

Robust Output-Feedback MPC for Nonlinear Systems with Applications to Robotic Exploration

Scott Brown, *Student Member, IEEE*, Mohammad Khajenejad, *Member, IEEE*,
Aamodh Suresh, *Member, IEEE*, and Sonia Martínez, *Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract—This paper introduces a novel method for robust output-feedback model predictive control (MPC) for a class of nonlinear discrete-time systems. We propose a novel interval-valued predictor which, given an initial estimate of the state, produces intervals which are guaranteed to contain the future trajectory of the system. By parameterizing the control input with an initial stabilizing feedback term, we are able to reduce the width of the predicted state intervals compared to existing methods. We demonstrate this through a numerical comparison where we show that our controller performs better in the presence of large amounts of noise. Finally, we present a simulation study of a robot navigation scenario, where we incorporate a time-varying entropy term into the cost function in order to autonomously explore an uncertain area.

Index Terms—Predictive control for nonlinear systems, nonlinear output feedback, robust control

I. INTRODUCTION

MODEL predictive control (MPC) is a well-known and effective method for controlling both linear and nonlinear systems subject to state and input constraints. It has received considerable research attention over the last three decades, which has led to the development of several different approaches, including robust and tube-based methods with various ways of representing the predicted trajectories [1].

In the context of robotics, many researchers have focused on the problem of planning trajectories for robots operating in uncertain environments which must be explored. Sampling-based planners [2], [3] are effective at planning long trajectories with lower computational cost than methods which rely on an exhaustive search. On the other hand, MPC-based planning methods continue to be studied for use on robotic manipulators [4], marine and road vehicles [5]–[7], and multi-agent systems [8].

Much of the MPC literature assumes access to direct measurements of the state. When these measurements are not available, however, the problem of *robustly* satisfying all state and input constraints becomes much more challenging. This

S. Brown and S. Martínez are with the Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering Department of the Jacobs School of Engineering, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, San Diego, CA, USA (e-mail: {sab007, soniamd}@ucsd.edu). M. Khajenejad is with the departments of Mechanical Engineering and Electrical and Computer Engineering, The University of Tulsa (e-mail: mohammad-khajenejad@utulsa.edu). A. Suresh is with the DEVCOM US Army Research Lab, Adelphi, MD, USA (e-mail: aamodh@gmail.com).

This work was partially supported by AI2C ARL grant W911NF-23-2-0009 and NSF grant 1947050.

has been the focus of a large body of research into output-feedback MPC. For example, [9] develops a robust controller for linear systems based on moving-horizon estimation.

A straightforward approach to output-feedback MPC is to incorporate an observer to generate state estimates, which must be analyzed in conjunction with the MPC controller [10]. A recent work [11] uses an *interval observer* to construct a robust output-feedback MPC controller for linear systems. Interval observers can be easily modified to generate predictions forward in time, by removing the measurement term. Compared to existing methods for tube-based output-feedback MPC, this method is more computationally tractable. Our work aims to extend the interval predictor approach to a class of nonlinear systems, so that it may be used more readily in robot motion planning applications.

Statement of Contributions. In this paper, we propose a novel output-feedback MPC controller which provides guaranteed safety and stability for a class of nonlinear systems. The MPC controller is based on an interval observer and predictor, and is the first of its kind for nonlinear systems. We show that, under some assumptions related to the observability and controllability of the system, the controller is able to maintain correct and bounded estimates and predictions of the system state. Furthermore, by parameterizing the control input with an initial stabilizing feedback term, we are able to reduce the width of the predicted state intervals, thus reducing the conservatism of the controller. The structure of this nonlinear predictor is compatible with existing off-the-shelf MPC solvers, meaning that the implementation (and computational complexity) is similar to nominal ones. We prove that under some mild assumptions on the cost function and terminal region, the controller achieves recursive feasibility and asymptotic stability. Finally, we demonstrate the controller on two example systems, a linear continuously stirred tank reactor (CSTR) and a unicycle robot.

Notation: The symbols \mathbb{R}^n , $\mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, \mathbb{N} , and \mathbb{N}_n denote the n -dimensional Euclidean space, the sets of n by p matrices, natural numbers (including 0), and natural numbers from 1 to n , respectively. For $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, M_{ij} denotes M 's entry in the i 'th row and the j 'th column, $M^\oplus \triangleq \max(M, \mathbf{0}_{n,p})$, $M^\ominus = M^\oplus - M$ and $|M| \triangleq M^\oplus + M^\ominus$, where $\mathbf{0}_{n,p}$ is the zero matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$. For a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ we denote

$$[A] \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} A^\oplus & -A^\ominus \\ -A^\ominus & A^\oplus \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n \times 2n}.$$

The symbol $\rho(M)$ denotes the spectral radius of M . For

vectors in \mathbb{R}^n , the comparisons $>$ and $<$ are considered element-wise. Finally, an interval $[z, \bar{z}] \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is the set of all real vectors $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ that satisfies $\underline{z} \leq z \leq \bar{z}$. Unless otherwise specified, for an interval $[z, \bar{z}]$, we define $\delta^z \triangleq \bar{z} - \underline{z}$ and for $[z_k, \bar{z}_k]$, $\delta_k^z \triangleq \bar{z}_k - \underline{z}_k$. A subscript k always denotes a time step, not a component of a vector.

II. PRELIMINARIES

Next, we introduce some definitions and results from interval analysis that will be leveraged in our interval observer and predictor design. In the following definitions let f be a function $f: \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$.

Definition 1: The function f is *Jacobian sign-stable* (JSS) if the sign of each element of the Jacobian matrix $J_f(x)$ is constant for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

Proposition 1: [12, Proposition 2] If the Jacobian of f is bounded, i.e., it satisfies $\underline{J}_f \leq J_f(x) \leq \bar{J}_f$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, then f can be written in additive-remainder form,

$$f(x) = Ax + \mu(x),$$

where the $(i, j)^{th}$ element of $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ satisfies

$$A_{ij} = (\underline{J}_f)_{ij} \quad \text{or} \quad A_{ij} = (\bar{J}_f)_{ij}$$

and the function μ is JSS. •

Definition 2: [13, Definition 4] A function $f_d: \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a *mixed-monotone decomposition function* for f if

- 1) $f_d(x, x) = f(x)$,
- 2) f_d is monotonically increasing in its first argument,
- 3) f_d is monotonically decreasing in its second argument.

Proposition 2: [12, Proposition 4 & Lemma 3] Suppose f is JSS and has bounded Jacobian. Then, the i^{th} component of a mixed-monotone decomposition function f_d is given by

$$f_{d,i}(x_1, x_2) \triangleq f_i(D^i x_1 + (I_n - D^i)x_2),$$

with $D^i = \text{diag}(\max(\text{sgn}((\bar{J}_f)_i), \mathbf{0}_{1,n}))$. Additionally, for any interval $[\underline{x}, \bar{x}] \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, it holds that $\delta_d^f \leq \bar{F}_f \delta^x$, where $\bar{F}_f \triangleq \bar{J}_f^\oplus + \underline{J}_f^\ominus$ and $\delta_d^f \triangleq f_d(\underline{x}, \bar{x}) - f_d(\bar{x}, \underline{x})$. •

Consequently, applying Proposition 2 to the JSS remainder from Proposition 1 yields a tight mixed-monotone decomposition function. Further details can be found in [12]. Finally, we review a well-known result which bounds the product of a matrix with an interval.

Proposition 3: [14, Lemma 1] Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$ and $\underline{x} \leq x \leq \bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then, $A^\oplus \underline{x} - A^\ominus \bar{x} \leq Ax \leq A^\oplus \bar{x} - A^\ominus \underline{x}$.

III. PROBLEM FORMULATION

A. System Dynamics

Consider a discrete-time nonlinear system of the form

$$\begin{aligned} x_{k+1} &= f(x_k) + Bu_k + w_k, \\ y_k &= Cx_k + v_k, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $x_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the state, $u_k \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the input, $y_k \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the output, $w_k \in [\underline{w}, \bar{w}] \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is the bounded process noise and $v_k \in [\underline{v}, \bar{v}] \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ is the bounded measurement noise. The function f , the matrices B and C , and the bounds on the noise are all known.

B. Control Objective

The objective is the minimization of a cost associated with the state and control input of the system. The cost function is defined over a horizon of length N . Let \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{u} denote the N and $(N-1)$ -long trajectories of x_k and u_k , respectively. Then, for a stage cost c and terminal cost V_f , the cost is

$$V_N(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} c(x_k, u_k) + V_f(x_N). \quad (2)$$

Since we do not have access to direct measurements of the state, this cost function will be modified to use both *estimates* and *predictions* of the state, as described in the next section.

In addition to minimizing the cost, we also require that the system satisfy state and input constraints. In other words, for some (closed) sets $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, the controller should guarantee that $x_k \in \mathcal{X}$, and $u_k \in \mathcal{U}$ for all k .

C. System Assumptions

Assumption 1: The function f has a bounded Jacobian over \mathcal{X} . In other words, for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $\underline{J}_f \leq J_f(x) \leq \bar{J}_f$.

Using Proposition 1, we decompose f into a linear plus a JSS remainder term,

$$f(x) = Ax + \mu(x). \quad (3)$$

To obtain bounded predictions of the state trajectories, we require an assumption related to stabilizability and detectability. As in Proposition 2, we define $\bar{F}_\mu = \bar{J}_\mu^\oplus + \underline{J}_\mu^\ominus$.

Assumption 2: There exist matrices L and K such that $\rho(|A - LC| + \bar{F}_\mu) < 1$ and $\rho(|A - BK| + \bar{F}_\mu) < 1$.

Remark 1: Assumption 2 requires that a *linear* controller and observer be sufficient to stabilize the error system of the predictor. Intuitively, \bar{F}_μ captures the most extreme behavior of the nonlinearity, which must not destabilize the prediction error. We have studied observer gain design thoroughly in our previous work [15, Theorem 2], which can be adapted to compute the gains L and K and verify the assumption.

IV. INTERVAL OBSERVER AND PREDICTOR DESIGN

A. Interval Observer

In this section we introduce a basic interval observer, which computes interval-valued state estimates using the measurement signal. The interval observer has dynamics

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{x}_{k+1} \\ \underline{x}_{k+1} \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} A - LC \\ B \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{x}_k \\ \underline{x}_k \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} B \\ B \end{bmatrix} u_k + \begin{bmatrix} \bar{w} - \underline{v}_L \\ \underline{w} - \bar{v}_L \end{bmatrix} \\ &+ \begin{bmatrix} L \\ L \end{bmatrix} y_k + \begin{bmatrix} \mu_d(\bar{x}_k, \underline{x}_k) \\ \mu_d(\underline{x}_k, \bar{x}_k) \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where μ_d is a mixed-monotone decomposition function for μ (cf. Definition 2), $\bar{v}_L = L^\oplus \bar{v} - L^\ominus \underline{v}$, and $\underline{v}_L = L^\oplus \underline{v} - L^\ominus \bar{v}$.

By construction, the estimates generated by this interval observer will always contain the true state, and the estimate error will remain bounded, as stated below.

Proposition 4: If the initial condition of the interval observer (5) satisfies $\underline{x}_0 \leq x_0 \leq \bar{x}_0$, then $\underline{x}_k \leq x_k \leq \bar{x}_k$ for all $k \geq 0$. Furthermore, if Assumption 2 holds, then $\bar{x}_k - \underline{x}_k \leq \Delta^x < \infty$ for some $\Delta^x \in \mathbb{R}$.

$$\begin{bmatrix} \bar{z}_{k,\ell+1} \\ \underline{z}_{k,\ell+1} \\ \bar{e}_{k,\ell+1} \\ \underline{e}_{k,\ell+1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} [A - BK] & [-BK] \\ 0 & [A - LC] \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{z}_{k,\ell} \\ \underline{z}_{k,\ell} \\ \bar{e}_{k,\ell} \\ \underline{e}_{k,\ell} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \bar{w} + Bu'_{k,\ell} \\ \underline{w} + Bu'_{k,\ell} \\ \bar{v}_L - \hat{v}_L + \hat{w} - \underline{w} \\ \underline{v}_L - \hat{v}_L + \hat{w} - \bar{w} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \mu_d(\bar{z}_{k,\ell}, \underline{z}_{k,\ell}) \\ \mu_d(\underline{z}_{k,\ell}, \bar{z}_{k,\ell}) \\ \mu_d(\bar{\xi}_{k,\ell}, \underline{\xi}_{k,\ell}) - \mu_d(\underline{z}_{k,\ell}, \bar{z}_{k,\ell}) \\ \mu_d(\underline{\xi}_{k,\ell}, \bar{\xi}_{k,\ell}) - \mu_d(\bar{z}_{k,\ell}, \underline{z}_{k,\ell}) \end{bmatrix} \quad (4)$$

Proof: The statement $\underline{x}_k \leq x_k \leq \bar{x}_k$ holds by induction, using Proposition 3 and the fact that μ_d is a mixed-monotone decomposition function for μ .

We show boundedness of the error term by defining $\delta_k^x = \bar{x}_k - \underline{x}_k$ and analyzing the comparison system

$$\delta_{k+1}^x \leq (|A - LC| + \bar{F}_\mu) \delta_k^x + \delta^w + \delta^{v_L}.$$

Since δ_k^x is guaranteed to be positive for all k , both the actual error dynamics and the comparison system are positive systems. Additionally, $|A - LC| + \bar{F}_\mu$ is stable by Assumption 2 thus rendering the comparison system ISS with respect to $\delta^w + \delta^{v_L}$, which is bounded. ■

B. Interval Predictor

This section outlines the design of the predictor, which computes upper and lower bounds of the reachable set from a set of initial conditions. At every time step, the initial condition of the predictor is updated with the latest estimate from the interval observer. We include an output feedback controller in the predictor system, which reduces the widths of the predicted intervals.

1) Feedback Parameterization: We begin by parameterizing the control input as a feedback term plus a feedforward term (u'_k), in order to reduce the width of the intervals generated by the predictor system. We use an additional observer to compute an estimate of the state, which is further leveraged to compute a control input as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{x}_{k+1} &= (A - LC)\hat{x}_k + Bu_k + \hat{w} - \hat{v}_L + Ly_k + \mu(\hat{x}_k), \\ u_k &= -K\hat{x}_k + u'_k. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Here, L is the *same* gain as in the interval observer, $\hat{w} = \frac{1}{2}(\bar{w} + \underline{w})$, and $\hat{v}_L = \frac{1}{2}(\bar{v}_L + \underline{v}_L)$.

Remark 2: The structure of the observer in (6) is similar to that of the interval observer (5). In fact, for linear systems (where μ is zero), \hat{x}_k is the *midpoint* of the interval observer's estimate, assuming it is initialized as such. For nonlinear systems, this is not the case, but $\hat{x}_k \in [\underline{x}_k, \bar{x}_k]$. ■

With the controller (6) in place, the closed loop system is

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} x_{k+1} \\ e_{k+1} \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} A - BK & -BK \\ 0 & A - LC \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_k \\ e_k \end{bmatrix} \\ &+ \begin{bmatrix} \mu(x_k) \\ \mu(\hat{x}_k) - \mu(x_k) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} w_k + Bu'_k \\ Lv_k - \hat{v}_L + \hat{w} - w_k \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where $e_k = \hat{x}_k - x_k$. Notice that although the feedback controller (6) has the observer in the loop, the closed loop dynamics does not contain the output y_k . This is advantageous, since we will not have access to future values of the output when designing the predictor. The fact that the output does not appear means we can directly design a predictor for this closed loop system.

2) Predictor Design: Using a technique similar to the construction of the interval observer, we can design a predictor for the system (7). The only difference is the predictor does not have access to any measurements, since it is predicting forward in time. To describe the predictions, we introduce a new time index ℓ , so that for a variable ξ , $\xi_{k,\ell}$ is the prediction ℓ steps into the future, starting from time k . We will denote the predicted upper and lower bounds of x as \bar{z} and \underline{z} , and those of e as \bar{e} and \underline{e} . These predictions depend on the (future) feedforward input u' , which will be determined by the MPC controller. The predictor dynamics are given by (4), where $\bar{\xi}_{k,\ell} = \bar{z}_{k,\ell} + \bar{e}_{k,\ell}$ and $\underline{\xi}_{k,\ell} = \underline{z}_{k,\ell} + \underline{e}_{k,\ell}$.

By construction, the predictor computes an overapproximation of the reachable sets of $x_{k+\ell}$ and $e_{k+\ell}$, as long as it is initialized correctly. We obtain the correct initialization from at every k from the interval observer. Now we are ready to state the key result of this section, which states that system (4) generates correct predictions and that the prediction error remains bounded for all time.

Proposition 5: Let $\underline{x}_k \leq x_k \leq \bar{x}_k$ for some k . If the initial condition of the predictor system (4) satisfies

$$\underline{z}_{k,0} \leq \underline{x}_k, \quad \bar{z}_{k,0} \geq \bar{x}_k, \quad \underline{e}_{k,0} \leq \underline{x}_k - \hat{x}_k, \quad \bar{e}_{k,0} \geq \bar{x}_k - \hat{x}_k,$$

then $\underline{z}_{k,\ell} \leq x_{k+\ell} \leq \bar{z}_{k,\ell}$ and $\underline{e}_{k,\ell} \leq e_{k+\ell} \leq \bar{e}_{k,\ell}$ for all $\ell \geq 0$. Furthermore, if Assumption 2 (on the existence of stabilizing gains) holds, the widths of the prediction intervals are uniformly bounded for all $\ell \geq 0$, i.e.,

$$\delta_{k,\ell}^z = \bar{z}_{k,\ell} - \underline{z}_{k,\ell} \leq \Delta^z, \quad \delta_{k,\ell}^e = \bar{e}_{k,\ell} - \underline{e}_{k,\ell} \leq \Delta^e,$$

where $\Delta^z < \infty$ and $\Delta^e < \infty$ are scalars.

Proof: Similar to Proposition 4, the statement that $\underline{z}_{k,\ell} \leq x_{k+\ell} \leq \bar{z}_{k,\ell}$ and $\underline{e}_{k,\ell} \leq e_{k+\ell} \leq \bar{e}_{k,\ell}$ holds by induction, using Proposition 3 and the fact that μ_d is a mixed-monotone decomposition function for μ . After some manipulation, we can write a comparison system for the dynamics of the width of the prediction sets, defining $\tilde{A} \triangleq \begin{bmatrix} |A - BK| + \bar{F}_\mu & |BK| \\ 0 & |A - LC| + \bar{F}_\mu \end{bmatrix}$, as follows:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \delta_{k,\ell+1}^z \\ \delta_{k,\ell+1}^e \end{bmatrix} \leq \begin{bmatrix} \delta^w \\ |L|\delta^v + \delta^w \end{bmatrix} + \tilde{A} \begin{bmatrix} \delta_{k,\ell}^z \\ \delta_{k,\ell}^e \end{bmatrix},$$

which is a positive system by construction. By Assumption 2, $\rho(\tilde{A}) < 1$, which, since δ^w and δ^v are constant, ensures that the prediction error remains bounded. ■

V. OUTPUT-FEEDBACK MPC

In this section we combine the interval observer and predictor to design an output-feedback model predictive controller. We begin by describing the cost function which the controller will attempt to minimize.

A. Cost function

Now that the predictor and its associated notation have been defined, we can correct the prototype cost function (2) into a form which can be evaluated using only the available predictions. The cost function is then

$$V_N(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{u}') = \sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1} c(\hat{z}_{k,\ell}, u'_{k,\ell}) + V_f(\hat{z}_{k,N}),$$

where \mathbf{z} and \mathbf{u}' are the N and $(N-1)$ -long trajectories of $(\hat{z}_{k,\ell}, \bar{z}_{k,\ell})$ and $u'_{k,\ell}$, respectively. The term $\hat{z}_{k,\ell} = \frac{1}{2}(\bar{z}_{k,\ell} + \underline{z}_{k,\ell})$ is the midpoint of the predicted interval at step ℓ .

B. Terminal region and controller

To ensure recursive feasibility of the MPC scheme, we constrain the system to reach a target set \mathcal{X}_f within a horizon of length N . Furthermore, we assume that there exists a feedback controller which renders \mathcal{X}_f forward invariant.¹

Assumption 3: There exists a terminal set \mathcal{X}_f and an associated controller $K_f : \mathcal{X}_f \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ such that for all $x \in \mathcal{X}_f$, $f(x, K_f(x), \hat{w}) \in \mathcal{X}_f$. Furthermore, the terminal set satisfies $\mathcal{X}_f \oplus \mathcal{B}_{\Delta^z} \subset \mathcal{X}$, where \mathcal{B}_{Δ^z} denotes the infinity-norm ball of radius Δ^z and \oplus denotes the Minkowski sum. •

We will use this terminal set to constrain the midpoint of the final step of the predicted trajectory. Therefore we also require that the entire predicted interval is safe whenever the midpoint is inside the target set, which is ensured by the second condition of the assumption.

C. Optimization problem

Our goal is to compute a sequence of feedforward inputs which minimizes the cost while ensuring satisfaction of the state and control constraints for *any* realization of the state and measurement disturbances. The optimization problem is

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{u}'} V_N(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{u}') \\ & \text{s.t. (4), } \hat{z}_{k,N} \in \mathcal{X}_f, \underline{z}_{k,0} \leq \underline{x}_k, \bar{z}_{k,0} \geq \bar{x}_k, \\ & \underline{e}_{k,0} \leq \underline{x}_k - \hat{x}_k, \bar{e}_{k,0} \geq \bar{x}_k - \hat{x}_k, \\ & [\underline{z}_{k,\ell}, \bar{z}_{k,\ell}] \subset \mathcal{X}, [\underline{u}_{k,\ell}, \bar{u}_{k,\ell}] \subset \mathcal{U}, \\ & \begin{bmatrix} \underline{u}_{k,\ell} \\ \bar{u}_{k,\ell} \end{bmatrix} = [K] \begin{bmatrix} \underline{z}_{k,\ell} \\ \bar{z}_{k,\ell} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} u'_{k,\ell} \\ u'_{k,\ell} \end{bmatrix}, \forall \ell \in \{0, \dots, N\}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Algorithm 1 describes the proposed improved robust output feedback MPC (IROF-MPC) scheme, which involves recursively updating the interval observer using measurements, and using the interval estimate to initialize the optimization.

D. Feasibility and stability

Theorem 1: Let Assumptions 1-3 hold. Then the MPC controller given by Algorithm 1 is recursively feasible, meaning that if (8) is feasible at $k=0$, then it is feasible for all $k > 0$.

¹As is common in the MPC literature, the existence of this controller is used to prove recursive feasibility. In practice, the system does not need to *actually* switch to this controller once the target set is reached. In our numerical examples we leave the MPC controller running in the target set.

Algorithm 1 Improved Robust Output Feedback-MPC (IROF-MPC) Scheme at Time Step k .

Input: $y_k, \underline{z}_{k-1,1}, \bar{z}_{k-1,1}$; **Output:** $u_k, \underline{z}_{k,1}, \bar{z}_{k,1}$
1: Update \underline{x}_k and \bar{x}_k using y_k and (5).
2: $\underline{x}_k \leftarrow \max\{\underline{x}_k, \underline{z}_{k-1,1}\}, \bar{x}_k \leftarrow \min\{\bar{x}_k, \bar{z}_{k-1,1}\}$
3: Solve (8) to determine u'_k
4: $u_k \leftarrow K\hat{x}_k + u'_k$
5: **return** u_k

Furthermore, the state and control satisfy $x_k \in \mathcal{X}$ and $u_k \in \mathcal{U}$, respectively, for all $k \geq 0$.

Proof: Assume there is a sequence of feedforward inputs $\{u'_{0,\ell}\}_{\ell=0}^{N-1}$ solving the optimization problem (8) at $k=0$. At $k=1$, a new sequence $\{u'_{1,\ell}\}_{\ell=0}^{N-1}$ can be constructed by letting $u'_{1,\ell} = u'_{0,\ell+1}$ for $\ell \in \{0, \dots, N-2\}$. The final term in the sequence is given by the feedback law from the target set, $u'_{1,N-1} = K_f(\hat{z}_{0,N-1})$, which is guaranteed to keep $\hat{z}_{1,N}$ in the target set by Assumption 3. This proves that the target set constraint is satisfied. The input constraints are also satisfied by this construction.

To prove that the state constraints are satisfied, note that since $[\underline{z}_{1,0}, \bar{z}_{1,0}] \subset [\underline{z}_{0,1}, \bar{z}_{0,1}]$, it must be true that $[\underline{z}_{1,\ell}, \bar{z}_{1,\ell}] \subset [\underline{z}_{0,\ell+1}, \bar{z}_{0,\ell+1}] \subset \mathcal{X}$ for $\ell \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$. Additionally, by Assumption 3, since $\hat{z}_{1,N} \in \mathcal{X}_f$, $[\underline{z}_{1,N}, \bar{z}_{1,N}] \subset \mathcal{X}$. This concludes the proof that $\{u'_{1,\ell}\}_{\ell=0}^{N-1}$ is a feasible solution of the optimization problem. This procedure can be repeated recursively.

The satisfaction of the constraints $x_k \in \mathcal{X}$ and $u_k \in \mathcal{U}$ follows directly from the constraints of (8), and the fact that by Proposition 5, the predicted state intervals are guaranteed to contain the future states of the system. ■

While this theorem guarantees that the state and input always satisfy their respective constraints, it does not guarantee asymptotic stability to the target set. Doing so requires some additional assumptions on the cost function and target set. The cost function should be positive definite about an equilibrium point inside the target set, so that it may act as a candidate Lyapunov function for the closed-loop system.

Assumption 4: The target set \mathcal{X}_f contains the origin, which is an equilibrium point of the dynamics (1). Furthermore, the stage cost $c(\cdot, u)$ is positive definite for all $u \in \mathcal{U}$, and the terminal cost V_f is positive definite.

The following theorem gives a sufficient condition for the stability of the closed-loop in a certain region of attraction. This region of attraction can be made larger by extending the prediction horizon of the controller.

Theorem 2: Let Assumptions 1-4 hold. If, for all $x \in \mathcal{X}_f$,

$$V_f(f(x, K_f(x), \hat{w})) - V_f(x) + c(x, K_f(x)) \leq 0,$$

then the closed-loop dynamics of $\hat{z}_{k,0}$ with the MPC controller described by Algorithm 1 is asymptotically stable. The region of attraction is the set of initial conditions for which the optimization problem (8) is feasible.

Proof: The proof is similar to classical results from the MPC literature, where the cost function is used to create a Lyapunov function for the closed loop system. Due to space concerns, we refer the reader to [1] for more details. ■

This result relies on the assumption that the terminal controller is able to attain a cost decrease within the terminal set. This assumption is standard in the literature on nonlinear MPC, and the computation of such a controller is beyond the scope of this paper. We refer the reader to [16] and [17] for discussions of this problem in the context of continuous-time systems; similar results hold in discrete-time.

VI. NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

A. Linear CSTR

In this section we compare our improved robust output feedback MPC (IROF-MPC) scheme with a recent work on interval MPC for linear systems [11] (DERP). We use the linear model (i.e., $f(x) = Ax$) of a continuous stirred tank reactor (CSTR) from [11], where the system matrices are:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0.745 & -0.002 \\ 5.610 & 0.780 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 5.6 \times 10^{-6} \\ 0.464 \end{bmatrix}, \quad C = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since the system is linear, the remainder function μ is the zero function. The constraints are $\mathcal{X} = [-0.4, 0.4] \times [-25, 25]$ and $\mathcal{U} = [-15, 15]$, and the disturbance bounds are $[\underline{w}, \bar{w}] = \alpha[-0.02, 0.02] \times [-0.4, 0.4]$ and $[\underline{v}, \bar{v}] = \beta[-0.1, 0.1]$, where α and β will be varied to test different magnitudes of noise. The observer gain is $L = [-0.002 \quad 0.390]^T$ and the interval observer is initialized with $\underline{x}_0 = [-0.1, -0.05]$ and $\bar{x}_0 = [0.1, 0.05]$.

The controller is designed to track a setpoint outside the feasible set, $x_r = [-0.25, 27.3]$. The cost function is quadratic in the error $e_r = x - x_r$, $c(x, u) = e_r^T H e_r + R u^2$, with $H = 100I$ and $R = 0.01$. The horizon is $N = 10$.

We conducted several trials with modified noise bounds, varying α and β . The noise is uniformly distributed over the bounding interval. In every trial, we run our method and the one from [11] with identical realizations of the noise, in order to compare their performance. Figure 1 shows the result of one of those trials. Figure 2 shows the results (the mean squared tracking error on a trajectory of 50 time steps) of varying one of either α and β while keeping the other parameter fixed. The improved performance of our method becomes clearer as the noise magnitude is increased. This increase in performance (i.e., decrease in tracking error) is due to our inclusion of a closed-loop control inside our predictor, which limits future uncertainty, narrowing the width of the prediction. This allows the system trajectory to get closer to the inequality constraint while still ensuring its satisfaction.

B. Robotic Exploration

In this section we demonstrate the effectiveness of our controller on a scenario involving a unicycle robot exploring and measuring an uncertain environment. For this purpose, we use our MPC controller along with the recently developed Behavioral Entropy [18] in the cost function to incentivize the agent to explore while still reaching the target state.




Fig. 1. Trajectories of x_k^2 (the second state component) for one trial of the experiment in Section VI-A, using the approach from [11] (DERP) and IROF-MPC. The objective is to operate as close to the constraint as possible.




Fig. 2. Mean square error of several experiments varying the magnitude of state and process noise, using the method from [11] (DERP) and our IROF-MPC.

After performing the JSS decomposition, the time-discretized ($\Delta_t = 0.1$) unicycle robot has dynamics

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \delta & 0 & \Delta_t & \Delta_t \\ 0 & 1 - \delta & \Delta_t & \Delta_t \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 - b_v \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ \Delta_t & 0 \\ 0 & \Delta_t \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\mu_1(x) = \Delta_t(x^4 \cos(x^3) - x^3 - x^4), \quad \mu_3(x) = \mu_4(x) = 0,$$

$$\mu_2(x) = \Delta_t(x^4 \sin(x^3) - x^3 - x^4).$$

We represent the environment as a compact set $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. We discretize \mathcal{E} using a square grid and call the resulting set \mathcal{D} . Associated to the grid \mathcal{D} is an occupancy function $f_{occ} : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, which represents the probability that a cell contains the quantity of interest. The occupancy map \mathcal{M} is the discrete field of f_{occ} over \mathcal{D} . The quantity represented by the occupancy map depends on the goal of the robot, but for example could be the presence of survivors in a search and rescue mission or the presence of a toxic gas. All cells in the initial occupancy map \mathcal{M}_0 have a value of 0.5. The goal of the robot is to reduce the uncertain area by measuring grid cells and updating the occupancy map \mathcal{M}_k . We assume that the robot “measures” a grid cell whenever its location is within that cell.

The total measure of uncertainty throughout the area is given by an entropy function which is evaluated over the occupancy map. More specifically, for any admissible generalized entropy H and occupancy map \mathcal{M} , the total uncertainty is $\bar{H}(\mathcal{M}) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{D}} H(p(x))$, where $p(x)$ denotes the Bernoulli distribution associated with the occupancy at x . In order for our controller to converge to a target region, we require that the uncertainty is always reduced over time. In other words, the occupancy




Fig. 3. Comparison of nominal output-feedback MPC versus IROF-MPC over 100 time steps in the robot exploration scenario.

map should satisfy $\bar{H}(\mathcal{M}_{k+1}) \leq \bar{H}(\mathcal{M}_k)$ for all $k \geq 0$.

Having defined the generalized entropy, the cost is

$$V_N(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{u}') = \sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1} [c(\hat{z}_{k,\ell}, \hat{u}_{k,\ell}) - \lambda U(\hat{z}_{k,\ell}; \mathcal{M}_k)] + V_f(\hat{z}_{k,N}),$$

where the function U represents the information gained by measuring the grid cell in \mathcal{D} which contains \hat{z}_k , given the current occupancy map \mathcal{M}_k , $U(x; \mathcal{M}) = H(p(x))$, where, as before, $p(x)$ is the Bernoulli distribution associated with the occupancy at x . The parameter λ can be tuned to control the emphasis on exploration vs. progress toward the goal.

For comparison, we also implement a nominal MPC controller, which uses the observer-based controller (6) in conjunction with a simplified optimization problem, with the same objective, state and input constraints, and predictions given by $\hat{z}_{k+1} = f(\hat{z}_k) + B(u'_k - K\hat{z}_k) + \hat{w}$, $\hat{z}_{k,0} = \hat{x}_k$.

Figure 3 shows the closed-loop trajectories of the simulation. Evidently the nominal controller causes the system to violate the (non-convex) obstacle constraint, because it does not account for the noise on the state and output. On the other hand, the proposed method avoids the obstacle due to the interval predictions which are robust to noise.

Table I lists the computation times (using Acados [19] on an i5-1240P @ 4.4GHz with 64GB RAM) averaged over 100 timesteps, with horizons of $N = 35$ and $N = 100$. Each trial is warm-started with a solution from a generic NLP solver. In all cases, the computational cost of our method is similar to that of the nominal controller.

TABLE I
COMPUTATION TIMES OVER 100 TIMESTEPS, IN MILLISECONDS

	$N = 35$			$N = 100$		
	max	avg	min	max	avg	min
IROF-MPC	3.89	1.16	0.58	12.743	1.96	1.19
Nominal	4.13	1.36	1.02	11.82	2.72	2.018

VII. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

This paper introduced a robust output-feedback MPC controller. We described an interval observer and predictor, which were then proven to generate correct and stable estimates and predictions. In addition, we showed that the closed loop system under the MPC controller is recursively feasible, safe,

and, with some additional assumptions on the cost function, asymptotically stable. We showed that our predictor design, which includes a stabilizing feedback term, was able to outperform existing methods, especially in the presence of noise. We further demonstrated its effectiveness in robotic exploration, where the optimization could be solved over a long horizon.

In the future we plan to investigate the robotic exploration scenario more thoroughly, including different cost functions. We also plan to design optimal observer and controller gains which result in the best closed-loop performance.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Rawlings, D. Mayne, and M. Diehl, *Model Predictive Control: Theory, Computation and Design*. Nob Hill Publishing, 2017.
- [2] S. Karaman and E. Frazzoli, "Sampling-based algorithms for optimal motion planning," *International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 30, no. 7, pp. 846–894, 2011.
- [3] M. Elbanhawi and M. Simic, "Sampling-based robot motion planning: A review," *IEEE Access*, vol. 2, pp. 56–77, 2014.
- [4] J. Nubert, J. Köhler, V. Berenz, F. Allgöwer, and S. Trimpe, "Safe and fast tracking on a robot manipulator: Robust MPC and neural network control," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 3050–3057, Apr. 2020.
- [5] H. Wei and Y. Shi, "MPC-based motion planning and control enables smarter and safer autonomous marine vehicles: Perspectives and a tutorial survey," *IEEE/CAA Journal of Automatica Sinica*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 8–24, Jan. 2023.
- [6] S. Dixit, U. Montanaro, M. Dianati, D. Oxtoby, T. Mizutani, A. Mouzakis, and S. Fallah, "Trajectory planning for autonomous high-speed overtaking in structured environments using robust MPC," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 2310–2323, Jun. 2020.
- [7] Q. Shi, J. Zhao, A. E. Kamel, and I. Lopez-Juarez, "MPC based vehicular trajectory planning in structured environment," *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 21 998–22 013, 2021.
- [8] A. Tajbakhsh, L. T. Biegler, and A. M. Johnson, "Conflict-based model predictive control for scalable multi-robot motion planning," in *IEEE Int. Conf. on Robotics and Automation*, May 2024, pp. 14 562–14 568.
- [9] F. D. Brunner, M. A. Müller, and F. Allgöwer, "Enhancing output-feedback MPC with set-valued moving horizon estimation," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 63, no. 9, pp. 2976–2986, 2018.
- [10] M. A. Rodrigues and D. Odloak, "Output feedback mpc with guaranteed robust stability," *Journal of Process Control*, vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 557–572, 2000.
- [11] A. dos Reis de Souza, D. Efimov, T. Raïssi, and X. Ping, "Robust output feedback model predictive control for constrained linear systems via interval observers," *Automatica*, vol. 135, p. 109951, 2022.
- [12] M. Khajenejad, F. Shoaib, and S. Z. Yong, "Interval observer synthesis for locally Lipschitz nonlinear dynamical systems via mixed-monotone decompositions," in *American Control Conference*, 2022, pp. 2970–2975.
- [13] L. Yang, O. Mickelin, and N. Ozay, "On sufficient conditions for mixed monotonicity," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 64, no. 12, pp. 5080–5085, 2019.
- [14] D. Efimov, T. Raïssi, S. Chebotarev, and A. Zolghadri, "Interval state observer for nonlinear time varying systems," *Automatica*, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 200–205, 2013.
- [15] M. Khajenejad, S. B. Brown, and S. Martínez, "Distributed resilient interval observer synthesis for nonlinear discrete-time systems," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.15511*, 2024.
- [16] H. Chen and F. Allgöwer, "A quasi-infinite horizon nonlinear model predictive control scheme with guaranteed stability," *Automatica*, vol. 34, no. 10, pp. 1205–1217, 1998.
- [17] W. Chen, J. O'Reilly, and D. J. Ballance, "On the terminal region of model predictive control for non-linear systems with input/state constraints," *International Journal of Adaptive Control and Signal Processing*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 195–207, 2003.
- [18] A. Suresh, C. Nieto, and S. Martínez, "Robotic exploration using generalized behavioral entropy," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 9, no. 9, 2024.
- [19] R. Verschuere et al., "acados – a modular open-source framework for fast embedded optimal control," *Mathematical Programming Computation*, 2021.