

Fast Switching in Mixed-Integer Model Predictive Control*

Artemi Makarow  and Christian Kirches 

Abstract—We derive stability results for finite control set and mixed-integer model predictive control and propose a unified theoretical framework. The presentation rests upon the inherent robustness properties of common model predictive control with stabilizing terminal conditions and techniques for solving mixed-integer optimal control problems by continuous optimization. Partial outer convexification and binary relaxation transform mixed-integer problems into common optimal control problems. We derive nominal asymptotic stability for the resulting relaxed system formulation and implement sum-up rounding to restore efficiently integer feasibility. If fast control switching is technically possible and inexpensive, we can approximate the relaxed system behavior in the state space arbitrarily close. We integrate input perturbed model predictive control with practical asymptotic stability. Numerical experiments support our theoretical findings and illustrate practical relevance of fast and systematic control switching.

I. INTRODUCTION

Formulating mixed-integer optimal control problems (MI-OCPs) for nonlinear dynamical systems significantly increases complexity compared to conventional OCPs. For practical applications, we can either transcribe a MI-OCP into a mixed-integer nonlinear program (MI-NLP) and apply the computational expensive branch-and-bound method as in [1] or we follow the numerically challenging variable time transformation in [2] that is based on a pre-defined switching sequence, see also [3]. For a survey on reformulating and solving generic MI-OCPs, refer to [4].

In this paper, we mainly focus on the integer approximation framework originally presented in [3], [5]. This framework applies three steps to generate an integer feasible but suboptimal solution to a MI-OCP: Partial outer convexification, relaxation, and integer reconstruction via sum-up rounding (SUR). Hence, we first transcribe a MI-OCP into a common OCP and then round its solution back into an integer feasible control trajectory in polynomial time. Sager et al. [5] show that the input and state approximation error are upper bounded and depend linearly on the largest sampling width. These dependencies on the maximum sampling width motivate fast switching. The tightest error bound for SUR follows from a dynamic programming argument [6].

Nonlinear mixed-integer model predictive control (MI-MPC) further lifts the complexity, as the question of stabilization now also arises. It is easy to imagine that stabi-

lization of a steady-state for a nonlinear system with discrete actuators is a challenging task. However, Rawlings and Riebeck [7] state by their Folk Theorem that the stability results for conventional MPC with stabilizing terminal conditions also hold for systems with continuous- and discrete-valued inputs. The key reason for this statement is that the input constraint set does not need to have an interior and thus permits some integer controls. MI-MPC continuous to be a relevant topic, and the current state-of-the-art is analyzed and discussed in the recent paper [8].

Note that partial outer convexification can be used to transform every finite control set OCP (FCS-OCP) into a binary-integer OCP (BI-OCP) [5]. In this case, MPC can only resort to integer (discrete-valued) controls for solving the stabilization task. The authors in [9], [10], [11] derive stabilizing properties of FCS-MPC for linear time-invariant systems based on robust control analysis and the construction of invariant sets. FCS-MPC is further employed in power electronics and is usually limited to a one-step horizon to satisfy real-time constraints with combinatorial optimization, see, for example, [12].

We, on the other hand, aim to integrate the integer approximation framework due to [5] with the inherently robust MPC as derived in [13], [14]. Our idea is to design nominal MPC in the relaxed domain and then determine maximum input perturbation bounds for robust control. The authors in [15] follow a similar idea, however, they derive stochastic tube-based MPC, where an additive disturbance term models the uncertainty induced by the SUR. An additional tracking controller is designed to follow robustly the nominal and relaxed reference trajectories. Related to our idea is also the work in [16]. Here, the authors propose a computationally demanding bi-level approach for switching systems. A second auxiliary and variable time OCP is used to minimize the impact of the rounding decisions induced by the solution of the switching minimizing mixed-integer linear program due to [17] on some first part of the relaxed and optimal control trajectory. Recursive feasibility only follows implicitly from a weak assumption that the terminal state constraint is always satisfied for every small input perturbation on the first part.

Implementing integer approximation approaches in the context of a receding horizon MI-MPC is not a new idea, however, has yet not been addressed in consideration of robust asymptotic stability. Recent publications on MI-MPC, relying on integer approximation strategies according to [5], [17], solve real-world problems as, for example, smart building heating [18] or controlling refrigeration systems [19]. Other existing contributions in this field of research investigate efficient numerical realizations as in [20], [21],

*Funded by the European Union. The views and opinions expressed are those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Council Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them. This work is supported by ERC grant SCARCE, 101087662.

The authors are with the Institute for Mathematical Optimization, Technische Universität Braunschweig, 38106 Braunschweig, Germany, {artemi.makarow,c.kirches}@tu-bs.de.

[22]. The work in [20] addresses, inter alia, closed-loop stability for shrinking horizon MI-MPC that is based on the real-time-iteration scheme due to [23].

Stability Terms. In the presentation of the results, we distinguish between three different stability terms: Asymptotic stability, \mathcal{P} -practical asymptotic stability, input-to-state stability (ISS). All three stability types assume local stability in the sense of Lyapunov, meaning that the nonlinear closed-loop system remains inside a small neighborhood of the origin though it undergoes a slight displacement from the origin, see, for example, [24], [25].

Asymptotic stability further assumes that the origin attracts the nonlinear closed-loop system. Although the closed-loop system approaches the origin, it may require an infinite number of steps to reach it, see, for example, [24], [25].

\mathcal{P} -practical asymptotic stability is a less restrictive stability term since it requires the attraction property only to hold outside some terminal positive invariant set \mathcal{P} , see [24]. This stability term therefore qualifies for the case of systematic input perturbations such as input rounding.

ISS considers external unknown disturbances. In the absence of external disturbance inputs, ISS is equivalent to asymptotic stability. In the presence of external disturbance inputs, ISS provides an upper state bound that depends on the disturbance inputs, see, for example, [26], [25].

Contributions. In Section II, we present in detail the transformation process from a FCS-OCP (or MI-OCP) into a common (discrete-time) OCP while discussing necessary modifications for the following stabilization task. At the end of Section II, we introduce a temporal oversampling grid with the aim of reducing the state error. In Section III, we exploit the inherent robustness properties of conventional MPC due to [14] and adopt them to the case of systematic input perturbations resulting from control rounding. As a result, we derive \mathcal{P} -practical asymptotic stability according to [24]. Section IV introduces SUR on the oversampling grid and shows that there always exists a temporal resolution for which we can ensure \mathcal{P} -practical asymptotic stability. In Section V, we substantiate our claims with a numerical example and show practical relevance of fast switching.

Notation. Let \mathbb{R}^n denote the n -dimensional vector space equipped with the Euclidean norm $\|\cdot\|$. The set of positive real numbers containing zero is denoted by \mathbb{R}_0^+ . For some subsets of the Euclidean space X and Y , $\mathcal{C}^k(X, Y)$ denotes the space of k -times differentiable functions $f : X \rightarrow Y$. Let us define the following classes of comparison functions: $\mathcal{K} := \{\alpha \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}_0^+, \mathbb{R}_0^+) \mid \forall x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}_0^+(x_1 < x_2 \implies \alpha(x_1) < \alpha(x_2)), \alpha(0) = 0\}$, $\mathcal{K}_\infty := \{\alpha \in \mathcal{K} \mid \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \alpha(x) = \infty\}$, $\mathcal{L} := \{\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}_0^+, \mathbb{R}_0^+) \mid \forall x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}_0^+(x_1 < x_2 \implies \lambda(x_1) > \lambda(x_2))\}$, $\mathcal{KL} := \{\beta \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}_0^+ \times \mathbb{R}_0^+, \mathbb{R}_0^+) \mid \beta(\cdot, y) \in \mathcal{K}, \beta(x, \cdot) \in \mathcal{L}\}$. The j th unit vector is defined by $\mathbf{1}^j$. Let $\mathcal{B}_\delta := \{x \in X \mid \|x\| \leq \delta\}$ denote the closed ball of radius $\delta > 0$. The symbol \odot represents the Hadamard product.

The symbol $\stackrel{!}{\leq}$ indicates the requirement “should be smaller than”.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

The following nonlinear and time-continuous ordinary differential equation defines the dynamical system of interest with state $\bar{x}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$, control $\bar{v}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_v}$, and time $t \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$:

$$\dot{\bar{x}}(t) = f(\bar{x}(t), \bar{v}(t)), \quad \bar{x}(0) = x. \quad (1)$$

We consider input constraints indicated by the set $\mathbb{V} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_v}$. Let $\bar{v} \in \mathcal{V}_{t_f} := \mathcal{PC}^1([0, t_f], \mathbb{V})$ be a piecewise continuously differentiable control function¹. The state trajectory $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{C}^0([0, t_f], \mathbb{R}^{n_x})$ is governed by the continuous vector field $f \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_v}, \mathbb{R}^{n_x})$, the initial state $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$, and follows from solving the initial value problem in (1):

$$\bar{x}(t) = \varphi_v(t, 0, x, \bar{v}) := x + \int_0^t f(\bar{x}(\tau), \bar{v}(\tau)) d\tau. \quad (2)$$

Assume that the last state at time t_f must be an element of the terminal set $\mathbb{X}_f \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$. The set of all feasible initial states is defined by:

$$\mathcal{X}_{t_f} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \mid \exists \bar{v} \in \mathcal{V}_{t_f} : \varphi_v(t_f, 0, x, \bar{v}) \in \mathbb{X}_f\}. \quad (3)$$

Further, we want to handle finite control sets of the form $\Omega := \{v^1, v^2, \dots, v^{|\Omega|}\} \subset \mathbb{V}$ with cardinality $2 \leq |\Omega| < \infty$. Let $\bar{v} \in \mathcal{V}_{t_f}^\Omega := \mathcal{PC}^1([0, t_f], \Omega) \subset \mathcal{V}_{t_f}$ denote the corresponding piecewise-continuous and discrete-valued control function.

A. Finite Control Set Optimal Control Problem

Assume that we have continuous stage cost functions $\ell_x \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}^{n_x}, \mathbb{R})$ and $\ell_v \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}^{n_v}, \mathbb{R})$ and a terminal cost function $J_f \in \mathcal{C}^0(\mathbb{R}^{n_x}, \mathbb{R})$, entering the total cost over the finite time horizon $t_f \in \mathbb{R}^+$ as follows:

$$I_{t_f}(\bar{x}, \bar{v}) := \int_0^{t_f} \ell_x(\bar{x}(t)) + \ell_v(\bar{v}(t)) dt + J_f(\bar{x}(t_f)). \quad (4)$$

The following two design Assumptions 1 and 2 are essential for the upcoming set-point stabilization task.

Assumption 1 (Steady-State Behavior): For some steady-state $(x_f, v_f) \in \mathcal{X}_{t_f} \times \mathbb{V}$, we have that $f(x_f, v_f) = 0$, $\ell_x(x_f) = 0$, $\ell_v(v_f) = 0$, and $J_f(x_f) = 0$.

Without loss of generality, we set the steady-state tuple (x_f, v_f) to $(0, 0)$.

Assumption 2 (Stage Cost Bounds): There exist functions $\alpha_{\ell_x}, \alpha_{\ell_v} \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ such that for all $x \in \mathcal{X}_{t_f}$ and all $v \in \mathbb{V}$ we have that $\alpha_{\ell_x}(\|x\|) \leq \ell_x(x)$ and $\alpha_{\ell_v}(\|v\|) \leq \ell_v(v)$.

Let us now define the FCS-OCP as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(FCS-OCP)} \quad & \min_{\bar{x}, \bar{v}} I_{t_f}(\bar{x}, \bar{v}) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \bar{x}(0) = x, \bar{x}(t_f) \in \mathbb{X}_f, \\ & \dot{\bar{x}}(t) = f(\bar{x}(t), \bar{v}(t)), \forall t \in [0, t_f], \\ & \bar{v} \in \mathcal{V}_{t_f}^\Omega. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Since the native FCS-OCP in (5) is not solvable by means of continuous optimization due to its finite control nature, we shall transform the FCS-OCP into a conventional OCP.

¹Recall that piecewise continuous functions are bounded (due to one-sided-limits) and continuous almost everywhere on compact intervals (due to finite discontinuity sets of zero measure), i.e., they are Riemann integrable.

Remark 1 (Continuous-Valued Controls): Without loss of generality, we omit continuous-valued controls $\bar{v} \in \mathcal{V}_{t_f}$ in (5) for brevity. The following partial outer convexification and relaxation approaches do not affect continuous-valued controls, such that the inclusion of continuous-valued controls would only increase the dimension of the optimization vector.

Remark 2 (Mixed-Integer OCP): The FCS-OCP in (5) inherently covers the formulation of a mixed-integer OCP. The following derivations do not distinguish between continuous- and integer-valued elements in the finite control set Ω .

B. Partial Outer Convexification and Relaxation

We now present a suitable approach for translating the discrete-valued FCS-OCP in (5) into a common continuous-valued OCP.

Following [5], we first apply outer convexification to the vector field f and the stage cost function ℓ_v with respect to the finite control set Ω . Then, we relax the convex multiplier in a second step to obtain a conventional OCP.

The compact set of convex multipliers satisfying the special ordered set of type 1 (SOS1) is given by [5], [6]:

$$\mathbb{S}^{|\Omega|} := \{s \in \{0, 1\}^{|\Omega|} \mid \sum_{i=1}^{|\Omega|} s_i = 1\}. \quad (6)$$

The SOS1 constraint establishes a bijection between the discrete-valued control functions $\bar{v} \in \mathcal{V}_{t_f}^\Omega$ and the following multiplier functions (see also [5], [6]):

$$\bar{\omega} \in \mathcal{S}_{t_f} := \mathcal{PC}^1\left([0, t_f], \mathbb{S}^{|\Omega|}\right). \quad (7)$$

We reformulate the system dynamics by successively substituting all control vectors of the finite control set Ω into the system dynamics and implementing multiplier functions for all $t \in [0, t_f]$ with $F: \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{|\Omega|}$ [3]:

$$F(\bar{x}(t))\bar{\omega}(t) := \sum_{i=1}^{|\Omega|} f(\bar{x}(t), v^i)\bar{\omega}_i(t) = f(\bar{x}(t), \bar{v}(t)). \quad (8)$$

The partial solution to the initial value problem in (1) with a tailored multiplier function $\bar{\omega}$ and initial state x_0 at time t_0 now results from:

$$\bar{x}(t) = \varphi(t, t_0, x_0, \bar{\omega}) := x_0 + \int_{t_0}^t F(\bar{x}(\tau))\bar{\omega}(\tau) d\tau. \quad (9)$$

Notice that the terminal constraint $\bar{x}(t_f) \in \mathbb{X}_f$, which can generally be casted into a system of inequality constraints, does not depend on $\bar{v}(t)$. Similar to the system dynamics, we apply outer convexification to the cost function ℓ_v for all $t \in [0, t_f]$ with $R \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times |\Omega|}$:

$$\ell_u(\bar{\omega}(t)) := R\bar{\omega}(t) := \sum_{i=1}^{|\Omega|} \ell_v(v^i)\bar{\omega}_i(t). \quad (10)$$

The overall finite horizon cost function is defined by:

$$J_{t_f}(\bar{x}, \bar{\omega}) := \int_0^{t_f} \ell_x(\bar{x}(t)) + \ell_u(\bar{\omega}(t)) dt + J_f(\bar{x}(t_f)). \quad (11)$$

Introducing convex multipliers transforms the FCS-OCP in (5) first into the BI-OCP as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(BI-OCP)} \quad & \min_{\bar{x}, \bar{\omega}} J_{t_f}(\bar{x}, \bar{\omega}) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \bar{x}(0) = x, \bar{x}(t_f) \in \mathbb{X}_f, \\ & \dot{\bar{x}}(t) = F(\bar{x}(t))\bar{\omega}(t), \forall t \in [0, t_f], \\ & \bar{\omega} \in \mathcal{S}_{t_f}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Note that the BI-OCP in (12) is still not solvable using continuous optimization. Therefore, we shall apply convex hull relaxation to obtain the following compact set [5], [6]:

$$\mathbb{U}^{|\Omega|} := \{u \in [0, 1]^{|\Omega|} \mid \sum_{i=1}^{|\Omega|} u_i = 1\}. \quad (13)$$

The multiplier functions are now elements of the following enlarged function space:

$$\bar{u} \in \mathcal{U}_{t_f} := \mathcal{PC}^1\left([0, t_f], \mathbb{U}^{|\Omega|}\right) \supset \mathcal{S}_{t_f}. \quad (14)$$

Null Space of R . Note that if $v_f \in \Omega$, then by bijection there is a $\omega_f \in \mathbb{S}^{|\Omega|}$ satisfying $F(x_f)\omega_f = f(x_f, v_f) = 0$ and, by Assumptions 1 and 2, also $\ell_u(\omega_f) = R\omega_f = \ell_v(v_f) = 0$. Hence, $\omega_f = \mathbf{1}^j$ is the only SOS1 admissible sample in the null space of R , which is $\ker(R) = \{0, \epsilon \mathbf{1}^j\}$ with $\epsilon \geq 0$ if j indexes v_f . Therefore, we do not need to introduce any regularization term.

The relaxation step invalidates the previously described bijective mapping, such that a relaxed steady-state control vector $u_f \in \mathbb{U}^{|\Omega|}$ with $u_f \notin \mathbb{S}^{|\Omega|} \subset \mathbb{U}^{|\Omega|}$ has no inverse control vector $v_f \in \Omega$ anymore. In this case, we observe that $\ell_u(u_f) = R u_f > 0$. However, since $F(x_f)u_f = 0$ with $u_f \notin \mathbb{S}^{|\Omega|}$ might be feasible, for example, for input affine systems, we shall perform a coordinate transformation to introduce a trivial steady-state. Let us redefine the stage cost function ℓ_u with $\bar{\xi}(t) := \bar{u}(t) - u_f$ for all $t \in [0, t_f]$:

$$\ell_u(\bar{u}(t)) := \sum_{i=1}^{|\Omega|} \ell_v(v^i) |\bar{u}_i(t) - u_{f,i}| := R |\bar{\xi}(t)| \geq 0. \quad (15)$$

The absolute value operator restricts the function values to be in the set $(0, \infty)$ since $u_f = 0$ is not SOS1 admissible. Now, we have that $\ell_u(u_f) = 0$ applies regardless of whether $u_f \in \mathbb{S}^{|\Omega|}$ or $u_f \notin \mathbb{S}^{|\Omega|}$.

The following Assumption 3 is important to ensure the existence of an admissible solution.

Assumption 3 (Constraint Sets): The terminal set $\mathbb{X}_f := \text{lev}_\pi J_f = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \mid J_f(x) \leq \pi\}$ contains x_f in its interior. The compact input set $\mathbb{U}^{|\Omega|}$ contains u_f .

We are now ready to present the resulting common OCP:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(OCP)} \quad & \min_{\bar{x}, \bar{u}} J_{t_f}(\bar{x}, \bar{u}) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \bar{x}(0) = x, \bar{x}(t_f) \in \mathbb{X}_f, \\ & \dot{\bar{x}}(t) = F(\bar{x}(t))\bar{u}(t), \forall t \in [0, t_f], \\ & \bar{u} \in \mathcal{U}_{t_f}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Note that the OCP in (16) is of infinite dimension and must therefore be discretized and parameterized in time for practical applications.

C. Time Discretization

The first step in deriving a finite dimensional optimization problem is to introduce a suitable time discretization.

Let us now specify the time grid on which the piecewise continuous functions $\bar{u} \in \mathcal{U}_{t_f}$ shall be implemented with the sampling width $\Delta t > 0$ and horizon length $N \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$t_0 = 0 < t_1 = \Delta t < \dots < t_N = N \Delta t. \quad (17)$$

Since the stability analysis in MPC is more intuitive in discrete-time, we define N control functions:

$$u_k \in \mathcal{U} := \mathcal{C}^1\left([0, \Delta t], \mathbb{U}^{|\Omega|}\right), k = 0, 1, \dots, N-1. \quad (18)$$

Hence, $\mathbf{u} = [u_0, u_1, \dots, u_{N-1}] \in \mathcal{U}^N$ denotes a sequence of functions (see, e.g., [24]) such that

$$\bar{u}(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{N-2} u_k(t) \chi_{(t_k, t_{k+1})}(t) + u_{N-1}(t) \chi_{(t_{N-1}, t_N)}(t), \quad (19)$$

where $\chi_{(t_k, t_{k+1})}$ and $\chi_{(t_{N-1}, t_N)}$ are indicator functions. In practice, we would implement, for example, polynomial control functions over Δt . The discrete-time state vector $x_k := \bar{x}(t_k)$ is only available at discrete time steps t_k . The corresponding transition map $f_{\Delta t} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathcal{PC}^1([0, \Delta t], \mathbb{U}^{|\Omega|}), \mathbb{R}^{n_x})$ follows by (see, e.g., [24, (2.8)]):

$$x_{k+1} = f_{\Delta t}(x_k, u_k) := \varphi(\Delta t, 0, x_k, u_k), u_k \in \mathcal{U}. \quad (20)$$

The following recursion equation describes the evolution of the discrete-time system:

$$\phi(k, x, \mathbf{u}) := \begin{cases} x & \text{if } k = 0, \\ f_{\Delta t}(\phi(k-1, x, \mathbf{u}), u_{k-1}) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

The set of all admissible control sequences is defined by:

$$\mathcal{U}_N(x) := \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}^N \mid \phi(N, x, \mathbf{u}) \in \mathbb{X}_f\}. \quad (22)$$

The feasible state space is therefore defined by:

$$\mathcal{X}_N := \{x \mid \mathcal{U}_N(x) \neq \emptyset\}. \quad (23)$$

Let equidistant time discretization also apply to the stage cost function as follows:

$$\ell_{\Delta t}(x_k, u_k) := \int_0^{\Delta t} \ell_x(\varphi(t, 0, x_k, u_k(t))) + \ell_u(u_k(t)) dt. \quad (24)$$

The following Assumption 4 is necessary for the stabilization of integer infeasible steady-states.

Assumption 4 (Steady-State Behavior after Relaxation):

For some steady-state $(x_f, u_f) \in \mathcal{X}_N \times \mathbb{U}^{|\Omega|}$, we have that $F(x_f) u_f = 0$.

By Assumptions 1 and 4, the transition map $f_{\Delta t}$ and the discretized stage cost function $\ell_{\Delta t}$ satisfy the discrete-time steady-state conditions $f_{\Delta t}(x_f, u_f) = x_f$ and also $\ell_{\Delta t}(x_f, u_f) = 0$. The overall finite horizon cost function in the discrete-time domain is as follows:

$$J_N(x, \mathbf{u}) := \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \ell_{\Delta t}(\phi(k, x, \mathbf{u}), u_k) + J_f(\phi(N, x, \mathbf{u})). \quad (25)$$

Now, consider the following discrete-time OCP (DT-OCP):

$$\text{(DT-OCP)} \quad V_N(x) := \min_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_N(x)} J_N(x, \mathbf{u}). \quad (26)$$

We assume that the DT-OCP in (26) is well-defined since the mappings $\mathbf{u} \mapsto \phi(k, x, \mathbf{u})$ and $\mathbf{u} \mapsto J_N(x, \mathbf{u})$ are continuous and valid on the compact set $\mathcal{U}_N(x) \neq \emptyset$ (see, e.g., [25, Prop. 2.4]). The optimal solution to the DT-OCP in (26) is denoted by $\mathbf{u}^* = [u_0^*, u_1^*, \dots, u_{N-1}^*] \in \mathcal{U}^N$. Note that the solution to the DT-OCP in (26) is not equal to the solution to the BI-OCP in (12) due to convex relaxation. Consequently, we cannot ensure an admissible projection on a solution of the FCS-OCP in (5). However, the DT-OCP in (26) serves as the baseline for \mathcal{P} -practical set-point stabilization with MPC in Section III.

D. Fast Sampling and Switching

Let us now introduce the fast sampling framework that shall form the basis for control rounding to restore integer feasibility. Recall that the optimal solution to DT-OCP in (26) is a sequence of relaxed multiplier functions, which might result in non-realizable controls for system (1).

We want to implement piecewise continuous functions u_n^{os} on intervals of length Δt :

$$u_n^{\text{os}} \in \mathcal{U}_{\Delta t} := \mathcal{PC}^1\left([0, \Delta t], \mathbb{U}^{|\Omega|}\right), n \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad (27)$$

Notice that $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{U}_{\Delta t}$ and thus we also observe that $u_0^* \in \mathcal{U}_{\Delta t}$. To refine u_n^{os} , we introduce the following time grid with step width $\delta t > 0$ and number of sampling steps $N_{\text{os}} \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$t_0 = 0 < t_1 = \delta t < \dots < t_{N_{\text{os}}} = N_{\text{os}} \delta t = \Delta t. \quad (28)$$

For this time grid, we redefine the transition map, while taking into account fast sampling:

$$x_{n+1} = f_{\Delta t}(x_n, u_n^{\text{os}}) := \varphi(\Delta t, 0, x_n, u_n^{\text{os}}), u_n^{\text{os}} \in \mathcal{U}_{\Delta t}. \quad (29)$$

Hence, for control, we can either use the optimal solution $u_0^* \in \mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{U}_{\Delta t}$ or implement a fast switching and also binary feasible control trajectory

$$u_n^{\text{os}} \in \mathcal{S}_{\Delta t} := \mathcal{PC}^1\left([0, \Delta t], \mathbb{S}^{|\Omega|}\right) \subset \mathcal{U}_{\Delta t} \quad (30)$$

since $\mathbb{S}^{|\Omega|} \subset \mathbb{U}^{|\Omega|}$. It is important to emphasize that we only implement fast sampling after the optimizer has converged on the coarser time grid (17) while solving DT-OCP (26).

III. PRACTICAL SET-POINT STABILIZATION

Using the optimal solutions to DT-OCP in (26) for closed-loop control on closed-loop intervals $[t_n, t_{n+1}]$ with $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ forms an autonomous system for which we need to ensure asymptotic stability properties.

We aim to asymptotically stabilize the steady-state (x_f, u_f) in \mathcal{X}_N for the following relaxed and autonomous system:

$$x_{n+1} = f_{\Delta t}(x_n, \mu(x_n)), \mu(x_n) := u_0^* \in \mathcal{U}_{\Delta t}, \forall x_n \in \mathcal{X}_N. \quad (31)$$

Thereby, we also want to transfer the binary-feasible and autonomous system

$$\check{x}_{n+1} = f_{\Delta t}(\check{x}_n, \mu_d(\check{x}_n)), \mu_d(\check{x}_n) \in \mathcal{S}_{\Delta t}, \forall \check{x}_n \in \mathcal{Y}_N \subseteq \mathcal{X}_N \quad (32)$$

in some small neighborhood of the steady-state, where it shall remain for all time steps. Here, $\mu_d(x) \in \mathcal{S}_{\Delta t} \subset \mathcal{U}_{\Delta t}$ denotes the state-dependent control law addressing control input rounding, which is derived from $\mu(x) \in \mathcal{U}_{\Delta t}$ via systematic approximation (follows in Section IV). We initialize both closed-loop systems with some feasible initial state $\check{x}_0 = x_0 \in \mathcal{Y}_N$. Let $\mathbf{u}_\mu := [\mu(x_0), \mu(x_1), \dots]$ and $\mathbf{u}_{\mu_d} := [\mu_d(\check{x}_0), \mu_d(\check{x}_1), \dots]$ denote infinite closed-loop control sequences.

A. Nominal Stability with Stabilizing Terminal Ingredients

We first want to make sure that our time-continuous formulation and the assumptions we made in Section II are sufficient to establish asymptotic stability of the origin for the discretized and nominal system (31) in \mathcal{X}_N .

The following Assumption 5 is particularly important and ensures both recursive feasibility of the terminal set \mathbb{X}_f and asymptotic stability of the origin in \mathbb{X}_f for the nonlinear system (20).

Assumption 5 (Control Invariant Terminal Set): There exists a stabilizing terminal control law $\mu_f : \mathbb{X}_f \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{X}_f$ it holds that:

$$f_{\Delta t}(x, \mu_f(x)) \in \mathbb{X}_f, \quad (33)$$

$$J_f(f_{\Delta t}(x, \mu_f(x))) - J_f(x) \leq -\ell_{\Delta t}(x, \mu_f(x)). \quad (34)$$

The function J_f serves as a local control Lyapunov function for the nonlinear system (20). Conventional MPC with stabilizing terminal conditions inherits the stabilizing properties of μ_f in \mathbb{X}_f and adopts them to the feasible state space \mathcal{X}_N [27], [25]. In [28], the authors present a possible procedure for determining a control invariant terminal set $\mathbb{X}_f = \text{lev}_\pi J_f$.

Proposition 3.1 (Asymptotic Stability After Relaxation): Suppose Assumptions 1-5 hold. Then the optimal value function V_N is a Lyapunov function for all $x \in \mathcal{X}_N$ with $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$:

$$\alpha_1(\|x\|) \leq V_N(x) \leq \alpha_2(\|x\|), \quad (35)$$

$$V_N(f_{\Delta t}(x, \mu(x))) \leq V_N(x) - \alpha_1(\|x\|). \quad (36)$$

The origin is asymptotically stable in the positive invariant set \mathcal{X}_N for the relaxed closed-loop system (31) such that for all $x \in \mathcal{X}_N$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we have that:

$$\|\phi(n, x, \mathbf{u}_\mu)\| \leq \beta(\|x\|, n), \quad \beta \in \mathcal{KL}. \quad (37)$$

Proof: a) The cost functions and the transition map $\ell_{\Delta t}$, J_f and $f_{\Delta t}$, respectively, are continuous by definition.

b) From Assumptions 1 and 4, we obtain the discrete-time steady-state conditions $f_{\Delta t}(0, u_f) = 0$ and $\ell_{\Delta t}(0, u_f) = 0$.

c) Since the input constraint set $\mathbb{U}^{|\Omega|}$ is compact, all control functions in $\mathcal{P}C^1([0, \Delta t], \mathbb{U}^{|\Omega|})$ are bounded, see also Remark A6. By Assumption 3, $\text{lev}_\pi V_N$ contains x_f in its interior.

d) Due to Assumption 2, the fact that $\ell_u(u) \geq 0$ for all $u \in \mathbb{U}^{|\Omega|}$, and the definition of the discretized stage cost function in (24), there exists a function $\alpha_1 = \alpha_{\ell_{\Delta t}} \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ such that for all $x \in \mathcal{X}_N$ and $u \in \mathcal{U}_{\Delta t}$ we have that:

$$\alpha_{\ell_{\Delta t}}(\|x\|) \leq \int_0^{\Delta t} \ell_x(\varphi(t, 0, x, u(t))) \leq \ell_{\Delta t}(x, u). \quad (38)$$

e) Since J_f is continuous at the origin and locally bounded on the compact set $\mathbb{X}_f = \text{lev}_\pi J_f$, see Assumption 3, there exists a function $\alpha_{J_f} \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{X}_f$ we have that [29], [14]:

$$J_f(x) \leq \alpha_{J_f}(\|x\|). \quad (39)$$

f) Together with Assumption 5, we have all the common stabilizing conditions in Theorem A1 together.

We rely on Theorem A1 to verify that V_N is a valid Lyapunov function and on Theorem A2 to derive asymptotic stability from this Lyapunov function. ■

B. Inherent Robustness to Input Perturbations

Restoring integer feasibility implies the need to round the relaxed control inputs. The deviation from the optimal control value can be interpreted as an input perturbation. Before we specify the integer-feasible control law μ_d more precisely, we want to integrate general input perturbed systems with the inherent robustness properties of nominal MPC with stabilizing terminal conditions due to [13], [14].

The authors in [13], [14], [25] show that nominal MPC is robust to small external state disturbances that are treated as bounded exogenous inputs. Since there is no guarantee that the optimal value function V_N is continuous, we cannot derive ISS from it [26]. Allan et al. [14], however, show that suboptimal MPC, which rests upon the continuous cost function J_N and an extended state containing the warm-start control sequence $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}(x)$, does fulfill ISS based on J_N . To proof ISS based on the optimal value function V_N , we would need to localize the set of discontinuities of V_N following [30], which is difficult for arbitrary OCPs. More constructive derivations for inherent robustness of nominal MPC based on the optimal value function V_N are given in [13] for continuous-time systems and in [25, Chap. 3.2.4] for discrete-time systems. Here, the authors show robust positive invariance and a sufficient cost decay to reach some small and positive invariant neighborhood of the steady-state in the presence of external and bounded disturbances.

We, in contrast, consider deterministic input perturbations rather than unknown external disturbances. Therefore, we formally integrate the derivations from [14], [25] with the definition of \mathcal{P} -practical asymptotic stability according to [24].

According to [14], [25], let $\mathcal{Y}_N := \text{lev}_\rho V_N := \{x \in \mathcal{X}_N \mid V_N(x) \leq \rho\}$ be the largest compact sublevel set of the optimal value function V_N that is fully contained in \mathcal{X}_N . Further, let us define the warm-start control sequence by:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{u}}(x) = [u_1^*, u_2^*, \dots, u_{N-1}^*, \mu_f(\phi(N, x, \mathbf{u}^*(x)))]. \quad (40)$$

The following derivations are mainly based on [14]. To evaluate the difference between the evolution of the nominal

and the input perturbed system in (31) and (32), respectively, we rely on the the following Lemma 3.2, wich originates from [14, Prop. 20].

Lemma 3.2 (See [14]): Define $C \subseteq D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ with C compact and D closed. Let $g \in \mathcal{C}^0(D, \mathbb{R}^{n_x})$ be a continuous mapping. Then there exists a function $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ such that for all $x \in D$ and $y \in C$ we have that $\|g(x) - g(y)\| \leq \alpha(\|x - y\|)$.

Proposition 3.3 (Stability With Input Perturbations):

Suppose Assumptions 1-5 hold. There exists some small $\gamma > 0$ for all $x \in \text{lev}_\rho V_N$ with

$$\|f_{\Delta t}(x, \mu_d(x)) - f_{\Delta t}(x, \mu(x))\| \leq \gamma \quad (41)$$

such that $\text{lev}_\rho V_N$ and $\mathcal{P} := \text{lev}_\kappa V_N \subset \text{lev}_\rho V_N$ with $\kappa < \rho$ are positive invariant sets for system (32). In addition, the optimal value function V_N is a Lyapunov function on the set $\text{lev}_\rho V_N \setminus \mathcal{P}$ for system (32) with $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$:

$$\alpha_1(\|x\|) \leq V_N(x) \leq \alpha_2(\|x\|), \quad (42)$$

$$V_N(f_{\Delta t}(x, \mu_d(x))) \leq V_N(x) - \alpha_3(\|x\|). \quad (43)$$

The origin is therefore \mathcal{P} -practically asymptotically stable in the positive invariant set $\text{lev}_\rho V_N$ for system (32) such that for all $x \in \text{lev}_\rho V_N$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $\phi(n, x, \mathbf{u}_{\mu_d}) \notin \mathcal{P}$ we have that:

$$\|\phi(n, x, \mathbf{u}_{\mu_d})\| \leq \tilde{\beta}(\|x\|, n), \quad \tilde{\beta} \in \mathcal{KL}. \quad (44)$$

Proof: The lower and upper bounds α_1 and α_2 follow from Proposition 3.1 and rely on Assumptions 1-3. To proof \mathcal{P} -practical asymptotic stability, we first combine the derivations in [14] (asymptotic stability, suboptimal MPC) and [25, Chap. 3.2.4] (exponential stability, optimal MPC). Then, we derive a cost decay bound $\alpha_3 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$. Let $\tilde{x}_+ := f_{\Delta t}(x, \mu_d(x))$ and $x_+ := f_{\Delta t}(x, \mu(x))$.

1) *Terminal Constraint Satisfaction:* We have continuous mappings $\tilde{x}_+ \mapsto \tilde{x}_+[N] := \phi(N, \tilde{x}_+, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}(x))$ and $x_+ \mapsto x_+[N] := \phi(N, x_+, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}(x))$. Based on Lemma 3.2, for all $x, x_+ \in \text{lev}_\rho V_N$ and $\tilde{x}_+ \in \mathcal{X}_N$ we have that (see [14]):

$$\|J_f(\tilde{x}_+[N]) - J_f(x_+[N])\| \leq \alpha_{J_f}(\|\tilde{x}_+ - x_+\|), \quad \alpha_{J_f} \in \mathcal{K}_\infty. \quad (45)$$

We drop the absolute value and obtain (see [14]):

$$J_f(\tilde{x}_+[N]) \leq J_f(x_+[N]) + \alpha_{J_f}(\|\tilde{x}_+ - x_+\|). \quad (46)$$

After inserting the nominal cost decrease from Assumption 5 with $x_n^*[N] := \phi(N, x, \mathbf{u}^*(x))$ we obtain (see [14]):

$$J_f(\tilde{x}_+[N]) \leq J_f(x_n^*[N]) - \alpha_{\ell_{\Delta t}}(\|x_n^*[N]\|) + \alpha_{J_f}(\|\tilde{x}_+ - x_+\|). \quad (47)$$

Following [14], if $\alpha_{J_f}(x_n^*[N]) \geq J_f(x_n^*[N]) \geq \pi/\tau$ with $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$, we have that $x_n^*[N] \geq \alpha_{J_f}^{-1}(\pi/\tau)$ such that the worst-case inequality is:

$$J_f(\tilde{x}_+[N]) \leq \pi - \alpha_{\ell_{\Delta t}}\left(\left\|\alpha_{J_f}^{-1}\left(\frac{\pi}{\tau}\right)\right\|\right) + \alpha_{J_f}(\|\tilde{x}_+ - x_+\|) \stackrel{!}{\leq} \pi. \quad (48)$$

The case $J_f(x_n^*[N]) < \pi/\tau$ implies the following worst-case inequality (see [14]):

$$J_f(\tilde{x}_+[N]) \leq \pi/\tau - 0 + \alpha_{J_f}(\|\tilde{x}_+ - x_+\|) \stackrel{!}{\leq} \pi. \quad (49)$$

If $J_f(\tilde{x}_+[N]) \leq \pi$, the warm-start is admissible with $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}(x) \in \mathcal{U}_N(\tilde{x}_+)$. Therefore, $\tilde{x}_+ \in \mathcal{X}_N$. To robustly satisfy the terminal constraint, we therefore demand that (see also [14]):

$$\|\tilde{x}_+ - x_+\| \stackrel{!}{\leq} \gamma_1 := \alpha_{J_f}^{-1}\left(\pi - \min_{\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}} \max\left\{\frac{\pi}{\tau}, \pi - \alpha_{\ell_{\Delta t}}\left(\left\|\alpha_{J_f}^{-1}\left(\frac{\pi}{\tau}\right)\right\|\right)\right\}\right). \quad (50)$$

Notice that if $\pi > 0$, we have that $\gamma_1 > 0$, otherwise $\gamma_1 \geq 0$. If the warm-start is admissible, we assume that the optimal solution will also be admissible.

2) *Positive Invariance:* We again rely on Lemma 3.2 and examine the continuous finite horizon cost function for all $x, x_+ \in \text{lev}_\rho V_N$ and $\tilde{x}_+ \in \mathcal{X}_N$ with $\alpha_{J_N} \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ (see [14]):

$$\|J_N(\tilde{x}_+, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}(x)) - J_N(x_+, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}(x))\| \leq \alpha_{J_N}(\|\tilde{x}_+ - x_+\|). \quad (51)$$

From Proposition 3.1, we know that $V_N(x_+) \leq J_N(x_+, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}(x)) \leq V_N(x) - \alpha_{\ell_{\Delta t}}(\|x\|)$ such that we obtain (see also [25, Chap. 3.2.4]):

$$V_N(\tilde{x}_+) \leq V_N(x) - \alpha_{\ell_{\Delta t}}(\|x\|) + \alpha_{J_N}(\|\tilde{x}_+ - x_+\|). \quad (52)$$

According to [14], if $\alpha_2(\|x\|) \geq V_N(x) \geq \rho/\tau$, we have that $\|x\| \geq \alpha_2^{-1}(\rho/\tau)$ such that the worst-case inequality is:

$$V_N(\tilde{x}_+) \leq \rho - \alpha_{\ell_{\Delta t}}\left(\left\|\alpha_2^{-1}\left(\frac{\rho}{\tau}\right)\right\|\right) + \alpha_{J_N}(\|\tilde{x}_+ - x_+\|) \stackrel{!}{\leq} \rho. \quad (53)$$

The case $V_N(x) < \rho/\tau$ implies the following worst-case inequality (see [14]):

$$V_N(\tilde{x}_+) \leq \rho/\tau - 0 + \alpha_{J_N}(\|\tilde{x}_+ - x_+\|) \stackrel{!}{\leq} \rho. \quad (54)$$

If $V_N(\tilde{x}_+) \leq \rho$, the level set $\text{lev}_\rho V_N$ is positive invariant for system (32) with $f_{\Delta t}(x, \mu_d(x)) \in \text{lev}_\rho V_N$ for all $x \in \text{lev}_\rho V_N$. To ensure positive invariance of $\text{lev}_\rho V_N$, we thus demand that (see also [14]):

$$\|\tilde{x}_+ - x_+\| \stackrel{!}{\leq} \gamma_2 := \alpha_{J_N}^{-1}\left(\rho - \min_{\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}} \max\left\{\frac{\rho}{\tau}, \rho - \alpha_{\ell_{\Delta t}}\left(\left\|\alpha_2^{-1}\left(\frac{\rho}{\tau}\right)\right\|\right)\right\}\right). \quad (55)$$

Again, if $\rho > 0$, we have that $\gamma_2 > 0$.

It is obvious that $\text{lev}_\kappa V_N \subset \text{lev}_\rho V_N$ is a terminal positive invariant set for the input perturbed system (32) if for some $\kappa < \rho$ we can ensure that (see also [25, Sec. 3.2.4]):

$$\|\tilde{x}_+ - x_+\| \stackrel{!}{\leq} \gamma_3 := \alpha_{J_N}^{-1}\left(\kappa - \min_{\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}} \max\left\{\frac{\kappa}{\tau}, \kappa - \alpha_{\ell_{\Delta t}}\left(\left\|\alpha_2^{-1}\left(\frac{\kappa}{\tau}\right)\right\|\right)\right\}\right). \quad (56)$$

3) *Cost Decay:* For a cost decay in the asymptotic sense, we want to ensure that $V_N(\tilde{x}_+) < V_N(x)$ for $\|x\| > 0$. From (52), we deduce that (see also [25, Chap. 3.2.4]):

$$\|\tilde{x}_+ - x_+\| \stackrel{!}{\leq} \alpha_{J_N}^{-1}(\alpha_{\ell_{\Delta t}}(\|x\|)). \quad (57)$$

Notice that for $\|x\| \rightarrow 0$, the perturbation bound also tends to zero. At the boundary of $\text{lev}_\kappa V_N$, we have that $V_N(x) = \kappa \leq \alpha_2(\|x\|)$. From this, we obtain $\|x\| \geq \delta := \alpha_2^{-1}(\kappa)$ and the more conservative bound (see also [25, Chap. 3.2.4]):

$$\|\tilde{x}_+ - x_+\| \stackrel{!}{\leq} \gamma_4 := \alpha_{J_N}^{-1}(\alpha_{\ell_{\Delta t}}(\alpha_2^{-1}(\kappa))). \quad (58)$$

This bound γ_4 is always greater than zero as long as $\kappa > 0$.

4) Cost Decay Comparison Function: To define a proper cost decay of the optimal value function, we must consider the worst-case scenario $\gamma_4 = \min\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4\}$. Recall that $\alpha_{\ell_{\Delta t}}(s) - \alpha_{J_N}(\gamma_4) > 0$ only holds as long as $s > \delta$ (see (52) and (58)). Therefore, we use an infinitesimally small part of the robustness margin $0 < \epsilon \ll \min\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4\}$ to lift $\alpha_{\ell_{\Delta t}}(\delta) - \alpha_{J_N}(\gamma_4)$ by introducing $\gamma := \min\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4\} - \epsilon > 0$. Define the cost decay function

$$\alpha_3(s) := \begin{cases} \alpha(s) & \text{if } s < \delta, \\ \alpha_{\ell_{\Delta t}}(s) - \alpha_{J_N}(\gamma) & \text{if } s \geq \delta, \end{cases} \quad (59)$$

where $\alpha \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ also shall satisfy $\alpha(\delta) = \alpha_{\ell_{\Delta t}}(\delta) - \alpha_{J_N}(\gamma)$. The specific choice of α is not relevant since we only strive for \mathcal{P} -practical asymptotic stability. However, we claim that $\alpha_3 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$.

We summarize that the optimal value function V_N is a valid Lyapunov function on the set $\text{lev}_\rho V_N \setminus \mathcal{B}_\delta$ for system (32) with $\mathcal{B}_\delta \subseteq \text{lev}_\kappa V_N$. The closed ball \mathcal{B}_δ is a subset of $\text{lev}_\kappa V_N$ since $\|x\| = \delta = \alpha_2^{-1}(\kappa)$ in (58) is the minimum Euclidean distance in $\text{lev}_\kappa V_N$. The control law μ_d renders both sets $\text{lev}_\rho V_N$ and $\mathcal{P} := \text{lev}_\kappa V_N$ positive invariant if it adheres to the perturbation bound γ . \mathcal{P} -Practical asymptotic stability finally follows from Theorem A3. ■

Remark 3 (Uniform Boundedness Over Δt): If the solution to the continuous-time system (8) is uniformly bounded over Δt , meaning that $\|\varphi(t, 0, x, \mu_d(x))\| \leq \vartheta(\|x\|)$ holds for all $t \in [0, \Delta t]$ with $\vartheta \in \mathcal{K}$, we also obtain \mathcal{P} -practical asymptotic stability in the continuous-time sense [24, Thm. 2.27].

IV. CONTROL INPUT ROUNDING

The idea is to derive the integer feasible control law $\mu_d(x)$ from the relaxed control law $\mu(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}_N$. From [5], [6], we extract that if the rounding error is bounded, then the state deviation is also bounded. We tailor the continuous-time formulation in [5], [6] to our discrete-time system and only consider fixed horizon lengths of Δt .

In order to adopt the results from [5], [6], we require further mild assumptions about the original system properties.

Assumption 6 (Lipschitz Continuity): The vector field f is Lipschitz continuous in its first argument on every compact subset of \mathcal{X}_{t_τ} with Lipschitz constant $L > 0$.

Assumption 7 (Differentiability): The continuous mapping $t \mapsto f(\bar{x}(t), v^i)$ is differentiable and its derivative admits an upper bound $C > 0$ such that

$$\left\| \frac{d}{dt} f(\bar{x}(t), v^i) \right\| \leq C \quad (60)$$

holds for all $v^i \in \Omega$ and all $t \in [0, t_\tau]$ with $\bar{x}(t) \in \mathcal{X}_{t_\tau}$.

Assumption 8 (Boundedness): The continuous mapping $t \mapsto f(\bar{x}(t), v^i)$ is bounded by some $M > 0$ such that

$$\|f(\bar{x}(t), v^i)\| \leq M \quad (61)$$

holds for all $v^i \in \Omega$ and all $t \in [0, t_\tau]$ with $\bar{x}(t) \in \mathcal{X}_{t_\tau}$.

Proposition 4.1 (Upper Approximation Bound, see [5]): Suppose that Assumptions 6-8 hold. Assume that the perturbed control law $\mu_d(x)$ satisfies the following integral pseudo metric for all $x \in \mathcal{X}_N$ with some $\sigma > 0$:

$$\sup_{t \in [0, \Delta t]} \left\| \int_0^t \mu(x)(\tau) - \mu_d(x)(\tau) d\tau \right\| \leq \sigma. \quad (62)$$

Then for all $x \in \mathcal{X}_N$ we obtain that:

$$\|f_{\Delta t}(x, \mu_d(x)) - f_{\Delta t}(x, \mu(x))\| \leq (M + C\Delta t) \sigma e^{L\Delta t}. \quad (63)$$

Proof: Refer to the continuous-time proof in [5]. ■

In Proposition 3.3, we claim that there exists some bound $\gamma > 0$ for the state deviation caused by input perturbations, see (41), that ensures \mathcal{P} -practical asymptotic stability. In (63), we specify an upper state error bound that formally depends on the integrated input error in (62). Notice that if $\sigma \rightarrow 0$, the state error bound in (63) also tends to zero. However, the latter observation does not imply pointwise convergence of $\mu_d(x)$ and $\mu(x)$ in time. Therefore, Proposition 4.1 motivates systematic and fast switching in the context of input rounding such that the right-hand side of (63) becomes smaller than γ in (41).

Notice that the upper state error bound in (63) does not depend on the specific rounding algorithm and mainly results from Grönwall's Lemma, see [5, Thm. 2].

Sum-Up Rounding (SUR)

In the following, we present possible rounding algorithms to restore integer feasibility in polynomial time, namely simple rounding (SR) and sum-up rounding (SUR), see [5], [6]. Alternative optimization based rounding approaches are presented, for example, in [17], [31], [32].

Let $i = 1, 2, \dots, N_{\text{os}}$ be the running index of the fast sampling time grid. Similar to [6], we define our input perturbed control law by

$$\mu_d(x)(t) := \mathbf{1}^{j^*(i, x)}, \quad \forall t \in [(i-1)\delta t, i\delta t], \quad (64)$$

where the index $j^*(i, x)$ is the solution to the problem

$$j^*(i, x) := \arg \max_{1 \leq j \leq |\Omega|} \left\{ \eta_j^{\{\text{SR}, \text{SUR}\}}(i, x) \right\}. \quad (65)$$

In case of SR, the inner integral argument is defined by:

$$\eta_j^{\text{SR}}(i, x) := \int_{(i-1)\delta t}^{i\delta t} \mu_j(x)(t) dt. \quad (66)$$

We detect the largest error in each dimension $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|\}$ and on each time interval $[(i-1)\delta t, i\delta t]$ with $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N_{\text{os}}\}$ and apply SOS1 admissible rounding on the fast sampling time grid. We therefore ensure that $\mu_d(x) \in \mathcal{S}_{\Delta t}$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}_N$. Since SR makes

it decision only based on the current closed-loop interval $[(i-1)\delta t, i\delta t]$, the maximum rounding error in (62) evidently depends on the number of oversampling steps N_{os} . In case of SUR, the inner integral argument is defined by:

$$\eta_j^{\text{SUR}}(i, x) := \int_0^{i\delta t} \mu_j(x)(t) dt - \int_0^{(i-1)\delta t} \mu_{d_j}(x)(t) dt. \quad (67)$$

In contrast to SR, we determine the largest error in each dimension $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, |\Omega|\}$ and on each time interval $[0, i\delta t]$ with $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N_{\text{os}}\}$, taking into account all previous rounding decisions. The tightest upper rounding error bound for SUR in (62) is given by [6]:

$$\sigma := \sqrt{|\Omega|} \delta t \sum_{j=2}^{|\Omega|} \frac{1}{j}. \quad (68)$$

The factor $\sqrt{|\Omega|}$ describes the equivalence relation between the maximum norm used in [6] and the Euclidean norm used in this paper. The input approximation error for SUR reaches its maximum value after only $|\Omega|$ rounding steps, see [6, Thm. 6.1]. Therefore, the upper bound in (68) is assumed to be constant and depends linearly on the sampling width δt , such that we obtain that $\sigma \rightarrow 0$ if $\delta t \rightarrow 0$. The latter observation brings us to our main result.

Theorem 4.2 (Fast Switching in MI-MPC): Suppose Assumptions 1-8 hold. Assume $\mu_d(x)$ is defined by (64) with the integral argument defined by (67) for all $x \in \text{lev}_\rho V_N$. Then for any $\gamma > 0$ in $\|f_{\Delta t}(x, \mu_d(x)) - f_{\Delta t}(x, \mu(x))\| \leq \gamma$, there exists a sampling width $\delta t > 0$ such that the origin is \mathcal{P} -practically asymptotically stable in the positive invariant set $\text{lev}_\rho V_N$ for the input perturbed system (32) with $\mathcal{P} := \text{lev}_\kappa V_N$ and $0 < \kappa < \rho$.

Proof: Let $\tilde{x}_+ := f_{\Delta t}(x, \mu_d(x))$ and $x_+ := f_{\Delta t}(x, \mu(x))$. We combine (68) with (63) and obtain:

$$\|\tilde{x}_+ - x_+\| \leq (M + C\Delta t) \sqrt{|\Omega|} \delta t \sum_{j=2}^{|\Omega|} \frac{1}{j} e^{L\Delta t}. \quad (69)$$

Now, we enforce the right-hand side to be smaller than the upper bound $\gamma > 0$ from Proposition 3.3:

$$(M + C\Delta t) \sqrt{|\Omega|} \delta t \sum_{j=2}^{|\Omega|} \frac{1}{j} e^{L\Delta t} \stackrel{!}{\leq} \gamma. \quad (70)$$

Finally, we rearrange the inequality to δt and obtain:

$$0 < \delta t \stackrel{!}{\leq} \delta t_{\text{max}} := \frac{\gamma}{(M + C\Delta t) \sqrt{|\Omega|} \sum_{j=2}^{|\Omega|} \frac{1}{j} e^{L\Delta t}}. \quad (71)$$

Note that $\delta t_{\text{max}} > 0$. With an arbitrary small δt , we have that $\|\tilde{x}_+ - x_+\| \leq \gamma$. \mathcal{P} -practical asymptotic stability thus follows from Proposition 3.3. ■

Remark 4 (Oversampling Width): Note that we first determine ρ in $\text{lev}_\rho V_N$ and then choose a $\kappa < \rho$ in $\text{lev}_\kappa V_N$. From this, we obtain an upper bound γ . Therefore, γ actually depends on κ . However, since $\gamma > 0$, we can choose an arbitrary small sampling width δt to also satisfy the choice of κ . In other words, either we choose a sampling width δt

and observe which value κ we obtain or we choose a specific $\kappa < \rho$ and seek an admissible sampling width δt .

Though we have derived an analytic upper bound $\delta t_{\text{max}} \geq \delta t$, it is not straightforward to evaluate it. However, in theory, we can use an arbitrary small sampling width δt to satisfy the upper bound δt_{max} . In practice, there usually also exists a lower bound $0 < \delta_{\text{min}} < \delta t$ that is determined by technical properties, such as transient reversal processes or safety functions. In electrical power systems, for example, switching times can be assumed to be very small [12].

V. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

We investigate the Van-der-Pol Oscillator with a nonlinear input. Consider the following nonlinear state space model with state dimension $n_x = 2$ and input dimension $n_v = 1$:

$$f(\bar{x}(t), \bar{v}(t)) = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{x}_2(t) \\ (1 - \bar{x}_1^2(t)) \bar{x}_2(t) - \bar{x}_1(t) + \sin(\bar{v}(t)) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (72)$$

Assume quadratic cost functions $\ell_x(\bar{x}(t)) = \bar{x}^\top(t) Q \bar{x}(t)$, $\ell_v(\bar{v}(t)) = \bar{v}^\top(t) R_v \bar{v}(t)$, and $\ell_u(\bar{u}(t)) = \bar{\xi}^\top(t) W \bar{\xi}(t) = R(\bar{\xi}(t) \odot \bar{\xi}(t)) = \sum_{i=1}^{|\Omega|} \ell_v(v^i) (\bar{u}_i(t) - u_{f,i})^2$ with $u_f = (0.5, 0.5)^\top$ and $W = \text{diag}(R)$. Q , R_v , and W denote positive definite weighting matrices. However, W cannot be chosen freely, it results from the choice of Ω and R_v . The terminal cost function $\text{lev}_\pi J_f = \bar{x}^\top(t) P \bar{x}(t)$ approximates the infinite-horizon costs of the nonlinear system where $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_x}$ is the positive definite solution to the continuous-time Lyapunov equation [28]:

$$(A_K + cI)^\top P + P(A_K + cI) = -Q^*. \quad (73)$$

Here, $A_K := A + BK$ and $Q^* := Q + K^\top WK$, where the pair (A, B) denotes the stabilizable linearization of the relaxed system $F(\bar{x}(t)) \bar{u}(t)$ at the integer infeasible and unstable steady-state $(x_f, u_f) = (0, u_f)$. The matrix $K := -W^{-1}B^\top \bar{P}$ forms the linear feedback controller and builds upon the solution $\bar{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x \times n_x}$ to the continuous-time algebraic Riccati equation:

$$A^\top \bar{P} + \bar{P}A - \bar{P}BW^{-1}B^\top \bar{P} + Q = 0. \quad (74)$$

Without a proof, we choose $\pi = 0.005$ and $c = 0.892$ according to the setup procedure in [28]. We define the finite control set as $\Omega = \{-1, 1\} \subset \mathbb{V} = \{v \in \mathbb{R} \mid |v| \leq 1\}$. With $Q = I$ and $R_v = 1$ we have that $R = I$. For the time discretization, we choose $\Delta t = 0.25$ s and $N = 12$. We apply direct Hermite-Simpson collocation to transcribe the DT-OC in (26) into a nonlinear program (NLP), refer, for example, to [33], and assume piecewise quadratic controls. Recall that for stabilization, the optimizer may resort to the terminal stabilizing control law $\mu_f(x) \in \mathcal{C}^1([0, \Delta t], \mathbb{U}^{|\Omega|})$, see Assumption 5. Here, we assume that a quadratic control spline is a sufficient approximation of the control trajectory of the continuous-time linear-quadratic-regulator (LQR) on the sampling interval Δt .

The numerical benchmark setup is built upon the automatic differentiation and optimization framework CasADi [34], the general purpose solver IPOPT [35], and the sparse linear solver MUMPS [36], [37].




Fig. 1. Closed-loop control. Robust set-point stabilization for the relaxed and the input perturbed closed-loop system (31) and (32), respectively. Input perturbation is due to input SUR for different oversampling rates. Top left: Phase portrait. Top right: Close-up of left figure. Bottom left: Corresponding relaxed closed-loop control trajectories that satisfy the SOS1 constraint. The integer feasible closed-loop control trajectories cannot be visualized/rendered clearly due to fast switching. Bottom right: Evolutions of the optimal value function for different oversampling rates. Abbreviation: Sum-up rounding (SUR).

In Figure 1, the implicit control law μ transfers, as expected, the relaxed system (20) from $x_0 = (0.5, 0)^\top$ to the origin and then stabilizes the steady-state $((0, 0)^\top, (0.5, 0.5)^\top)$ according to Proposition 3.1 (see black graphs). Note that for $\delta t = \Delta t$, SUR turns into common SR, taking a single decision on the whole interval Δt . The perturbed control law μ_d distracts the nonlinear system (29) at an early stage and ends up with a strongly oscillating state space behavior, which of course also stems from the extreme choice of $\Omega = \{-1, 1\}$. The evolution of the optimal value function reveals that costs do not decrease in the sense of Lyapunov. We have deliberately chosen the example such that a simple rounding step over the entire sampling width $\delta t = \Delta t$ does not destabilize the origin to investigate the impact of SUR on the approximation quality for different oversampling rates. For SUR with $\delta t = \Delta t/10 = 0.025s$, we observe a state trajectory that is on average much more similar to the relaxed state trajectory. The close-up of the state-space shows that system remains inside some small neighborhood of the origin for all times. Notice that for $\delta t = \Delta t/10$, the evolution of the optimale value function nearly resembles the evolution of the relaxed optimal value function, which decreases in the sense of Lyapunov.

Let us consider Table I for a quantitative analysis, where we want to evaluate the discretized maximal integral control

TABLE I
MAXIMAL CONTROL INTEGER AND STATE GAPS DUE TO CONTROL INPUT ROUNDING FOR DIFFERENT OVERSAMPLING RATES.
ABBREVIATIONS: SUM-UP ROUNDING (SUR). SIMPLE ROUNDING (SR)

	$\delta t =$	Δt	$\Delta t/2$	$\Delta t/5$	$\Delta t/10$	$\Delta t/50$
SR	σ_{\max}	0.1757	0.1707	0.1747	0.1722	0.1720
	γ_{\max}	0.2369	0.2296	0.2353	0.2320	0.2318
SUR	σ_{\max}	0.1757	0.0881	0.0352	0.0176	0.0035
	γ_{\max}	0.2369	0.1170	0.0473	0.0212	0.0041

input error (control integer gap)

$$\sigma_{\max} := \max_{n \in \{0, 1, \dots, 71\}} \left\{ \left\| \int_0^{\Delta t} \mu(\tilde{x}_n)(\tau) - \mu_d(\tilde{x}_n)(\tau) d\tau \right\| \right\} \quad (75)$$

and the maximal state space deviation (state gap)

$$\gamma_{\max} := \max_{n \in \{0, 1, \dots, 71\}} \{ \|f_{\Delta t}(\tilde{x}_n, \mu_d(\tilde{x}_n)) - f_{\Delta t}(\tilde{x}_n, \mu(\tilde{x}_n))\| \} \quad (76)$$

for the same numerical setup as in Figure 1.

The finer the time resolution of the oversampling grid, the smaller is the control integer gap σ_{\max} for SUR. This observation does not hold for SR. Here, the increasing sampling rate has nearly no impact on the approximation error. For SUR, the control integer and the state gap almost vanish for $\delta t = \Delta t/50$ according to (68) and (63), respectively. Hence, we know that for $\delta t \rightarrow 0$, we have that $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ and thus also $\kappa \rightarrow 0$. For $\delta t = \Delta t/50$, the resulting state trajectory is nearly identical to that of the relaxed trajectory (black graph in Fig. 1) since $\gamma_{\max} = 0.0041$. Therefore, we do not plot this graph in Figure 1. These numeric results obviously support our claim in Theorem 4.2.

Remark 5 (Quadratic Multiplier): In this section, we follow common techniques to approximate the infinite horizon costs and derive a stabilizing terminal control law μ_t . For quadratic cost functions with respect to the states and the inputs, the infinite horizon costs follow from the solution of the algebraic Riccati equation in (74), see, for example, [28], [27], [25]. However, quadratic controls contradict the weighted L^1 -norm penalty in (15). Therefore, we loose optimality claims with respect to the outer convexified problem (26), even if SUR would enable an error-free reconstruction. An alternative formulation could consider slack variables to reformulate the absolute values in (15). Instead of solving the Riccati equation (74), we could therefore solve a bound constrained quadratic program. To improve regularity of the solution, we could also add a low weighted L^2 -norm penalty term, refer to the discussion in [38].

In this paper, however, we mainly focus on stability and assume that fast switching is technically possible and inexpensive. Recall that \mathcal{P} -practical stability only depends on the state deviation γ in (41). We assume that the penalization of the control effort in the DT-OCP (26) only offers an additional degree of freedom to set a desired system behavior, which we can approximate arbitrary close by fast switching.

VI. CONCLUSION

We have formally derived \mathcal{P} -practical asymptotic stability for mixed-integer model predictive control. To achieve this stability results, we have fused the findings on inherent robustness of conventional model predictive control (closed-loop) with stabilizing terminal conditions due to [27], [14], [25] with the integer approximation algorithm for mixed-integer optimal control (open-loop) due to [3], [5] and its theoretical properties in [5], [6] on the boundedness of the approximation errors.

After applying partial outer convexification and relaxation, we obtain relaxed system and cost formulations. This relaxed optimal control problem serves as the foundation for providing a desired stabilizing state space behavior for the real and integer feasible system. We have introduced sum-up rounding of the implicit control law on an oversampled temporal grid. If we assume that switching is inexpensive and technically possible, we have shown theoretically and with a numerical example that the approximation error due to rounding tends to zero the faster we switch the control input. This approximation property is especially interesting for applications with fast dynamics such as power electronics.

APPENDIX

The following Theorem A1 originates from [25, Thm. 2.19 (a)]

Theorem A1 (Lyapunov Function [25]): Let $X := \mathbb{R}^p$, $U := \mathbb{R}^m$, $\mathbb{U} \subset U$, and $\mathbb{X}_f \subset X$. Suppose we have system dynamics $x_+ = f(x, u)$ and a finite horizon cost function $J_N(x, \mathbf{u}) := \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \ell(x(k), u(k)) + J_f(x(N))$ with $\mathbf{u} := (u(0), u(1), \dots, u(N-1))$. Let the set of admissible control sequences be denoted by $\mathcal{U}_N(x) := \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{U}^N \mid \phi(N, x, \mathbf{u}) \in \mathbb{X}_f\}$ and the feasible set by $\mathcal{X}_N := \{x \in X \mid \mathcal{U}_N(x) \neq \emptyset\}$. Let $\phi(N, x, \mathbf{u})$ be the recursive solution to the system dynamics at the end of the horizon N using the control sequence \mathbf{u} and starting at x . Define $\mathbf{u}^*(x) := \arg \min_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_N(x)} J_N(x, \mathbf{u})$. Let $\mu(x) := u^*(0)$ be the implicit control law in which $u^*(0)$ denotes the the first part of the optimal control trajectory $\mathbf{u}^*(x)$.

Suppose the following assumptions hold.

a) Assume that $f \in \mathcal{C}^0(X \times \mathbb{U}, X)$, $\ell \in \mathcal{C}^0(X \times U, \mathbb{R}_0^+)$, and $J_f \in \mathcal{C}^0(X, \mathbb{R}_0^+)$.

b) The transition map and the cost functions satisfy $f(0, 0) = 0$, $\ell(0, 0) = 0$, and $J_f(0) = 0$.

c) Assume that the input constraint set \mathbb{U} is compact and contains the origin. Suppose that \mathbb{X}_f is compact and contains the origin in its interior.

d) Suppose that there exists a class \mathcal{K}_∞ function α_1 such the we have that $\alpha_1(\|x\|) \leq \ell(x, u)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}_N$ and all $u \in \mathbb{U}$.

e) Suppose that there exists a class \mathcal{K}_∞ function α_f such the we have that $J_f(x) \leq \alpha_f(\|x\|)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{X}_f$.

f) Assume that for all $x \in \mathbb{X}_f$ there exists a control $u \in \mathbb{U}$ for which we obtain that $f(x, u) \in \mathbb{X}_f$ and $J_f(f(x, u)) - J_f(x) \leq -\ell(x, u)$.

Then the optimal value function $V_N(x) := \min_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}_N(x)} J_N(x, \mathbf{u})$ is a valid Lyapunov function in

the positive invariant set \mathcal{X}_N for the autonomous system $f(x, \mu(x))$. With $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$, we obtain the following Lyapunov function for all $x \in \mathcal{X}_N$:

$$\alpha_1(\|x\|) \leq V_N(x) \leq \alpha_2(\|x\|), \quad (77)$$

$$V_N(f(x, \mu(x))) \leq V_N(x) - \alpha_1(\|x\|). \quad (78)$$

Remark A6 (Compactness of Input Constraint Set):

Notice that the system $x_+ = f(x, u)$ in Theorem A1 assumes piecewise constant controls since $u \in \mathbb{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^m$. This rather restrictive assumption simplifies the notation and is often used in practice. In Theorem A1, the compactness of \mathbb{U} is used to show local boundedness of J_N and V_N on $\mathcal{X}_N \times \mathbb{U}^N$ to derive an upper bound $a_2 \in \mathcal{K}_\infty$ [25, Prop. 2.15 and Prop. 2.16].

The following Theorem A2 originates from [25, Thm. 2.13]

Theorem A2 (Asymptotic Stability [25]): Assume that $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ is positive invariant for the system $x_+ = f(x)$. Let $\phi(n, x)$ be the recursive solution to the autonomous system $x_+ = f(x)$ after n steps. If there is a valid Lyapunov function in \mathcal{X} for the system $x_+ = f(x)$, then the origin is asymptotically stable with

$$\|\phi(n, x)\| \leq \beta(\|x\|, n), \quad \beta \in \mathcal{KL}, \quad (79)$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

The following Theorem A3 originates from [24, Thm. 2.20]

Theorem A3 (\mathcal{P} -Practical Asymptotic Stability [24]):

Let $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ and $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{X}$ be positive invariant sets for the autonomous system $x_+ = f(x)$. Assume that \mathcal{P} contains the origin in its interior. Let $\phi(n, x)$ be the recursive solution to the autonomous system $x_+ = f(x)$ after n steps. If there is a valid Lyapunov function in $\mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{P}$ for the system $x_+ = f(x)$, then the origin is \mathcal{P} -practically asymptotically stable with

$$\|\phi(n, x)\| \leq \beta(\|x\|, n), \quad \beta \in \mathcal{KL}, \quad (80)$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $\phi(n, x) \notin \mathcal{P}$.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Gerdt, "Solving mixed-integer optimal control problems by branch & bound: a case study from automobile test-driving with gear shift," *Optimal Control Applications and Methods*, vol. 26, no. 1, p. 1–18, 2005.
- [2] —, "A variable time transformation method for mixed-integer optimal control problems," *Optimal Control Applications and Methods*, vol. 27, no. 3, p. 169–182, 2006.
- [3] S. Sager, H. G. Bock, and G. Reinelt, "Direct methods with maximal lower bound for mixed-integer optimal control problems," *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 118, no. 1, p. 109–149, 2007.
- [4] S. Sager, "Reformulations and algorithms for the optimization of switching decisions in nonlinear optimal control," *Journal of Process Control*, vol. 19, no. 8, p. 1238–1247, 2009.
- [5] S. Sager, H. G. Bock, and M. Diehl, "The integer approximation error in mixed-integer optimal control," *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 133, no. 1–2, p. 1–23, 2010.
- [6] C. Kirches, F. Lenders, and P. Manns, "Approximation properties and tight bounds for constrained mixed-integer optimal control," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 58, no. 3, p. 1371–1402, 2020.

- [7] J. B. Rawlings and M. J. Risbeck, "Model predictive control with discrete actuators: Theory and application," *Automatica*, vol. 78, p. 258–265, 2017.
- [8] R. D. McAllister and J. B. Rawlings, "Advances in mixed-integer model predictive control," in *American Control Conference (ACC)*, 2022, p. 364–369.
- [9] B. Picasso, S. Pancanti, A. Bemporad, and A. Bicchi, "Receding-horizon control of lti systems with quantized inputs," *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 36, no. 6, p. 259–264, 2003.
- [10] R. P. Aguilera and D. E. Quevedo, "On the stability of mpc with a finite input alphabet," *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 44, no. 1, p. 7975–7980, 2011.
- [11] —, "Stability analysis of quadratic mpc with a discrete input alphabet," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 58, no. 12, p. 3190–3196, 2013.
- [12] P. Karamanakos and T. Geyer, "Guidelines for the design of finite control set model predictive controllers," *IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics*, vol. 35, no. 7, p. 7434–7450, 2020.
- [13] S. Yu, M. Reble, H. Chen, and F. Allgöwer, "Inherent robustness properties of quasi-infinite horizon nonlinear model predictive control," *Automatica*, vol. 50, no. 9, p. 2269–2280, 2014.
- [14] D. A. Allan, C. N. Bates, M. J. Risbeck, and J. B. Rawlings, "On the inherent robustness of optimal and suboptimal nonlinear mpc," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 106, p. 68–78, 2017.
- [15] T. Ebrahim, S. Subramanian, and S. Engell, "Robust tube-based nmpc for dynamic systems with discrete degrees of freedom," *Automatica*, vol. 160, p. 1–10, 2024.
- [16] T. Ebrahim and S. Engell, "A bi-level approach to mpc for switching nonlinear systems," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 53, no. 2, p. 6762–6768, 2020.
- [17] S. Sager, M. Jung, and C. Kirches, "Combinatorial integral approximation," *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research*, vol. 73, no. 3, p. 363–380, 2011.
- [18] A. Burda, D. Bitner, F. Bestehorn, C. Kirches, and M. Grotjahn, "Mixed-integer real-time control of a building energy supply system," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 7, p. 907–912, 2023.
- [19] T. Ebrahim, S. Subramanian, and S. Engell, "Hybrid nmpc for switching systems applied to a supermarket refrigeration system," in *2018 European Control Conference (ECC)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 813–818.
- [20] C. Kirches, *Fast Numerical Methods for Mixed-Integer Nonlinear Model-Predictive Control*. Vieweg+Teubner Verlag, 2011.
- [21] A. Bürger, C. Zeile, A. Altmann-Dieses, S. Sager, and M. Diehl, "Design, implementation and simulation of an mpc algorithm for switched nonlinear systems under combinatorial constraints," *Journal of Process Control*, vol. 81, p. 15–30, 2019.
- [22] Y. Chen and M. Lazar, "An efficient mpc algorithm for switched systems with minimum dwell time constraints," *Automatica*, vol. 143, p. 1–11, 2022.
- [23] M. Diehl, H. G. Bock, and J. P. Schlöder, "A real-time iteration scheme for nonlinear optimization in optimal feedback control," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 43, no. 5, p. 1714–1736, 2005.
- [24] L. Grüne and J. Pannek, *Nonlinear Model Predictive Control*. Springer International Publishing, 2017.
- [25] J. B. Rawlings, D. Q. Mayne, and M. Diehl, *Model Predictive Control - Theory, Computation, and Design*, 2nd ed. Nob Hill Publishing, 2020.
- [26] Z.-P. Jiang, E. Sontag, and Y. Wang, "Input-to-state stability for discrete-time nonlinear systems," *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 32, no. 2, p. 2403–2408, 1999.
- [27] D. Mayne, J. Rawlings, C. Rao, and P. Scokaert, "Constrained model predictive control: Stability and optimality," *Automatica*, vol. 36, no. 6, p. 789–814, 2000.
- [28] H. Chen and F. Allgöwer, "A quasi-infinite horizon nonlinear model predictive control scheme with guaranteed stability," *Automatica*, vol. 34, no. 10, p. 1205–1217, 1998.
- [29] J. B. Rawlings and M. J. Risbeck, "On the equivalence between statements with ϵ - δ and \mathcal{K} -functions," University of Wisconsin-Madison, Department of Chemical and Biological Engineering, Tech. Rep., 2017.
- [30] D. A. Allan and J. B. Rawlings, "Inherent robustness of discontinuous mpc: Even (u, u_3) is robust," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 51, no. 20, p. 475–480, 2018.
- [31] M. Jung, "Relaxations and approximations for mixed-integer optimal control," Dissertation, Heidelberg University, 2014.
- [32] F. Bestehorn, C. Hansknecht, C. Kirches, and P. Manns, "A switching cost aware rounding method for relaxations of mixed-integer optimal control problems," in *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2019, p. 7134–7139.
- [33] M. Kelly, "An introduction to trajectory optimization: How to do your own direct collocation," *SIAM Review*, vol. 59, no. 4, p. 849–904, 2017.
- [34] J. A. E. Andersson, J. Gillis, G. Horn, J. B. Rawlings, and M. Diehl, "CasADi – A software framework for nonlinear optimization and optimal control," *Mathematical Programming Computation*, vol. 11, no. 1, p. 1–36, 2019.
- [35] A. Wächter and L. T. Biegler, "On the implementation of an interior-point filter line-search algorithm for large-scale nonlinear programming," *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 106, no. 1, p. 25–57, 2005.
- [36] P. Amestoy, I. S. Duff, J. Koster, and J.-Y. L'Excellent, "A fully asynchronous multifrontal solver using distributed dynamic scheduling," *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 15–41, 2001.
- [37] P. Amestoy, A. Buttari, J.-Y. L'Excellent, and T. Mary, "Performance and Scalability of the Block Low-Rank Multifrontal Factorization on Multicore Architectures," *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software*, vol. 45, p. 2:1–2:26, 2019.
- [38] P. Manns and C. Kirches, "Multi-dimensional sum-up rounding for elliptic control systems," *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, vol. 58, no. 6, pp. 3427–3447, 2020.