Abstract—Recently, there has been a surge of interest in approximating the model predictive control (MPC) law using expert supervised learning techniques, such as deep neural networks (DNN). Approximating the MPC control policy requires labeled training data sets, which is typically obtained by sampling the state-space and evaluating the control law by solving the numerical optimization problem offline for each sample. The accuracy of the MPC policy approximation is dependent on the availability of large training data set sampled across the entire state space. Although the resulting approximate MPC law can be cheaply evaluated online, generating large training samples to learn the MPC control law can be time consuming and prohibitively expensive. This paper aims to address this issue, and proposes the use of NLP sensitivities in order to cheaply generate additional training samples in the neighborhood of the existing samples.

I. INTRODUCTION

Model predictive control (MPC) is a popular control strategy for constrained multivariable systems that is based on repeatedly solving a receding horizon optimal control problem at each sampling time of the controller. As the range of MPC application extends beyond the traditional process industries, additional challenges such as computational effort and memory footprint need to be addressed. One approach to eliminate the need for solving optimization problems online, is to predetermined the optimal control policy \( u^* = \pi(x) \) as a function of the states \( x \).

This idea was first proposed under the context of explicit MPC for constrained linear quadratic systems where the MPC feedback law is expressed as a piecewise-affine function defined on polytopes [1], [2]. However, this can quickly become computationally intractable for large systems, since the number of polytopic regions grows exponentially with the number of decision variables and constraints. The extension to nonlinear systems is also not straightforward.

An alternative approach is to use some parametric function approximator, such as artificial neural networks (ANN) to approximate the MPC control law. Although this idea dates back to the mid 90s [3], the use of neural networks to approximate the MPC control law remained more or less dormant until very recently. Motivated by the recent developments and promises of deep learning techniques, there has been an unprecedented surge of interest in the past couple of years in approximating the MPC policy using deep neural networks. This interest has resulted in a number of research works from several research groups published just in the past couple of years. See for example [4]–[11] to name a few.

The underlying framework adopted in these works is as follows. The feasible state-space is sampled offline to generate a finite number of \( N_s \) discrete states \( \{x_i\}_{i=1}^{N_s} \). The NMPC problem is solved offline for each discrete state as the initial condition to obtain the corresponding optimal control law \( u_i^* = \pi_{mpc}(x_i) \) for all \( i = 1, \ldots, N_s \). The resulting MPC control law \( \pi_{mpc}(\cdot) \) is approximated using any suitable regression technique using \( \{(x_i,u_i^*)\}_{i=1}^{N_s} \) as the training data set, such that the trained model \( \pi_{approx}(\cdot) \) can be used online to cheaply evaluate the optimal control input. This approach is also studied more generally in the context of policy approximation, where such a framework is known as “expert supervised learning” [12].

However, one of the main bottleneck of this approach is that, generating the training data set can be time consuming and prohibitively expensive. The availability of large training data set covering the entire feasible state space is a key stipulation in using deep learning techniques and has a major impact on the accuracy of the approximate policy. This implies that the sample size \( N_s \) must be sufficiently large, covering the entire feasible state space. One then typically has to solve a large number of nonlinear programming (NLP) problems offline in order to generate adequate training samples. This challenge is only amplified for higher dimensional systems, since the number of samples \( N_s \) required to adequately cover the feasible state-space increases exponentially.

For example, the authors in [9] reported a computation time of roughly 500 hours on a Quad-Core PC\(^1\) to learn the approximate MPC control law for the case study considered in their work. Other works also report the need for a large training data set to adequately approximate the MPC control law.

In the field of machine learning and deep neural networks, the problem of insufficient training data samples is typically addressed using a process known as “data augmentation”, which is a strategy to artificially increase the number of training samples using computationally inexpensive transformations [13], [14]. This has been extensively studied in the context of deep learning for image classification problems, where geometric transformations (such as rotation, cropping etc.) and photometric transformations (such as color, contrast, brightness etc.) are often used to augment the existing data set with artificially generated training samples. Unfortunately, such data augmentation techniques are not applicable in the context of MPC policy approximation.

This paper aims to address the key issue of generating the

\(^{1}\)without parallelization of the sampling and validation
training data samples by exploiting the NLP sensitivities to generate multiple training samples using the solution of a single optimization problem solved offline. That is, the MPC problem solved offline can be considered as a parametric optimization problem parameterized with respect to the initial state \( x_i \). The NLP sensitivity then tells us how the optimal solution \( u_i^* \) changes for perturbations \( \Delta x \) in the neighborhood of \( x_i \).

Therefore, using the solution to one parametric optimization problem solved for \( x_i \), we can cheaply generate multiple training data samples for other state realizations in the neighborhood of \( x_i \) using the NLP sensitivity (also known as tangential predictor). This only requires computing the solution to a system of linear equations, which is much cheaper to evaluate than solving a nonlinear programming problem.

To this end, the aim of this paper is not to present a new MPC approximation algorithm, but rather address the pivotal issue of generating training data samples, that would facilitate practical implementation of the approximate explicit MPC framework. Thus, the main contribution of this paper is a sensitivity-based data augmentation technique to efficiently and cheaply generate training data samples that can be used to approximate the MPC control law.

The reminder of the paper is organized as follows. Section II formulates the problem and recalls the approximate explicit MPC framework. The sensitivity-based data augmentation technique to efficiently generate the training samples is presented in Section III. The proposed approach is illustrated using two different examples in Section IV before concluding the paper in Section V.

II. PRELIMINARIES
A. Problem Formulation

Consider a discrete-time nonlinear system

\[
    x(t+1) = f(x(t), u(t))
\]

where \( x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \) and \( u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \) are the states and control input at time \( t \) respectively. The mapping \( f : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \) denotes the plant model. The MPC problem \( \mathcal{P}(x(t)) \) is formulated as

\[
    \begin{align*}
        V_N(x(t)) &= \min_{x(t),u(t)} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \ell(x(k|t), u(k|t)) \\
        \text{s.t.} & \quad x(k+1|t) = f(x(k|t), u(k|t)) \quad (2a) \\
        & \quad x(k|t) \in \mathcal{X}, \quad u(k|t) \in \mathcal{U} \quad (2b) \\
        & \quad x(N|t) \in \mathcal{X}_f \quad (2c) \\
        & \quad x(0|t) = x(t) \quad (2e)
    \end{align*}
\]

where \( \ell : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) denotes the stage cost, which may be either a tracking or economic objective, \( N \) is the length of the prediction horizon, \( (2c) \) denotes the path constraints, \( (2d) \) denotes the terminal constraint, and \( (2e) \) denotes the initial condition constraints. In the traditional MPC paradigm, the optimization problem \( (2) \) is solved at each sample time \( t \) using \( x(t) \) as the state feedback, and the optimal input \( u^*(0|t) \) is injected into the plant in a receding horizon fashion. This implicitly leads to the control law

\[
    u^*(t) = \pi_{\text{mpc}}(x(t))
\]

B. Approximate Explicit MPC

This subsection recalls the underlying idea of the approximate explicit MPC framework common to works such as [3], [5],[8] and [9]. To approximate the MPC control law \( (3) \), the feasible state space \( \mathcal{X} \) is sampled to generate \( N_s \) randomly chosen initial states \( \{x_i\}_{i=1}^{N_s} \). For each initial state \( x_i \), the MPC problem \( \mathcal{P}(x_i) \) is solved to obtain the corresponding optimal input \( u_i^* = \pi_{\text{mpc}}(x_i) \). Using the data samples \( D := \{(x_i, u_i^*)\}_{i=1}^{N_s} \), any desirable functional form \( \pi_{\approx}(x; \theta) \) parameterized by the parameters \( \theta \) is trained in order to minimize the mean squared error

\[
    \hat{\theta} = \arg \min_{\theta} \frac{1}{N_s} \sum_{i=1}^{N_s} \| \pi_{\approx}(x_i; \theta) - u_i^* \|^2
\]

This is summarized in Algorithm 1.

Deep neural networks have become a popular choice for the functional form for approximating the MPC control law. For a deep neural network with \( L \) hidden layers and \( M \) neurons in each hidden layer,

\[
    \pi_{\approx}(x; \theta) = h_{L+1} \circ \alpha_L \circ h_L \circ \cdots \circ \alpha_1 \circ h_1
\]

Each hidden layer is made of an affine function \( h_l(\xi_l-1) = W_l^T \xi_{l-1} + b_l \quad \forall l = 1, \ldots, L \) where \( \xi_{l-1} \in \mathbb{R}^M \) is the output of the previous layer and \( \xi_0 = x \). \( \alpha_l(h_l) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) denotes a nonlinear activation function such as sigmoid, rectified linear unit (ReLU) etc. The parameter \( \theta \) contains all the weights \( W_l \) and biases \( b_l \).

Once the network architecture is trained, the approximate control law \( \pi_{\approx}(x; \hat{\theta}) \) can be used online to cheaply evaluate the optimal control input.

III. PROPOSED METHOD

As mentioned in the previous section, generating the training data requires solving \( N_s \) numerical optimization problems, which can be time consuming and computationally expensive. This section leverages the NLP sensitivity to cheaply generate training data samples that can be used to learn the MPC control law.
law. To keep the notation light, we rewrite the MPC problem (2) into a standard parametric NLP problem of the form,

\[ V_N(p) = \min_w J(w, p) \]

\[ \text{s.t. } c(w, p) = 0 \]

\[ g(w, p) \leq 0 \]

where \( p = x(0(t)) = x(t) \) is the initial state, the decision variables \( w := [u(0(t)), \ldots, u(N - 1(t))]^T \) are denoted by (6a), the system equations (2b) and terminal constraints (2d) are collectively denoted by (6c). Since the focus is on solving the MPC problem offline, we drop the time dependency of the initial state, and simply denote the initial condition as \( x \) instead of \( x(t) \).

The Lagrangian (6) is given by

\[ \mathcal{L}(w, p, \lambda, \mu) := J(w, p) + \lambda^T c(w, p) + \mu^T g(w, p) \]

where \( \lambda \) and \( \mu \) are the Lagrangian multipliers of (6b) and (6c) respectively, and the KKT conditions for this problem is given by

\[ \nabla_w \mathcal{L}(w, p, \lambda, \mu) = 0 \]  

\[ c(w, p) = 0 \]  

\[ g(w, p) \leq 0 \]  

\[ \mu_i g_i(w, p) = 0, \quad \mu_i \geq 0 \quad \forall i \]

Any point \( s^*(p) \) that satisfies the KKT conditions (8) for a given initial condition \( p \) is known as a KKT point for \( p \). We define the set of active inequality constraints \( g_A(w, p) \subseteq g(w, p) \) such that \( g_A(w, p) = 0 \), and strict complementarity is said to hold if the corresponding Lagrange multipliers \( \mu_A > 0 \). This set of KKT conditions can be represented compactly as \( \varphi(s(p), p) \).

**Theorem 1** ([15]). Let \( J(\cdot, \cdot) \) and \( c(\cdot, \cdot) \) of the parametric NLP problem \( \mathcal{P}(p) \) be twice continuously differentiable in a neighborhood of the KKT point \( s^*(p) \). Further, let linear inequality constraint qualification (LICQ), second order sufficient conditions (SOSC) and strict complementarity hold for the solution vector \( s^*(p) \). Then

- \( s^*(p) \) is a unique local minimizer of \( \mathcal{P}(p) \).
- For parametric perturbations \( \Delta p \) in the neighborhood of \( p \), there exists a unique, continuous, and differentiable vector function \( s^*(p + \Delta p) \) which is a KKT point satisfying LICQ and SOSC for \( \mathcal{P}(p + \Delta p) \).
- There exists positive Lipschitz constants \( L_s \) and \( L_V \) such that the solution vector and the optimal cost satisfies \( \|s^*(p + \Delta p) - s^*(p)\| \leq L_s \|\Delta p\| \) and \( \|V_N(p + \Delta p) - V_N(p)\| \leq L_V \|\Delta p\| \) respectively.

**Proof.** See [15]

Linearizing the KKT conditions \( \varphi(s(p), p) \) around \( s^*(p) \) gives

\[ 0 = \nabla_s \varphi(s^*(p), p) + \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial p} \nabla_s \varphi(s^*(p), p) \Delta p + O(\|\Delta p\|^2) \]

where \( \varphi \) and \( \Delta p \) are the corresponding optimal solution, denoted by \( \hat{u}_j^* \), can be approximated using \( (11) \). By exploiting the sensitivities, one can generate \( N_sN_p \) number of training samples using only \( N_s \) offline optimization problems. The pseudo-code for the proposed sensitivity-based data augmentation technique

**Algorithm 2** Sensitivity-based data augmentation to learn an approximate MPC control law

**Input:** \( \mathcal{P}(x), \mathcal{X}, D = \emptyset \)

1: for \( i = 1, \ldots, N_s \) do
2: Sample \( x_i \in \mathcal{X} \)
3: Solve \( \mathcal{P}(x_i) \)
4: Extract \( u_i^* \) from the solution vector \( s^*(x_i) \)
5: \( D \leftarrow D \cup \{ (x_i, u_i^*) \} \)
6: for \( j = 1, \ldots, N_p \) do
7: Sample \( \Delta x_j \) in the neighborhood of \( x_i \)
8: \( \hat{s}^*(x_i + \Delta x_j) = s^*(x_i) + M^{-1}N \Delta x_j \)
9: Extract \( \hat{u}_j^* \) from the solution vector \( \hat{s}^*(x_i + \Delta x_j) \)
10: \( D \leftarrow D \cup \{ (x_i + \Delta x_j, \hat{u}_j^*) \} \)
11: end for
12: end for
13: \( \theta \leftarrow \arg \min_\theta \frac{1}{N_sN_p} \sum_{i=1}^{N_sN_p} \| \pi_{\text{approx}}(x_i) - u_i^* \|^2 \)

**Output:** \( \pi_{\text{approx}}(x; \theta) \)

Consequently,

\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial p} \nabla_s \varphi(s^*(p)) \Delta p = \left( \mathcal{M} \frac{\partial s^*}{\partial p} + N \right) \Delta p \approx 0 \]

where

\[ \mathcal{M} := \begin{bmatrix} \nabla^2_{ww} \mathcal{L}(s^*(p)) & \nabla_w c(s^*(p)) & \nabla_w g_A(s^*(p)) \\ \nabla_w c(s^*(p)) & 0 & 0 \\ \nabla_w g_A(s^*(p)) & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \]

is the KKT matrix and

\[ \mathcal{N} := \begin{bmatrix} \nabla_{wp} \mathcal{L}(s^*(p)) \\ \nabla_p c(s^*(p)) \\ \nabla_p g_A(s^*(p)) \end{bmatrix} \]

Therefore, the solution of the neighboring problems \( p_0 + \Delta p \) can be obtained from

\[ \hat{s}^*(p_0 + \Delta p) = s^*(p) + \frac{\partial s^*}{\partial p} \Delta p \]

where \( \hat{s}^*(p_0 + \Delta p) \) is the approximate primal-dual solution of the optimization problem \( \mathcal{P}(p_0 + \Delta p) \). Therefore, \( \Delta s^* := \hat{s}^*(p_0 + \Delta p) - s^*(p) \) can be computed as the solution to the system of linear equations,

\[ \mathcal{M} \Delta s^* = -\mathcal{N} \Delta p \]

From this we can see that once the solution to the NLP problem \( \mathcal{P}(x_i) \) is available for a given initial state \( x_i \in \mathcal{X} \), we can exploit the parametric property of the NLP to compute a fast approximate solution for an additional finite set of \( j = 1, \ldots, N_p \) optimization problems \( \mathcal{P}(x_i + \Delta x_j) \) with initial states \( x_i + \Delta x_j \in \mathcal{X} \) in the neighborhood of \( x_i \). Using the solution to a system of linear equations (11) the corresponding optimal solution, denoted by \( \hat{u}_j^* \), can then be cheaply evaluated using (11). By exploiting the sensitivities, one can generate \( N_sN_p \) number of training samples using only \( N_s \) offline optimization problems. The pseudo-code for the proposed sensitivity-based data augmentation technique
to learn an approximate MPC control law is summarized in Algorithm 2.

Remark 1. In the case of linear MPC where $\ell(\cdot, \cdot)$ is convex quadratic and $f(\cdot)$ is linear, then $\hat{s}^*(x + \Delta x) = s^*(x + \Delta x)$.

Remark 2. If the perturbation $\Delta x_j$ induces a change in the set of active constraints, then one would have to solve a quadratic programming problem, often known as predictor QP, in order to obtain the approximate solution $\hat{s}^*(x + \Delta x)$ [16], which may still be computationally cheaper than solving a full NLP problem. Alternatively, one can simply discard the sensitivity updates that induce a change in active constraint set.

Note that the idea of exploiting the parametric property of the MPC problem with respect to the initial states is also used in other parts of MPC literature such as the advanced-step MPC [17], [18] and adaptive horizon MPC [19], [20].

The proposed sensitivity-based data augmentation scheme can also be utilized by parameterizing the optimization problem with respect to other time-varying parameters such as exogenous disturbances, or time varying setpoints, in addition to the initial states. The proposed approach is also not restricted to the MPC formulation (2), but can also be used with other variants of MPC formulation, such as the multistage scenario-based MPC used in [21].

IV. ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES

A. Benchmark CSTR

We now apply the proposed approach on a benchmark CSTR problem from [22] that was also used in the context of approximate MPC in [9]. This problem consists of two states, namely the concentration and reactor temperature (denoted by $x_1$ and $x_2$ respectively). The process is controlled using the coolant flow rate $u$. The model is given by

$$\dot{x}_1 = (1/\tau)(1 - x_1) - k x_1 e^{-M/x_2}$$
$$\dot{x}_2 = (1/\tau)(x_f - x_2) + k x_1 e^{-M/x_2} - \alpha u (x_2 - x_c)$$

and the model parameters are $\tau = 20$, $k = 300$, $M = 5$, $x_f = 0.3947$, $x_c = 0.3816$, and $\alpha = 0.117$. The feasible state space is given by $X = [0.0632, 0.4632] \times [0.4519, 0.8519]$ and $U = [0, 2]$. The setpoint is given by $x^{sp} = [0.2632, 0.6519]^T$.

The stage cost is given by $\ell(x, u) = \|x - x^{sp}\|^2 + 10^{-4}\|u\|^2$. The MPC problem is solved with a sampling time of 3 s and a prediction horizon of $N = 140$.

One approach to generate the learning samples is to use a grid-based sampling approach as done in [9], where the state space $X$ is divided into finite number of uniform grids. The optimal input $u^* = \pi_{mpc}(x)$ is then evaluated at each grid point. In general, a small grid size is preferred since this would improve the MPC approximation. However, this would lead to large sample size $N_s$.

The proposed approach enables us to choose a relatively larger grid size, where the corresponding optimal input $\pi_{mpc}(x)$ is evaluated by solving the optimization problem. Additional grid points can then be generated with a smaller grid size around each grid point, and the corresponding optimal input can be computed by using the sensitivity update (11).

This is shown in Fig. 1 where the state space is sampled into grids with a larger grid size (shown in red circle) with an interval of 0.0211 for $x_1$ and $x_2$, and around each grid point, the state space is further sampled with a smaller grid size (shown in black dots) with an interval of 0.0052 for $x_1$ and $x_2$.

By using this approach, we were able to generate a total of 6968 training samples, out of which 268 training samples (shown in red circles) were generated by solving a numerical optimization problem, and 6700 training samples (shown in black dots) were generated by using the sensitivity update. Note that not all the grid points have a feasible solution. Hence only the feasible points are included in the training data set $D$ and are shown in Fig. 1.

The optimization problem was solved offline using IPOPT [23]. The samples were generated on a 2.6 GHz processor with 16GB memory. The minimum, maximum and average CPU time for generating the training samples using the full optimization problem and the sensitivity-update are summarized in Table I, from which it can be seen that the CPU times differ roughly by a factor of 100.

Using the generated training samples, we approximate the MPC control law using deep neural networks with $L = 3$.
layers and \( M = 10 \) neurons with rectified linear units (ReLU) as the activation function in each layer\(^2\). From the generated training samples, 4878 training samples were used for training, 1045 training samples were used for validation, and 1045 training samples were used for testing.

Fig. 2 shows the closed loop simulation results using the approximate MPC control law \( \pi_{\text{approx}}(x) \) (shown in red) compared with the traditional MPC control law \( \pi_{\text{mpc}}(x) \) (shown in blue).

From this it can be seen that by using the proposed approach, we can choose a relatively larger grid size between the samples (sparse sampling), which reduces the number of optimization problems that need to be solved offline. Consequently, the overall time and computational cost required to generate the training samples is significantly lesser.

### B. Building Climate Control

We now illustrate the proposed approach on a building climate control problem, for which there have been several works considering MPC as the control strategy [10], [24]. In our simulations, we model the heat dynamics of a building based on the modeling framework from [25], as shown below,

\[
\frac{dT_s}{dt} = \frac{1}{R_{sC_s}}(T_i - T_s) \\
\frac{dT_i}{dt} = \frac{1}{R_{iC_i}}(T_s - T_i) + \frac{1}{R_{ihC_i}}(T_h - T_i) + \frac{A_w \Phi}{C_i} \\
\frac{dT_h}{dt} = \frac{1}{R_{hC_h}}(T_e - T_h) + \frac{u}{C_h} \\
\frac{dT_e}{dt} = \frac{1}{R_{eC_e}}(T_e - T_c) + \frac{1}{R_{eaC_e}}(T_n - T_e) + \frac{A_s \Phi}{C_e}
\]

where the subscripts \((\cdot)_s, (\cdot)_i, (\cdot)_h, (\cdot)_a\) and \((\cdot)_a\) denotes the sensor, building interior, heater, building envelop, and ambient, respectively. \( T \) denotes the temperature, \( R \) denotes the thermal resistance, \( C \) denotes the heat capacity and \( u \) denotes the heat flux. The solar irradiation \( \Phi \) enters the building interior through the effective window area \( A_w \) in addition to heating the building envelop with effective area \( A_e \). The states are given by \( x = [T_s, T_i, T_h, T_e]^T \) with \( T_{s,i,h} \in [12,40] \) °C. The ambient temperature \( T_a \in [-5,20] \) °C and the solar irradiation \( \Phi \in [0,0.2] \) kW/m\(^2\) are considered as external disturbances. The parameter values used in the simulation are shown in Table III.

The objective is to drive the interior temperature \( T_i \) to a desired setpoint \( T_i^{sp} \in [18,25] \) °C, while penalizing the rate of change of the input usage \( u \in [0,40] \) kW. The stage cost is then given by \( \ell(x,u) = (T_i - T_i^{sp})^2 + 0.1(\Delta u)^2 \). The MPC problem is formulated with a sampling time of 1 min and a prediction horizon of \( N = 3 \) hours. The goal is to approximate the MPC control law \( \pi_{\text{approx}}(\hat{x}) \). In this example \( \hat{x} = [T_s, T_i, T_h, T_e, T_n^{sp}, T_a, \Phi, u]^T \), which requires sampling a 8-dimensional space in order to generate the training samples.

We randomly generate a total of 6930 samples, out of which, 330 samples were generated by solving the optimization problem and 6600 samples were generated using the sensitivity update. The average, minimum and maximum CPU time for solving the optimization problem and for computing the sensitivity update are shown in Table II.

Using the generated training samples, we approximate the MPC control law using deep neural networks with \( L = 3 \) layers and \( M = 10 \) neurons with rectified linear units (ReLU) as the activation function in each neuron. From the generated training samples, 4850 training samples were used for training, 1040 training samples were used for validation, and 1040 training samples were used for testing.

We test the performance of the approximate control law for a total simulation time of 12 hours, with changes in the setpoint (at \( t = 3 \) h), solar irradiation (at time \( t = 6 \) h), and ambient temperature (at \( t = 9 \) h). Fig. 3 shows the closed loop simulation results using the traditional MPC control law \( \pi_{\text{mpc}}(x) \) obtained by solving the MPC problem online, and the performance of the approximate explicit MPC control law \( \pi_{\text{approx}}(x) \) approximated using the training samples generated using Algorithm 2. From this it can be seen that the proposed sensitivity-based data augmentation framework can be used to parameterize the measured disturbances, setpoints, and the control input in addition to the states in order to handle time varying disturbances and setpoints.

### V. CONCLUSIONS

To conclude, this brief paper addresses an important implementation aspect of approximate explicit MPC design, namely

| TABLE I: Example A: CPU time in [s] for generating the training samples. |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|                          | Full NLP                 | Sensitivity update       |
|                          | min avg max # of samples | min avg max # of samples |
| Full NLP                 | 0.2837 0.5980 2.7697     | 0.0290 0.0344 0.1034     |
| Sensitivity update       | 0.0038 0.0055 0.0222     | 0.0940 0.1054 0.2122     |

| TABLE II: Example B: CPU time in [s] for generating the training samples. |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|                          | Full NLP                 | Sensitivity update       |
|                          | min avg max # of samples | min avg max # of samples |
| Full NLP                 | 0.3925 0.55 1.0683       | 0.0290 0.0344 0.1034     |
| Sensitivity update       | 0.0038 0.0055 0.0222     | 0.0940 0.1054 0.2122     |

| TABLE III: Example 2: Parameter used in the building climate control problem. |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|                         | \( R_{s} \) Heat resistance between interior & sensor | 1.89 °C/kW |
|                         | \( R_{h} \) Heat resistance between interior & heater | 0.146 °C/kW |
|                         | \( R_{e} \) Heat resistance between interior & envelop | 0.897 °C/kW |
|                         | \( R_{ea} \) Heat resistance between envelop & ambient | 0.25 °C/kW |
|                         | \( C_{s} \) Heat capacitance for the sensor | 0.0549 kWh/°C |
|                         | \( C_{i} \) Heat capacitance for the interior | 0.0928 kWh/°C |
|                         | \( C_{e} \) Heat capacitance for the envelop | 3.32 kWh/°C |
|                         | \( C_{h} \) Heat capacitance for the heater | 0.889 kWh/°C |
|                         | \( A_{e} \) Effective area of solar irradiation | 3.87 m\(^2\) |
|                         | \( A_{w} \) Effective window area | 5.75 m\(^2\) |
the cost of training. Algorithm 2 exploits the parameteric sensitivities to cheaply generate several training samples using the solution of a single optimization problem. It was shown that by using the proposed approach, one can

- sample the state space relatively sparsely, hence reducing the number of optimization problems that needs to be solved offline,
- and augment the data set with additional samples using NLP sensitivity.

The proposed scheme can be used with any MPC formulation that can be cast as a nonlinear programming problem.
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