

Practical asymptotic stability of data-driven model predictive control using extended DMD*

Lea Bold¹, Lars Grüne², Manuel Schaller¹, and Karl Worthmann¹

¹Optimization-based Control Group, Technische Universität Ilmenau, Germany

²Chair of Applied Mathematics, University of Bayreuth, Germany

July 2023

Abstract: The extended Dynamic Mode Decomposition (eDMD) is a very popular method to obtain data-driven surrogate models for nonlinear (control) systems governed by ordinary and stochastic differential equations. Its theoretical foundation is the Koopman framework, in which one propagates observable functions of the state to obtain a linear representation in an infinite-dimensional space. In this work, we prove practical asymptotic stability of a (controlled) equilibrium for eDMD-based model predictive control, in which the optimization step is conducted using the data-based surrogate model. To this end, we derive error bounds that converge to zero if the state approaches the desired equilibrium. Further, we show that, if the underlying system is cost controllable, then this stabilizability property is preserved. We conduct numerical simulations, which illustrate the proven practical asymptotic stability.

1 Introduction

Model Predictive Control (MPC; [19, 43]) is a well-established feedback control technique. In each iteration, an optimal control problem is solved, and a first portion of the optimal control is applied to the system [8]. This process is then repeated at the successor time instant after measuring (or estimating) the resulting state of the system. The popularity of MPC is mainly due to its solid mathematical foundation and the ability to cope with nonlinear multi-input systems with state and control constraints. In the optimization step, it is, however, necessary to predict the cost functional and/or constraints along the flow of the underlying dynamical system, which requires a model. A common approach is to model the system by means of first principles.

Due to the recent progress in data-driven methods, there are several works considering MPC using data-driven surrogate models. For linear discrete-time systems, a very powerful predictive-control approach [9] is based on Willems et al.'s so-called fundamental lemma [53], see [1] for the respective closed-loop analysis and also the recent survey paper [13] as well as [10, 52] for extensions of the underlying concept towards stochastic systems, distributional robustness, and multiple data

*K. Worthmann gratefully acknowledges funding by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – Project-ID 507037103

sets. Several other data-based MPC-related approaches are available based on, e.g., Gaussian-processes [23] invoking nowadays well-established error bounds [7], reinforcement learning [58], and many more. Another popular approach is based on extended Dynamic Mode Decomposition (eDMD) [55] as an approximation technique [26] in the Koopman framework [2]. The key idea is to lift a nonlinear (control) system to a linear, but infinite-dimensional one and, then, employ eDMD to generate a data-driven finite-dimensional approximation [38]. Recently, the respective data-based surrogate models were applied in the prediction step for MPC, cf. [39, 27] and [60] for a robust tube-based approach.

Generally speaking, the Koopman framework can be utilized for data-driven predictions of so-called observables (quantities of interest, e.g., the stage cost in MPC) along the flow of the dynamical (control) system. Convergence in the infinite-data limit was shown in [28] and finite-data error bounds for ordinary and stochastic differential equations with i.i.d. and ergodic sampling were recently proven in [45, 37]. Therein, the approximation error is split up into two sources: A deterministic projection error quantifying the error due to a finite dictionary (i.e., finitely many observable functions defined on the state space), and a probabilistic estimation error due to the finite amount of data. To avoid or to mitigate the projection error, subspace identification methods may be employed to (approximately) ensure invariance of the dictionary, i.e., the space spanned by the chosen observables, see, e.g., [22, 30]. For controlled systems there are two popular approaches: The first seeks a linear surrogate control system and is widely called (e)DMDc [41, 27]. The second approach yields a bi-linear representation, cf. [50, 54] and also [5] and in particular performs very well for systems with direct state-control coupling. Moreover, rigorous error bounds for this bi-linear approach are available [45, 37].

Due to its potential to also obtain data-driven surrogates for control systems, there are many works considering Koopman-based optimal control and stabilization. In [32], an LQR-based approach to control unconstrained systems by means of a linear surrogate model using Taylor arguments is proposed. The performance of such an LQR-approach was assessed in [31] by means of a simulation study. The authors in [24] add, in addition, an RL strategy, which is experimentally verified. Further, simulation-based case studies can be found in [57] for Koopman-based MPC. For the bi-linear approach [25] see also the recent survey [33] on Koopman and control for vehicles. A state feedback law leveraging control Lyapunov functions and a bi-linear Koopman ansatz was provided in [47]. Very recently, robust control of the bi-linear Koopman model with guarantees was performed in [49] or, using Lyapunov-based arguments [48, 36]. The main drawback of the known work is that the closed-loop analysis is conducted in the lifted space without ensuring consistency of the training data and the data-driven surrogate model by projecting back, see [34] and the follow-up work [51]. However, without such a consistency step, the optimization step within MPC is conducted based on the *current* lifted state, which may not have a preimage in the original state space.

The main contribution of this work is to lay a theoretical foundation for practical asymptotic stability (PAS) of eDMD-based MPC of nonlinear control-affine systems building upon the error bounds derived in [37] and [45] for bi-linear eDMD-based surrogate models. Instead of a uniform error bound independent of the state, we rather exploit that the dynamical system has a (controlled) equilibrium at the desired set point (always taken as the origin in this paper) to show that the error scales with the deviation from the desired set point. Then, after recalling a central result from [19] on PAS for numerical approximations, the key step in this paper is to rigorously derive all required conditions for this result, based on the assumption that the underlying original

system is cost controllable (i.e., asymptotically null controllable with stage costs satisfying some bound). In particular, we show that cost controllability is preserved under the eDMD-based approximations, which allows to rigorously derive semi-global practical asymptotic stability of the original system if the feedback law is computed using the data-driven surrogate model only. The main argumentation of this work is generalizable to MPC with terminal ingredients.

The manuscript is organized as follows. In Section 2, we briefly recap eDMD within the Koopman framework. In Section 3, we concisely introduce MPC and the relaxed Lyapunov inequality, before we derive a key result on the approximation error and providing the problem formulation. Then, in Section 4, we present our main result showing practical asymptotic stability of eDMD-based MPC. In the subsequent section, we illustrate our findings by means of a simulation study for the van-der-Pol oscillator. Finally, conclusions are drawn in Section 6.

Notation: For integers $n \leq m$, we denote $[n : m] := [n, m] \cap \mathbb{Z}$. The i -th standard unit vector in \mathbb{R}^n is denoted by e_i , $i \in [1 : n]$. For a matrix $A = (a_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $\|A\|_F = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m a_{ij}^2}$ denotes the Frobenius norm. For a set X , we denote the interior by $\text{int}(X)$. We further make use of the following comparison functions:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K} &:= \{\alpha : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mid \alpha \text{ is continuous and strictly increasing with } \alpha(0) = 0\} \\ \mathcal{K}_\infty &:= \{\alpha \in \mathcal{K} \mid \alpha \text{ is unbounded}\} \\ \mathcal{L} &:= \{\delta : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mid \delta \text{ is continuous and strictly decreasing with } \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \delta(t) = 0\} \\ \mathcal{KL} &:= \{\beta : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mid \beta \text{ is continuous, } \beta(\cdot, t) \in \mathcal{K}, \beta(r, \cdot) \in \mathcal{L}\}. \end{aligned}$$

2 Koopman-based prediction and control

In this section, we recap the basics of surrogate modeling of nonlinear (control) systems within the Koopman framework. The underlying idea is to exploit an identity between the nonlinear flow of an ordinary differential equation and a linear, but infinite-dimensional operator. Then, a compression of this operator onto a finite-dimensional subspace can be approximated by extended Dynamic Mode Decomposition (eDMD) using finitely many samples of the system.

2.1 The Koopman framework

First, we consider an autonomous continuous-time dynamical system governed by the *nonlinear* ordinary differential equation (ODE)

$$\dot{x}(t) = g_0(x(t)), \tag{2.1}$$

where the map $g_0 : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ is locally Lipschitz continuous. For given initial condition $x(0) = \hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$, we denote the unique solution of System (2.1) at time $t \in [0, \infty)$ by $x(t; \hat{x})$. We consider the ODE (2.1) on a compact and non-empty set $\mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$. Then, to avoid technical difficulties in this introductory section, forward invariance of the set \mathbb{X} w.r.t. the dynamics (2.1) is assumed, i.e., $x(t; \hat{x}) \in \mathbb{X}$, $t \geq 0$, holds for all $\hat{x} \in \mathbb{X}$. This may be ensured, e.g., by some inward-pointing

condition and guarantees existence of the solution on $[0, \infty)$. Otherwise, additional care has to be paid to technical details, see, e.g., [59] or [45] for an extension for control systems. Then, the Koopman semigroup $(\mathcal{K}^t)_{t \geq 0}$ of bounded linear operators is defined by the identity

$$(\mathcal{K}^t \varphi)(\hat{x}) = \varphi(x(t; \hat{x})) \quad \forall t \geq 0, \hat{x} \in \mathbb{X}, \varphi \in L^2(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{R}), \quad (2.2)$$

see, e.g., [35, Prop. 2.4]. Here, the real-valued functions φ are called *observables*. The identity (2.2) states that, instead of evaluating the observable φ at the solution of the *nonlinear* differential equation (2.1) emanating from initial state \hat{x} at time t , one may also apply the *infinite-dimensional* Koopman operator \mathcal{K}^t to the observable φ and, then, evaluate the propagated observable at \hat{x} .

Since the flow of system (2.1) is continuous, $(\mathcal{K}^t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a strongly-continuous semigroup of bounded linear operators. Correspondingly, we can define the, in general, unbounded infinitesimal generator \mathcal{L} of this semigroup by

$$\mathcal{L}\varphi := \lim_{t \searrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{K}^t \varphi - \varphi}{t} \quad \forall \varphi \in D(\mathcal{L}), \quad (2.3)$$

where the domain $D(\mathcal{L})$ consists of all L^2 -functions, for which the above limit exists. Using this generator, we may formulate an evolution equation, which describes the action of the Koopman operator (2.2): The propagated observable $\Phi(t) = \mathcal{K}^t \varphi = \varphi(x(t; \cdot))$ solves the abstract Cauchy problem

$$\dot{\Phi}(t) = \mathcal{L}\Phi(t), \quad \Phi(0) = \varphi, \quad (2.4)$$

see, e.g., [11] for details on abstract evolution equations.

Next, we recap the extension of the Koopman theory to control-affine systems, i.e., systems governed by the dynamics

$$\dot{x}(t) = g_0(x(t)) + \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} g_i(x(t))u_i(t), \quad (2.5)$$

where the control function $u \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^{n_c})$ serves as an input and the input maps $g_i : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$, $i \in [0 : n_c]$, are locally Lipschitz continuous. A popular approach to obtain a data-based surrogate model is DMDC [41] or eDMDC [27], where one seeks a linear control system. In this paper, we pursue an alternative *bi-linear* approach, which exploits the control-affine structure of the system (2.5) and was – to the best of our knowledge – first proposed by [54, 50], see also [39] for further details. This approach shows a superior performance for systems with state-control coupling [5, 14, 4]. Moreover, a rigorous analysis of the approximation error depending on the amount of employed data is available, see [37] and [45] for a detailed exposition w.r.t. the estimation and the projection error, respectively. We recap the required details in Subsection 2.2.

For the flow of the control system (2.5) with constant control input u , the Koopman operator \mathcal{K}_u^t is defined analogously to (2.2). A straightforward computation shows that its generator preserves control affinity, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{L}^u = \mathcal{L}^0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} u_i (\mathcal{L}^{e_i} - \mathcal{L}^0) \quad (2.6)$$

holds for $u \in \mathbb{R}^{n_c}$, where \mathcal{L}^0 and \mathcal{L}^{e_i} , $i \in [1 : n_c]$, are the generators of the Koopman semigroups corresponding to the constant control function $u \equiv 0$ and $u \equiv e_i$, $i \in [1 : n_c]$, respectively. For general control functions $u \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^{n_c})$, one can now state the respective abstract Cauchy problem analogously to (2.4) replacing the generator \mathcal{L} by its time-varying counterpart $\mathcal{L}^{u(t)}$ defined by (2.6), see [37] for details.

2.2 Data-driven approximations via eDMD

The success of the Koopman approach in recent years is due to its linear nature such that the compression of the Koopman operator or its generator (2.6) to a finite-dimensional subspace – called dictionary – leads to matrix representations. Being finite-dimensional objects, these matrices can then be approximated by a finite amount of data.

Let the dictionary $\mathbb{V} := \text{span}(\{\psi_k : k \in [1 : M]\})$ be the M -dimensional subspace spanned by the chosen observables ψ_k , $k \in [1 : M]$. We denote the L^2 -orthogonal projection onto \mathbb{V} by $P_{\mathbb{V}}$. Further, using d i.i.d. data points $x_1, \dots, x_d \in \mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$, we define the $(M \times d)$ -matrices

$$X := \left(\left(\begin{array}{c} \psi_1(x_1) \\ \vdots \\ \psi_M(x_1) \end{array} \right) \middle| \dots \middle| \left(\begin{array}{c} \psi_1(x_d) \\ \vdots \\ \psi_M(x_d) \end{array} \right) \right) \quad \text{and} \quad Y := \left(\left(\begin{array}{c} (\mathcal{L}^0 \psi_1)(x_1) \\ \vdots \\ (\mathcal{L}^0 \psi_M)(x_1) \end{array} \right) \middle| \dots \middle| \left(\begin{array}{c} (\mathcal{L}^0 \psi_1)(x_d) \\ \vdots \\ (\mathcal{L}^0 \psi_M)(x_d) \end{array} \right) \right),$$

where $(\mathcal{L}^0 \psi_k)(x_j) = \nabla \psi_k(x_j)^\top g_0(x_j)$ holds for $k \in [1 : M]$ and $j \in [1 : d]$. Then, the empirical estimator of the compressed Koopman generator $P_{\mathbb{V}} \mathcal{L}^0|_{\mathbb{V}}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_d^0 := \arg \min_{L \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times M}} \|LX - Y\|_F^2,$$

i.e., as the solution of a regression problem. We have to repeat this step for \mathcal{L}^{e_i} , $i \in [1 : n_c]$, based on the identity $(\mathcal{L}^{e_i} \psi_k)(x_j) = \nabla \psi_k(x_j)^\top (g_0(x_j) + g_i(x_j))$ to construct the data-driven approximation of \mathcal{L}^u according to (2.6). Consequently, for $\varphi \in \mathbb{V}$ and control function $u \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty([0, t], \mathbb{R}^{n_c})$, a data-driven predictor is given as the solution of the linear time-varying Cauchy problem (2.4), where the unbounded operator \mathcal{L} is replaced by $\mathcal{L}_d^{u(t)}$. The convergence of this estimator was shown in [28] if both the dictionary size and the number of data points goes to infinity. Finite-data bounds typically split the error into two sources: A projection error stemming from the finite dictionary and an estimation error resulting from a finite amount of data. For an analysis of these errors for autonomous systems and i.i.d. data, we refer the reader to [59]. An estimation error for control systems was derived in [37], where, in addition to i.i.d. sampling of ODEs, also SDEs and ergodic sampling, i.e. sampling along one sufficiently-long trajectory, were considered. A full approximation error bound for control systems was provided in [45] using a dictionary of finite elements. For error bounds in reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces we refer the reader to [40]. We provide an error bound tailored to the sampled-data setting used in this work in Proposition 8 of Subsection 3.2.

3 MPC, sampled-data systems, and problem formulation

We consider a discrete-time dynamical control system governed by the dynamics

$$x^+ = f(x, u) \tag{3.1}$$

with (nonlinear) map $f : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_c} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$. Then, for given (initial) state $\hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ and sequence of control values $(u(k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$, $x_u(n; \hat{x})$ denotes the solution at time instant $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, which is recursively defined by the dynamics (3.1) and the initial condition $x_u(0; \hat{x}) = \hat{x}$. In the following, we assume that $f(0, 0) = 0$ holds, i.e., that the origin is a controlled equilibrium for the control value $u = 0$. After reviewing the basics of model predictive control in the subsequent subsection, we derive a sampled-data representation of the continuous-time dynamics (2.5) and the corresponding abstract Cauchy problem, i.e., (2.4) with $\mathcal{L}^{u(t)}$ including its eDMD-based surrogate in Subsection 3.2. Finally, we provide the problem formulation in Subsection 3.3.

3.1 Stability and suboptimality of model predictive control

We impose state and control constraints using the compact sets $\mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ and $\mathbb{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_c}$ with $(0, 0) \in \text{int}(\mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{U})$, respectively. Then, admissibility of a sequence of control values is defined as follows.

Definition 1. *A sequence of control values $(u(k))_{k=0}^{N-1} \subset \mathbb{U}$ of length N is said to be admissible for state $\hat{x} \in \mathbb{X}$, if $x_u(k; \hat{x}) \in \mathbb{X}$ holds for all $k \in [1 : N]$. For $\hat{x} \in \mathbb{X}$, the set of admissible control sequences is denoted by $\mathcal{U}_N(\hat{x})$. If, for $u = (u(k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$, $(u(k))_{k=0}^{N-1} \in \mathcal{U}_N(\hat{x})$ holds for the restriction of u for all $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we write $u \in \mathcal{U}_\infty(\hat{x})$.*

We introduce the quadratic (and continuous) stage cost $\ell : \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ given by

$$\ell(x, u) := \|x\|_Q^2 + \|u\|_R^2 := x^\top Qx + u^\top Ru \quad (3.2)$$

for symmetric and positive definite matrices $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_x}$ and $R \in \mathbb{R}^{n_c \times n_c}$. Here, we choose quadratic costs in order to streamline the presentation. Otherwise, some adaptations of the proposed error bound, see Proposition 8 below, are required to ensure consistency between stage cost and error bound, which is required to deduce our main result presented in Theorem 17. Then, based on Definition 1, we introduce the MPC Algorithm, where we tacitly assume existence of an optimal sequence of control values in Step (2) along the MPC closed-loop dynamics and full-state measurement.

Algorithm 2 (Model Predictive Control). *At each time instant $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$:*

- (1) *Measure the state $x(n) \in X$ and set $\hat{x} := x(n)$.*
- (2) *Solve the optimization problem*

$$u^* \in \operatorname{argmin}_{u \in \mathcal{U}_N(\hat{x})} J_N(\hat{x}, u) := \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \ell(x_u(k; \hat{x}), u(k))$$

subject to $x_u(0; \hat{x}) = \hat{x}$ and $x_u(k+1; \hat{x}) = f(x_u(k; \hat{x}), u(k))$, $k \in [0 : N-2]$.

- (3) *Apply the feedback value $\mu_N(x(n)) := u^*(0) \in \mathbb{U}$ at the plant.*

Overall, Algorithm 2 yields the MPC closed-loop dynamics

$$x_{\mu_N}^+ = f(x_{\mu_N}, \mu_N(x_{\mu_N})), \quad (3.3)$$

where the feedback law μ_N is well defined at \hat{x} if $\mathcal{U}_N(\hat{x}) \neq \emptyset$ holds. We emphasize that this condition holds if, e.g., \mathbb{X} is controlled forward invariant and refer to [3] and [12] for sufficient condition to ensure recursive feasibility without requiring controlled forward invariance of \mathbb{X} (and without terminal conditions) for discrete and continuous-time systems, respectively. The closed-loop solution resulting from the dynamics (3.3) is denoted by $x_{\mu_N}(n; \hat{x})$, where $x_{\mu_N}(0; \hat{x}) = \hat{x}$ holds. Moreover, we define the (optimal) value function $V_N : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$ as $V_N(x) := \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}_N(x)} J_N(x, u)$.

Next, we recall [19, Theorem 4.11] regarding *asymptotic stability and suboptimality estimates* of the MPC closed-loop, see also [21].

Proposition 3. *Suppose that, for $N \in \mathbb{N}$, a set $S \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ is forward-invariant w.r.t. the closed-loop dynamics (3.3) and there exists $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ such that the relaxed Lyapunov inequality*

$$V_N(x) \geq \alpha \ell(x, \mu_N(x)) + V_N(f(x, \mu_N(x))) \quad \forall x \in S \quad (3.4)$$

holds. Then, the suboptimality estimate $J_\infty^{\text{cl}}(\hat{x}) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \ell(x_{\mu_N}(n; \hat{x}), \mu_N(x_{\mu_N}(n; \hat{x}))) \leq V_N(\hat{x})/\alpha$ holds for all $\hat{x} \in S$. If, in addition, $\exists \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ such that

$$\alpha_1(\|x\|) \leq V_N(x) \leq \alpha_2(\|x\|) \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_{u \in \mathbb{U}} \ell(x, u) \geq \alpha_3(\|x\|)$$

hold for all $x \in S$, then the origin is asymptotically stable w.r.t. the closed-loop dynamics (3.3) on S in the sense of [19, Definition 2.16], i.e., there exists $\beta \in \mathcal{KL}$ satisfying the inequality $\|x_{\mu_N}(n; \hat{x})\| \leq \beta(\|\hat{x}\|, n)$, for all $\hat{x} \in S$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Before we conclude this section, we briefly note that the argumentation is not limited to finite-dimensional spaces.

3.2 Sampled-data systems with zero-order hold and eDMD

We consider the nonlinear continuous-time control system governed by the dynamics (2.5). Equidistantly discretizing the time axis $[0, \infty)$, i.e., using the partition $\bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} [k\Delta t, (k+1)\Delta t)$ with sampling period $\Delta t > 0$, and using a (piecewise) constant control function on each sampling interval, i.e., $u(t) \equiv \hat{u} \in \mathbb{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_c}$ on $[k\Delta t, (k+1)\Delta t)$, we can generate a discrete-time system governed by the dynamics

$$x^+ = f(\hat{x}, \hat{u}) := \int_0^{\Delta t} g_0(x(t; \hat{x}, u)) + \sum_{i=1}^{n_c} g_i(x(t; \hat{x}, u)) u_i(t) dt. \quad (3.5)$$

We emphasize that the drift g_0 does not exhibit an offset independently of the state variable x in view of our assumption $f(0, 0) = 0 = g_0(0)$. We define the vector-valued observable

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(x) &= (\psi_1(x), \dots, \psi_M(x)) \\ &= (1, x_1, \dots, x_{n_x}, \psi_{n_x+2}(x), \dots, \psi_M(x)), \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

where $\psi_1(x) \equiv 1$, $\psi_{k+1}(x) = x_k$, $k \in [1 : n_x]$ and $\psi_k \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}^{n_x}, \mathbb{R})$, $k \in [n_x + 2 : M]$, are locally-Lipschitz continuous functions satisfying $\psi_k(0) = 0$ and $(D\psi_k)(0) = 0$. Hence, $\Psi : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^M$ is Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant L_Ψ such that $\|\Psi(x) - \Psi(0)\| \leq L_\Psi \|x\|$. A

straightforward calculation then shows $(P_{\mathbb{V}}\mathcal{L}^0|_{\mathbb{V}})_{k,1} \equiv 0$, $k \in [1 : M]$, which we impose for the data-driven approximation to ensure consistency, i.e., that $f(0,0) = g_0(0) = 0$ is preserved. For g_i , $i \in [1 : n_c]$, the first (constant) observable enable us to approximate components of the control maps, which do not depend on the state x , *separately*. Moreover, $\Psi(\mathbb{R}^{n_x}) := \{y \in \mathbb{V} : \exists x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x} : \Psi(x) = y\}$ is an n_x -dimensional submanifold of the dictionary \mathbb{V} defined in Section 2.2. We emphasize that, for all measurable control functions $u : [0, \Delta t) \rightarrow \mathbb{U}$, the Koopman operator $\mathcal{K}_u^{\Delta t}$ respects the manifold structure since $(\mathcal{K}_u^{\Delta t}\Psi)(\hat{x}) := ((\mathcal{K}_u^{\Delta t}\psi_1)(\hat{x})^\top, \dots, (\mathcal{K}_u^{\Delta t}\psi_M)(\hat{x})^\top)^\top = \Psi(x(\Delta t; \hat{x}, u)) \in \Psi(\mathbb{R}^{n_x})$ holds for all \hat{x} . Here, $\mathcal{K}_u^{\Delta t}\psi_k$, $k \in [1 : M]$, denotes the solution of the respective time-varying abstract Cauchy problem.

Remark 4 (Metric spaces). *We point out that all results presented in Section 3.1 can be generalized to arbitrary metric spaces X and U instead of \mathbb{R}^{n_x} and \mathbb{R}^{n_c} , respectively. In particular, the latter would allow us to define U as the space of control functions on some interval, e.g., $u \in U = L^\infty([0, \Delta t), \mathbb{R}^{n_c})$ instead of control values $u \in \mathbb{R}^{n_c}$, see [56] and [19, Chapter 2 and 3] for details.*

In this paper, we make use of the following Assumption 5, which ensures that no projection error occurs. This assumption is common in systems and control when the Koopman framework is used, see, e.g., [42, 27]. The construction of suitable dictionaries ensuring this assumption is discussed in [6, 29, 46] and also in the recent preprint [15] for control-affine systems based on differential-geometric arguments. A condition ensuring this invariance is provided, e.g., in [16, Theorem 1], where even a method for the construction of a suitable dictionary is discussed in detail, see also [16, Section III and IV].

Assumption 5 (Invariance of \mathbb{V} from Section 2.2). *For any $\varphi \in \mathbb{V}$, the relation $\varphi(x(\Delta t; \cdot, u)) \in \mathbb{V}$ holds for all $u(t) \equiv \hat{u} \in \mathbb{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_c}$.*

Next, we provide a bound on the estimation error adapted to our sampled-data setting. Assumption 5 implies that the compression of the generator coincides with its restriction onto \mathbb{V} , i.e., $P_{\mathbb{V}}\mathcal{L}^u|_{\mathbb{V}} = \mathcal{L}^u|_{\mathbb{V}}$. Thus, for $u \in \mathbb{U}$, the Koopman operator is the matrix exponential of the generator, that is, $\mathcal{K}_u^{\Delta t} = e^{\Delta t\mathcal{L}^u}$.

Proposition 6. *Let Assumption 5 hold. Let an error bound $\varepsilon > 0$ and a probabilistic tolerance $\delta \in (0, 1)$ be given. Then there is an amount of data $d_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the error bound*

$$\|e^{\Delta t\mathcal{L}^u|_{\mathbb{V}}} - e^{\Delta t\mathcal{L}_d^u}\| \leq \varepsilon \quad (3.7)$$

holds for all $d \geq d_0$ and all $u \in \mathbb{U}$ for the Koopman operator $\mathcal{K}_u^{\Delta t} = e^{\Delta t\mathcal{L}^u}$ with probability $1 - \delta$.

Proof. By definition of the matrix exponential, we compute

$$\|e^{\Delta t\mathcal{L}^u|_{\mathbb{V}}} - e^{\Delta t\mathcal{L}_d^u}\| = \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\Delta t^k}{k!} (\mathcal{L}^u|_{\mathbb{V}} - \mathcal{L}_d^u)^k \right\| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\Delta t^k}{k!} \|\mathcal{L}^u|_{\mathbb{V}} - \mathcal{L}_d^u\|^k \leq e^{\Delta t\|\mathcal{L}^u|_{\mathbb{V}} - \mathcal{L}_d^u\|} - 1.$$

Invoking [45, Theorem 3] yields a sufficient amount of data $d_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|\mathcal{L}^u|_{\mathbb{V}} - \mathcal{L}_d^u\| \leq \ln(1 + \varepsilon)/\Delta t$ holds for $d \geq d_0$ with probability $1 - \delta$. Plugging this into the above computations implies (3.7) with probability $1 - \delta$. \square

Remark 7. We briefly quantify the sufficient amount of data d_0 of Proposition 6 in view of the dictionary size M , the error bound ε and the probabilistic tolerance δ . First, by a standard Chebychev inequality, one obtains a dependency $d_0 \sim M^2/\varepsilon^2\delta$, cf. [45, 37]. This can be improved in a reproducing kernel Hilbert space setting, where the dictionary is given by feature maps given by the kernel evaluated at the samples. Here a scaling depending logarithmically on δ was shown in [40, Proposition 3.4] using Hoeffding's inequality.

For the discrete-time dynamics (3.5), we get the identity

$$f(\hat{x}, \hat{u}) = P_x e^{\Delta t \mathcal{L}^{\hat{u}}} \Psi(\hat{x}) \quad (3.8)$$

resulting from sampling with zero-order hold based on Assumption 5, where $P_x : \mathbb{R}^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ is the projection onto the first n_x components. Further, based on the bi-linear eDMD-based surrogate model of Subsection 2.2 for d data points and the respective error bound (3.7) linking the error ε with the amount of data d , we define the data-driven surrogate model

$$f^\varepsilon(\hat{x}, \hat{u}) = P_x e^{\Delta t \mathcal{L}_d^{\hat{u}}} \Psi(\hat{x}). \quad (3.9)$$

Next, we leverage the finite-data error bound (3.7) to ensure that the error becomes small close to the origin.

Proposition 8. Let L_Ψ be the Lipschitz constant of Ψ on \mathbb{X} . Then, for each desired error bound $\varepsilon > 0$, the inequality

$$\|f(x, u) - f^\varepsilon(x, u)\| \leq \varepsilon (L_\Psi \|x\| + \Delta t \cdot \tilde{c} \|u\|) \quad (3.10)$$

holds for all $x \in \mathbb{X}$ and $u \in \mathbb{U}$ with some constant \tilde{c} if (3.7) holds provided $\{f(x, u), f^\varepsilon(x, u)\} \in \mathbb{X}$.

Proof. By local Lipschitz continuity of Ψ , $0 \in \text{int}(\mathbb{X})$ and $\|P_x\| \leq 1$ we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \|f(x, u) - f^\varepsilon(x, u)\| &= \|P_x (e^{\Delta t \mathcal{L}^u|_{\mathbb{V}}} - e^{\Delta t \mathcal{L}_d^u}) \Psi(x)\| \\ &\leq \| (e^{\Delta t \mathcal{L}^u|_{\mathbb{V}}} - e^{\Delta t \mathcal{L}_d^u}) (\Psi(x) \pm \Psi(0)) \| \\ &\leq \underbrace{\varepsilon \|\Psi(x) - \Psi(0)\|}_{\leq L_\Psi \varepsilon \|x\|} + \underbrace{\| (e^{\Delta t \mathcal{L}^u|_{\mathbb{V}}} - e^{\Delta t \mathcal{L}_d^u}) \Psi(0) \|}_{=: h(\Delta t)}, \end{aligned}$$

Then, using the Taylor series expansion for $h(\Delta t)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} h(\Delta t) &= h(0) + \Delta t \cdot h'(\xi) = 0 + \Delta t \cdot \left(e^{\xi \mathcal{L}^u|_{\mathbb{V}}} \mathcal{L}^u|_{\mathbb{V}} \pm e^{\xi \mathcal{L}_d^u} \mathcal{L}^u|_{\mathbb{V}} - e^{\xi \mathcal{L}_d^u} \mathcal{L}_d^u \right) \Psi(0) \\ &= \Delta t \left[\left(e^{\xi \mathcal{L}^u|_{\mathbb{V}}} - e^{\xi \mathcal{L}_d^u} \right) \mathcal{L}^u|_{\mathbb{V}} \Psi(0) + e^{\xi \mathcal{L}_d^u} (\mathcal{L}^u|_{\mathbb{V}} - \mathcal{L}_d^u) \Psi(0) \right] \end{aligned}$$

with $\xi \in [0, \Delta t]$. The second summand can be estimated by

$$\|e^{\xi \mathcal{L}_d^u}\| \|(\mathcal{L}^u|_{\mathbb{V}} - \mathcal{L}_d^u) \Psi(0)\| \leq c_1 \varepsilon \|u\| \quad (3.11)$$

with $c_1 := \max_{u \in \mathbb{U}, \xi \in [0, \Delta t]} \|e^{\xi \mathcal{L}_d^u}\|$, where we have used that the contribution of \mathcal{L}^0 and \mathcal{L}_d^0 cancels out thanks to $\Psi(0)$ and the control value acts as a multiplicative (constant) factor. The same line of reasoning shows $\|\mathcal{L}^u|_{\mathbb{V}} \Psi(0)\| \leq c_2 \|u\|$ with $c_2 := \max_{u \in \mathbb{U}} \|\mathcal{L}^u|_{\mathbb{V}}\|$. Combining this inequality with Inequality (3.7) of Proposition 6 and the derived Inequality (3.11) yields the assertion, i.e., Inequality (3.10) with $\tilde{c} := c_1 + c_2$. \square

In [49], a bound of the form (3.10) was assumed in the lifted space, i.e., without the projection P_x . Therein, the bound was used to construct a feedback controller achieving robust local stability using a finite gain argument.

In the following, the dependence of the right hand side of (3.10) on $\|x\|$ is key, since we get convergence of the error to zero if the state approaches the origin.

3.3 Problem statement

We will leverage the error bound of Proposition 8 to provide a stability result when using the surrogate model f^ε in Step (2) of the MPC Algorithm 2 to stabilize the original system with right hand side f . The main result will show that, if the nominal MPC controller is asymptotically stabilizing, the data-based controller with f^ε ensures convergence to a neighborhood of the origin, whose size depends on ε , i.e., practical asymptotic stability as defined in the following.

Definition 9 (Practical asymptotic stability). *For $\varepsilon > 0$, let μ_N^ε be the feedback law defined in Algorithm 2 with $f = f^\varepsilon$, where admissibility of control sequences at \hat{x} , i.e., $u \in \mathcal{U}_N^\varepsilon(\hat{x})$, is defined w.r.t. the tightened set $\mathbb{X} \ominus \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(0)$. Consider a set $A \subset \mathbb{X} \ominus \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(0)$ such that the optimal control problem defining μ_N^ε is feasible for all $\hat{x} \in A$. Then we say that the origin is semi-globally practically asymptotically stable on A with respect to the error ε if there is $\beta \in \mathcal{KL}$ such that the following holds:*

For each $r > 0$ and $R > r$ there is $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for each $\hat{x} \in A$ with $\|\hat{x}\| \leq R$ and all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$ such that (3.10) holds, the solution $x_{\mu_N^\varepsilon}(\cdot, \hat{x})$ of

$$x_{\mu_N^\varepsilon}(n+1) = f(x_{\mu_N^\varepsilon}(n), \mu_N^\varepsilon(x_{\mu_N^\varepsilon}(n))) \quad (3.12)$$

with $x_{\mu_N^\varepsilon}(0) = \hat{x}$ satisfies $x_{\mu_N^\varepsilon}(n; \hat{x}) \in A$ and

$$\|x_{\mu_N^\varepsilon}(n; \hat{x})\| \leq \max\{\beta(\|\hat{x}\|, n), r\} \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

The incorporation of the Pontryagin difference $\mathbb{X} \ominus \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(0)$ in the admissibility of control sequences for the surrogate model ensures that the original system evolves in the compact set \mathbb{X} , i.e., that every optimal control function is, in particular, admissible for the original system in view of the error bound of Proposition 6. In the following section, we will show that the error bound shown in Proposition 8 and cost-controllability of the original dynamics imply practical asymptotic stability of the closed-loop using data-based MPC.

4 Practical asymptotic stability of surrogate-based MPC

In this part, we prove the main result of this work, i.e., practical asymptotic stability of data-based MPC Algorithm 2 using the eDMD-based surrogate f^ε as defined in (3.9) to stabilize the original system given by f as defined in (3.5) or, equivalently, (3.8).

4.1 Approximation errors and stability

In this section, we follow the line of reasoning outlined in [19, Section 11.5]. To this end, in Proposition 10 we recall [19, Theorem 11.10] regarding *stability for perturbed solutions*, which is

key in our analysis. We define

$$V_N^\varepsilon(\hat{x}) := \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}_N^\varepsilon(\hat{x})} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \ell(x_u^\varepsilon(k; \hat{x}), u(k))$$

where $x_u^\varepsilon(0; \hat{x}) = \hat{x}$ and $x_u^\varepsilon(k+1; \hat{x}) = f^\varepsilon(x_u^\varepsilon(k; \hat{x}), u(k))$ for $k \in [0 : N-2]$.

Proposition 10. *Consider the NMPC-feedback law μ_N^ε obtained from Algorithm 2 with $f = f^\varepsilon$ with f^ε satisfying Condition (3.10) and let $S \subset \mathbb{X}$ be a set that is forward invariant w.r.t. $f^\varepsilon(\cdot, \mu_N^\varepsilon(\cdot))$. Further assume that the following hold:*

- (i) V_N^ε satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 3 in the following sense: There is $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ such that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$ the relaxed dynamic programming inequality

$$V_N^\varepsilon(x) \geq \alpha \ell(x, \mu_N^\varepsilon(x)) + V_N^\varepsilon(f^\varepsilon(x, \mu_N^\varepsilon(x)))$$

holds on S . Further there exist $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ such that for all $x \in S$

$$\alpha_1(\|x\|) \leq V_N^\varepsilon(x) \leq \alpha_2(\|x\|) \quad \text{and} \quad \ell(x, u) \geq \alpha_3(\|x\|)$$

hold for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$ and $u \in \mathbb{U}$.

- (ii) V_N^ε is uniformly continuous on closed balls $\overline{B}_\rho(0)$ in the following sense: There is ε_0 such that for each $\rho > 0$ there exists $\omega_V \in \mathcal{K}$ satisfying

$$|V_N^\varepsilon(x) - V_N^\varepsilon(y)| \leq \omega_V(\|x - y\|).$$

for all $x, y \in \overline{B}_\rho(0) \cap S$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$.

- (iii) f^ε is uniformly continuous on closed balls $\overline{B}_\rho(0)$, uniformly in u : There is $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for each $\rho > 0$ there exists $\omega_f \in \mathcal{K}$ satisfying

$$\|f^\varepsilon(x, u) - f^\varepsilon(y, u)\| \leq \omega_f(\|x - y\|)$$

for all $x, y \in \overline{B}_\rho(x^*) \cap S$, $u \in \mathbb{U}$, and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$.

Then the exact closed-loop system with perturbed feedback μ_N^ε defined in (3.12) is semiglobally practically asymptotically stable with respect to ε on $A = S$ in the sense of Definition 9.

4.2 Practical asymptotic stability of the eDMD-based surrogate model

We first verify the second condition of Proposition 10 in the following proposition.

Proposition 11 (Uniform continuity of f^ε). *Let $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ be given such that the error bound (3.7) holds with ε_0 . Then there is a constant $c(\varepsilon_0) \geq 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$*

$$\|f^\varepsilon(x, u) - f^\varepsilon(y, u)\| \leq c(\varepsilon_0)L_\Psi\|x - y\| \tag{4.1}$$

holds for all $x, y \in \mathbb{X}$ and $u \in \mathbb{U}$. Thus, condition (iii) of Proposition 10 holds true for $\omega_f(r) = c(\varepsilon_0)L_\Psi r$.

Proof. Since the error bound (3.7) holds with ε_0 and $\|P_x\| \leq 1$, we have

$$\|P_x e^{\Delta t \mathcal{L}_d^u}\| \leq \|e^{\Delta t \mathcal{L}_d^u}\| \leq \|e^{\Delta t \mathcal{L}_d^u} - e^{\Delta t \mathcal{L}^u}\| + \|e^{\Delta t \mathcal{L}^u}\| \leq \varepsilon_0 + \underbrace{\|e^{\Delta t \mathcal{L}^u}\|}_{=: c(\varepsilon_0)} \leq \varepsilon_0 + \max_{u \in \mathbb{U}} \|e^{\Delta t \mathcal{L}^u}\| \quad (4.2)$$

for all $u \in \mathbb{U}$ and all $d \geq d_0$. Further, for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$, $x, y \in \mathbb{X}$ and $u \in \mathbb{U}$, the claim follows from

$$\|f^\varepsilon(x, u) - f^\varepsilon(y, u)\| = \|P_x e^{\Delta t \mathcal{L}_d^u}(\Psi(x) - \Psi(y))\| \leq c(\varepsilon_0) \|\Psi(x) - \Psi(y)\| \leq c(\varepsilon_0) L_\Psi \|x - y\|.$$

□

Next, we show condition (i) of Proposition 10. To this end, we assume that the original system satisfies a sufficient condition for cost controllability and show that this controllability property is preserved for the data-based surrogate model (3.9). Cost controllability links stabilizability with the stage cost employed in MPC, see, e.g., [20, 56].

Proposition 12 (Condition (i) of Proposition 10). *Let the following cost-controllability-like assumption for the original dynamics (3.5) and the quadratic stage cost (3.2) hold: There is $(c_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with $\gamma := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n < \infty$ and a set $S \subseteq \mathbb{X} \ominus \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(0) \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ such that, for each $\hat{x} \in S$, there exists an admissible sequence of control values $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0} \in \mathcal{U}_N(\hat{x}) \cap \mathcal{U}_N^\varepsilon(\hat{x})$ with the property*

$$\ell(x_u(n; \hat{x}), u_n) \leq c_n \ell^*(\hat{x}) := c_n \cdot \inf_{u \in \mathbb{U}} \ell(\hat{x}, u). \quad (4.3)$$

Then there is a prediction horizon $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all sufficiently small $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, if the error bound (3.7) holds for $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$, condition (i) of Proposition 10 holds for the system dynamics (3.9).

Proof. First, we note that the lower bound on the optimal value function can be straightforwardly inferred from the choice of the stage cost in (3.2):

$$V_N^\varepsilon(\hat{x}) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}_N^\varepsilon(\hat{x})} J_N^\varepsilon(\hat{x}, u) \geq \inf_{u \in \mathbb{U}} \ell(\hat{x}, u) = \|\hat{x}\|_Q^2 \geq \lambda_{\min}(Q) \|\hat{x}\|^2,$$

where $\lambda_{\min}(Q) > 0$ denotes the minimal eigenvalue of the positive definite matrix Q . Let $\hat{x} \in S$ be arbitrarily chosen, but fixed. Further, invoking the assumption based on \hat{x} yields a sequence of control values $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ satisfying property (4.3). Let $\tilde{x}_u(n)$ and $x_u(n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, denote the trajectories governed by $\tilde{x}_u(n+1) = f^\varepsilon(\tilde{x}_u(n), u(n))$, $\tilde{x}_u(0) = \hat{x}$ and $x_u(n+1) = f(x_u(n), u(n))$, $x_u(0) = \hat{x}$, respectively. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(\tilde{x}_u(n), u(n)) &= \|\tilde{x}_u(n)\|_Q^2 + \|u(n)\|_R^2 \\ &= \|\tilde{x}_u(n) - x_u(n) + x_u(n)\|_Q^2 + \|u(n)\|_R^2 \\ &\leq \|\tilde{x}_u(n) - x_u(n)\|_Q^2 + 2\lambda_{\max}(Q) \|\tilde{x}_u(n) - x_u(n)\| \|x_u(n)\| + \ell(x_u(n), u(n)) \\ &\stackrel{(4.3)}{\leq} \|\tilde{x}_u(n) - x_u(n)\|_Q^2 + \frac{2\sqrt{c_n} \lambda_{\max}(Q)}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\min}(Q)}} \cdot \|\tilde{x}_u(n) - x_u(n)\| \|\hat{x}\|_Q + c_n \ell^*(\hat{x}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda_{\max}(Q) > 0$ denotes the maximal eigenvalue of the positive definite matrix Q . If (3.7) holds, then Proposition 8 yields the bound (3.10) on the difference of f and f^ε . Thus, we may estimate the term $e_n := \|\tilde{x}_u(n) - x_u(n)\|$:

$$e_n = \|f_\varepsilon(\tilde{x}_u(n-1), u(n-1)) \pm f(\tilde{x}_u(n-1), u(n-1)) - f(x_u(n-1), u(n-1))\|$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \varepsilon (L_\Psi \|\tilde{x}_u(n-1)\| + \Delta t \bar{c} \|u(n-1)\|) + L_f \|\tilde{x}_u(n-1) - x_u(n-1)\| \\ &= \varepsilon \bar{c} (\|\tilde{x}_u(n-1)\| + \|u(n-1)\|) + L_f e_{n-1} \end{aligned}$$

with $\bar{c} := \max\{L_\Psi, \Delta t \bar{c}\}$. Then, using the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{x}_u(n-1)\| &= \|\tilde{x}_u(n-1) - x_u(n-1) + x_u(n-1)\| \\ &\leq e_{n-1} + \|x_u(n-1)\| \stackrel{(4.3)}{\leq} e_{n-1} + \frac{\sqrt{c_{n-1}} \lambda_{\max}(Q)}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\min}(Q)}} \|\hat{x}\| - \|u(n-1)\| \end{aligned}$$

yields

$$e_n \leq (L_f + \varepsilon \bar{c}) e_{n-1} + \varepsilon \bar{c} \frac{\sqrt{c_{n-1}} \lambda_{\max}(Q)}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\min}(Q)}} \|\hat{x}\|. \quad (4.4)$$

Iterative application of the recursion (4.4) and using $e_0 := 0$ yields

$$e_n \leq \varepsilon \cdot \left(\frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q) \bar{c}}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\min}(Q)}} \sum_{i=1}^n (L_f + \bar{c} \varepsilon)^{i-1} \sqrt{c_{n-i}} \right) \|\hat{x}\|.$$

Overall, using $\ell^*(\hat{x}) = \|\hat{x}\|_Q^2$, we get the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(\tilde{x}_n(n), u(n)) &\leq \lambda_{\max}(Q) e_n^2 + \frac{2\sqrt{c_n} \lambda_{\max}(Q)}{\sqrt{\lambda_{\min}(Q)}} \cdot e_n \|\hat{x}\|_Q + c_n \ell^*(\hat{x}) \\ &\leq \left[\varepsilon^2 \frac{\lambda_{\max}(Q)^3 \bar{c}^2}{\lambda_{\min}(Q)} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (L_f + \bar{c} \varepsilon)^{i-1} \sqrt{c_{n-i}} \right)^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \varepsilon \frac{2\sqrt{c_n} \lambda_{\max}(Q)^2 \bar{c}}{\lambda_{\min}(Q)} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (L_f + \bar{c} \varepsilon)^{i-1} \sqrt{c_{n-i}} \right) + c_n \right] \ell^*(\hat{x}) =: c_n^\varepsilon \ell^*(\hat{x}). \end{aligned}$$

Next, we choose the prediction horizon N large enough such that $\alpha = \alpha(N) \in (0, 1)$ holds for α_N as introduced in [20, Theorem 5.4] and [56], i.e.,

$$\alpha = \alpha_N := 1 - \frac{(\gamma_2 - \omega)(\gamma_N - 1) \prod_{i=3}^N (\gamma_i - 1)}{\prod_{i=2}^N \gamma_i - (\gamma_2 - \omega) \prod_{i=3}^N (\gamma_i - 1)} \quad (4.5)$$

using the notation $\gamma_i := \sum_{n=0}^{i-1} c_n$ for $i \in [2 : N]$ and setting $\omega = 1$. Then, defining α^ε analogously using the coefficient sequence $(c_n^\varepsilon)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ instead and invoking $\lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} c_n^\varepsilon = c_n$, yields $\alpha^\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ for sufficiently small ε . Using this ε as ε^0 ensures the relaxed Lyapunov inequality for all V_N^ε , $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon^0]$ by applying [17, Theorem 5.2].

Last, the desired upper bound on the value function $V_N^\varepsilon(\hat{x})$ directly follows from the deduced cost controllability with $\alpha_2(r) := \lambda_{\min}(Q)^{-1} \cdot \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} c_n^\varepsilon \cdot r^2$. \square

We emphasize that condition (4.3) coincides with the one proposed in [17] except for the slight amendment that the respective control sequence has to be admissible for the surrogate model. While this may be a severe restriction close to the boundary of the set $\mathbb{X} \ominus \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(0)$, it is typically satisfied on a suitably chosen sub-level set of the optimal value function V_N in view of the finite prediction horizon N .

Remark 13. We may add a term $\omega \ell(x_u(N; \hat{x}), u(N))$ to the cost functional to be minimized in Step (2) of the MPC Algorithm 2, where $\omega \in [1, \gamma_2)$ denotes the terminal weight. Doing so may drastically reduce the required length of the prediction horizon N to ensure positivity of $\alpha = \alpha(N)$, see, e.g., [56].

We briefly provide an extension of the previous result, in which we replace the condition (4.3) by cost controllability as defined in [8] and [56] for continuous- and discrete-time systems, respectively. The proof is similar to the one of Proposition 12, but slightly more technical. Hence, we present the additional details in the appendix.

Proposition 14 (Cost controllability). *Assume that there is a monotonically increasing and bounded sequence $(B_k)_{k=1}^\infty \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that for all $x \in S \subseteq \mathbb{X} \ominus \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(0)$ the growth bound*

$$V_k(\hat{x}) \leq J_k(\hat{x}, u_{\hat{x}}^*) \leq B_k \ell^*(\hat{x}) \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N} \quad (4.6)$$

holds with the (optimal) sequence of control values $u_{\hat{x}} \in \mathcal{U}_N(\hat{x}) \cap \mathcal{U}_N^\varepsilon(\hat{x})$. Then, for all sufficiently small $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, if the error bound (3.7) holds for $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$, condition (i) of Proposition 10 holds for the system dynamics (3.9).

Finally, invoking our finding on cost controllability, we verify the third condition of Proposition 10 in the following. In the previous result we showed that the optimal value function V_N^ε is a Lyapunov function for the closed loop along the surrogate dynamics f^ε .

Proposition 15 (Uniform continuity of V_N^ε). *Let $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ be given such that the error bound (3.7) holds with ε_0 . Let $S \subset \mathbb{X} \ominus \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(0)$ and $\eta > 0$ be given such that, for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$, the optimal value function $V_N^\varepsilon(\hat{x})$, $\hat{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ is finite on S and the minimum is attained for a control function $u^* \in \mathcal{U}_N^\varepsilon(\hat{x})$ such that $x_{u^*}^\varepsilon(k; \hat{x}) \in \mathbb{X} \ominus \mathcal{B}_{\varepsilon+\eta}(0)$ for all $k \in [0 : N - 1]$. Then there is $L \geq 0$ such that*

$$|V_N^\varepsilon(y_1) - V_N^\varepsilon(y_2)| \leq L \|y_1 - y_2\| \quad \forall y_1, y_2 \in S$$

holds for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$. In particular, Condition (ii) of Proposition 10 holds with $\omega_V(r) = Lr$.

The assumption that $V_N^\varepsilon(x)$ is finite is, in view of compactness of the sets \mathbb{X} and \mathbb{U} , equivalent to the existence of an admissible sequence of control values, i.e., $\mathcal{U}_N^\varepsilon(x) \neq \emptyset$ and can be relaxed by restricting the assertion to some level set of V_N^ε contained in the compact set $\mathbb{X} \ominus \mathcal{B}_\varepsilon(0)$. The assumption that the minimum exists may be completely dropped and is only imposed to streamline the presentation, see, e.g., [19, p. 59] for details.

Proof. In combination with the uniform continuity of f^ε proven in Proposition 11, the assumption that $x_{u^*}^\varepsilon(k; \hat{x}) \in \mathbb{X} \ominus \mathcal{B}_{\varepsilon+\eta}(0)$ for all $k \in [0 : N - 1]$ implies the existence of some $\hat{\eta} > 0$ such that, for each $\hat{x} \in \mathbb{X}$, the optimal control $u^* \in \mathcal{U}_N^\varepsilon(\hat{x})$ remains admissible for all initial values from $\mathcal{B}_{\hat{\eta}}(\hat{x})$. That means that there exists at least one optimal sequence of control values for which the corresponding optimal trajectory is bounded away from the state constraints – uniformly w.r.t. the initial condition chosen in the set S .

Then, V_N^ε is uniformly bounded on S . This immediately shows the assertion for all $y_1, y_2 \in S$ satisfying $\|y_1 - y_2\| > \hat{\eta}$, see, e.g., [3] for a detailed outline of the construction. Hence, we only have to show the assumption for $y_1, y_2 \in S$ satisfying $\|y_1 - y_2\| \leq \hat{\eta}$.

Based on our assumption that an optimal sequence of control values exists, for every $y_2 \in \mathbb{X}$ there is $u_2^* \in \mathcal{U}_N^\varepsilon(y_2)$ such that $V_N^\varepsilon(y_2) = J_N(y_2, u_2^*)$ and

$$V_N^\varepsilon(y_1) - V_N^\varepsilon(y_2) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}_N^\varepsilon(y_1)} J_N(y_1, u) - \inf_{u \in \mathcal{U}_N^\varepsilon(y_2)} J_N(y_2, u) \leq J_N(y_1, u_2^*) - J_N(y_2, u_2^*),$$

where we invoked admissibility of u_2^* for y_1 . As $f^\varepsilon(\cdot, u)$ is uniformly Lipschitz continuous on S in ε , $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$, and $u \in \mathbb{U}$ as shown in Proposition 11, we get

$$\begin{aligned} V_N^\varepsilon(y_1) - V_N^\varepsilon(y_2) &\leq J_N(y_1, u_2^*) - J_N(y_2, u_2^*) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \|x_{u_2^*}^\varepsilon(k; y_1)\|_Q^2 - \|x_{u_2^*}^\varepsilon(k; y_2)\|_Q^2 \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \|x_{u_2^*}^\varepsilon(k; y_1) - x_{u_2^*}^\varepsilon(k; y_2)\|_Q^2 + 2x_{u_2^*}^\varepsilon(k; y_2)^\top Q(x_{u_2^*}^\varepsilon(k; y_1) - x_{u_2^*}^\varepsilon(k; y_2)) \\ &\leq \|Q\| \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \left(\|x_{u_2^*}^\varepsilon(k; y_1) - x_{u_2^*}^\varepsilon(k; y_2)\|^2 + 2\|x_{u_2^*}^\varepsilon(k; y_2)\| \|x_{u_2^*}^\varepsilon(k; y_1) - x_{u_2^*}^\varepsilon(k; y_2)\| \right) \\ &\leq \left[\|Q\| (c(\varepsilon_0)L_\Psi)^k \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \left((c(\varepsilon_0)L_\Psi)^k \|y_1 - y_2\| + 2\|x_{u_2^*}^\varepsilon(k; y_2)\| \right) \right] \|y_1 - y_2\| \end{aligned}$$

for all $y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{X}$, where we have invoked the derived Lipschitz continuity k times. Then, using that both $\|y_1 - y_2\|$ as well as $\|x_{u_2^*}^\varepsilon(k; y_2)\|$ are uniformly bounded for y_1 and y_2 belonging to the compact set \mathbb{X} , we have derived the inequality $V_N^\varepsilon(y_1) - V_N^\varepsilon(y_2) \leq L\|y_1 - y_2\|$. Analogously, inserting an optimal sequence of control values $u_1^* \in \mathcal{U}_N^\varepsilon(y_1)$ satisfying $V_N^\varepsilon(y_1) = J_N(y_1, u_1^*)$, we can analogously derive the inequality

$$V_N^\varepsilon(y_2) - V_N^\varepsilon(y_1) \leq J_N(y_2, u_1^*) - J_N(y_1, u_1^*) \leq L\|y_1 - y_2\|.$$

for all $y_1, y_2 \in S$. Combining both inequalities yields the assertion. \square

Remark 16. *The imposed (technical) condition w.r.t. $\eta > 0$ in the assumptions of Proposition 15 can, e.g., be ensured in view of Propositions 12 and 14 by choosing a sufficiently small sub-level set $\{x \in S : V_N^\varepsilon(x) \leq a\}$ such that $x_{u^*}^\varepsilon(k) \notin \mathbb{X} \ominus \mathcal{B}_{\varepsilon+\eta}(0)$ for some $k \in [1 : N-1]$ yields a contradiction in view of the quadratic penalization of that state in the stage cost and the assumed bound a on the sub-level set – similar to the construction used in [3].*

We now state the main result of this work.

Theorem 17 (PAS of eDMD-based MPC). *Let Assumption 5 hold and suppose that the assumptions of Proposition 15 hold. Further assume cost controllability, i.e., Condition (4.6), of the dynamics (3.5) and the stage cost (3.2) and that the prediction horizon N is chosen such that $\alpha_N^\varepsilon > 0$ holds for the respective suboptimality index defined by (4.5) with $\gamma_k = B_k^\varepsilon$.*

If the error bound (3.7) holds with $\varepsilon > 0$, then the eDMD-based MPC controller ensures semi-global practical asymptotic stability of the origin w.r.t. ε on the set S from Proposition 15.

Proof. By Propositions 11, 14 and 15, the bound (3.7) and the stated assumptions imply conditions (i)–(iii) of Proposition 10. This yields the claim. \square

Theorem 17 shows that the bound (3.7) is the key ingredient for PAS of eDMD-based MPC. In Proposition 6 we proved that such a bound can be guaranteed with probability $1 - \delta$. This allows to also deduce PAS with probability $1 - \delta$. Increasing the number of samples can then be used to either increase the confidence (that is, to reduce δ), or reduce ε which allows to shrink the set of PAS, i.e., reduce the radius $r > 0$ in Definition 9.

We conclude this section by briefly sketching a possible extension to stochastic dynamics.

Remark 18 (Stochastic dynamical systems). *The central error bound (3.7) is – with slight adaptation including an expected value – also transferable to the dynamics given by a stochastic differential equation with i.i.d. or ergodic sampling, cf. [37]. In this context, one would optimize an expected value and may then be able to derive a decrease of the corresponding optimal value function in expectation.*

5 Numerical simulations

In this section we conduct numerical simulations illustrating practical asymptotic stability of the origin for eDMD-based MPC as proven in Theorem 17. To this end, we consider two nonlinear two-dimensional control systems: the van der Pol oscillator and a simple pendulum.

5.1 Van-der-Pol oscillator

First, we consider the van-der-Pol oscillator, whose system dynamics is modeled as

$$\dot{x}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \dot{x}_1(t) \\ \dot{x}_2(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x_2(t) \\ \mu(1 - x_1^2(t))x_2(t) - x_1(t) + u(t) \end{pmatrix} \quad (5.1)$$

with the scalar parameter $\mu = 0.1$. Since the linearization at the origin is controllable, cost controllability holds for the quadratic stage cost (3.2), see, e.g., [56]. We consider the ODE (5.1) as a sampled-data system with zero-order hold as introduced in (3.5), where the integrals are numerically solved using the Runge-Kutta-Fehlberg method (RK45) with step-size control (Python function `scipy.integrate.solve_ivp`). This results in a discrete-time system

$$x_u(k+1; \hat{x}) = f(x_u(k; \hat{x}), u(k)), \quad x_u(0; \hat{x}) = \hat{x} \quad (5.2)$$

which serves as the ground truth. For the approximation of the Koopman operator on the set $\mathbb{X} = [-2, 2]^2$, eDMD as described in Section 2.2 is used. As dictionary of observables we choose all n_x -variate monomials of degree less or equal than three, resulting in a dictionary size of $M = 10$.

First, we inspect the open-loop error of the eDMD-based surrogate compared to the ground truth (5.2). In Figure 1, we show the results for a random but fixed control sequence u and different numbers of data points $d \in \{10, 50, 100, 1000, 10000\}$. The left plot of Figure 1 shows the average norm of the error for 100 initial conditions distributed uniformly over $\mathbb{X} = [-2, 2]^2$. As to be expected from Proposition 8, the open-loop error decreases for increased number of samples.

Next, we inspect the MPC closed-loop behavior. To this end, we define an optimal control problem with quadratic costs $J_N(\hat{x}, u) := \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \|x_u(k; \hat{x})\|_2^2 + \lambda \|u(k)\|_2^2$ subject to (5.2), $-5 \leq u(k) \leq 5$ for $k \in [0 : N-1]$ and $x(k) \in \mathbb{X}$ for $k \in [0 : N]$. In Figure 3, we compare the performance of the closed-loop of nominal MPC denoted by x_{μ_N} as defined in (3.3) and the closed-loop of eDMD-based MPC




Figure 1: Averaged error of eDMD-based solution for different number of data points (left) for fixed random control sequence (right).

$x_{\mu_{\tilde{N}}}$ defined in (3.12) for two choices of the control penalization parameter $\lambda \in \{0.05, 0.25\}$ and two optimization horizons $N \in \{30, 50\}$. The approximation of the Koopman matrix is performed using eDMD with the monomial dictionary described above and with $d = 10000$ i.i.d. data points.

In Figure 2, we depict the closed-loop behavior of nominal MPC in phase space. We see, that the state approaches the origin for all horizons $N \in \{30, 50\}$ and penalization parameters $\lambda \in \{0.05, 0.25\}$.




Figure 2: Phase portrait of closed-loop solution corresponding to (5.1) for nominal MPC.

Next, we compare the nominal MPC with eDMD-based MPC in Figure 3. For small control penalization parameter $\lambda = 0.05$, the norm of the closed-loop state corresponding to nominal MPC converges to the precision 10^{-12} of the optimization solver used. As to be expected, this convergence is faster for a longer prediction horizon. As proven in our main result Theorem 17, the eDMD-based surrogate only enjoys practical asymptotic stability, i.e., for both horizons the




Figure 3: Norm of closed-loop solution of (5.1) for nominal MPC (black) and eDMD-based MPC (gray) for horizons $N = 30$ (solid) and $N = 50$ (dashed) and penalization parameters $\lambda = 0.05$ (left) and $\lambda = 0.25$ (right).

convergence stagnates around 10^{-8} . More precisely, increasing the horizon only increases the convergence speed and does not lead to a lower norm at the end of the considered simulation horizon. The same qualitative behavior also can be observed for the larger control penalization $\lambda = 0.25$. Here, both nominal and eDMD-based MPC converge slower due to a higher control cost. However, the behavior of eDMD-based MPC is qualitatively the same: At around 10^{-8} , the convergence stagnates. The fact that this point of stagnation is the same for both horizons and both control penalization parameters illustrates that the bottleneck is the approximation quality of the eDMD-based surrogate.

In Figure 4, we illustrate the decrease of the optimal value function along the closed-loop trajectory. The behavior is qualitatively very similar to the norm of the solution depicted in Figure 3. Moreover, as a consequence of the established relaxed Lyapunov inequality (inferred from the imposed cost controllability in the proof of Proposition 12) of the original dynamics, the value function V_N is a Lyapunov function for the nominal closed loop, such that we observe a strict decrease over time. This is not the case for the eDMD-based MPC, for which we only proved *practical* asymptotic stability of the origin in Theorem 17. To this end, V_N^ε was shown to be a Lyapunov function for the surrogate system only, compare Propositions 12 and 14. Correspondingly, $V_N(x_{\mu_N}(\cdot; \hat{x}))$ only decreases outside of a neighborhood of the origin.

5.2 Simple pendulum

The second example we consider is the simple pendulum

$$\dot{x}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \dot{x}_1(t) \\ \dot{x}_2(t) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x_2(t) \\ 0.01x_2 - \sin(x_1) + u \end{pmatrix} \quad (5.3)$$

with angular displacement $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ and angular velocity $x_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. This system was also explored in the Lyapunov-based data-driven MPC approach of [36]. Again, we utilize the RK45 method to




Figure 4: Optimal value function along the closed-loop corresponding to (5.1) for nominal MPC (black) and eDMD-based MPC (gray) for horizons $N = 30$ (solid) and $N = 50$ (dashed) and $\lambda = 0.25$.

obtain a discrete dynamics of type (5.2) serving as the ground truth. For the approximation of the Koopman operator, the same set \mathbb{X} , the same observables, and the same number of training data points are used as in Subsection 5.1 for the van-der-Pol oscillator. Again, we consider the optimal control problem with quadratic costs $J_N(\hat{x}, u) := \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \|x_u(k; \hat{x})\|_2^2 + \lambda \|u(k)\|_2^2$ subject to the system dynamics, the control constraints $-5 \leq u(k) \leq 5$ for $k \in [0 : N - 1]$, and the state constraints $x(k) \in \mathbb{X}$ for $k \in [0 : N]$.




Figure 5: Norm of closed-loop solution of (5.3) for nominal MPC (black) and eDMD-based MPC (gray) for horizons $N = 30$ (solid) and $N = 50$ (dashed) and penalization parameters $\lambda = 0.05$ (left) and $\lambda = 0.25$ (right).

In Figure 5, we inspect the closed-loop results. The evolution of the optimal value functions are very similar to those in Subsection 5.1. For larger prediction horizon N and a smaller penalization

parameter λ the convergence is faster. For nominal MPC, the optimal value function converges to the precision of the optimal control solver used. The eDMD-based MPC feedback law again leads only to practical asymptotic stability as proven in Theorem 17, as the convergence stagnates around 10^{-8} for both horizons and control penalizations.

6 Conclusions and outlook

We proved practical asymptotic stability of data-driven MPC for nonlinear systems using extended Dynamic Mode Decomposition embedded in the Koopman framework. To this end, we provided a novel error bound, which shows that the approximation error vanishes if the lifted state approaches the origin. Further, we showed that cost controllability of the original model implies cost controllability of the data-based surrogate for quadratic stage cost. Last, we provided two numerical examples, i.e., the van der Pol-oscillator and a simple pendulum, to illustrate our findings and, in particular, the practical asymptotic stability of the origin.

Future work will generalize the derived results to more general stage cost, see, e.g., [8] and to economic MPC schemes based on dissipativity conditions, see, e.g., [18] and the references therein. Moreover, future work may also be devoted to include constraints resulting from cost controllability in the construction of the surrogate model. In addition, using trajectory-based data within the construction of the surrogate model might be considered, see, e.g., [44].

References

- [1] J. Berberich, J. Köhler, M. A. Müller, and F. Allgöwer. Data-driven model predictive control with stability and robustness guarantees. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 66(4):1702–1717, 2020.
- [2] P. Bevanda, S. Sosnowski, and S. Hirche. Koopman operator dynamical models: Learning, analysis and control. *Annual Reviews in Control*, 52:197–212, 2021.
- [3] A. Boccia, L. Grüne, and K. Worthmann. Stability and feasibility of state constrained mpc without stabilizing terminal constraints. *Systems & Control letters*, 72:14–21, 2014.
- [4] L. Bold, H. Eschmann, M. Rosenfelder, H. Ebel, and K. Worthmann. On Koopman-based surrogate models for non-holonomic robots. *Preprint arXiv:2303.09144*, 2023.
- [5] D. Bruder, X. Fu, and R. Vasudevan. Advantages of bilinear Koopman realizations for the modeling and control of systems with unknown dynamics. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 6(3):4369–4376, 2021.
- [6] S. L. Brunton, B. W. Brunton, J. L. Proctor, and J. N. Kutz. Koopman invariant subspaces and finite linear representations of nonlinear dynamical systems for control. *PloS one*, 11(2):e0150171, 2016.
- [7] A. Capone, A. Lederer, and S. Hirche. Gaussian process uniform error bounds with unknown hyperparameters for safety-critical applications. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2609–2624. PMLR, 2022.

- [8] J.-M. Coron, L. Grüne, and K. Worthmann. Model predictive control, cost controllability, and homogeneity. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 58(5):2979–2996, 2020.
- [9] J. Coulson, J. Lygeros, and F. Dörfler. Data-enabled predictive control: In the shallows of the deepc. In *18th European Control Conference (ECC)*, pages 307–312, 2019.
- [10] J. Coulson, J. Lygeros, and F. Dörfler. Distributionally robust chance constrained data-enabled predictive control. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 67(7):3289–3304, 2021.
- [11] R. F. Curtain and H. Zwart. *An introduction to infinite-dimensional linear systems theory*, volume 21. Springer New York, NY, 2012.
- [12] W. Esterhuizen, K. Worthmann, and S. Streif. Recursive feasibility of continuous-time model predictive control without stabilising constraints. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 5(1):265–270, 2020.
- [13] T. Faulwasser, R. Ou, G. Pan, P. Schmitz, and K. Worthmann. Behavioral theory for stochastic systems? a data-driven journey from Willems to Wiener and back again. *Annual Reviews in Control*, 2023.
- [14] C. Folkestad and J. W. Burdick. Koopman NMPC: Koopman-based learning and nonlinear model predictive control of control-affine systems. In *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 7350–7356, 2021.
- [15] D. Gadginmath, V. Krishnan, and F. Pasqualetti. Data-driven feedback linearization using the Koopman generator. *Preprint arXiv:2210.05046*, 2022.
- [16] D. Goswami and D. A. Paley. Bilinearization, reachability, and optimal control of control-affine nonlinear systems: A Koopman spectral approach. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 67(6):2715–2728, 2021.
- [17] L. Grüne. Analysis and design of unconstrained nonlinear mpc schemes for finite and infinite dimensional systems. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 48(2):1206–1228, 2009.
- [18] L. Grüne. Dissipativity and optimal control: Examining the turnpike phenomenon. *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, 42(2):74–87, 2022.
- [19] L. Grüne and J. Pannek. *Nonlinear model predictive control*. Springer Cham, 2017.
- [20] L. Grüne, J. Pannek, M. Seehafer, and K. Worthmann. Analysis of unconstrained nonlinear MPC schemes with time varying control horizon. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 48(8):4938–4962, 2010.
- [21] L. Grüne and A. Rantzer. On the infinite horizon performance of receding horizon controllers. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 53(9):2100–2111, 2008.
- [22] M. Haseli and J. Cortés. Learning Koopman eigenfunctions and invariant subspaces from data: Symmetric subspace decomposition. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 67(7):3442–3457, 2021.

- [23] L. Hewing, J. Kabzan, and M. N. Zeilinger. Cautious model predictive control using Gaussian process regression. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, 28(6):2736–2743, 2019.
- [24] T. Iwata and Y. Kawahara. Controlling nonlinear dynamical systems with linear quadratic regulator-based policy networks in Koopman space. In *60th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 5086–5091. IEEE, 2021.
- [25] M. Kanai and M. Yamakita. Linear model predictive control with lifted bilinear models by Koopman-based approach. *SICE Journal of Control, Measurement, and System Integration*, 15(2):162–171, 2022.
- [26] S. Klus, F. Nüske, S. Peitz, J.-H. Niemann, C. Clementi, and C. Schütte. Data-driven approximation of the Koopman generator: Model reduction, system identification, and control. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 406:132416, 2020.
- [27] M. Korda and I. Mezić. Linear predictors for nonlinear dynamical systems: Koopman operator meets model predictive control. *Automatica*, 93:149–160, 2018.
- [28] M. Korda and I. Mezić. On convergence of extended dynamic mode decomposition to the Koopman operator. *Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 28(2):687–710, 2018.
- [29] M. Korda and I. Mezić. Optimal construction of Koopman eigenfunctions for prediction and control. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 65(12):5114–5129, 2020.
- [30] A. Krolicki, D. Tellez-Castro, and U. Vaidya. Nonlinear dual-mode model predictive control using Koopman eigenfunctions. In *61st IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 3074–3079. IEEE, 2022.
- [31] X. Ma, B. Huang, and U. Vaidya. Optimal quadratic regulation of nonlinear system using Koopman operator. In *2019 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pages 4911–4916. IEEE, 2019.
- [32] G. Mamakoukas, M. L. Castano, X. Tan, and T. D. Murphey. Derivative-based Koopman operators for real-time control of robotic systems. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, 37(6):2173–2192, 2021.
- [33] W. Manzoor, S. Rawashdeh, and A. Mohammadi. Vehicular applications of Koopman operator theory—a survey. *IEEE Access*, 2023.
- [34] A. Mauroy and J. Goncalves. Linear identification of nonlinear systems: A lifting technique based on the Koopman operator. In *55th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 6500–6505, 2016.
- [35] A. Mauroy, Y. Susuki, and I. Mezić. *Koopman operator in systems and control*. Springer Cham, 2020.
- [36] A. Narasingam, S. H. Son, and J. S.-I. Kwon. Data-driven feedback stabilisation of nonlinear systems: Koopman-based model predictive control. *International Journal of Control*, 96(3):770–781, 2023.

- [37] F. Nüske, S. Peitz, F. Philipp, M. Schaller, and K. Worthmann. Finite-data error bounds for Koopman-based prediction and control. *Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 33(1):14, 2023.
- [38] S. E. Otto and C. W. Rowley. Koopman operators for estimation and control of dynamical systems. *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, 4:59–87, 2021.
- [39] S. Peitz, S. E. Otto, and C. W. Rowley. Data-driven model predictive control using interpolated Koopman generators. *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems*, 19(3):2162–2193, 2020.
- [40] F. Philipp, M. Schaller, K. Worthmann, S. Peitz, and F. Nüske. Error bounds for kernel-based approximations of the Koopman operator. *Preprint: arXiv:2301.08637*, 2023.
- [41] J. L. Proctor, S. L. Brunton, and J. N. Kutz. Dynamic mode decomposition with control. *SIAM J. Applied Dynamical Systems*, 15(1):142–161, 2016.
- [42] J. L. Proctor, S. L. Brunton, and J. N. Kutz. Generalizing Koopman theory to allow for inputs and control. *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems*, 17(1):909–930, 2018.
- [43] J. B. Rawlings, D. Q. Mayne, and M. Diehl. *Model predictive control: theory, computation, and design*, volume 2. Nob Hill Publishing Madison, WI, 2017.
- [44] M. B. Saltık, B. Jayawardhana, and A. Cherukuri. Iterative learning and model predictive control for repetitive nonlinear systems via Koopman operator approximation. In *61st IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 3059–3065. IEEE, 2022.
- [45] M. Schaller, K. Worthmann, F. Philipp, S. Peitz, and F. Nüske. Towards reliable data-based optimal and predictive control using extended DMD. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 56(1):169–174, 2023.
- [46] L. Shi and K. Karydis. Acq-edmd: Analytical construction for dictionaries of lifting functions in Koopman operator-based nonlinear robotic systems. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 7(2):906–913, 2021.
- [47] S. Sinha, S. P. Nandanoori, J. Drgona, and D. Vrabie. Data-driven stabilization of discrete-time control-affine nonlinear systems: A Koopman operator approach. In *2022 European Control Conference (ECC)*, pages 552–559, 2022.
- [48] S. H. Son, A. Narasingam, and J. S.-I. Kwon. Development of offset-free Koopman Lyapunov-based model predictive control and mathematical analysis for zero steady-state offset condition considering influence of Lyapunov constraints on equilibrium point. *Journal of Process Control*, 118:26–36, 2022.
- [49] R. Strässer, J. Berberich, and F. Allgöwer. Control of bilinear systems using gain-scheduling: Stability and performance guarantees. *Preprint arXiv:2304.04486*, 2023.
- [50] A. Surana. Koopman operator based observer synthesis for control-affine nonlinear systems. In *55th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 6492–6499, 2016.
- [51] P. van Goor, R. Mahony, M. Schaller, and K. Worthmann. Reprojection methods for Koopman-based modelling and prediction. *Preprint arXiv:2306.13331*, 2023.

- [52] H. J. van Waarde, C. De Persis, M. K. Camlibel, and P. Tesi. Willems’ fundamental lemma for state-space systems and its extension to multiple datasets. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 4(3):602–607, 2020.
- [53] J. C. Willems, P. Rapisarda, I. Markovskiy, and B. L. De Moor. A note on persistency of excitation. *Systems & Control Letters*, 54(4):325–329, 2005.
- [54] M. O. Williams, M. S. Hemati, S. T. Dawson, I. G. Kevrekidis, and C. W. Rowley. Extending data-driven Koopman analysis to actuated systems. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 49(18):704–709, 2016.
- [55] M. O. Williams, I. G. Kevrekidis, and C. W. Rowley. A data-driven approximation of the Koopman operator: Extending dynamic mode decomposition. *Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 25:1307–1346, 2015.
- [56] K. Worthmann. *Stability analysis of unconstrained receding horizon control schemes*. PhD thesis, University of Bayreuth, 2011.
- [57] S. Yu, C. Shen, and T. Ersal. Autonomous driving using linear model predictive control with a Koopman operator based bilinear vehicle model. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 55(24):254–259, 2022.
- [58] M. Zanon and S. Gros. Safe reinforcement learning using robust MPC. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 66(8):3638–3652, 2020.
- [59] C. Zhang and E. Zuazua. A quantitative analysis of Koopman operator methods for system identification and predictions. *Comptes Rendus. Mécanique*, 351(S1):1–31, 2023.
- [60] X. Zhang, W. Pan, R. Scattolini, S. Yu, and X. Xu. Robust tube-based model predictive control with Koopman operators. *Automatica*, 137:110114, 2022.

A Proof of Proposition 14

We present the proof of Proposition 14 for $Q = \text{Id}_{n_x}$ and $R = \text{Id}_{n_c}$ to keep it less technical. Furthermore, we focus on the required changes in comparison to the proof of Proposition 12.

Proof. Analogously to the proof of Proposition 12, one derives

$$\ell(\tilde{x}_u(n), u(n)) \leq \ell(x_u(n), u(n)) + 2e_n \|x_u(n)\| + e_n^2$$

and

$$e_n \leq \varepsilon \bar{c} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (L_f + \varepsilon \bar{c})^{i-1} (\|x_u(n-i)\| + \|u(n-i)\|) \right)$$

where $\bar{c} := \max\{L_\Psi, \Delta t \bar{c}\}$ with \bar{c} from Inequality (3.10) of Proposition 6. Combining both inequalities and using $\|x_u(k)\|^2 + \|u(k)\|^2 = \ell(x_u(k), u(k))$, $k \in [0 : N-1]$, yields for every $n \in [1 : N-1]$

$$\ell(\tilde{x}_u(n), u(n))$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \ell(x_u(n), u(n)) + \varepsilon^2 \bar{c}^2 (L_f + \varepsilon \bar{c})^{2(n-1)} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \ell(x_u(i), u(i)) \\
&\quad + 2\varepsilon \bar{c} (L_f + \varepsilon)^{n-1} \ell(x_u(n), u(n)) \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \ell(x_u(i), u(i)) \\
&\leq \ell(x_u(n), u(n)) + 2\varepsilon^2 \bar{c}^2 (L_f + \varepsilon \bar{c})^{2(n-1)} B_{n-1} \\
&\quad + 2\varepsilon \bar{c} (L_f + \varepsilon)^{n-1} \sqrt{B_{n-1}} \sqrt{B_n}.
\end{aligned}$$

Summing up these inequalities for $n \in [1 : N - 1]$ and using that the first summand in $\tilde{J}_N(\hat{x}, u)$ and $V_N(\hat{x})$ coincides, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{V}_N(\hat{x}) &\leq \tilde{J}_N(\hat{x}, u) \\
&\leq V_N(\hat{x}) + \varepsilon \bar{c} \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} (L_f + \varepsilon \bar{c})^n (\varepsilon \bar{c} (L_f + \varepsilon \bar{c})^{n-1} B_{n-1} + 2B_n).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the remaining argumentation remains unchanged. □