

# Model-free stochastic linear quadratic design by semidefinite programming

Jing Guo<sup>a,b</sup>, Xiushan Jiang<sup>c</sup>, Weihai Zhang<sup>a,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*College of Electrical Engineering and Automation, Shandong University of Science and Technology, Qingdao, 266590, China*

<sup>b</sup>*School of Mathematics and Statistics, Shandong University of Technology, Zibo, 250049, China*

<sup>c</sup>*College of New Energy, China University of Petroleum (East China), Qingdao, 266580, China*

---

## Abstract

In this article, we study a model-free design approach for stochastic linear quadratic (SLQ) controllers. Based on the convexity of the SLQ dual problem and the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions, we find the relationship between the optimal point of the dual problem and the Q-function, which can be used to develop a novel model-free semidefinite programming (SDP) algorithm for deriving optimal control gain. This study provides a new optimization perspective for understanding Q-learning algorithms and lays a theoretical foundation for effective reinforcement learning (RL) algorithms. Finally, the effectiveness of the proposed model-free SDP algorithm is demonstrated by two case simulations.

### Keywords:

SLQ dual problem, model-free design, reinforcement learning, Q-learning, convex optimization, semidefinite programming.

---

## 1. Introduction

Reinforcement learning (RL), which has its roots in the psychology of animal learning, is an approach to learning by trial-and-error. RL originally attracted a lot of attention from the artificial intelligence field, and Sutton established the link between RL and the control domain [1]. In the control domain, RL approach means the interaction of the controller to the dynamic system, where the aim is to learn the optimal control policy by observing certain indices without full knowledge of the system dynamics [1, 2]. Over the past decades,

---

☆ This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No.62373229.

\* Corresponding author.

Email address: w\_hzhang@163.com (Weihai Zhang)

many effective model-free RL algorithms have been proposed for a variety of optimal control problems associated with various dynamic systems, see, for example, [3, 4, 5, 6, 7] and recent survey [8] for details. However, most of the current RL methods are weakly extendible or lacking in theoretical assurances, thus necessitating further investigation of RL.

In order to further comprehend the intrinsic mechanisms of various RL algorithms and also to better utilize the optimization theory to make more progress in the field of RL, many investigators have started to reconsider the linear quadratic regulator (LQR) problem, which, as a long-standing and well known archetypal problem in optimal control problems, captures the characteristics of RL despite the simplicity of the problem setup. For time invariant systems, a standard approach to solving LQR problem is to solve the Bellman equation or the algebraic Riccati equation (ARE) via dynamic programming [9]. Studies on the design of model-free controllers for LQR by means of the methods of RL, such as temporal difference [10], Q-learning [11] and so on, can be found in [12, 13, 14, 15]. With the development of convex analysis [16], LQR problem, for which the system dynamics are completely known, has been extensively studied using convex optimization techniques [17, 18, 19], for example, [19] studied the duality of the stochastic linear quadratic (SLQ) problem using semidefinite programming (SDP). Recently, many researchers have reconsidered the LQR problem from the point of optimization by connecting the RL method with classical convex optimization theory, and some valuable results have been given according to the duality of LQR problem, see, for example [20, 21, 22]. Specifically, based on the results in [19], [20] established a novel primal-dual Q-learning framework for LQR according to Lagrangian duality theories, utilized the framework to design a model-free primal-dual Q-learning algorithm to solve the LQR problem, and further interpreted the duality results from the Q-learning perspective. [21] studied the model-free design of SLQ controllers from the viewpoint of primal-dual optimization. The presented optimization formulation is different from that of [20] owing to the effect of random additive noise, and this difference also brings some difficulties in the equivalence descriptions of the primal and dual problems, respectively. In the work of both [20] and [21], proving that strong duality holds is a challenging task, and both of their proposed primal-dual Q-learning algorithms require that the initial policy to be stable and requires the collection of a set of trajectories whose initial states are linearly independent. Unlike the work in [20], [22] exploited the properties of optimization frameworks and proposed a new model-free algorithm on the basis of SDP for learning Q-function. The algorithm is characterized by high sampling efficiency, intrinsic robustness to model uncertainty, and does not need to provide an initially stabilizing controller.

Inspired by the above works, this paper investigates the model-free SLQ design by SDP. The SLQ problem is first equivalently re-represented as a non-convex optimization

problem. The nonconvexity of the primal problem leads to the nontrivial task of proving its strong duality, as done in [21]. Instead of proving strong duality, we start directly from the dual problem of the SLQ problem, use the KKT conditions and the convexity of the dual problem to find out the relationship between the optimal point of the dual problem and the parameters of the Q-function, which can be directly used to derive a new model-based SDP algorithm to obtain the controller gain. Finally, a model-free implementation of the controller design is given based on Monte-Carlo method.

The proposed model-free SDP approach has the following characteristics that are worth noting:

- It does not need to provide an initially stabilizing controller.
- It does not need hyper-parameter adjustment.
- The algorithm implementation procedure is done in a single step, not iteratively.
- It only needs to collect state and input data over a short time horizon.

The remainder is structured below. In Section 2 the SLQ problem of interest is presented with some preliminary preparations. In Section 3, the SLQ problem is reformulated as an optimization problem and a novel model-based SDP approach for SLQ controller design is proposed based on the relationship between the dual problem and the Q-function. In Section 4, a model-free implementation of model-based SDP approach is presented. In Section 5, the proposed model-free algorithm is verified by applying it to different systems, which include both stable and unstable dynamic systems. Some conclusions are given in Section 6.

For convenience, we adopt the following notations:

$\mathcal{Z}_+$ : the collection of nonnegative integers;  $\mathcal{R}^l$ : the collection of  $l$  dimensional vectors;  $\mathcal{R}^{l \times m}$ : the collection of  $l \times m$  real matrices.  $I_l$ : the  $l \times l$  identity matrix,  $\mathbf{0}$ : the zero vector or matrix with the appropriate dimension.  $M^\top$ : the transpose of a vector or matrix  $M$ ;  $\text{tr}(M)$ : the trace of a square matrix  $M$ ;  $\rho(M)$ : the spectral radius of  $M$ ;  $\lambda_{\max}(M)$  ( $\lambda_{\min}(M)$ ): the maximum (minimum) eigenvalues of  $M$ .  $\mathbb{R}(M)$ : the range space of  $M$ ;  $\mathbb{N}(M)$ : the nullspace of  $M$ . For vectors  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$ ,  $\text{col}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{bmatrix}$ . The

direct sum of matrices  $M_1$  and  $M_2$ :  $M_1 \oplus M_2 \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} M_1 & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & M_2 \end{bmatrix}$ .  $\mathcal{S}^l$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_+^l$  and  $\mathcal{S}_{++}^l$  are the collections of all  $l \times l$  symmetric, symmetric positive semidefinite and symmetric positive definite matrices, respectively; we write  $M \succeq \mathbf{0}$ , (resp.  $M \succ \mathbf{0}$ ) if  $M \in \mathcal{S}_+^l$ , (resp.  $M \in \mathcal{S}_{++}^l$ ).

## 2. Problem formulation and preliminaries

Consider a class of discrete-time linear time-invariant systems subject to additive noise as:

$$\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = A\mathbf{x}_k + B\mathbf{u}_k + \mathbf{w}_k, \quad (1)$$

where  $k \in \mathcal{Z}_+$  is the discrete-time index,  $\mathbf{x}_k \in \mathcal{R}^n$  is the system state,  $\mathbf{u}_k \in \mathcal{R}^m$  is the control input,  $\mathbf{w}_k \in \mathcal{R}^n$  is the system additive noise defined on a given complete probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})$ ,  $A \in \mathcal{R}^{n \times n}$  and  $B \in \mathcal{R}^{n \times m}$  are the system coefficient matrices. The initial state  $\mathbf{x}_0$  is assumed to be a random variable. For convenience, it is further assumed that the following Assumption 1 holds.

**Assumption 1.** (i)  $\mathbf{x}_0 \sim \mathcal{N}_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0, \Sigma_0)$ , where  $\Sigma_0 \succ \mathbf{0}$ ;

(ii) The sequence of random vectors  $\{\mathbf{w}_k, k \in \mathcal{Z}_+\}$  is independent and identically distributed, and furthermore,  $\mathbf{w}_k \sim \mathcal{N}_n(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$  for each  $k \in \mathcal{Z}_+$ , where  $\Sigma \succeq \mathbf{0}$ ;

(iii)  $\mathbf{x}_0$  is independent of  $\{\mathbf{w}_k, k \in \mathcal{Z}_+\}$ .

**Definition 1.** [23] System (1) with  $\mathbf{u}_k \equiv \mathbf{0}$  is said mean square stable (MSS) if for any  $\mathbf{x}_0$  and  $\{\mathbf{w}_k, k \in \mathcal{Z}_+\}$  satisfying Assumption 1, there exist  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{R}^n$  and  $X \in \mathcal{R}^{n \times n}$ , which are independent of  $\mathbf{x}_0$ , such that

(i)  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{x}_k) - \boldsymbol{\mu}\| = 0$ ,

(ii)  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top) - X\| = 0$ .

The following lemma gives sufficient and necessary conditions under which the system is MSS.

**Lemma 1.** [23] [15] [21]

The following statements are equivalent:

(i) System (1) with  $\mathbf{u}_k \equiv \mathbf{0}$  is MSS;

(ii)  $\rho(A) < 1$ ;

(iii) when  $r > 1 - \frac{\lambda_{\min}(Z)}{\lambda_{\max}(A^\top S A)}$ , for each given  $Z \succ \mathbf{0}$ , there exists a unique  $S \succ \mathbf{0}$ , such that  $rA^\top S A + Z = S$ .

In view of Lemma 1, we assume that  $r \in (0, 1)$  is close to 1 throughout the paper.

**Definition 2.** The state feedback control  $\mathbf{u}_k = L\mathbf{x}_k$  is called admissible, if  $\mathbf{x}_{k+1} = (A + BL)\mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{w}_k$  is MSS. In this case,  $L \in \mathcal{R}^{m \times n}$  is called a stabilizing gain of system (1), and the set of all stabilizing gains is denoted as  $\mathcal{L}$ .

Consequently, the cost functional can be defined as

$$J(L, \mathbf{x}_0) \triangleq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} r^k \mathbb{E} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_k \\ L\mathbf{x}_k \end{bmatrix}^\top W \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_k \\ L\mathbf{x}_k \end{bmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

where  $r \in (0, 1)$  is the discount factor and  $W \triangleq Q \oplus R \succeq \mathbf{0}$  is a block-diagonal matrix consisting of the weighting matrices  $Q \in \mathcal{S}_+^n$  and  $R \in \mathcal{S}_{++}^m$ , respectively.

In this paper, we consider the infinite-horizon SLQ problem.

**Problem 1.** ( SLQ problem )

Find an optimal feedback gain  $L^* \in \mathcal{L}$ , if it exists, that minimize the cost functional (2). That is,

$$L^* \triangleq \arg \min_{L \in \mathcal{L}} J(L, \mathbf{x}_0).$$

The following assumptions are necessary to ensure that an optimal feedback gain  $L^*$  exists.

**Assumption 2.** Assume that

- (i)  $(A, B)$  is stabilizable;
- (ii)  $(A, \sqrt{Q})$  is detectable.

Under Assumption 2, the optimal value of  $\inf_{L \in \mathcal{L}} J(L, \mathbf{x}_0)$  exists and is attained, and the corresponding optimal cost  $J(L^*, \mathbf{x}_0)$ , which is abbreviated as  $J^*$ , is given by [15]

$$J^* = \mathbb{E} (\mathbf{x}_0^\top P^* \mathbf{x}_0) + \frac{r}{1-r} \text{tr} (P^* \Sigma),$$

where  $P^* \succeq \mathbf{0}$  is the unique solution to the following discrete-time algebraic Riccati equation (DARE):

$$P = Q + rA^\top P A - r^2 A^\top P B (R + rB^\top P B)^{-1} B^\top P A. \quad (3)$$

The corresponding optimal control gain  $L^*$  for the SLQ problem is given by

$$L^* = -r (R + rB^\top P^* B)^{-1} B^\top P^* A.$$

From the above, it is easy to conclude that the SLQ problem can be solved with knowing the system dynamics  $A$  and  $B$ . The following Q-learning provides a model-free design approach to solve the SLQ problem. Define the Q-function as (see [15] for more details)

$$Q(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k) \triangleq \mathbb{E}(U(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k)) + rV(L, \mathbf{x}_{k+1}),$$

where the value function

$$V(L, \mathbf{x}_k) \triangleq \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=k}^{\infty} r^{i-k} U(\mathbf{x}_i, L\mathbf{x}_i),$$

with  $U(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{u}_i) \triangleq \mathbf{x}_i^\top Q \mathbf{x}_i + \mathbf{u}_i^\top R \mathbf{u}_i$ .

The optimal value function produced by the optimal admissible control policy is denoted as

$$V^*(\mathbf{x}_k) \triangleq V(L^*, \mathbf{x}_k) = \min_{L \in \mathcal{L}} V(L, \mathbf{x}_k).$$

For the case of SLQ, we have

**Lemma 2.** [15] Define the optimal Q-function as  $Q^*(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k) \triangleq \mathbb{E}(U(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k)) + rV^*(\mathbf{x}_{k+1})$ , then  $Q^*(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k)$  can be expressed as

$$Q^*(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k) = \mathbb{E} \left[ [\mathbf{x}_k^\top, \mathbf{u}_k^\top] H^* [\mathbf{x}_k^\top, \mathbf{u}_k^\top]^\top \right] + \frac{r}{1-r} \text{tr}(P^* \Sigma), \quad (4)$$

where  $P^* \succeq \mathbf{0}$  is the unique solution to DARE (3),  $H^* \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} H_{11}^* & H_{12}^* \\ H_{21}^* & H_{22}^* \end{bmatrix}$  with  $H_{11}^* = Q + rA^\top P^* A$ ,  $H_{12}^* = rA^\top P^* B = (H_{21}^*)^\top$ ,  $H_{22}^* = R + rB^\top P^* B$ . Furthermore, the optimal control is derived from

$$\mathbf{u}_k^* = L^* \mathbf{x}_k = \arg \min_{\mathbf{u}_k} Q^*(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k)$$

with the optimal control gain

$$L^* = -(H_{22}^*)^{-1} (H_{12}^*)^\top. \quad (5)$$

### 3. Model-based design of SLQ control via SDP

In Section 3.1, the SLQ problem is first reformulated as a non-convex optimization problem, and then in Section 3.2, a non-iterative SDP optimization method is developed to find the optimal Q-function parameters from the dual of the SLQ problem. Finding the optimal Q-function means finding the optimal control policy for the SLQ problem.

### 3.1. Problem reformulation

By introducing the augmented system, which is described by

$$\mathbf{z}_{k+1} = A_L \mathbf{z}_k + \bar{L} \mathbf{w}_k, \quad (6)$$

where the augmented state vector  $\mathbf{z}_k \triangleq \text{col}(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k)$  with the initial augmented state vector  $\mathbf{z}_0 \triangleq \text{col}(\mathbf{x}_0, L\mathbf{x}_0)$ ,  $A_L \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ LA & LB \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $\bar{L} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} I_n \\ L \end{bmatrix}$ , we can obtain the alternative formulation of the Problem 1 (SLQ problem) and described by the following Problem 2.

**Problem 2.** (Primal Problem): Non-convex optimization with optimization variables  $L \in \mathcal{R}^{m \times n}$  and  $S \in \mathcal{S}^{n+m}$ .

$$\begin{aligned} J_p &\triangleq \min_{L \in \mathcal{R}^{m \times n}, S \in \mathcal{S}^{n+m}} \text{tr}(WS), \\ \text{s.t. } & S \succ \mathbf{0}, \\ & rA_L S A_L^\top + \bar{L} X_0 \bar{L}^\top + \frac{r}{1-r} \bar{L} \Sigma \bar{L}^\top = S. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Note that Problem 2 is a non-convex optimization problem because constraint (7) is not linear. We first prove that Problem 2 is a non-convex optimization equivalent to Problem 1.

**Proposition 1.** Problem 2 is equivalent to Problem 1 in a meaning that  $J_p = J^*$  and  $L_p = L^*$ , where  $(S_p, L_p)$  is the optimal point of Problem 2. In addition,  $(S_p, L_p)$  is unique.

*Proof.* Using the properties of matrix traces, we can reformulate the objective function of Problem 1 as

$$J(L, \mathbf{x}_0) = \text{tr}(WS),$$

where

$$S \triangleq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} r^k \mathbb{E} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_k \\ L\mathbf{x}_k \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_k \\ L\mathbf{x}_k \end{bmatrix}^\top. \quad (8)$$

From (6), for  $k \geq 1$ , we get

$$\mathbf{z}_k = A_L^k \mathbf{z}_0 + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} A_L^j \bar{L} \mathbf{w}_{k-j-1}. \quad (9)$$

Using Eq. (9) and the item (ii) in Assumption 1, for  $k \geq 1$  and any  $L \in \mathcal{L}$ , one can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{z}_k \mathbf{z}_k^\top] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[ A_L^k \mathbf{z}_0 (\mathbf{z}_0)^\top (A_L^k)^\top \right] + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \mathbb{E} \left[ A_L^j \bar{L} \mathbf{w}_{k-j-1} \mathbf{w}_{k-j-1}^\top \bar{L}^\top (A_L^j)^\top \right] \\ &= A_L^k \bar{L} \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{x}_0 \mathbf{x}_0^\top] \bar{L}^\top (A_L^k)^\top + \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} A_L^j \bar{L} \Sigma \bar{L}^\top (A_L^j)^\top. \end{aligned}$$

Denote  $X_0 \triangleq \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{x}_0 \mathbf{x}_0^\top] = \Sigma_0 + \boldsymbol{\mu}_0 \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^\top$  in the sequel for brevity, thus,  $S$  in (8) becomes

$$S = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} r^k A_L^k \bar{L} X_0 \bar{L}^\top (A_L^k)^\top + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} r^k \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} A_L^j \bar{L} \Sigma \bar{L}^\top (A_L^j)^\top.$$

By an algebraic manipulation, we can get that

$$S - r A_L S A_L^\top = \bar{L} X_0 \bar{L}^\top + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} r^k \bar{L} \Sigma \bar{L}^\top = \bar{L} X_0 \bar{L}^\top + \frac{r}{1-r} \bar{L} \Sigma \bar{L}^\top,$$

which means that  $S$  satisfies (7).

From  $X_0 \succ \mathbf{0}$ ,  $\Sigma \succeq \mathbf{0}$  and  $0 < r < 10$ , we get  $X_0 + \frac{r}{1-r} \Sigma \succ \mathbf{0}$ , which leads to  $\bar{L} (X_0 + \frac{r}{1-r} \Sigma) \bar{L}^\top \succ \mathbf{0}$ . Then, when  $r > 1 - \frac{\lambda_{\min}(\bar{L} (X_0 + \frac{r}{1-r} \Sigma) \bar{L}^\top)}{\lambda_{\max}(A_L^\top S A_L)}$ , it follows from Lemma 1 that  $\rho(A_L) < 1$  if and only if (7) has a unique solution  $S \succ \mathbf{0}$ . We can obtain from Lemma 1 in [20] that  $\rho(A + BL) = \rho(A_L)$ . Thus, the constraint  $L \in \mathcal{L}$  in Problem 1 can be replaced by  $S \succ \mathbf{0}$  that does not change its optimal point.

If  $(S_p, L_p)$  is the optimal point of Problem 2 and  $J_p$  is the related optimal value, then  $S_p \succ \mathbf{0}$  and  $\rho(A_{L_p}) < 1$ .  $L_p \in \mathcal{L}$  is a feasible point of Problem 1, implying  $J_p \geq J^*$ . If  $S_p$  is the unique solution of (7) with  $L_p = L^* \in \mathcal{L}$ , then the corresponding objective function of Problem 2 is  $J_p = J^*$ . Therefore, one can obtain that  $J_p = J^*$ . The uniqueness of  $(S_p, L_p)$  is demonstrated by the uniqueness of  $L^*$ .  $\square$

**Remark 1.** Although both [21] and this paper investigate SLQ problems with additive noise, the cost functional in [21] is defined from a sample from the initial state, whereas the cost functional in this paper is defined directly from the assumption that the initial state is a random variable, and thus the cost functional defined in this paper is more general. Because of this, the equivalent optimization formulation of SLQ problem obtained in this paper is different from that of [21].



### 3.2. Model-based design of SLQ control via SDP

In this section, we first represent the Lagrange dual problem associated with Problem 2 as an SDP problem, where the affine objective function shows the dependence of the objective function on the initial state and additive noise, while the LMI constraints are independent of the initial state and additive noise, which also shows the independence of the optimal point of the dual problem from the initial state and the additive noise. In addition, the optimal point of the dual problem is related to the parameters of the optimal Q-function, which provides us with a way to find the parameters of the optimal Q-function.

We begin by describing the Lagrangian dual problem associated with Problem 2 as a standard convex optimization problem.

**Theorem 1.** The Lagrange dual problem associated with Problem 2 can be expressed as a convex optimization problem indicated by Problem 3.

**Problem 3.** (Dual Problem): Convex optimization with optimization variables  $M \in \mathcal{R}^{n \times n}$  and  $F = \begin{bmatrix} F_{11} & F_{12} \\ F_{12}^\top & F_{22} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{S}^{n+m}$  with  $F_{11} \in \mathcal{S}^n$ ,  $F_{22} \in \mathcal{S}^m$ , and  $F_{12} \in \mathcal{R}^{n \times m}$ .

$$\max_{F, M} \operatorname{tr} \left( \left( X_0 + \frac{r}{1-r} \Sigma \right) M \right), \quad (10)$$

$$\text{s.t. } r [A \ B]^\top (F_{11} - F_{12} F_{22}^{-1} F_{12}^\top) [A \ B] - F + W \succeq \mathbf{0}, \quad (11)$$

$$F_{22} \succ \mathbf{0}, \quad (12)$$

$$F_{11} - F_{12} F_{22}^{-1} F_{12}^\top - M \succeq \mathbf{0}. \quad (13)$$

*Proof.* In order to express the Lagrangian, the multipliers  $F_0 \in \mathcal{S}_+^{n+m}$  and  $F \in \mathcal{S}^{n+m}$  are introduced, and the Lagrangian associated with Problem 2 is obtained as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_1(S, L, F_0, F) &\triangleq \operatorname{tr}(WS) - \operatorname{tr}(F_0 S) \\ &\quad + \operatorname{tr} \left( \left( r A_L S A_L^\top + \bar{L} X_0 \bar{L}^\top + \frac{r}{1-r} \bar{L} \Sigma \bar{L}^\top - S \right) F \right) \\ &= \operatorname{tr} \left( (r A_L^\top F A_L - F - F_0 + W) S \right) \\ &\quad + \operatorname{tr} \left( \left( X_0 + \frac{r}{1-r} \Sigma \right) \bar{L}^\top F \bar{L} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The Lagrange dual function is

$$\mathcal{D}_1(F_0, F) \triangleq \inf_L \inf_{S \succeq \mathbf{0}} \mathcal{L}_1(S, L, F_0, F), \quad (14)$$

and then, the Lagrange dual problem is

$$\max_{F_0, F} \mathcal{D}_1(F_0, F), \quad (15)$$

$$\text{s.t. } F_0 \succeq \mathbf{0}. \quad (16)$$

When the Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_1(S, L, F_0, F)$  is not bounded from below, then the value of the dual function  $\mathcal{D}_1(F_0, F)$  is  $-\infty$ . Thus for the Lagrange dual problem (15), the dual feasibility requires that  $F_0 \succeq \mathbf{0}$  and that  $\mathcal{D}_1(F_0, F) > -\infty$ . For given  $F_0$  and  $F$ , since  $S \succeq \mathbf{0}$ , the Lagrange dual function  $\mathcal{D}_1(F_0, F)$  which is given in (14) becomes

$$\mathcal{D}_1(F_0, F) = \begin{cases} \inf_L \text{tr} \left( \left( X_0 + \frac{r}{1-r} \Sigma \right) \bar{L}^\top F \bar{L} \right), & \text{if } r A_L^\top F A_L - F - F_0 + W \succeq \mathbf{0} \\ -\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

Since the Lagrange multiplier  $F_0$  only appears in the constraint condition of the Lagrange dual function (17):  $r A_L^\top F A_L - F - F_0 + W \succeq \mathbf{0}$ , the dual feasibility is equivalent to  $r A_L^\top F A_L - F + W \succeq \mathbf{0}$ . Using the block-diagonal matrix representation of the Lagrange multiplier  $F$  in Problem 3, the objective function in (17), which is denoted by  $\mathcal{L}_2(L, F)$ , can be represented as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_2(L, F) &\triangleq \text{tr} \left( \left( X_0 + \frac{r}{1-r} \Sigma \right) \bar{L}^\top F \bar{L} \right) \\ &= \text{tr} \left( \left( X_0 + \frac{r}{1-r} \Sigma \right) (L^\top F_{22} L + L^\top F_{12}^\top + F_{12} L + F_{11}) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Therefore, the dual problem (15)–(16) is equivalent to

$$\max_F \inf_L \mathcal{L}_2(L, F), \quad (19)$$

$$\text{s.t. } r A_L^\top F A_L - F + W \succeq \mathbf{0}. \quad (20)$$

To give an explicit expression for the function  $\mathcal{D}_2(F) \triangleq \inf_L \mathcal{L}_2(L, F)$ , consider the following three different situations:

Situation 1: Let  $F_{22} \succ \mathbf{0}$ . In this situation, letting  $\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_2(L, F)}{\partial L} = \mathbf{0}$  yields

$$F_{22} L \left( X_0 + \frac{r}{1-r} \Sigma \right) + F_{22}^\top L \left( X_0 + \frac{r}{1-r} \Sigma \right)^\top + F_{12}^\top \left( X_0 + \frac{r}{1-r} \Sigma \right) + F_{12} \left( X_0 + \frac{r}{1-r} \Sigma \right)^\top = \mathbf{0}.$$

By solving the above equation, the optimal point of the function  $\mathcal{L}_2(L, F)$  can be solved to be  $L^* = -F_{22}^{-1} F_{12}^\top$ , so the infimum of  $\mathcal{L}_2(L, F)$  is attained at  $L^*$ , and hence

$$\mathcal{D}_2(F) = \mathcal{L}_2(L^*, F) = \text{tr} \left( \left( X_0 + \frac{r}{1-r} \Sigma \right) (F_{11} - F_{12} F_{22}^{-1} F_{12}^\top) \right). \quad (21)$$

Substituting  $L^*$  in the constraint (20) and combining with the objective function in (21) results in an alternative equivalent representation of the dual problem (19)–(20):

$$\begin{aligned} \max_F \quad & \text{tr} \left( \left( X_0 + \frac{r}{1-r} \Sigma \right) (F_{11} - F_{12} F_{22}^{-1} F_{12}^\top) \right), \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & r \begin{bmatrix} A & B \end{bmatrix}^\top (F_{11} - F_{12} F_{22}^{-1} F_{12}^\top) \begin{bmatrix} A & B \end{bmatrix} - F + W \succeq \mathbf{0}. \end{aligned}$$

**Situation 2:** Let  $F_{22} \succeq \mathbf{0}$  be a singular matrix assuming that  $\mathbb{R}(F_{22}) \supseteq \mathbb{R}(F_{12}^\top)$ . In this situation, the infimum of  $\mathcal{L}_2(L, F)$  still exists. Suppose  $\text{rank}(F_{22}) = q < m$ , then  $F_{22}$  can be factored as  $F_{22} = U_q \Lambda_q U_q^\top$ , where  $U_q \in \mathcal{R}^{m \times q}$  satisfies  $U_q^\top U_q = I_q$  and  $\Lambda_q = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_q)$  with  $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_q > 0$ . Moreover, the columns of  $U_q$  span  $\mathbb{R}(F_{22})$ . The pseudo-inverse  $F_{22}^\dagger$  can be expressed as  $F_{22}^\dagger = U_q \Lambda_q^{-1} U_q^\top$ . By a process similar to that of Situation 1, the Lagrangian dual problem associated with problem 2 for Situation 2 can be deduced as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \max_F \quad & \text{tr} \left( \left( X_0 + \frac{r}{1-r} \Sigma \right) (F_{11} - F_{12} F_{22}^\dagger F_{12}^\top) \right), \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & r \begin{bmatrix} A & B \end{bmatrix}^\top (F_{11} - F_{12} F_{22}^\dagger F_{12}^\top) \begin{bmatrix} A & B \end{bmatrix} - F + W \succeq \mathbf{0}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\mathbb{R}(F_{22}) \supseteq \mathbb{R}(F_{12}^\top)$ , there exists an unitary matrix  $U_{m-q}$  such that the columns of  $U_{m-q}$  span  $\mathbb{N}(F_{12}^\top)$ . Let  $\Lambda_{m-q}$  be any diagonal matrix where the diagonal elements are positive, and construct a matrix  $\bar{F}_{22} \succ \mathbf{0}$  as

$$\bar{F}_{22} = \begin{bmatrix} U_q & U_{m-q} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_q & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \Lambda_{m-q} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} U_q & U_{m-q} \end{bmatrix}^\top.$$

Noting that

$$\begin{aligned} & F_{12} \bar{F}_{22}^{-1} F_{12}^\top \\ &= F_{12} \begin{bmatrix} U_q & U_{m-q} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_q^{-1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \Lambda_{m-q}^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} U_q^\top \\ U_{m-q}^\top \end{bmatrix} F_{12}^\top \\ &= F_{12} U_q \Lambda_q^{-1} U_q^\top F_{12}^\top - \underbrace{F_{12} U_{m-q} \Lambda_{m-q}^{-1} U_{m-q}^\top F_{12}^\top}_0 \\ &= F_{12} F_{22}^\dagger F_{12}^\top, \end{aligned}$$

it can be concluded that each admissible candidate  $F_{22} \succeq \mathbf{0}$  leads to a value of the objective which can be obtained by substituting a counterpart  $\bar{F}_{22} \succ \mathbf{0}$ .

**Situation 3:**  $F_{22} \succeq \mathbf{0}$  while  $\mathbb{R}(F_{22}) \not\supseteq \mathbb{R}(F_{12}^\top)$  or at least one negative eigenvalue is contained in matrix  $F_{22}$ . In this situation, the Lagrangian is unbounded from below through minimizing (18) in terms of  $L$ .

To summarize, without loss of generality, we follow up with the assumption that  $F_{22} \succ \mathbf{0}$ . Therefore, the dual problem (19) – (20) is equivalent to

$$\max_F \operatorname{tr} \left( \left( X_0 + \frac{r}{1-r} \Sigma \right) (F_{11} - F_{12} F_{22}^{-1} F_{12}^\top) \right), \quad (22)$$

$$\text{s.t. } r \begin{bmatrix} A & B \end{bmatrix}^\top (F_{11} - F_{12} F_{22}^{-1} F_{12}^\top) \begin{bmatrix} A & B \end{bmatrix} - F + W \succeq \mathbf{0}, \quad (23)$$

$$F_{22} \succ \mathbf{0}. \quad (24)$$

Finally, through the introduction of the slack variable  $M \in \mathcal{S}^n$  and the added constraint (13), the Lagrange dual problem (22)–(24) can be equivalently described by Problem 3. In fact, let  $F^*$  be the optimal point of the dual problem (22)–(24) and  $(F^*, M^*)$  be the optimal point of Problem 3. Based on the positive definiteness of  $X_0 + \frac{r}{1-r} \Sigma$  and the constraint (13),

$$\operatorname{tr} \left( \left( X_0 + \frac{r}{1-r} \Sigma \right) M^* \right) \leq \operatorname{tr} \left( \left( X_0 + \frac{r}{1-r} \Sigma \right) (F_{11}^* - F_{12}^* (F_{22}^*)^{-1} (F_{12}^*)^\top) \right).$$

Because  $M^*$  is the maximum point of the objective function (13),

$$\operatorname{tr} \left( \left( X_0 + \frac{r}{1-r} \Sigma \right) M^* \right) \geq \operatorname{tr} \left( \left( X_0 + \frac{r}{1-r} \Sigma \right) (F_{11}^* - F_{12}^* (F_{22}^*)^{-1} (F_{12}^*)^\top) \right),$$

and hence

$$\operatorname{tr} \left( \left( X_0 + \frac{r}{1-r} \Sigma \right) (M^* - F_{11}^* + F_{12}^* (F_{22}^*)^{-1} (F_{12}^*)^\top) \right) = 0.$$

Therefore, all eigenvalues of the matrix  $M^* - F_{11}^* + F_{12}^* (F_{22}^*)^{-1} (F_{12}^*)^\top$  are zero. As  $M^*$  is symmetric, it results that

$$M^* = F_{11}^* - F_{12}^* (F_{22}^*)^{-1} (F_{12}^*)^\top,$$

which implies that the dual problem (22)–(24) is equivalent to Problem 3.  $\square$

The next theorem gives the relationship between the optimal point to the dual problem associated with SLQ problem and the optimal Q-function.

**Theorem 2.** Denote  $(F^*, M^*)$  as the optimal point to Problem 3, then  $(F^*, M^*)$  is independent of  $X_0 + \frac{r}{1-r} \Sigma$ . Furthermore,  $F^* = H^*$  and  $M^* = P^*$ , where  $H^*$  is the parameter of the optimal Q-function expressed in (4) and  $P^*$  is the solution to DARE (3).

*Proof.* By introducing multipliers  $G_1 \in \mathcal{S}_+^{n+m}$ ,  $G_2 \in \mathcal{S}_+^m$  and  $G_3 \in \mathcal{S}_+^n$ , the Lagrangian associated with Problem 3 is derived by

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{L}_3(F, M, G_1, G_2, G_3) \\ &= -\operatorname{tr} \left( \left( X_0 + \frac{r}{1-r} \Sigma \right) M \right) \\ & \quad - \operatorname{tr} \left( G_1 \left( r \begin{bmatrix} A & B \end{bmatrix}^\top (F_{11} - F_{12} F_{22}^{-1} F_{12}^\top) \begin{bmatrix} A & B \end{bmatrix} - F + W \right) \right) \\ & \quad - \operatorname{tr} (G_2 F_{22}) - \operatorname{tr} (G_3 (F_{11} - F_{12} F_{22}^{-1} F_{12}^\top - M)) . \end{aligned}$$

As Problem 3 is convex, the necessary condition under which the points are primal and dual optimal points is the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions [16]. That is, if  $\hat{F}$ ,  $\hat{M}$ ,  $\hat{G}_1$ ,  $\hat{G}_2$  and  $\hat{G}_3$  are any points that satisfy the KKT conditions of Problem 3 summarized below

- (1) Primal feasibility: (11)–(13);
- (2) Dual feasibility:

$$G_1 \succeq \mathbf{0}, \quad G_2 \succeq \mathbf{0}, \quad G_3 \succeq \mathbf{0};$$

- (3) Complementary slackness:

$$\operatorname{tr} \left( G_1 \left( r \begin{bmatrix} A & B \end{bmatrix}^\top (F_{11} - F_{12} F_{22}^{-1} F_{12}^\top) \begin{bmatrix} A & B \end{bmatrix} - F + W \right) \right) = 0, \quad (25)$$

$$\operatorname{tr} (G_2 F_{22}) = 0,$$

$$\operatorname{tr} (G_3 (F_{11} - F_{12} F_{22}^{-1} F_{12}^\top - M)) = 0; \quad (26)$$

- (4) Stationarity conditions:

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_3}{\partial M} = \mathbf{0}, \quad \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_3}{\partial F} = \mathbf{0}, \quad (27)$$

then  $(\hat{F}, \hat{M})$  and  $(\hat{G}_1, \hat{G}_2, \hat{G}_3)$  are primal and dual optimal points, respectively.

Choose  $\hat{F} = H^*$  and  $\hat{M} = P^*$ . Taking  $\hat{F} = H^*$  into the left-hand side of (11) causes the left-hand side of (11) to be equal to  $\mathbf{0}$ , from which it follows that the constraint (11) is active, i.e., the constraint (25) is satisfied naturally without imposition of any constraints on  $\hat{G}_1$ . Moreover, taking  $(\hat{F}, \hat{M}) = (H^*, P^*)$  into the left-hand side of constraint (13) causes the left-hand side of (13) to be equal to  $\mathbf{0}$ . That is, the constraint (13) is active and (26) is satisfied naturally without imposition of any constraints on  $\hat{G}_3$ . Since  $\hat{F}_{22} = H_{22}^* \succ \mathbf{0}$ , the constraint (12) is not active at the point  $\hat{F} = H^*$ , which results in  $\hat{G}_2 = \mathbf{0}$ .

It is shown below that the stationary conditions (27) can be satisfied at  $(\hat{F}, \hat{M})$  by a proper choice of  $\hat{G}_1$  and  $\hat{G}_3$ . To this end, the matrix variable  $F$  is reformulated as

$$F = E_1 F_{11} E_1^\top + E_1 F_{12} E_2^\top + E_2 F_{12}^\top E_1^\top + E_2 F_{22} E_2^\top$$

by utilizing  $E_1 = [I_n \ \mathbf{0}]^\top$  and  $E_2 = [\mathbf{0} \ I_m]^\top$ . Then, (27) can be equivalently expressed as (28)–(31).

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_3}{\partial M} = - \left( X_0 + \frac{r}{1-r} \Sigma \right)^\top + G_3^\top = \mathbf{0}, \quad (28)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_3}{\partial F_{11}} = -G_3 - r [A \ B] G_1 [A \ B]^\top + E_1^\top G_1 E_1 = \mathbf{0}, \quad (29)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_3}{\partial F_{12}} = 2r [A \ B] G_1 [A \ B]^\top \hat{F}_{12} \hat{F}_{22}^{-1} + 2G_3 \hat{F}_{12} \hat{F}_{22}^{-1} + 2E_1^\top G_1 E_2 = \mathbf{0}, \quad (30)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_3}{\partial F_{22}} = E_2^\top G_1 E_2 - \hat{F}_{22}^{-1} \left( F_{12}^\top G_3 \hat{F}_{12} + \hat{F}_{12}^\top r [A \ B] G_1 [A \ B]^\top \hat{F}_{12} \right) \hat{F}_{22}^{-1} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (31)$$

Choose

$$\hat{G}_3 = X_0 + \frac{r}{1-r} \Sigma \succ \mathbf{0}, \quad (32)$$

which satisfies the stationary condition (28).

From (29) and (30),  $G_1$  should be subject to the following constraint:

$$E_1^\top G_1 E_1 \hat{F}_{12} \hat{F}_{22}^{-1} + E_1^\top G_1 E_2 = \mathbf{0}. \quad (33)$$

Furthermore, from (29) and (31),  $G_1$  should also be subject to the following constraint:

$$-\hat{F}_{12}^\top E_1^\top G_1 E_1 \hat{F}_{12} + \hat{F}_{22} E_2^\top G_1 E_2 \hat{F}_{22} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (34)$$

By dividing  $G_1$  into the block matrix  $G_1 = \begin{bmatrix} G_{11}^1 & G_{12}^1 \\ (G_{12}^1)^\top & G_{22}^1 \end{bmatrix}$ , (33) and (34) are represented as

$$G_{11}^1 \hat{F}_{12} \hat{F}_{22}^{-1} + G_{12}^1 = \mathbf{0}, \quad (35)$$

$$-\hat{F}_{12}^\top G_{11}^1 \hat{F}_{12} + \hat{F}_{22} G_{22}^1 \hat{F}_{22} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (36)$$

By substituting (32) (35) and (36) in (29), we have

$$\hat{G}_3 + r \left[ A - B \hat{F}_{22}^{-1} \hat{F}_{12}^\top \right] G_{11}^1 \left[ A - B \hat{F}_{22}^{-1} \hat{F}_{12}^\top \right]^\top = G_{11}^1. \quad (37)$$

Based on the representation of the optimal control gain given in (5), substituting  $\hat{F} = H^*$  in  $A - B\hat{F}_{22}^{-1}\hat{F}_{12}^\top$  results in  $A + BL^*$ . Since  $L^* \in \mathcal{L}$  leads to  $\rho\left(A - B\hat{F}_{22}^{-1}\hat{F}_{12}^\top\right) < 1$ . Then, when

$$r > 1 - \frac{\lambda_{\min}\left(\hat{G}_3\right)}{\lambda_{\max}\left(\left[A - B\hat{F}_{22}^{-1}\hat{F}_{12}^\top\right]G_{11}^1\left[A - B\hat{F}_{22}^{-1}\hat{F}_{12}^\top\right]^\top\right)},$$

one can obtain from Lemma 1 that for given  $\hat{G}_3 = X_0 + \frac{r}{1-r}\Sigma \succ \mathbf{0}$ , there exists a unique  $\hat{G}_{11}^1 \succ \mathbf{0}$  such that (37) holds. Accordingly, construct  $\hat{G}_1$  as follows

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{G}_1 &= \begin{bmatrix} \hat{G}_{11}^1 & -\hat{G}_{11}^1\hat{F}_{12}\hat{F}_{22}^{-1} \\ -\hat{F}_{22}^{-1}\hat{F}_{12}^\top\hat{G}_{11}^1 & \hat{F}_{22}^{-1}\hat{F}_{12}^\top\hat{G}_{11}^1\hat{F}_{12}\hat{F}_{22}^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} I_n & \\ -\hat{F}_{22}^{-1}\hat{F}_{12}^\top & \end{bmatrix} \hat{G}_{11}^1 \begin{bmatrix} I_n & -\hat{F}_{12}\left(\hat{F}_{22}^{-1}\right)^\top \end{bmatrix} \succeq \mathbf{0}.\end{aligned}$$

In summary, there exist  $\hat{F} = H^*$ ,  $\hat{M} = P^*$ ,  $\hat{G}_1 = \begin{bmatrix} I_n & \\ -\hat{F}_{22}^{-1}\hat{F}_{12}^\top & \end{bmatrix} \hat{G}_{11}^1 \begin{bmatrix} I_n & -\hat{F}_{12}\left(\hat{F}_{22}^{-1}\right)^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top$ ,  $\hat{G}_2 = \mathbf{0}$  and  $\hat{G}_3 = X_0 + \frac{r}{1-r}\Sigma_0$  that satisfy the KKT conditions of Problem 3, thus  $(H^*, P^*)$  and  $\left(\begin{bmatrix} I_n & \\ -\hat{F}_{22}^{-1}\hat{F}_{12}^\top & \end{bmatrix} \hat{G}_{11}^1 \begin{bmatrix} I_n & -\hat{F}_{12}\left(\hat{F}_{22}^{-1}\right)^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top, \mathbf{0}, X_0 + \frac{r}{1-r}\Sigma_0\right)$  are primal and dual optimal points, respectively. Hence,  $F^* = H^*$  and  $M^* = P^*$ . Moreover, according to the expressions of  $H^*$  and  $P^*$ ,  $(H^*, P^*)$  is independent of  $X_0 + \frac{r}{1-r}\Sigma$ .  $\square$

**Remark 2.** Note that for optimization problems that hold for strong duality, when the primal problem is convex, the KKT conditions are sufficient and necessary conditions such that the points are primal and dual optimal [16]. And for general primal problems that are convex, strong duality holds under some modest conditions (e.g., the Slater's condition) [16]. The fact that the primal problem of this paper is non-convex makes the task of proving that strong duality holds nontrivial, as it was in [20] and [21]. Instead of proceeding directly to show that strong duality holds, this paper finds a relationship between the optimal point to the dual problem and the parameter in Q-learning, starting from the dual problem and then using the convexity of the dual problem and the conclusion that the KKT conditions in convex optimization is a sufficient condition for optimality [16].

Based on the above two theorems, we can now represent the dual problem associated with the SLQ problem as a standard SDP problem in Problem 4.

**Proposition 2.** Problem 3 is equivalent to Problem 4 in a meaning that optimal points are the same.

**Problem 4.** SDP with optimization variables  $F \in \mathcal{S}^{n+m}$  and  $M \in \mathcal{S}^n$ .

$$\max_{F, M} \text{tr}(M), \quad (38)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \begin{bmatrix} r \begin{bmatrix} A & B \end{bmatrix}^\top F_{11} \begin{bmatrix} A & B \end{bmatrix} - F + W & r^{\frac{1}{2}} \begin{bmatrix} A & B \end{bmatrix}^\top F_{12} \\ r^{\frac{1}{2}} (F_{12})^\top \begin{bmatrix} A & B \end{bmatrix} & F_{22} \end{bmatrix} \succeq \mathbf{0}, \quad (39)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} F_{11} - M & F_{12} \\ F_{12}^\top & F_{22} \end{bmatrix} \succeq \mathbf{0}. \quad (40)$$

*Proof.* Using the Schur complement property, the constraints (11) and (13) of Problem 3 can be rewritten in the LMI forms described by (39) and (40), respectively. Moreover, the constraint (12) of Problem 3 is implicitly contained in (40). That is, the constraints of Problem 3 and Problem 4 are equivalent, then their optimal points are the same, and subsequently we denote them by the same notation  $(F^*, M^*)$ . Finally, Theorem 2 means that  $(F^*, M^*)$  is independent of  $(X_0 + \frac{r}{1-r}\Sigma)$ . Then, without loss of generality, the objective function (10) of Problem 3 can be expressed as (38) in Problem 4. Thus, Problem 3 is equivalently described by the SDP in Problem 4.  $\square$

With the above preparation, we can now present the model-based SDP algorithm.

---

**Algorithm 1** Model-Based SDP Algorithm

---

- 1: Choose a positive discount factor  $r$  close to 1 and choose the initial state  $\mathbf{x}_0 \sim \mathcal{N}_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0, \Sigma_0)$ , where  $\Sigma_0 \succ \mathbf{0}$ .
  - 2: Solve SDP in Problem 4 for  $(F^*, M^*)$ .
  - 3: Obtain the optimal state feedback controller  $L^* = -(F_{22}^*)^{-1} (F_{12}^*)^\top$ .
- 

#### 4. Model-free implementation of model-based SDP algorithm

The optimization problem in Section 3 involves knowing the system dynamics. In this section, we attempt to avoid this requirement and propose the model-free implementation of SLQ controller design.

Assume that the triplets  $(\mathbf{x}_k^{(i)}, \mathbf{u}_k^{(i)}, \mathbf{x}_{k+1}^{(i)})$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, l$ ,  $k = 0, \dots, N-1$  are available, where  $l$  denotes the number of sampling experiments implemented and  $N$  denotes the length of the sampling time horizon in the data collection phase. Using the data obtained



from the  $l$  sampling experiments to define  $Y^{(i)} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1^{(i)} & \mathbf{x}_2^{(i)} & \cdots & \mathbf{x}_N^{(i)} \end{bmatrix}$  and  $Z^{(i)} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_0^{(i)} & \mathbf{x}_1^{(i)} & \cdots & \mathbf{x}_{N-1}^{(i)} \\ \mathbf{u}_0^{(i)} & \mathbf{u}_1^{(i)} & \cdots & \mathbf{u}_{N-1}^{(i)} \end{bmatrix}$ , respectively,  $i = 1, \dots, l$ . Suppose that for each  $i = 1, \dots, l$ ,  $Z^{(i)}$  has full row rank. According to the properties of matrix congruence, the inequality constraint (11) in Problem 3 is left-multiplied by  $(Z^{(i)})^\top$  and right-multiplied by  $Z^{(i)}$ , which yields its equivalent constraint

$$r (Z^{(i)})^\top \begin{bmatrix} A & B \end{bmatrix}^\top (F_{11} - F_{12}F_{22}^{-1}F_{12}^\top) \begin{bmatrix} A & B \end{bmatrix} Z^{(i)} - (Z^{(i)})^\top (F - W) Z^{(i)} \succeq \mathbf{0}.$$

Using the properties of positive semidefinite matrices and  $l > 0$ , one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{l} \sum_{i=1}^l \left[ r (Z^{(i)})^\top \begin{bmatrix} A & B \end{bmatrix}^\top (F_{11} - F_{12}F_{22}^{-1}F_{12}^\top) \begin{bmatrix} A & B \end{bmatrix} Z^{(i)} \right] \\ & - \frac{1}{l} \sum_{i=1}^l \left[ (Z^{(i)})^\top (F - W) Z^{(i)} \right] \succeq \mathbf{0}. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Based on the Monte-Carlo method, we can approximate the mathematical expectation using the numerical average of  $l$  sample paths. Hence, noting that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ Y^\top (F_{11} - F_{12}F_{22}^{-1}F_{12}^\top) Y \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E} \left[ Z^\top \begin{bmatrix} A & B \end{bmatrix}^\top (F_{11} - F_{12}F_{22}^{-1}F_{12}^\top) \begin{bmatrix} A & B \end{bmatrix} Z \right] \\ & \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathcal{W}^\top (F_{11} - F_{12}F_{22}^{-1}F_{12}^\top) \mathcal{W} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Z & \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_0 & \mathbf{x}_1 & \cdots & \mathbf{x}_{N-1} \\ \mathbf{u}_0 & \mathbf{u}_1 & \cdots & \mathbf{u}_{N-1} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{W} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{w}_0 & \mathbf{w}_1 & \cdots & \mathbf{w}_{N-1} \end{bmatrix}, \\ Y & \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 & \mathbf{x}_2 & \cdots & \mathbf{x}_N \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A & B \end{bmatrix} Z + \mathcal{W}, \end{aligned}$$

one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{l} \sum_{i=1}^l \left[ r (Z^{(i)})^\top \begin{bmatrix} A & B \end{bmatrix}^\top (F_{11} - F_{12}F_{22}^{-1}F_{12}^\top) \begin{bmatrix} A & B \end{bmatrix} Z^{(i)} \right] \\ & \approx \frac{1}{l} \sum_{i=1}^l \left[ r (Y^{(i)})^\top (F_{11} - F_{12}F_{22}^{-1}F_{12}^\top) Y^{(i)} \right] - r \operatorname{tr} \left( (F_{11} - F_{12}F_{22}^{-1}F_{12}^\top) \Sigma \right) I_N. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

By substituting (42) in (41), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{l} \sum_{i=1}^l \left[ r (Y^{(i)})^\top (F_{11} - F_{12} F_{22}^{-1} F_{12}^\top) Y^{(i)} \right] - r \operatorname{tr} \left( (F_{11} - F_{12} F_{22}^{-1} F_{12}^\top) \Sigma \right) I_N \\ & - \frac{1}{l} \sum_{i=1}^l \left[ (Z^{(i)})^\top (F - W) Z^{(i)} \right] \succeq \mathbf{0}. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Because  $F_{22} \succ \mathbf{0}$ , applying Schur complement and using matrix direct sum, one can equivalently express the constraint (43) as

$$\begin{bmatrix} r \tilde{I} \tilde{D}^\top \tilde{F}_{11} \tilde{D} \tilde{I}^\top + e & r^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{I} \tilde{D}^\top \tilde{F}_{12} \\ r^{\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{F}_{12}^\top \tilde{D} \tilde{I}^\top & \tilde{F}_{22} \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0, \quad (44)$$

where  $e \triangleq -rl \operatorname{tr} \left( (F_{11} - F_{12} F_{22}^{-1} F_{12}^\top) \Sigma \right) I_N - \sum_{i=1}^l \left[ (Z^{(i)})^\top (F - W) Z^{(i)} \right]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{D} & \triangleq \underbrace{Y^{(1)} \oplus Y^{(2)} \oplus \dots \oplus Y^{(l)}}_l, & \tilde{F}_{11} & \triangleq \underbrace{F_{11} \oplus F_{11} \oplus \dots \oplus F_{11}}_l, \\ \tilde{F}_{12} & \triangleq \underbrace{F_{12} \oplus F_{12} \oplus \dots \oplus F_{12}}_l, & \tilde{F}_{22} & \triangleq \underbrace{F_{22} \oplus F_{22} \oplus \dots \oplus F_{22}}_l, \\ \tilde{I} & \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} I_N & I_N & \dots & I_N \\ \underbrace{\hspace{1.5cm}}_l \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Based on the above analysis, the following Theorem 3 gives an SDP that solves the SLQ problem in the presence of unknown information about the system dynamics and without the need for an initial stabilizing control policy.

**Theorem 3.** Suppose that  $Z^{(i)}$  has full row rank, for each  $i = 1, \dots, l$ . Then the optimal state feedback gain associated with the SLQ problem is approximated by

$$\hat{L}^* = - (F_{22}^d)^{-1} (F_{12}^d)^\top, \quad (45)$$

where  $(F^d, M^d)$  is the optimal point of Problem 5 with  $F^d = \begin{bmatrix} F_{11}^d & F_{12}^d \\ (F_{12}^d)^\top & F_{22}^d \end{bmatrix}$ .

**Problem 5.** SDP with optimization variables  $F \in \mathcal{S}^{n+m}$  and  $M \in \mathcal{S}^n$ .

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{F, M} \text{tr}(M), \\ & \text{s.t.} \begin{bmatrix} r\tilde{I}\tilde{D}^\top \tilde{F}_{11} \tilde{D}\tilde{I}^\top + e & r^{\frac{1}{2}}\tilde{I}\tilde{D}^\top \tilde{F}_{12} \\ r^{\frac{1}{2}}\tilde{F}_{12}^\top \tilde{D}\tilde{I}^\top & \tilde{F}_{22} \end{bmatrix} \succeq \mathbf{0}, \\ & \begin{bmatrix} F_{11} - M & F_{12} \\ F_{12}^\top & F_{22} \end{bmatrix} \succeq \mathbf{0}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* It is already shown that according to the properties of positive semidefinite matrices and matrix congruence, (44) is equivalent to (11) in Problem 3. According to Theorem 2 and Proposition 2, the parameters of the optimal Q-function can be obtained by solving Problem 3, which is equivalent to Problem 5. Based on Lemma 2, the parameters of the optimal Q-function lead to an estimate of the optimal state feedback controller, as shown in (45).  $\square$

**Remark 3.** In order to ensure that  $Z^{(i)}$  has full row rank, for each  $i = 1, \dots, l$ , the length of the sampling time horizon  $N$  must be more than or equal to the sum of the dimensions of the input and the state. Moreover, the rank condition in Theorem 3 is analogous to the persistent excitation (PE) requirement [24] in some sense. Both of these conditions are designed to allow the system to oscillate sufficiently during the learning process to produce enough data to be able to fully learn the system information. In practice, it is necessary to add a probing noise consisting of a sum of sinusoids or Gaussian white noise to the control to make sure that both conditions hold.

In view of the results given above, Algorithm 2 provides a way to solve the SLQ problem based on the available data.

---

**Algorithm 2** Model-Free SDP Algorithm

---

- 1: Choose a positive discount factor  $r$  close to 1 and choose the initial state  $\mathbf{x}_0 \sim \mathcal{N}_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0, \Sigma_0)$ , where  $\Sigma_0 \succ \mathbf{0}$ .
  - 2: Apply control policy with probing noises to system (1) and collect the data to construct the data matrices  $Z^{(i)}$  and  $Y^{(i)}$  for each  $i = 1, \dots, l$  until the condition in Theorem 3 is satisfied.
  - 3: Solve SDP in Problem 5 for  $(F^d, M^d)$ .
  - 4: Obtain the estimate of the optimal control gain  $\hat{L}^*$  associated with SLQ problem described by (45).
-

**Remark 4.** It should be noted that the model-free primal–dual (MF-PD) algorithm in [21] needs an initial stabilizing controller, while our proposed model-free SDP algorithm does not need an initial stabilizing control policy. In addition, the MF-PD algorithm in [21] is an iterative algorithm. Theoretically, the state-feedback gain reaches its optimal value only when the number of iterations approaches infinity. While our proposed algorithm is non-iterative. Furthermore, our proposed algorithm does not need hyper-parameter tuning.

## 5. Simulation

In this section, the proposed model-free SDP algorithm is tested on different systems, consisting of both stable and unstable dynamic systems. In Section 5.1, the effectiveness of the proposed algorithm is verified in the design of an SLQ controller for a turbocharged diesel engine equipped of exhaust gas recirculation. In Section 5.2, a numerical example of an open-loop unstable system is considered.

### 5.1. Example 1: A Stable System

In this section, we consider the design of an SLQ controller for a turbocharged diesel engine equipped of exhaust gas recirculation. The discrete-time dynamical system is obtained by discretizing the continuous-time one given in [25, 26] which is in the form of  $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = A_c \mathbf{x} + B_c \mathbf{u}$  with

$$A_c = \begin{bmatrix} -0.4125 & -0.0248 & 0.0741 & 0.0089 & 0 & 0 \\ 101.5873 & -7.2651 & 2.7608 & 2.8068 & 0 & 0 \\ 0.0704 & 0.0085 & -0.0741 & -0.0089 & 0 & 0.0200 \\ 0.0878 & 0.2672 & 0 & -0.3674 & 0.0044 & 0.3962 \\ -1.8414 & 0.0990 & 0 & 0 & -0.0343 & -0.0330 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -359.0000 & 187.5364 & -87.0316 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$B_c = \begin{bmatrix} -0.0042 & 0.0064 \\ -1.0360 & 1.5849 \\ 0.0042 & 0 \\ 0.1261 & 0 \\ 0 & -0.0168 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

via standard zero-order-hold discretization techniques with sampling time  $T = 0.1s$ . To save space, we do not present the coefficient matrices  $A$ ,  $B$  here. Select the weight matrices and discount factor as  $Q = \text{diag}(1, 1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1)$ ,  $R = I_2$  and  $r = 0.8$ , respectively. Assume that the discrete-time dynamical system suffers from additive noise  $\mathbf{w}_k$  and that  $\mathbf{w}_k \sim \mathcal{N}_6(0, 0.001I_6)$ .

In the proceeding, the model-free SDP Algorithm 2 is utilized to design the optimal controller. Choose the initial state  $\mathbf{x}_0$  from a Gaussian distribution with mean vector  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_0 = [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6]^\top$  and covariance matrix  $\Sigma_0 = 5I_6 \succ \mathbf{0}$  and then apply the input with Gaussian exploration noise to system (1) to generate  $l = 100000$  state trajectories in the sampling time horizon  $\{0, \dots, 9\}$  to construct the matrices  $Z^{(i)}$  and  $Y^{(i)}$  for each  $i = 1, \dots, l$ . Problem 5 is solved using CVX for MATLAB by Mosek as the core solver and the optimal gain is acquired as

$$\hat{L}^* = \begin{bmatrix} 0.7448 & 0.0328 & 0.0270 & -0.0056 & 0.0147 & 0 \\ -1.3009 & -0.0528 & -0.0497 & -0.0405 & 0.0015 & -0.0002 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Fig. 1 depicts the state trajectories of the closed-loop systems during the data collection phase of the reinforcement learning process. Fig. 2 illustrates the numerical average of the




Figure 1: The state trajectories during the data collection phase.

state trajectories using the data obtained from 100000 sampling trials during the model-free design approach, where the trajectories in time domains  $\{0, \dots, 9\}$  are the numerical average of 100000 trajectories obtained during the data collection phase, at time step 10, the optimal data-driven controller is implemented and the trajectories are optimally regulated.

In the following, the model-free SDP Algorithm 2 is compared to model-based algorithm. In the presence of no structural constraints, the solution of DARE (3) reveals realizable optimal point, which can be seen as a baseline for the simulation results. When the system matrices  $A$  and  $B$  are available, the optimal control gain can be obtained using the MATLAB command DARE as

$$L^* = \begin{bmatrix} 0.7446 & 0.0328 & 0.0271 & -0.0057 & 0.0146 & 0 \\ -1.3011 & -0.0528 & -0.0496 & -0.0404 & 0.0015 & -0.0002 \end{bmatrix}.$$




Figure 2: A numerical average of state trajectories in data collection phase and after learning.

Comparing these two optimal control gains obtained and subtracting them, we have

$$L^* - \hat{L}^* = 10^{-3} \times \begin{bmatrix} -0.1912 & 0.0085 & 0.0995 & -0.0618 & -0.0493 & 0.0052 \\ -0.2288 & 0.0093 & 0.0614 & 0.0260 & 0.0012 & 0.0038 \end{bmatrix}$$

and  $\|L^* - \hat{L}^*\|_F = 10^{-4} \times 3.3123$ . The above comparison results show that although Algorithm 2 does not know the information about the system dynamics, the optimal control gain obtained is very close to that obtained from the known model information, and the model-free Algorithm 2 performs very effectively.

### 5.2. Example 2: An Unstable System

Consider system (1) with

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0.3 & 0.4 & 0.2 & 0.2 \\ 0.2 & 0.3 & 0.3 & 0.2 \\ 0.2 & 0.2 & 0.4 & 0.4 \\ 0.4 & 0.2 & 0.2 & 0.4 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = I_4.$$

Select the weight matrices and discount factor as

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} 3 & -1 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 3 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 3 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & -1 & 3 \end{bmatrix},$$

$R = I_4$  and  $r = 0.8$ , respectively. Assume that system (1) suffers from additive noise  $\mathbf{w}_k$  and that  $\mathbf{w}_k \sim \mathcal{N}_4(0, 0.01I_4)$ . The open-loop system is unstable because the maximum eigenvalue is 1.1267.

The model-free Algorithm 2 is employed to develop the optimal controller in the steps that follow. Choose  $\mathbf{x}_0 \sim \mathcal{N}_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0, \Sigma_0)$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_0 = [1, 2, 3, 4]^\top$  and  $\Sigma_0 = 5I_4 \succ \mathbf{0}$  and then apply the input with Gaussian exploration noise to system (1) to produce  $l = 100$  state trajectories in the sampling time horizon  $\{0, \dots, 8\}$  to build the matrices  $Z^{(i)}$  and  $Y^{(i)}$  for each  $i = 1, \dots, l$ . CVX is used to solve Problem 5 and the optimal control gain is acquired as

$$\hat{L}^* = \begin{bmatrix} -0.1757 & -0.2506 & -0.1089 & -0.1038 \\ -0.1085 & -0.1744 & -0.1743 & -0.1027 \\ -0.1046 & -0.1087 & -0.2503 & -0.2453 \\ -0.2530 & -0.1062 & -0.1061 & -0.2475 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Fig. 3 depicts the state trajectories derived from the numerical average of the data collected from 100 sampling experiments during the model-free design approach, where the trajectories in time domains  $\{0, \dots, 8\}$  are the state trajectories gathered during the data collection phase of the reinforcement learning process, and starting at moment 9, the system begins to apply the model-free optimal controller to generate optimal state trajectories.




Figure 3: A numerical average of state trajectories in data collection phase and after learning.

Utilizing the system model to solve DARE (3), the optimal controller is obtained as

$$L^* = \begin{bmatrix} -0.1756 & -0.2506 & -0.1089 & -0.1039 \\ -0.1084 & -0.1744 & -0.1743 & -0.1028 \\ -0.1046 & -0.1087 & -0.2504 & -0.2453 \\ -0.2529 & -0.1062 & -0.1062 & -0.2476 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Comparing these two optimal control gains obtained and subtracting them, one has

$$L^* - \hat{L}^* = 10^{-4} \times \begin{bmatrix} 0.4984 & 0.0699 & -0.0886 & -0.2940 \\ 0.5387 & -0.1775 & -0.4655 & -0.4758 \\ 0.2987 & -0.0016 & -0.1178 & -0.2228 \\ 0.7544 & 0.1269 & -0.1820 & -0.4037 \end{bmatrix}$$

and  $\|L^* - \hat{L}^*\|_F = 10^{-4} \times 1.4306$ . Comparison results indicate that model-free Algorithm 2 exhibits good performance in terms of accuracy and effectiveness even for unstable systems.

## 6. Conclusion

In this paper, a novel model-free SDP method for solving the SLQ problem has been proposed. The controller design scheme is based on an SDP with LMI constraints and is sample-efficient and non-iterative. Moreover, it does not necessitate the use of an initial stabilizing controller. In addition, the proposed algorithm has been tested on a turbocharged diesel engine equipped of exhaust gas recirculation and an unstable numerical example. The results confirm that the proposed algorithm is able to efficiently learn the optimal control gains and stabilize the systems. Future work focus on extending the proposed method to stochastic systems with both additive and multiplicative noise by using the proposed framework and performing stability analysis in the model-free design.

- [1] R. S. Sutton, A. G. Barto, Reinforcement learning: An introduction, *Robotica* 17 (2) (1999) 229–235.
- [2] D. Bertsekas, Reinforcement learning and optimal control, Athena Scientific, 2019.
- [3] T. Bian, Y. Jiang, Z.-P. Jiang, Adaptive dynamic programming for stochastic systems with state and control dependent noise, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 61 (12) (2016) 4170–4175.
- [4] B. Kiumarsi, F. L. Lewis, Z.-P. Jiang,  $H_\infty$  control of linear discrete-time systems: Off-policy reinforcement learning, *Automatica* 78 (2017) 144–152.
- [5] B. Pang, T. Bian, Z.-P. Jiang, Robust policy iteration for continuous-time linear quadratic regulation, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 67 (1) (2021) 504–511.



- [6] X. Jiang, Y. Wang, D. Zhao, L. Shi, Online pareto optimal control of mean-field stochastic multi-player systems using policy iteration, *Science China Information Sciences* 67 (4) (2024) 1–17.
- [7] B.-C. Wang, S. Li, Y. Cao, An online value iteration method for linear-quadratic mean field social control with unknown dynamics, *Science China Information Sciences* 67 (4) (2024) 1–2.
- [8] B. Kiumarsi, K. G. Vamvoudakis, H. Modares, F. L. Lewis, Optimal and autonomous control using reinforcement learning: A survey, *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* 29 (6) (2017) 2042–2062.
- [9] D. Bertsekas, *Dynamic programming and optimal control: Volume I*, Vol. 4, Athena scientific, 2012.
- [10] R. S. Sutton, Learning to predict by the methods of temporal differences, *Machine learning* 3 (1988) 9–44.
- [11] C. J. Watkins, P. Dayan, Q-learning, *Machine learning* 8 (1992) 279–292.
- [12] S. J. Bradtke, B. E. Ydstie, A. G. Barto, Adaptive linear quadratic control using policy iteration, in: *Proceedings of 1994 American Control Conference*, Vol. 3, IEEE, 1994, pp. 3475–3479.
- [13] S. A. A. Rizvi, Z. Lin, Output feedback Q-learning control for the discrete-time linear quadratic regulator problem, *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* 30 (5) (2018) 1523–1536.
- [14] K. Krauth, S. Tu, B. Recht, Finite-time analysis of approximate policy iteration for the linear quadratic regulator, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 32 (2019).
- [15] J. Lai, J. Xiong, Z. Shu, Model-free optimal control of discrete-time systems with additive and multiplicative noises, *Automatica* 147 (2023) 110685.
- [16] S. Boyd, L. Vandenberghe, *Convex optimization*, Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [17] S. Boyd, L. El Ghaoui, E. Feron, V. Balakrishnan, *Linear matrix inequalities in system and control theory*, SIAM, 1994.
- [18] M. A. Rami, X. Y. Zhou, Linear matrix inequalities, Riccati equations, and indefinite stochastic linear quadratic controls, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 45 (6) (2000) 1131–1143.

- [19] D. D. Yao, S. Zhang, X. Y. Zhou, Stochastic linear-quadratic control via semidefinite programming, *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization* 40 (3) (2001) 801–823.
- [20] D. Lee, J. Hu, Primal-dual Q-learning framework for LQR design, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 64 (9) (2018) 3756–3763.
- [21] M. Li, J. Qin, W. X. Zheng, Y. Wang, Y. Kang, Model-free design of stochastic LQR controller from a primal–dual optimization perspective, *Automatica* 140 (2022) 110253.
- [22] M. Farjadnasab, M. Babazadeh, Model-free LQR design by Q-function learning, *Automatica* 137 (2022) 110060.
- [23] C. Kubrusly, O. Costa, Mean square stability conditions for discrete stochastic bilinear systems, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 30 (11) (1985) 1082–1087.
- [24] J. C. Willems, P. Rapisarda, I. Markovsky, B. L. De Moor, A note on persistency of excitation, *Systems & Control Letters* 54 (4) (2005) 325–329.
- [25] M. Jung, K. Glover, U. Christen, Comparison of uncertainty parameterisations for  $H_\infty$  robust control of turbocharged diesel engines, *Control Engineering Practice* 13 (1) (2005) 15–25.
- [26] Y. Jiang, Z.-P. Jiang, Computational adaptive optimal control for continuous-time linear systems with completely unknown dynamics, *Automatica* 48 (10) (2012) 2699–2704.