - (1 - \hat{\alpha}) \|A + |B| \bar{E}\|_1 \beta p.$$

Next, using  $p(t) \leq \check{\alpha}^{-1} p$  in the right hand side of the last inequality and letting  $1 - \hat{\alpha} = \rho \beta \check{\alpha}^{-1}$ , we get the desired result

$$\check{\alpha}^{-1} \left( 1 + \rho \beta \left( 1 + \beta \|A + |B| \bar{E}\|_1 \right) \right) p - s \geq A^\top p + K^\top(t) \left( r + B^\top p \right).$$

■

#### A.5. Proof of Corollary 1

The following holds

$$\begin{aligned} x_{t+1}^\top p &= \left( (A + BK(t)) x(t) + B\epsilon(t) + w(t) \right)^\top p \\ &= \left( (A + BK(t)) x(t) \right)^\top p + \left( B\epsilon(t) + w(t) \right)^\top p \\ &\leq \left( (A + BK(t)) x(t) \right)^\top p + |B\epsilon(t) + w(t)|^\top p \\ &= x^\top(t) (A + BK(t))^\top p + |B\epsilon(t) + w(t)|^\top p. \end{aligned}$$

Define  $\theta \triangleq \check{\alpha}^{-1} \left( 1 + \rho \beta \left( 1 + \beta \|A + |B| \bar{E}\|_1 \right) \right)$ . The application of theorem 2 then yields

$$\begin{aligned} (A + BK(t))^\top p &\leq \theta p - K^\top(t) r - s = p - K^\top(t) r - s + (\theta - 1) p \\ &= p - \left( s + K^\top(t) r - (\theta - 1) p \right). \end{aligned}$$

Next, we let  $\gamma$  be a constant such that

$$s + K^\top(t)r - (\theta - 1)p \geq \gamma \left( s + K^\top(t)r \right) \Leftrightarrow (1 - \gamma) \left( s + K^\top(t)r \right) \geq (\theta - 1)p.$$

Since  $s + K^\top(t)r \geq s - \bar{E}^\top r$  and  $p \leq \beta s$  it suffices that  $\gamma$  satisfies

$$(1 - \gamma) \left( s - \bar{E}^\top r \right) \geq (\theta - 1)\beta s \Leftrightarrow \gamma \left( s - \bar{E}^\top r \right) \leq s - \bar{E}^\top r - (\theta - 1)\beta s.$$

Such  $\gamma$  is guaranteed to exist by virtue of Assumption 2. Then, it holds that

$$(A + BK(t))^\top p \leq p - \gamma \left( s + K^\top(t)r \right),$$

and also that

$$\begin{aligned} x_{t+1}^\top p &\leq x^\top(t)p - \gamma x^\top(t) \left( s + K^\top(t)r \right) + |B\epsilon(t) + w(t)|^\top p \\ &\leq x^\top(t)p - \gamma x^\top(t) \left( s + K^\top(t)r \right) + |B\epsilon(t) + w(t)|^\top \beta s. \end{aligned}$$

Re-adjusting yields

$$\gamma \left( x^\top(t)s + x^\top(t)K^\top(t)r \right) \leq x^\top(t)p - x_{t+1}^\top p + \beta |B\epsilon(t) + w(t)|^\top s.$$

Taking the transpose and dividing both sides by  $\gamma$  yields

$$s^\top x(t) + r^\top K(t)x(t) \leq \gamma^{-1} \left( p^\top x_t - p^\top x_{t+1} + \beta s^\top |B\epsilon(t) + w(t)| \right)$$

Summing over  $t_0 \leq t \leq T - 1$  yields the following desired result

$$\sum_{t=t_0}^{T-1} s^\top x(t) + r^\top K(t)x(t) \leq \gamma^{-1} \left( p^\top x_{t_0} + \sum_{t=t_0}^{T-1} \beta s^\top |B\epsilon(t) + w(t)| \right).$$

■