

Exact Covariance Characterization for Controlled Linear Systems subject to Stochastic Parametric and Additive Uncertainties [★]

Kaouther Moussa ^{a,b}, Mirko Fiacchini ^c

^aUPHF, CNRS, UMR 8201 - LAMIH, F-59313 Valenciennes, France

^bINSA Hauts-de-France, F-59313, Valenciennes, France

^cUniv. Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, Grenoble INP, GIPSA-lab, 38000 Grenoble, France

Abstract

This work addresses the exact characterization of the covariance dynamics related to linear discrete-time systems subject to both additive and parametric stochastic uncertainties that are potentially unbounded. The derived exact representation allows to understand how the covariance of the multiplicative parametric uncertainties affects the stability of the state covariance dynamics through a transformation of the parameters covariance matrix, allowing therefore to address the problem of control design for state covariance dynamics in this context. Numerical results assess this new characterization by comparing it to the empirical covariance and illustrating the control design problem.

Key words: Uncertain systems, covariance characterization, invariance, stochastic MPC

1 Introduction

The covariance control problem, addressed in the literature since the 80s, see [8,13], aims at controlling the covariance matrix of a linear discrete-time system affected by additive stochastic noises. Also recent works addressed different types of stochastic systems, for example those subject to input constraints in [2], those considering chance constraints in [18] and constant random parameters in [14]. Furthermore, the stabilization of linear stochastic systems has also been addressed in [12], in which equivalent stability and synthesis conditions were provided for the case of independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) additive and parametric uncertainties.

This paper addresses the problem of covariance control from the point of view of Stochastic Model Predictive Control (SMPC) approaches, for which the exact characterization of covariance dynamics is useful to tighten

time-varying constraints using concentration inequalities such as the Chebyshev's inequality, as used for example in [9] and [11]. Contrary to randomized methods relying on the generation of disturbance scenarios, for instance in [7,17,5,6], concentration-inequalities based methods rely on an analytic formulation of the covariance dynamics. Exact characterization techniques for SMPC have mainly concerned linear discrete-time dynamical systems affected by additive stochastic uncertainties:

$$x_{k+1} = Ax_k + Bu_k + w_k,$$

with $x_k, w_k \in \mathbb{R}^n, u_k \in \mathbb{R}^m$.

One of the main approaches for uncertainties handling in Model Predictive Control (MPC) is the tube-based one [16]. It consists in separating the state into a deterministic and an uncertain component and designing a prestabilizing feedback allowing to handle the uncertainties and their effects on chance constraints in the stochastic case. This is achieved by considering $e_k = x_k - z_k$, where $z_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ represents the nominal deterministic component following the dynamics $z_{k+1} = Az_k + Bv_k$, with $u_k = Ke_k + v_k$, in which $K \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ represents the prestabilizing feedback. The stochastic component e_k follows, therefore, the dynamics $e_{k+1} = (A+BK)e_k + w_k$ and it can be directly noticed that if $e_0 = 0$, then, the

[★] This paper was not presented at any IFAC meeting. Corresponding author K. Moussa.

Email addresses: kaouther.moussa@uphf.fr (Kaouther Moussa), mirko.fiacchini@gipsa-lab.fr (Mirko Fiacchini).

expectation of e_k is also null, which leads to the following covariance dynamics of e_k under the assumption that w_k is i.i.d. with respect to time k :

$$\text{cov}(e_{k+1}) = (A + BK)\text{cov}(e_k)(A + BK)^T + W, \quad (1)$$

with W being the covariance of w_k , i.e. $\text{cov}(w_k) = \mathbb{E}[w_k w_k^T] = W$, when $\mathbb{E}[w_k] = 0$.

We can notice that stabilizing the covariance dynamics in (1) consists in designing the feedback K such that $A + BK$ is Schur. In the case where multiplicative parametric uncertainties are also involved, this stability condition does not hold anymore because of the presence of the uncertain parameters in the error dynamics. The error covariance dynamics in (1) has been used, for instance, in [15,10] for reachability analysis with correlated disturbances and in [1] for SMPC, in which the parametric uncertainties were considered to be bounded with a polytopic description.

Contribution

The main contribution of this technical note is to derive a novel exact characterization of the error covariance dynamics when both multiplicative and additive uncertainties (of stochastic nature and potentially unbounded) affect a discrete-time linear system. This characterization is derived on the vectorization of the error covariance dynamics, using a property linking the vectorization operator to the Kronecker product. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time that such characterization is derived, allowing therefore to understand how the stochastic properties of the uncertain parameters affect the stability of the error covariance dynamics, via a specific matrix resulting from a transformation of the parameters covariance matrix. Furthermore, we derive a Linear Matrix Inequality (LMI)-based condition for covariance control design, the latter allowing to stabilize the covariance dynamics that contain quadratic terms of the prestabilizing feedback gain K resulting from a Kronecker product property.

Notation

Denote with \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{N} , respectively, the sets of real and integer numbers. The expectation of a random variable x is denoted by $\mathbb{E}[x]$. Given a random vector v , $\text{cov}(v) = \mathbb{E}[(v - \mathbb{E}[v])(v - \mathbb{E}[v])^T]$ stands for the covariance of v , if the latter has a zero mean ($\mathbb{E}[v] = 0$), then the covariance of v is simply $\text{cov}(v) = \mathbb{E}[v v^T]$. The normal distribution of mean μ and covariance matrix Σ is denoted $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$. The Kronecker product is denoted by \otimes , $\text{vec}(\cdot)$ stands for the vectorization operator and $\text{vec}(\cdot)^{-1}$ stands for the inverse of the vectorization operator. Given a square matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, with $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\rho(A)$ and $\sigma_{max}(A)$ stand, respectively, for the spectral

radius and the maximal singular value of A . The multiset consisting of the eigenvalues of A including their algebraic multiplicity is denoted by $\text{mspec}(A)$. $\lambda_{max}(A)$ stands for the largest eigenvalue of A having real eigenvalues. The zero and identity matrices of appropriate dimensions are denoted, respectively, 0 and I . Given a symmetric matrix M , $M \succ 0$ means that M is positive definite.

2 Problem statement

Consider the following discrete-time linear system:

$$x_{k+1} = A(p_k)x_k + B u_k + w_k, \quad (2)$$

where $x_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $u_k \in \mathbb{R}^m$ represent, respectively, the state and the control input. The initial state x_0 is assumed to be deterministic.

Assumption 1 *The additive disturbance $w_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is an i.i.d. sequence of random variables with $\mathbb{E}[w_k] = 0$ and covariance $\text{cov}(w_k) = \mathbb{E}[(w_k - \mathbb{E}[w_k])(w_k - \mathbb{E}[w_k])^T] = \mathbb{E}[w_k w_k^T] = W$, with $W \succ 0$.*

We denote by $p_k \in \mathbb{R}^l$ an i.i.d. sequence of random variables representing the uncertain parameters, affecting the terms of the state matrix $A(p_k)$ in an affine way, and having as covariance $\Sigma \succ 0$. Therefore, the state matrix $A(p_k)$ can be written as:

$$A(p_k) = A_0 + \sum_{i=1}^l A_i p_{ik} = A_0 + \bar{A}(p_k),$$

where A_0 represents the known (or nominal) and deterministic component of $A(p_k)$, whereas $\bar{A}(p_k)$ represents the stochastic time-varying component and p_{ik} stands for the i^{th} component of the random vector p_k .

Assumption 2 *The parameter vector $p_k \in \mathbb{R}^l$ is an i.i.d. sequence of random variables with $\mathbb{E}[p_k] = 0$ and covariance $\text{cov}(p_k) = \mathbb{E}[p_k p_k^T] = \Sigma$, with $\Sigma \succ 0$.*

Note that this assumption, from which $\mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(p_k)] = 0$ follows, does not induce a loss of generality since the parameters means can always be accounted for by appropriately adding an offset to A_0 . The pair (A_0, B) is assumed stabilizable. Both Assumption 1 and 2 are supposed to hold in the rest of the paper.

Furthermore, we assume that the elements of $\bar{A}(p_k)$ are mutually independent of the elements of w_k . Note that the latter assumption is not restrictive, it is only considered to simplify the exact characterization of the covariance dynamics, and additional terms resulting from its non-satisfaction (that can be easily considered) do

not affect the stability analysis of the covariance dynamics. Since the sequences of p_k and w_k are i.i.d, then the elements of $\bar{A}(p_k)$ and those of w_k are also independent of the state for the same time step k , meaning that $\mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(p_k)x_k] = \mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(p_k)]\mathbb{E}[x_k] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[x_k w_k^T] = \mathbb{E}[x_k]\mathbb{E}[w_k^T] = 0$.

Given system (2) and the assumptions formulated above, the problem that will be addressed in this paper is finding an exact expression of the state covariance dynamics related to system (2), often useful in the context of tube-based stochastic MPC applications. Generally, in this context, the state is expressed as a sum of a deterministic and a random component. This paper addresses the problem of finding the state covariance dynamics from the same point of view.

Moreover, in this paper, we are interested in studying the stability of the state covariance in order to derive a condition allowing to design a prestabilizing feedback gain that guarantees the stability of the state covariance in the presence of stochastic parametric and additive uncertainties.

3 Exact covariance characterization

Consider system (2), the state x_k can be expressed as the sum of a deterministic component z_k and a random component e_k that is

$$x_k = z_k + e_k, \quad (3)$$

such that

$$z_{k+1} = A_0 z_k + B v_k, \quad (4)$$

with $z_0 = x_0$ and then $e_0 = 0$. From $e_k = x_k - z_k$ and by considering $u_k = K e_k + v_k$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} e_{k+1} &= x_{k+1} - z_{k+1} = (A_0 + BK)e_k + \bar{A}(p_k)x_k + w_k \\ &= (A(p_k) + BK)e_k + \bar{A}(p_k)z_k + w_k. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The following standard assumption is functional to the subsequent results and is not restrictive since (A_0, B) is assumed to be stabilizable, which is commonly used in standard MPC methods.

Assumption 3 *The system (4) is exponentially stabilized by the control v_k .*

The following proposition shows that $\mathbb{E}[e_k] = 0$ which helps in the exact characterization of the covariance dynamics presented subsequently.

Proposition 1 *From $e_0 = 0$ it follows that $\mathbb{E}[e_k] = 0$ for all time instants k .*

Proof The expectation of the error dynamics is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[e_{k+1}] &= \mathbb{E}[(A(p_k) + BK)e_k + \bar{A}(p_k)z_k + w_k] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(A(p_k) + BK)e_k] + \mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(p_k)z_k] + \mathbb{E}[w_k]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $A(p_k)$ is independent of both e_k and z_k and the expectation of the product of two independent random variables is the product of their respective expectations [4] then it follows:

$$\mathbb{E}[e_{k+1}] = \mathbb{E}[(A(p_k) + BK)]\mathbb{E}[e_k] + \mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(p_k)]z_k + \mathbb{E}[w_k]. \quad (6)$$

Moreover, since $\mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(p_k)] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[w_k] = 0$, then

$$\mathbb{E}[e_{k+1}] = \mathbb{E}[(A(p_k) + BK)]\mathbb{E}[e_k],$$

and therefore, since e_0 is deterministic and $e_0 = 0$, we have that $\mathbb{E}[e_k] = 0$ for all time instants k . ■

A direct implication of Proposition 1 is that $\text{cov}(e_k) = \mathbb{E}[e_k e_k^T]$. The following property is used hereafter for the covariance exact characterization proof.

Property 1 (Proposition 7.1.9., page 401 in [3]) *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times l}$ and $C \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times k}$, then:*

$$\text{vec}(ABC) = (C^T \otimes A) \text{vec}(B).$$

The main result on the characterization of the covariance matrix of the error is presented hereafter.

Theorem 1 *The dynamics of the error covariance related to system (2) is given by the following equivalent expressions:*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cov}(e_{k+1}) &= (A_0 + BK)\text{cov}(e_k)(A_0 + BK)^T + W \\ &+ \text{vec}^{-1}(\mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(p_k) \otimes \bar{A}(p_k)]\text{vec}(\text{cov}(e_k) + z_k z_k^T)), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

and

$$\epsilon_{k+1} = \left((A_0 + BK) \otimes (A_0 + BK) + C_p \right) \epsilon_k + C_p \zeta_k + \omega_k, \quad (8)$$

where $\epsilon_k = \text{vec}(\text{cov}(e_k))$, $\zeta_k = \text{vec}(z_k z_k^T)$, $\omega_k = \text{vec}(\text{cov}(w_k))$ and $C_p = \mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(p_k) \otimes \bar{A}(p_k)]$.

Proof From (5) and Proposition 1, it follows

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cov}(e_{k+1}) &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left((A_0 + BK) e_k + \bar{A}(p_k)x_k + w_k \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \cdot \left((A_0 + BK) e_k + \bar{A}(p_k)x_k + w_k \right)^T \right] \\ &= (A_0 + BK) \mathbb{E}[e_k e_k^T] (A_0 + BK)^T \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(p_k)x_k x_k^T \bar{A}(p_k)^T] + \mathbb{E}[w_k w_k^T], \end{aligned}$$

since $\bar{A}(p_k)$ and w_k are mutually independent from x_k and e_k . The first term is dependent on the error covariance $\text{cov}(e_k) = \mathbb{E}[e_k e_k^T]$, while the second one, resulting from the presence of uncertain parameters, is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(p_k) x_k x_k^T \bar{A}(p_k)^T] &= \mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(p_k) (e_k + z_k) (e_k + z_k)^T \bar{A}(p_k)^T] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(p_k) e_k e_k^T \bar{A}(p_k)^T] + \mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(p_k) z_k z_k^T \bar{A}(p_k)^T] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(p_k) e_k z_k^T \bar{A}(p_k)^T] + \mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(p_k) z_k e_k^T \bar{A}(p_k)^T]. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

By using Property 3 on the different terms of (9), from the linearity of the vectorization operator, and the fact that the expectation of a matrix is the matrix of expectations, implying that the vectorization operator and the expectation can commute, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vec}(\mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(p_k) x_k x_k^T \bar{A}(p_k)^T]) &= \text{vec}(\mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(p_k) e_k e_k^T \bar{A}(p_k)^T]) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(p_k) z_k z_k^T \bar{A}(p_k)^T] + \mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(p_k) e_k z_k^T \bar{A}(p_k)^T] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(p_k) z_k e_k^T \bar{A}(p_k)^T] \\ &= \text{vec}(\mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(p_k) e_k e_k^T \bar{A}(p_k)^T]) + \text{vec}(\mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(p_k) z_k z_k^T \bar{A}(p_k)^T]) \\ &\quad + \text{vec}(\mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(p_k) e_k z_k^T \bar{A}(p_k)^T]) + \text{vec}(\mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(p_k) z_k e_k^T \bar{A}(p_k)^T]). \end{aligned}$$

From Proposition 1 and Property 3 it follows

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vec}(\mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(p_k) e_k z_k^T \bar{A}(p_k)^T]) &= \mathbb{E}[\text{vec}(\bar{A}(p_k) e_k z_k^T \bar{A}(p_k)^T)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(\bar{A}(p_k) \otimes \bar{A}(p_k)) \text{vec}(e_k z_k^T)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(\bar{A}(p_k) \otimes \bar{A}(p_k))] \text{vec}(\mathbb{E}[e_k z_k^T]) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(\bar{A}(p_k) \otimes \bar{A}(p_k))] \text{vec}(\mathbb{E}[e_k] z_k^T) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Analogous results hold for the term $\mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(p_k) z_k e_k^T \bar{A}(p_k)^T]$, and hence, following the same steps as in (10), one has:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vec}(\mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(p_k) x_k x_k^T \bar{A}(p_k)^T]) &= \\ &\quad \mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(p_k) \otimes \bar{A}(p_k)] \text{vec}(\mathbb{E}[e_k e_k^T]) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(p_k) \otimes \bar{A}(p_k)] \text{vec}(z_k z_k^T), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

z_k being deterministic. Finally, from (11) it follows equation (7).

By defining $\epsilon_k = \text{vec}(\text{cov}(e_k)) \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2}$, $\zeta_k = \text{vec}((z_k z_k^T)) \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2}$, $\omega_k = \text{vec}(\text{cov}(w_k)) \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2}$ and $C_p = \mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(p_k) \otimes \bar{A}(p_k)]$, equation (8) follows directly. \blacksquare

Theorem 1 is therefore a generalization of the covariance dynamics already presented in the literature, for example in [15,10], which considered only additive disturbances. It shows thereby that the covariance evolves like a linear controlled system whose dynamics is affected by uncertain parameters through the specific matrix $C_p = \mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(p_k) \otimes \bar{A}(p_k)]$.

Remark 1 The matrix $C_p = \mathbb{E}[\bar{A}(p_k) \otimes \bar{A}(p_k)]$ is constant, since it contains the parameters variances

$\mathbb{E}[p_{ik}^2]$, $i = 1, \dots, l$ as well as their mutual covariances $\mathbb{E}[p_{ik} p_{jk}]$, $i, j = 1, \dots, l$ with $i \neq j$. Therefore, this matrix is a representation of the parameters covariance matrix with a different structure.

The following corollary provides the limit of the error covariance if system (8) is asymptotically stable.

Corollary 1 Define M as follows

$$M = \left((A_0 + BK) \otimes (A_0 + BK) + C_p \right).$$

assume that K is such that $\rho(M) < 1$, and let Assumption 3 hold. Then the covariance matrix of e_k corresponding to system (2) converges to the matrix $\text{vec}^{-1} \left((I - M)^{-1} \text{vec}(W) \right)$.

4 Covariance control design

The following properties will be used to derive an LMI condition for the design of the stabilizing gain K for the matrix M .

Property 2 (Fact 5.12.2., page 333 in [3]) Given matrices $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$:

$$\rho(A + B) \leq \sigma_{\max}(A + B) \leq \sigma_{\max}(A) + \sigma_{\max}(B).$$

Property 3 (Proposition 7.1.6., page 400 in [3])

Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times k}$, $C \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times q}$ and $D \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times p}$, then:

$$(A \otimes B)(C \otimes D) = AC \otimes BD.$$

Property 4 (Proposition 7.1.10., page 401 in [3])

Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, then:

$$\text{mspec}(A \otimes B) = \{ \lambda \mu : \lambda \in \text{mspec}(A), \mu \in \text{mspec}(B) \}_{\text{ms}}.$$

The following theorem presents a sufficient condition for the Schur stability of the matrix $(A_0 + BK) \otimes (A_0 + BK) + C_p$, ensuring the asymptotic stability of the covariance dynamics in presence of the stochastic parametric uncertainties, as mentioned in Corollary 1, and allowing to design the stabilizing gain K .

Theorem 2 Given $A_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ and $C_p \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2 \times n^2}$, if K is such that as the following holds:

$$\begin{bmatrix} (1 - \sigma_{\max}(C_p))I & (A_0 + BK)^T \\ (A_0 + BK) & I \end{bmatrix} \succ 0,$$

then K is such that $\left((A_0 + BK) \otimes (A_0 + BK) + C_p\right)$ is Schur stable.

Proof Consider $A_K = A_0 + BK$, using Property 2 on the matrix $A_K \otimes A_K + C_p$, we have:

$$\rho(A_K \otimes A_K + C_p) \leq \sigma_{max}(A_K \otimes A_K) + \sigma_{max}(C_p).$$

Therefore, $\sigma_{max}(A_K \otimes A_K) + \sigma_{max}(C_p) < 1$ implies that $\rho(A_K \otimes A_K + C_p) < 1$, and then, in order to impose that $A_K \otimes A_K + C_p$ is Schur stable, it is sufficient to impose that

$$\sigma_{max}(A_K \otimes A_K) < 1 - \sigma_{max}(C_p), \quad (12)$$

which is equivalent to:

$$\lambda_{max}\left(\left(A_K^T \otimes A_K^T\right)\left(A_K \otimes A_K\right)\right) < \left(1 - \sigma_{max}(C_p)\right)^2. \quad (13)$$

By using Property 3 and considering $\beta = 1 - \sigma_{max}(C_p)$, (13) is equivalent to:

$$\lambda_{max}\left(\left(A_K^T A_K\right) \otimes \left(A_K^T A_K\right)\right) < \beta^2,$$

which is equivalent to $\lambda_{max}^2(A_K^T A_K) < \beta^2$ (by using Property 4), and to $\lambda_{max}(A_K^T A_K) < \beta$, that leads to the following:

$$A_K^T A_K \prec \beta I,$$

which, by using the Schur complement, is equivalent to:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \beta I & (A_0 + BK)^T \\ (A_0 + BK) & I \end{bmatrix} \succ 0. \quad \blacksquare$$

Note that the condition provided by Theorem 2 might be conservative because of the bound in (12). The conditions provided in [12] are necessary and sufficient for the control design related to system (2), the dimension of these conditions is $(n^2(n+m)+n) \times (n^2(n+m)+n)$. Although the condition provided in Theorem 2 is sufficient and might be more conservative, it offers the possibility of having a lower dimensional condition $(2n \times 2n)$ for a systematic design of K , in presence of unbounded stochastic parametric uncertainties, for the matrix M involving quadratic terms of K .

The next section presents a numerical example assessing the exact characterization of the error covariance dynamics and the design of the stabilizing gain K .

5 Numerical example

Consider the following dynamical system:

$$x_{k+1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1.2 + p_{1k} & 0.1 + p_{2k} \\ p_{3k} & 0.1 + p_{4k} \end{pmatrix} x_k + \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} u_k + w_k, \quad (14)$$

where the covariance of w_k is $\mathbb{E}[w_k w_k^T] = I_n$. Note that the matrices A_0 and $\bar{A}(p_k)$, with $p_k = (p_{1k}, p_{2k}, p_{3k}, p_{4k})^T$ are defined as follows:

$$A_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1.2 & 0.1 \\ 0 & 0.1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \bar{A}(p_k) = \begin{pmatrix} p_{1k} & p_{2k} \\ p_{3k} & p_{4k} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The parameter vector p_k follows a multivariate normal distribution with zero mean and a covariance matrix Σ , i.e. $p_k \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$, where

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 7.88 & 7.40 & 7.43 & 8.17 \\ 7.40 & 15.70 & 13.91 & 14.24 \\ 7.43 & 13.91 & 12.92 & 12.68 \\ 8.17 & 14.24 & 12.68 & 13.59 \end{pmatrix} \cdot 0.01,$$

resulting in the following matrix C_p :

$$C_p = \begin{pmatrix} 7.88 & 7.40 & 7.40 & 15.70 \\ 7.43 & 8.17 & 13.91 & 14.24 \\ 7.43 & 13.91 & 8.17 & 14.24 \\ 12.92 & 12.68 & 12.68 & 13.59 \end{pmatrix} \cdot 0.01. \quad (15)$$

By solving the LMI condition in (2), we can obtain $K = (-0.6 \ -0.1)^T$ stabilizing the matrix M .

We compute the evolution of the vectorization of the error covariance using the difference equation in (8), as well as the empirical covariance based on $N = 1000$ trials. We denote by ϵ_{ij}^{th} and ϵ_{ij}^{em} , respectively, the theoretical and the empirical elements of the error covariance matrix, for $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$. Fig. 1 shows that the empirical error covariance matches the theoretical one. Furthermore, they both converge to the following matrix:

$$\text{vec}^{-1}\left(\left(I - M\right)^{-1} \text{vec}(W)\right) = \begin{pmatrix} 2.33 & -0.42 \\ -0.42 & 2.35 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that in this example, and for simulation purposes, the control v_k is considered as a state feedback of the form $v_k = F z_k$, where F is designed to make $A_0 + BF$ Schur. In the case of a stochastic MPC implementation, v_k should be designed by a deterministic MPC strategy.




Fig. 1. Theoretical and empirical error covariance evolution related to system (14) with C_p as in (15).

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we provide an exact characterization of the dynamics of the error covariance for discrete-time linear systems under potentially unbounded additive and parametric uncertainties and present an LMI-based condition for the stability of these dynamics. The presented characterization is useful in the context of stochastic tube-based MPC approaches as well as in stochastic invariance problems. The proposed numerical example shows that the theoretical and the empirical error covariance converge to the same matrix when the stability conditions are satisfied. Future works would focus on using this characterization to design stochastic invariant sets and SMPC strategies.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported in part by the Clinical project, funded by the ANR under grant ANR-24-CE45-4255, in part by the FMJH Program Gaspard Monge for optimization and operations research and their interactions with data science and in part by the LabEx PERSYVAL-Lab funded by the French Program Investissement d'avenir under Grant ANR-11-LABX-0025-01

References

- [1] Elena Arcari, Andrea Iannelli, Andrea Carron, and Melanie N. Zeilinger. Stochastic MPC with robustness to bounded parametric uncertainty. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 68(12):7601–7615, 2023.
- [2] Efstathios Bakolas. Finite-horizon covariance control for discrete-time stochastic linear systems subject to input constraints. *Automatica*, 91:61–68, 2018.
- [3] Dennis S. Bernstein. *Matrix Mathematics, Theory, Facts, and Formulas (Second Edition)*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2009.
- [4] Dimitri P. Bertsekas and John N. Tsitsiklis. *Introduction to Probability*. 2002.
- [5] Lars Blackmore, Masahiro Ono, Askar Bektassov, and Brian C. Williams. A probabilistic particle-control approximation of chance-constrained stochastic predictive control. *IEEE transactions on Robotics*, 26(3):502–517, 2010.
- [6] Giuseppe C. Calafiore and Lorenzo Fagiano. Robust model predictive control via scenario optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 58(1):219–224, 2012.
- [7] Mark Cannon, Basil Kouvaritakis, Saša V. Raković, and Qifeng Cheng. Stochastic tubes in model predictive control with probabilistic constraints. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 56(1):194–200, 2011.
- [8] Emman Collins and Robert E. Skelton. A theory of state covariance assignment for discrete systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 32(1):35–41, 1987.
- [9] Marcello Farina, Luca Giulioni, and Riccardo Scattolini. Stochastic linear model predictive control with chance constraints – a review. *Journal of Process Control*, 44:53–67, 2016.
- [10] Mirko Fiacchini and Teodoro Alamo. Probabilistic reachable and invariant sets for linear systems with correlated disturbance. *Automatica*, 132:109808, 2021.
- [11] Lukas Hewing and Melanie N Zeilinger. Stochastic model predictive control for linear systems using probabilistic reachable sets. In *2018 IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 5182–5188. IEEE, 2018.
- [12] Yohei Hosoe and Tomomichi Hagiwara. Equivalent stability notions, lyapunov inequality, and its application in discrete-time linear systems with stochastic dynamics determined by an i.i.d. process. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 64(11):4764–4771, 2019.
- [13] Chen Hsieh and Robert E Skelton. All covariance controllers for linear discrete-time systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 35(8):908–915, 1990.
- [14] Jacob W Knaup and Panagiotis Tsiotras. Covariance steering for systems subject to unknown parameters. In *2023 62nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 1790–1795. IEEE, 2023.
- [15] Ernesto Kofman, José A. De Doná, and Maria M. Seron. Probabilistic set invariance and ultimate boundedness. *Automatica*, 48(10):2670–2676, 2012.
- [16] Wilbur Langson, Ioannis Chrysochoos, Saša V. Raković, and David Q. Mayne. Robust model predictive control using tubes. *Automatica*, 40(1):125–133, 2004.
- [17] Matthias Lorenzen, Fabrizio Dabbene, Roberto Tempo, and Frank Allgöwer. Constraint-tightening and stability in stochastic model predictive control. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 62(7):3165–3177, 2016.
- [18] Kazuhide Okamoto, Maxim Goldshtein, and Panagiotis Tsiotras. Optimal covariance control for stochastic systems under chance constraints. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 2(2):266–271, 2018.