

Persistently Exciting Data-Driven Model Predictive Control

Lucca Heinze Faro, Yuanbo Nie, and Paul Trodden

Abstract—Persistence of excitation (PE) of the system input is a fundamental requirement for the successful operation of data-driven model predictive control, as it ensures that the input–output data contains sufficient information about the underlying system dynamics. Nonetheless, this property is usually assumed rather than guaranteed. This paper introduces a novel data-driven predictive control formulation that maintains persistence of excitation. The technical development that permits this is the characterization of the *nonexciting* input set *i.e.*, the set of inputs that lead to loss of PE, and the consequent derivation of a pair of disjoint, linear inequality constraints on the input that, if satisfied, maintain PE. When used in the predictive control formulation, these constraints lead to a mixed-integer optimal control problem with a single binary variable or, equivalently, a pair of disjoint quadratic programming problems that can be efficiently and reliably solved in parallel. Numerical examples show how these constraints are able to maintain persistence of excitation on the input during the controller’s operation.

I. INTRODUCTION

Data-driven model predictive control (DD-MPC) replaces the dynamics model traditionally used in predictive control by a direct representation of the dynamics using past trajectories of the system [1]. This formulation has seen a surge in interest in recent years as it allows the design of controllers directly from data, without a model identification step [2]. Notable progress has been made in areas such as stability, robustness and constraint satisfaction [3]. A core ingredient to the success of the DD-MPC formulation is the requirement that the system input satisfy a property known as *persistence of excitation* (PE), which ensures that the past input–output data is sufficiently rich and therefore can accurately capture the system dynamics [4].

For DD-MPC controllers, it is often assumed that a fixed, persistently exciting sequence of past input–output data is available and can be used to accurately represent the system [1], [5], [6]. In the practice, however, systems being controlled are typically nonlinear or time-varying, and thus the data may need to be updated online to capture the changing dynamics. In this scenario, persistence of excitation is also assumed, rather than enforced [7]–[10]. Guaranteeing persistence of excitation online for data-driven controllers is thus a relevant research direction [7], [10], as it can ensure that the data accurately captures the system dynamics over time or the full operating region.

This work was supported by the MSc Conversion Scholarship of the (former) Department of Automatic Control & Systems Engineering, University of Sheffield.

The authors are with the School of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, University of Sheffield, S1 3JD, United Kingdom. (Email: {lheinze, ynie, p.trodden}@sheffield.ac.uk)

In contrast to DD-MPC, persistence of excitation is frequently ensured in traditional model-based predictive controllers by using an appropriate constraint, either in the main optimal control problem (OCP) or in an auxiliary OCP [11]–[17]. These constraints, however, correspond to nonlinear matrix inequalities, and result in a nonlinear and nonconvex optimization problem even when, otherwise, the optimal control problem would be a convex quadratic programming (QP) problem. Linearizations are proposed in [11], [18], but the resulting linearized constraints are conservative.

Given this background, the main contribution of this paper is the characterization of the set of *nonexciting* inputs, *i.e.* the input selections that would lead to a loss of PE. This result then facilitates the development of a novel pair of disjoint linear constraints that, if satisfied, maintain PE of the input. Subsequently, we formulate a persistently exciting data-driven MPC controller that employs these constraints. Our approach involves solving, at each time step, *up to* two quadratic programming problems in parallel that ensure the control input is persistently exciting.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II defines the problem statement. Section III develops the formulation of the novel PE constraint. In Section IV, a persistently exciting data-driven predictive controller is formulated, employing this constraint. Section V presents an example of the proposed formulation, before conclusions are drawn in Section VI.

Notation: For a vector $z_k \in \mathbb{R}^q$, $k \in \mathbb{I}$, we denote

$$z_{[i,j]}^\top = [z_i^\top \ \dots \ z_j^\top] \in \mathbb{R}^{(j-i+1)q}.$$

The n -length vector of ones is $\mathbb{1}_n$, and the $n \times n$ identity matrix is I_n . The symbol \otimes denotes the Kronecker product. The Hankel matrix of a signal $u_{[k-T+1,k]}$, where $u_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$, is given by

$$\mathcal{H}_L(u_{[k-T+1,k]}) := \begin{bmatrix} u_{k-T+1} & \cdots & u_{k-L} & u_{k-L+1} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ u_{k-T+L-1} & \cdots & u_{k-2} & u_{k-1} \\ u_{k-T+L} & \cdots & u_{k-1} & u_k \end{bmatrix} \quad (1a)$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} H_{11,k} & H_{12,k} \\ H_{21,k} & u_k \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{mL \times (T-L+1)}, \quad (1b)$$

where $H_{11,k} \in \mathbb{R}^{m(L-1) \times (T-L)}$, $H_{12,k} \in \mathbb{R}^{m(L-1) \times 1}$, and $H_{21,k} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times (T-L)}$ depend on $u_{[k-T+1,k-1]}$, but not on u_k .

II. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Consider the controllable and observable, discrete-time, linear system

$$x_{k+1} = Ax_k + Bu_k \quad (2a)$$

$$y_k = Cx_k + Du_k \quad (2b)$$

where $(x_k, u_k, y_k) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^p$ are the states, inputs and outputs at time instance k . This paper is concerned with the DD-MPC problem of tracking the setpoint (u^S, y^S) while satisfying the constraints

$$u_k \in \mathbb{U}, \quad y_k \in \mathbb{Y}. \quad (3)$$

A standard DD-MPC formulation, \mathbb{P}_0 , adapted from [5], is given by

$$\mathbb{P}_0(u_{[k-n, k-1]}, y_{[k-n, k-1]}) := \min_{\substack{\alpha, \sigma, \\ \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \bar{u}_{[-n, N-1]} \\ \bar{y}_{[-n, N-1]} \end{array} \right\}}} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \|\bar{u}_i - u^S\|_R^2 + \|\bar{y}_i - y^S\|_Q^2 + \lambda_\alpha \|\alpha\|_2^2 + \lambda_\sigma \|\sigma\|_2^2 \quad (4a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \begin{bmatrix} \bar{u}_{[-n, N-1]} \\ \bar{y}_{[-n, N-1]} + \sigma \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_{N+n}(u^d) \\ \mathcal{H}_{N+n}(y^d) \end{bmatrix}, \alpha \quad (4b)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \bar{u}_{[-n, -1]} \\ \bar{y}_{[-n, -1]} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} u_{[k-n, k-1]} \\ y_{[k-n, k-1]} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (4c)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \bar{u}_{[N-n, N-1]} \\ \bar{y}_{[N-n, N-1]} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{1} \otimes u^S \\ \mathbb{1} \otimes y^S \end{bmatrix}, \quad (4d)$$

$$\bar{u}_i, \bar{y}_i \in \mathbb{U} \times \mathbb{Y}, \quad i = 0, \dots, N-1. \quad (4e)$$

where $(\bar{u}, \bar{y}, \alpha, \sigma) \in \mathbb{R}^{(N+n)m} \times \mathbb{R}^{(N+n)p} \times \mathbb{R}^{T-(N+n)+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{(N+n)p}$ are decision variables and $(u^d, y^d) \in \mathbb{R}^{mT} \times \mathbb{R}^{pT}$ are input–output data collected in an offline experiment of length T . The input applied to (2) at time k is $u_k = \bar{u}_0^*$, where $\bar{u}_{[-n, N-1]}^*$ is the solution to (4).

In this formulation, the system dynamics are represented in (4b) using the Hankel matrices of u^d and y^d . This formulation is based on the Fundamental Lemma, originally proposed in [19], which allows the direct representation of linear systems using only past input–output data. Since the predicted trajectories in (4b) have a length of $N+n$, the Fundamental Lemma requires that u^d is persistently exciting of order $N+2n$ according to Definition 1 [5]. This condition ensures that (u^d, y^d) accurately represents the system dynamics.

Definition 1 (Rank-based PE, adapted from [19], [20]). The signal $u_{[k-T+1, k]}$ is persistently exciting of order L if its Hankel matrix $\mathcal{H}_L(u_{[k-T+1, k]})$ has rank mL .

Remark 2. Given that the Hankel matrix (1) has mL rows, Definition 1 establishes that a signal is persistently exciting of order L if $\mathcal{H}_L(u_{[k-T+1, k]})$ has linearly independent rows. To achieve this, $\mathcal{H}_L(u_{[k-T+1, k]})$ must also have at least mL

columns. Considering that the number of columns is $T-L+1$, this implies that ([2], [20])

$$T \geq (m+1)L - 1. \quad (5)$$

An important aspect of \mathbb{P}_0 is that the data used to represent the system, (u^d, y^d) , is collected offline and therefore fixed. Although, for simplicity, this paper considers the linear, time-invariant system (2), the practical reality is that it merely represents a model of a nonlinear or time-varying system. In such cases, the data (u^d, y^d) may need to be updated online to represent the changing dynamics. However, even if (u^d, y^d) were updated online, \mathbb{P}_0 does not guarantee that the input data would be persistently exciting and thus ensuring PE becomes a relevant and necessary concern.

The particular objective of the paper is therefore to (i) propose a novel linear persistence of excitation constraint and, based on this constraint, (ii) propose a persistently exciting DD-MPC algorithm that maintains excitation given prior persistently exciting input data.

III. PE CONSTRAINT FORMULATION

A. Properties of the Hankel Matrix

Before deriving the novel PE constraints, some properties of the Hankel matrix (1) must be established, to the end of characterizing the *nonexciting* set of inputs. Lemma 3 provides necessary results for these derivations.

Lemma 3. Suppose that, at time $k-1$, $u_{[k-T, k-1]}$ is persistently exciting of order L . Then, at time k , the following properties hold for $u_{[k-T+1, k]}$ and its Hankel matrix (1):

$$\text{rank} \begin{bmatrix} H_{11, k} & H_{12, k} \end{bmatrix} = mL - m \quad (6)$$

i.e., $\begin{bmatrix} H_{11, k} & H_{12, k} \end{bmatrix}$ has linearly independent rows,

$$mL - 1 \leq \text{rank} \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{11, k} \\ H_{21, k} \end{bmatrix} \right) \leq mL, \quad (7)$$

and,

$$mL - 1 \leq \text{rank} \left(\mathcal{H}_L(u_{[k-T+1, k]}) \right) \leq mL. \quad (8)$$

The hypothesis in Lemma 3 indicates that the objective of the proposed formulation is to *maintain* persistence of excitation rather than create it where it previously did not hold. A consequence of Lemma 3 is that choosing $T = (m+1)L - 1$, i.e., the smallest value such that the Hankel matrix has linearly independent rows, represents the most demanding version of the problem of maintaining excitation. In that case, the Hankel matrix is square,

$$\text{rank} \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{11, k} \\ H_{21, k} \end{bmatrix} \right) = mL - 1,$$

and persistence of excitation is maintained if and only if u_k is chosen to make all rows of the Hankel matrix linearly independent. If $T > (m+1)L - 1$, however, then $\mathcal{H}_L(u_{[k-T+1, k]})$ has fewer rows than columns and linear independence of

the rows can be maintained without careful selection of u_k (albeit at the expense of an increase in computational cost). Nevertheless, both scenarios are considered in the following developments.

B. Nonexciting Input Set

Having established the necessary properties of the Hankel matrix, let us now consider the set \mathbb{U}_k^- , defined as

$$\mathbb{U}_k^- := \{u_k \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid \text{rank}(\mathcal{H}_L(u_{[k-T+1,k]})) < mL\} \quad (9)$$

and named the *nonexciting input set*. The rank condition in (9) corresponds to a loss of linear independence among the rows of $\mathcal{H}_L(u_{[k-T+1,k]})$, and thus \mathbb{U}_k^- is the set of inputs that cause loss of excitation at time k . Conversely, to *maintain* PE, the input u_k must satisfy the exclusion constraint

$$u_k \notin \mathbb{U}_k^-. \quad (10)$$

Given that the Hankel matrix must have linearly independent rows, however, a more useful definition for \mathbb{U}_k^- can be obtained by considering the problem of determining the left null space of $\mathcal{H}_L(u_{[k-T+1,k]})$:

$$\begin{bmatrix} H_{11,k} & H_{12,k} \\ H_{21,k} & u_k \end{bmatrix}^\top z = 0, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^{mL}, \quad (11)$$

which has $z = 0$ as its only solution if and only if the rows of $\mathcal{H}_L(u_{[k-T+1,k]})$ are linearly independent. The nonexciting input set can thus be equivalently defined as

$$\mathbb{U}_k^- := \{u_k \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid \exists z \neq 0 \text{ such that (11) holds}\}.$$

Given that, at time k , $u_k = \bar{u}_0^*$ is yet to be determined, \mathbb{U}_k^- can be obtained by splitting (11) into two equalities:

$$\begin{bmatrix} H_{11,k} \\ H_{21,k} \end{bmatrix}^\top z = 0, \quad (12)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} H_{12,k} \\ u_k \end{bmatrix}^\top z = 0. \quad (13)$$

If, then, a solution $z_k^* \neq 0$ to (12) exists, it is a solution to (11) if and only if it is also a solution to (13). Therefore \mathbb{U}_k^- can be characterized by first determining the conditions for which a solution $z_k^* \neq 0$ to (12) exists and then determining the values of u_k for which (13) holds with $z = z_k^*$. The following lemma provides the results for the first step.

Lemma 4. *For the equality system (12),*

- 1) *If $\text{rank} \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{11,k} \\ H_{21,k} \end{bmatrix} \right) = mL$, then $z_k^* \equiv 0$.*
- 2) *If $\text{rank} \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{11,k} \\ H_{21,k} \end{bmatrix} \right) = mL - 1$, then*

$$z_k^* = \gamma z_{P,k}^*, \quad z_{P,k}^* \neq 0 \quad (14)$$

where $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ and $z_{P,k}^*$ is a particular solution to (12).

Applying the results of Lemma 4 to (13), the main theoretical result of the paper can be derived, which is the characterization of the nonexciting input set.

Theorem 5. *If the past data $u_{[k-T+1,k-1]}$ are such that*

- 1) *$\text{rank} \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{11,k} \\ H_{21,k} \end{bmatrix} \right) = mL$, then persistence of excitation is maintained for all $u_k \in \mathbb{U}$. Therefore,*

$$\mathbb{U}_k^- = \emptyset.$$

- 2) *$\text{rank} \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{11,k} \\ H_{21,k} \end{bmatrix} \right) = mL - 1$, then \mathbb{U}_k^- is given by*

$$\mathbb{U}_k^- := \{u_k \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid a_k^\top u_k + c_k = 0\} \subset \mathbb{R}^m, \quad (15)$$

where $a_k \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $c_k \in \mathbb{R}$ are given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} b_k \\ a_k \end{bmatrix} = z_{P,k}^*, \quad c_k = b_k^\top H_{12,k}, \quad (16)$$

with $b_k \in \mathbb{R}^{mL-m}$.

Remark 6. *For $\text{rank} \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{11,k} \\ H_{21,k} \end{bmatrix} \right) = mL - 1$, \mathbb{U}_k^- defines a hyperplane of dimension $m - 1$.*

C. Novel PE Constraint

Similarly to the discussion of Lemma 3, no special consideration is needed in the MPC formulation for the first scenario of Theorem 5 and only the second scenario is of interest, since an inappropriate choice of u_k can result in a loss of excitation. Considering the representation of \mathbb{U}_k^- given by (15), a pair of disjoint, linear persistence of excitation conditions can be devised as

$$a_k^\top \bar{u}_0 + c_k \geq +\|a_k\| \varepsilon \quad (17a)$$

$$\text{or } a_k^\top \bar{u}_0 + c_k \leq -\|a_k\| \varepsilon \quad (17b)$$

where $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$ is a tuning parameter. These constraints ensure that u_k is at least ε distant from the nonexciting input set given by the hyperplane $a_k^\top u_k + c_k = 0$ and therefore can maintain the excitation. A representation of these constraints is shown in Figure 1. As $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, $\|a_k\| \varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and (17) is trivially verified for $\varepsilon = 0$.




Fig. 1. --- \mathbb{U}_k^- , ■ feasible region for (17a), and ■ feasible region for (17b) for $m = 2$, $\varepsilon = 0.2$, $L = 5$, $T = 14$, some random initial input sequence and $\mathbb{U} = \{u : \|x\|_\infty \leq 1\}$. The distance of the disjoint, linear constraints from \mathbb{U}_k^- can be adjusted by changing the parameter ε .

Remark 7. *If $\mathbb{U}_k^- \cap \mathbb{U} = \emptyset$, i.e., \mathbb{U}_k^- does not intersect \mathbb{U} , then there exists a $\varepsilon > 0$ such that (17a) or (17b) is verified. In this scenario, any $u_k \in \mathbb{U}$ maintains excitation.*

Considering the disjoint nature of (17), a mixed-integer PE constraint that enforces either (17a) or (17b) via single binary variable can be formulated as

$$(1-v)a_k^\top \bar{u}_0 \geq (1-v)(\|a_k\|\varepsilon - c_k), \quad (18a)$$

$$va_k^\top \bar{u}_0 \leq v(-\|a_k\|\varepsilon - c_k), \quad (18b)$$

$$v \in \{0, 1\}. \quad (18c)$$

IV. PERSISTENTLY EXCITING DATA-DRIVEN MPC

Given that constraint (18) ensures *maintenance* of excitation, the following assumption is required to formulate a persistently exciting DD-MPC (PE-DD-MPC). The same assumption is present in other DD-MPC implementations [1], [5], [6].

Assumption 8. *At $k = 0$, the input signal $u_{[-T+1, -1]}$ is PE of order $N + 2n$.*

The proposed PE-DD-MPC controller, presented in Algorithm 1, involves solving a DD-MPC problem with the addition of constraint (18). The resulting formulation is

$$\mathbb{P}_1(u_{[k-T, k-1]}, y_{[k-T, k-1]}) := \min_{\substack{\alpha, \sigma, v \\ \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \bar{u}_{[-n, N-1]}, \\ \bar{y}_{[-n, N-1]} \end{array} \right\}}} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \|\bar{u}_i - u^S\|_R^2 + \|\bar{y}_i - y^S\|_Q^2 + \lambda_\alpha \|\alpha\|_2^2 + \lambda_\sigma \|\sigma\|_2^2 \quad (19a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{u}_{[-n, N-1]} \\ \bar{y}_{[-n, N-1]} + \sigma \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_{N+n}(u_{[k-T, k-1]}) \\ \mathcal{H}_{N+n}(y_{[k-T, k-1]}) \end{bmatrix} \alpha \quad (19b)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \bar{u}_{[-n, -1]} \\ \bar{y}_{[-n, -1]} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} u_{[k-n, k-1]} \\ y_{[k-n, k-1]} \end{bmatrix} \quad (19c)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \bar{u}_{[N-n, N-1]} \\ \bar{y}_{[N-n, N-1]} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1} \otimes u^S \\ \mathbf{1} \otimes y^S \end{bmatrix} \quad (19d)$$

$$(1-v)a_k^\top \bar{u}_0 \geq (1-v)(\|a_k\|\varepsilon - c_k) \quad (19e)$$

$$va_k^\top \bar{u}_0 \leq v(-\|a_k\|\varepsilon - c_k) \quad (19f)$$

$$v \in \{0, 1\}, \quad (19g)$$

$$\bar{u}_i, \bar{y}_i \in \mathbb{U} \times \mathbb{Y}, \quad i = 0, \dots, N-1 \quad (19h)$$

In addition to the PE constraints (19e)–(19g), the proposed PE-DD-MPC (19) differs from (4) in that the dynamic constraint (19b) uses the most recent measurements, rather than a set of data (u^d, y^d) collected offline.

Given that (19e)–(19g) are mixed-integer constraints with a single binary variable v , problem (19) can alternatively be solved by considering two disjoint DD-MPC problems, one with (17a) and another with (17b), and implementing the solution that minimises the cost over the two problems. Given that (17a) and (17b) are linear constraints, these problems remain QP problems similar in size to \mathbb{P}_0 .

Furthermore, as pointed out in Remark 7, constraints (19e)–(19g) are required only if \mathbb{U}^- and \mathbb{U} intersect. This

can be verified, prior to solving \mathbb{P}_1 , by solving the linear programming problem

$$J(u) = \min_u |a_k^\top u + c_k| \quad (20a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } u \in \mathbb{U} \quad (20b)$$

for which the solution is $u^* = 0$ if, and only if, $\mathbb{U}_k^- \cap \mathbb{U} \neq \emptyset$. In that case, (19) can be solved at time k omitting constraints (19e)–(19g), reducing the complexity of the OCP.

Algorithm 1 Persistently Exciting Data-Driven MPC

Offline:

- 1: Define ε
- 2: Apply an initial control sequence $u_{[-T, -1]}$ that is exciting according to Definition 1.

Online: $k = 0$

- 3: Measure u_k and y_k .
 - 4: Calculate a_k and c_k according to (16).
 - 5: Verify, using (20), if \mathbb{U}_k^- intersects \mathbb{U} .
 - 6: **if** $\mathbb{U}_k^- \cap \mathbb{U} \neq \emptyset$ **then**
 - 7: Compute the solution $\bar{u}_{[-n, N-1]}^*$ to \mathbb{P}_1
 - 8: Apply $u_k = \bar{u}_0^*$
 - 9: **else**
 - 10: Compute the solution $\bar{u}_{[-n, N-1]}^*$ to \mathbb{P}_1 without (19e)–(19g)
 - 11: Apply $u_k = \bar{u}_0^*$
 - 12: **end if**
 - 13: Set $k = k + 1$ and to back to step 3.
-

V. ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE

In this section, Algorithm 1 is applied to a modified version of the linearized four-tank system [5] given by

$$x_{k+1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.921 & 0 & 0.041 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.918 & 0 & 0.033 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.924 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.937 \end{bmatrix} x_k + \begin{bmatrix} \delta(k) & 0.001 \\ 0.001 & 0.023 \\ 0 & 0.061 \\ 0.072 & 0 \end{bmatrix} u_k, \quad (21)$$

$$y_k = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x_k, \quad (22)$$

with initial state $x_0^\top = [0.4 \ 0.4 \ 0 \ 0]$. The objective of the controller is to track the setpoint

$$(u^S, y^S) = \left(\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0.65 \\ 0.77 \end{bmatrix} \right).$$

The prediction, data and simulation horizons are $N = 30$, $T = 150$ and $N_S = 750$. The weights in (19a) are

$$Q = 3 \cdot \mathbb{I}_p, \quad R = 10^{-4} \cdot \mathbb{I}_m, \quad \lambda_\alpha = 0.1, \quad \lambda_\sigma = 1000,$$

and the input and output constraint sets are

$$\mathbb{U} = [-1, 1.5]^2, \quad \mathbb{Y} = \mathbb{R}^2.$$

The proposed controller is evaluated for two scenarios involving the parameter $\delta(k)$ in the B matrix: $\delta(k) = 0.017$ and $\delta(k) = 0.017 + k \cdot 10^{-5}$, modelling a system with parameter drift.

A. Case 1: $\delta(k) = 0.017$

To evaluate the performance of Algorithm 1, the system was simulated for 100 initial input sequences of length T and 100 values of ε . The components of the initial input sequences were sampled uniformly from the interval $[0, 1]^2$, while the values of ε were sampled linearly from the interval $[10^{-4}, 3 \cdot 10^{-1}]$. The initial sequences were used to provide an initial excitation to the system in the interval $[1, T]$ and Algorithm 1 was applied from the instant $T + 1$.

Fig. 2 compares the trajectories of y_1 and u_1 for two values of ε . The trajectories obtained using \mathbb{P}_0 , with no PE constraints or data update, are also presented as a reference. As expected for a time-invariant system, \mathbb{P}_0 was able to track the references, although with some offset. The two implementations of Algorithm 1 were also able to track the references. The oscillations present in these two scenarios can be attributed to the oscillations in u_k necessary to maintain persistence of excitation.




Fig. 2. Trajectories of y_1 and u_1 for $\delta(k) = 0.017$ and \mathbb{P}_0 (top), \mathbb{P}_1 with $\varepsilon = 0.05518$ (middle) and \mathbb{P}_1 with $\varepsilon = 0.3$ (bottom). The setpoints are $y_1^S = 0.65$ and $u_1^S = 1$.

Fig. 3 evaluates the steady-state relation between the value of ε and the condition number of the square submatrix of $\mathcal{H}_L(u_{[k-T+1, k]})$ composed of its mL rows and its last mL columns, i.e., the square submatrix with the most recent data. These plots consider the average, minimum and maximum condition numbers, over all initial sequences, for the interval $[N_s - T + 1, N_s]$. It can be observed that, as the value of ε increases, the condition number decreases, indicating a better-conditioned problem.

B. Case 2: $\delta(k) = 0.017 + k \cdot 10^{-5}$

In this scenario, the controlled system corresponds in fact to a linear, time-varying system. Although this contradicts




Fig. 3. Steady-state condition number of $\mathcal{H}_L(u_{[k-T+1, k]})$ for all initial input sequences over the interval $[N_s - T + 1, N_s]$ as a function of ε .

the assumption of a time-invariant system, this example is used to show that the data update with a persistently exciting input can approximately capture the dynamics of the system and result in a good tracking performance.

Fig. 4 compares the trajectories of y_1 and u_1 for \mathbb{P}_0 and for Algorithm 1 with two values of ε . For y_1 , the application of \mathbb{P}_0 results in a drift of the output. This is expected since the initial data does not accurately capture the changing dynamics. For the simulations using Algorithm 1, however, this drift is not observed, indicating a successful data update.

For the input u_1 , a drift is observed in all scenarios. This, however, is expected, as the changing dynamics cause the setpoint to stop being an equilibrium point for the system. Given that the objective function attributes more weight to the outputs, y_1 is better tracked at the expense of u_1 .




Fig. 4. Trajectories of y_1 and u_1 for $\delta(k) = 0.017 + k \cdot 10^{-5}$ and \mathbb{P}_0 (top), \mathbb{P}_1 with $\varepsilon = 0.05518$ (middle) and \mathbb{P}_1 with $\varepsilon = 0.3$ (bottom). The setpoints are $y_1^S = 0.65$ and $u_1^S = 1$.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, the set of nonexciting inputs, which cause PE to be lost in a data-driven model predictive control setup, was characterized. This nonexciting input set was then used to develop a novel set of disjoint, linear inequality constraints that, at the current time, maintain PE of a previously exciting input sequence. These constraints were employed in a DD-MPC problem that ensures maintain persistence of excitation; it was shown that, despite its mixed-integer nature, the problem can be solved efficiently as two alternative quadratic programming problems. Future work will focus on comparing the proposed linear PE constraints to other nonlinear and linearised constraints used in the literature.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We thank Bernardo A. Hernández Vicente for the helpful discussions and comments.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Coulson, J. Lygeros, and F. Dörfler, “Data-Enabled Predictive Control: In the Shallows of the DeepPC,” in *2019 18th European Control Conference (ECC)*, Jun. 2019, pp. 307–312.
- [2] I. Markovsky and F. Dörfler, “Behavioral systems theory in data-driven analysis, signal processing, and control,” *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 52, pp. 42–64, Jan. 2021.
- [3] J. Berberich and F. Allgöwer, “An overview of systems-theoretic guarantees in data-driven model predictive control,” Jun. 2024.
- [4] M. Green and J. B. Moore, “Persistence of Excitation in Linear Systems,” in *1985 American Control Conference*, Jun. 1985, pp. 412–417.
- [5] 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*, vol. 66, no. 4, pp. 1702–1717, Apr. 2021.
- [6] J. Bongard, J. Berberich, J. Köhler, and F. Allgöwer, “Robust stability analysis of a simple data-driven model predictive control approach,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 5, pp. 2625–2637, May 2023.
- [7] J. Berberich, J. Köhler, M. A. Müller, and F. Allgöwer, “Linear tracking MPC for nonlinear systems Part II: The data-driven case,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 67, no. 9, pp. 4406–4421, Sep. 2022.
- [8] C. Verhoek, H. S. Abbas, R. Tóth, and S. Haesaert, “Data-Driven Predictive Control for Linear Parameter-Varying Systems,” *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 54, no. 8, pp. 101–108, Jan. 2021.
- [9] J. Berberich, J. Köhler, M. A. Müller, and F. Allgöwer, “Linear tracking MPC for nonlinear systems Part I: The model-based case,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 67, no. 9, pp. 4390–4405, Sep. 2022.
- [10] S. Baros, C.-Y. Chang, G. E. Colón-Reyes, and A. Bernstein, “Online data-enabled predictive control,” *Automatica*, vol. 138, p. 109926, Apr. 2022.
- [11] H. Genceli and M. Nikolaou, “New approach to constrained predictive control with simultaneous model identification,” *AICHE Journal*, vol. 42, no. 10, pp. 2857–2868, 1996.
- [12] E. Aggelogiannaki and H. Sarimveis, “Multiobjective constrained MPC with simultaneous closed-loop identification,” *International Journal of Adaptive Control and Signal Processing*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 145–173, 2006.
- [13] G. Marafioti, R. R. Bitmead, and M. Hovd, “Persistently exciting model predictive control,” *International Journal of Adaptive Control and Signal Processing*, vol. 28, no. 6, pp. 536–552, 2014.
- [14] P. Verheijen, G. R. Gonçalves da Silva, and M. Lazar, “Recursive data-driven predictive control with persistence of excitation conditions,” in *2022 IEEE 61st Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, Dec. 2022, pp. 467–473.
- [15] X. Lu and M. Cannon, “Robust adaptive model predictive control with persistent excitation conditions,” *Automatica*, vol. 152, p. 110959, Jun. 2023.

- [16] E. Žáčková, S. Prívára, and M. Pčolka, “Persistent excitation condition within the dual control framework,” *Journal of Process Control*, vol. 23, no. 9, pp. 1270–1280, Oct. 2013.
- [17] B. A. Hernandez Vicente and P. A. Trodden, “Stabilizing predictive control with persistence of excitation for constrained linear systems,” *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 126, pp. 58–66, Apr. 2019.
- [18] X. Lu and M. Cannon, “Robust Adaptive Tube Model Predictive Control,” in *2019 American Control Conference (ACC)*, Jul. 2019, pp. 3695–3701.
- [19] J. C. Willems, P. Rapisarda, I. Markovsky, and B. L. M. De Moor, “A note on persistency of excitation,” *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 54, no. 4, pp. 325–329, Apr. 2005.
- [20] C. De Persis and P. Tesi, “Formulas for Data-Driven Control: Stabilization, Optimality, and Robustness,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 65, no. 3, pp. 909–924, Mar. 2020.
- [21] S. Axler, *Linear Algebra Done Right*, ser. Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2024.

APPENDIX

Proof. (Lemma 3) At time k , the Hankel matrix of the past inputs is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_L(u_{[k-T+1,k]}) &= \begin{bmatrix} u_{k-T+1} & u_{k-T+2} & \cdots & u_{k-L} & u_{k-L+1} \\ u_{k-T+2} & u_{k-T+3} & \cdots & u_{k-L+1} & u_{k-L+2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \\ u_{k-T+L-1} & u_{k-T+L} & \cdots & u_{k-2} & u_{k-1} \\ u_{k-T+L} & u_{k-T+L+1} & \cdots & u_{k-1} & u_k \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_{11,k} & \mathcal{H}_{12,k} \\ \mathcal{H}_{21,k} & u_k \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

and at time $k-1$ the Hankel matrix is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_L(u_{[k-T,k-1]}) &= \begin{bmatrix} u_{k-T} & u_{k-T+1} & \cdots & u_{k-L-1} & u_{k-L} \\ u_{k-T+1} & u_{k-T+2} & \cdots & u_{k-L} & u_{k-L+1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \\ u_{k-T+L-2} & u_{k-T+L-1} & \cdots & u_{k-3} & u_{k-2} \\ u_{k-T+L-1} & u_{k-T+L} & \cdots & u_{k-2} & u_{k-1} \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Comparing the structure of the matrices, the last $T-1$ columns of $\mathcal{H}_L(u_{[k-T,k-1]})$, i.e. all of its columns except for the first one, correspond to the first $T-1$ columns of $\mathcal{H}_L(u_{[k-T+1,k]})$, i.e. all of its columns except for the last one. Similarly, the last $mL-m$ rows of $\mathcal{H}_L(u_{[k-T,k-1]})$ correspond to the first $mL-m$ rows of $\mathcal{H}_L(u_{[k-T+1,k]})$. These correspondences are presented in Fig. 5.

1. Assuming that $u_{[k-T,k-1]}$ is persistently exciting of order L , $\mathcal{H}_L(u_{[k-T,k-1]})$ has linearly independent rows. Since the submatrix $[\mathcal{H}_{11,k} \ \mathcal{H}_{12,k}] \in \mathbb{R}^{m(L-1) \times (T-L+1)}$ is also part of $\mathcal{H}_L(u_{[k-T,k-1]})$, these rows are linearly independent and

$$\text{rank}([\mathcal{H}_{11,k} \ \mathcal{H}_{12,k}]) = mL - m,$$

establishing the first point of Lemma 3. Furthermore, this also establishes the lower bound

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rank}(\mathcal{H}_L(u_{[k-T+1,k]})) &\geq \text{rank}([\mathcal{H}_{11,k} \ \mathcal{H}_{12,k}]) \\ &= mL - m. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\mathcal{H}_{11,k} \\
\left[\begin{array}{ccccc}
u_{k-T} & u_{k-T+1} & \cdots & u_{k-L-1} & u_{k-L} \\
u_{k-T+1} & u_{k-T+2} & \cdots & u_{k-L} & u_{k-L+1} \\
\vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\
u_{k-T+L-2} & u_{k-T+L-1} & \cdots & u_{k-3} & u_{k-2} \\
u_{k-T+L-1} & u_{k-T+L} & \cdots & u_{k-2} & u_{k-1}
\end{array} \right] \\
\mathcal{H}_{21,k} \\
\text{(a)}
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\left[\begin{array}{ccccc}
u_{k-T} & u_{k-T+1} & \cdots & u_{k-L-1} & u_{k-L} \\
u_{k-T+1} & u_{k-T+2} & \cdots & u_{k-L} & u_{k-L+1} \\
\vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\
u_{k-T+L-2} & u_{k-T+L-1} & \cdots & u_{k-3} & u_{k-2} \\
u_{k-T+L-1} & u_{k-T+L} & \cdots & u_{k-2} & u_{k-1}
\end{array} \right] \\
\mathcal{H}_{11,k} \qquad \mathcal{H}_{12,k} \\
\text{(b)}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 5. $\mathcal{H}_L(u_{[k-T,k-1]})$ and its correspondence (a) with the columns and (b) with the rows of $\mathcal{H}_L(u_{[k-T+1,k]})$

2. Similarly to the previous point, the columns $\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_{11,k} \\ \mathcal{H}_{21,k} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(mL) \times (T-L)}$ are present both in $\mathcal{H}_L(u_{[k-T,k-1]})$ and in $\mathcal{H}_L(u_{[k-T+1,k]})$. Comparing $\mathcal{H}_L(u_{[k-T,k-1]})$ to $\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_{11,k} \\ \mathcal{H}_{21,k} \end{bmatrix}$, the Hankel matrix has an additional column given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} u_{k-T} \\ \vdots \\ u_{k-T+L-1} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{mL}.$$

Consequently, the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_{11,k} \\ \mathcal{H}_{21,k} \end{bmatrix}$ has, at most, one less linearly independent row than $\mathcal{H}_L(u_{[k-T,k-1]})$ and therefore

$$\text{rank} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_{11,k} \\ \mathcal{H}_{21,k} \end{bmatrix} \right) \geq mL - 1,$$

which corresponds to the lower bound on the second item.

Similarly to (23), the inequality above also establishes a lower bound on the rank of $\mathcal{H}_L(u_{[k-T+1,k]})$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{rank} \left(\mathcal{H}_L(u_{[k-T+1,k]}) \right) &\geq \text{rank} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_{11,k} \\ \mathcal{H}_{21,k} \end{bmatrix} \right) \\
&\geq mL - 1
\end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

This bound, however, is more strict than (23) and corresponds to the lower bound of the third item of Lemma 3.

The upper bound

$$\text{rank} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_{11,k} \\ \mathcal{H}_{21,k} \end{bmatrix} \right) \leq mL$$

corresponds to the scenario where the additional column present in $\mathcal{H}_L(u_{[k-T,k-1]})$ is linearly dependent on $\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_{11,k} \\ \mathcal{H}_{21,k} \end{bmatrix}$,

and therefore

$$\text{rank} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H}_{11,k} \\ \mathcal{H}_{21,k} \end{bmatrix} \right) = mL.$$

3. The upper bound

$$\text{rank} \left(\mathcal{H}_L(u_{[k-T+1,k]}) \right) \leq mL$$

is trivial and represents the full row rank condition. \square

Proof. (Lemma 4) To prove this Lemma, the Fundamental Theorem of Linear Maps must first be established.

Theorem 9 (Fundamental Theorem of Linear Maps [21]). *Suppose V and W are vector spaces, V has finite dimensions and $M: V \rightarrow W$ is a linear map from V to W . Then the range of M is finite-dimensional and*

$$\dim V = \dim \text{null } M + \dim \text{range } M$$

The solution z_k^* to (12) corresponds to the null space of

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} H_{11,k} \\ H_{21,k} \end{bmatrix}^\top,$$

and its dimension can be determined using Theorem 9. From Lemma 3, M has mL columns and mL or $mL - 1$ independent vectors and therefore

$$\text{rank } M = mL \text{ or } mL - 1.$$

These two scenarios are considered below.

$\text{rank}(M) = mL$. If M has mL independent columns, then $\dim \text{range}(M) = mL$ and Theorem 9 yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\dim \text{null}(M) &= \dim(V) - \dim \text{range}(M) \\
&= \dim(z) - \dim \text{range}(M) \\
&= mL - mL = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

and the only solution to (12) is $z_k^* \equiv 0$.

$\text{rank}(M) = mL - 1$. If M has $mL - 1$ independent columns, then $\dim \text{range}(M) = mL - 1$ and Theorem 9 yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\dim \text{null}(M) &= \dim(V) - \dim \text{range}(M) \\
&= \dim(z) - \dim \text{range}(M) \\
&= mL - mL + 1 = 1,
\end{aligned}$$

and therefore the solution to (12) has the form

$$z_k^* = \gamma z_{P,k}^*, \quad z_{P,k}^* \neq 0, \quad (25)$$

where $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ and $z_{P,k}^*$ is one particular solution to (12). \square

Proof. (Theorem 5) To prove this theorem, the results of Lemma 4 are applied to (13).

1. For $\text{rank} \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{11,k} \\ H_{21,k} \end{bmatrix} \right) = mL$, Lemma 4 establishes that the solution to (12) is $z_k^* \equiv 0$. Replacing $z = z_k^*$ into

$$\begin{bmatrix} H_{12,k} \\ u_k \end{bmatrix}^\top z = 0,$$

the equality is verified $\forall u_k \in \mathbb{R}^m$. This means that any choice of input would guarantee excitation and therefore $\mathbb{U}^- = \emptyset$. This result is expected, since the rows of $\mathcal{H}_L(u_{[k-T+1,k]})$ are already independent regardless of u_k .

2. For $\text{rank} \left(\begin{bmatrix} H_{11,k} \\ H_{21,k} \end{bmatrix} \right) = mL - 1$, the solution to (12) is

$$z_k^* = \gamma z_{P,k}^*, \quad z_{P,k}^* \neq 0.$$

Defining the partition

$$z_{P,k}^* = \begin{bmatrix} b_k \\ a_k \end{bmatrix}, \quad a_k \in \mathbb{R}^m, \quad b_k \in \mathbb{R}^{mL-m}$$

and replacing $z = z_k^*$ into (13), the input u^- that causes loss of excitation can be determined as

$$a_k^\top u^- = -b_k^\top H_{12,k} \quad (26)$$

which corresponds to the equation of a hyperplane. \mathbb{U}^- is then given by

$$\mathbb{U}_k^- := \{u_k \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid a_k^\top u_k + b_k^\top H_{12,k} = 0\} \quad (27)$$

Theorem 9 can be used to determine the dimension of \mathbb{U}_k^- . Given that $T = a_k^\top$ has m columns and has one row, Theorem 9 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \dim \text{null}(T) &= \dim(V) - \dim \text{range}(T) \\ \dim \text{null}(a_k^\top) &= \dim(u^-) - \dim \text{range}(a_k^\top) \\ &= m - 1, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore the dimension of \mathbb{U}_k^- is $m - 1$ and $\mathbb{U}_k^- \in \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$. \square