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Abstract

Recently, a number of regional MPC approaches have been proposed that exploit the piecewise affine structure of the optimal solution (without computing the entire explicit solution before). Here, regional refers to the idea of using the affine feedback law that is optimal in a vicinity of the current state of operation, and therefore provides the optimal input signal without requiring to solve a QP. We extend the original approach [10] to linear systems with bounded additive disturbances by replacing the underlying classical MPC problem by a min-max MPC problem. We analyse the performance of the new approach and compare it to an existing regional tube-based approach.

1 Introduction

Model predictive control is an established method for the control of multivariable dynamical systems that allows to take state and input constraints into account already in the controller design. The method, however, requires the solution of an optimization problem in every time step resulting in a high computational effort. Some contributions propose to avoid the online optimization whenever possible. These contributions include event-triggered approaches that apply feedback to the system only if necessary, i.e., in the case of an event. Events may, e.g., be a large difference between the predicted and actual trajectory (see, e.g., [13, 14, 1]) or a high rate of change of the cost function (see, e.g., [1, 6]).

Recently, a new event-triggered MPC approach has been proposed that takes a different path and exploits the structure of the solution of the MPC problem [10]. It computes an affine feedback law and a region of validity from the solution at the current state. The feedback law can be reused to avoid online optimizations in subsequent time steps. Only when the current polytope is left (the event in this case), a new optimization problem is solved. However, simulations show that closed-loop trajectories often step from polytope to polytope and therefore feedback laws are often not reused in the original approach [10]. Therefore, several extensions, such as exploiting active set updates and suboptimality, have been developed to increase the reusability and reduce the number of optimization problems (see, e.g., [11, 12, 13]). Since the original approach from [10] does not take disturbances into account directly (note it is robust to some extent due to the polytopes), in [20] it has been robustified by replacing the underlying classical MPC problem with a tube-based MPC problem (see, e.g., [16]). This new robust approach has also been extended by active set updates and suboptimality to reduce the computational effort for the online optimizations [2].

It is the purpose of the present paper to analyse a new robust regional MPC approach that is based on the solution of a min-max optimization problem (see [22, 3]). Unlike the tube-based approach, the min-max approach minimizes the objective function for the worst possible case of disturbances. We investigate the number of online optimizations that can be saved by reusing robust affine feedback laws. Moreover, we extend the new approach by exploiting active set updates and suboptimality to reduce the number of optimization problems further. We compare the new approach to the tube-based approach [20] and the original approach [10].

We state the system and problem class along with some preliminaries in Sect. 2. The new approach is
presented in Sect. 3 and applied to an example in Sect. 4. In Sect. 5 we give a short outlook.

2 Problem statement

Consider a linear discrete-time system with bounded additive disturbances

\[ x_{k+1} = Ax_k + Bu_k + Dw_k, \quad x_0 \text{ given,} \tag{1} \]

with states \( x_k \in \mathbb{R}^n \), inputs \( u_k \in \mathbb{R}^m \), disturbances \( w_k \in \mathbb{R}^p \) and system matrices \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \), \( B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \) and \( D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \). Assume state and input constraints and bounded disturbances

\[ x_k \in X, \quad u_k \in U, \quad w_k \in D \tag{2} \]

apply for all \( k \in \mathbb{N} \), where \( X, U \) and \( D \) are closed polyhedrons that contain the origin as an interior point. The control input in (1) is given by

\[ u_k = -K_x x_k + v_k, \tag{3} \]

with the LQR feedback gain \( K_x \) and the correction control input \( v_k \in \mathbb{R}^m \). The dynamics of the system (1) can be rewritten as

\[ x_{k+1} = A_d x_k + B v_k + D w_k \quad \text{with} \quad A_d = (A - BK_x). \tag{4} \]

The proposed MPC controller aims at steering system (4) to a robust positively invariant set (RPI set) around the origin while satisfying constraints (2). For this purpose, it minimizes a cost function for the worst possible case that might result from the disturbances. This problem can be formulated as a min-max optimal control problem (OCP)

\[
\min_{X,V} \max_{W \in D} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} (\tilde{x}_i' Q \tilde{x}_i + \tilde{u}_i' R \tilde{u}_i) \right]
\]

s.t. \( \tilde{x}_0 = x_0, \)

\[
\tilde{x}_{i+1} = A_d \tilde{x}_i + B \tilde{u}_i + D \tilde{w}_i, \quad i = 0, \ldots, N - 1, \]

\[
\tilde{u}_i = -K_x \tilde{x}_i + B \tilde{v}_i, \quad i = 0, \ldots, N - 1, \]

\[
\tilde{x}_i \in X, \quad \tilde{u}_i \in U, \quad \tilde{w}_i \in D, \quad i = 0, \ldots, N - 1, \]

\[
\tilde{x}_N \in T, \tag{5} \]

which is solved for the current state \( x_0 \) on a receding horizon \( N \in \mathbb{N} \), where \( W = (\tilde{w}_0, \tilde{w}_1, \ldots, \tilde{w}_{N-1})' \) represents a sequence of disturbances to the system and \( X = (\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_2, \ldots, \tilde{x}_N)' \) and \( V = (\tilde{v}_0, \tilde{v}_1, \ldots, \tilde{v}_{N-1})' \) are a predicted state sequence and correction control input sequence, respectively. A closed-loop system results by solving the problem (5) at each sampling instant and applying the optimal correction control input \( u_k^* \) to system (4). Assume \( Q \succeq 0, P \succeq 0 \) and \( R > 0 \) with the obvious dimensions, \((A, B)\) is stabilizable and \((Q, A)\) is detectable. In order to guarantee robust stability, \( P \) is chosen as the solution of the discrete-time algebraic Riccati equation, and \( T \) to a robust control invariant set for the LQR regulated system. We introduce the set of possible disturbance sequences \( D_N \) of length \( N \), i.e.

\[
\mathcal{D}_N = \{ (w_0, \ldots, w_{N-1}) | w_i \in D \forall i \in \{0, \ldots, N - 1\} \}. \tag{6} \]

Since the cost function in (5) is convex in \( W \), the maximum of the inner optimization for all possible uncertainties \( W \in \mathcal{D}_N \) is attained at least at one of the vertices \( \text{Ver} (\mathcal{D}_N) \).

By some straightforward reformulations (more details in [1], [4]), OCP (5) can be expressed as a quadratic program

\[
\begin{align*}
\min_{Z, \gamma} & \quad \frac{1}{2} Z' H Z + \gamma \\
\text{s.t.} & \quad G_m Z + g_m \gamma \leq W_m + S_m x, \\
& \quad G_c Z \leq W_c + S_c x, \tag{7}
\end{align*}
\]

with the optimizers \( Z \in \mathbb{R}^{mN} \) and \( \gamma \in \mathbb{R} \), where

\[
Z = V + H^{-1} F' x_0 \tag{8}
\]

and \( H \in \mathbb{R}^{mN \times mN}, G_m \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times mN}, g_m \in \mathbb{R}^r, W_m \in \mathbb{R}^r, S_m \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times mN}, G_c \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times mN}, W_c \in \mathbb{R}^q \).
and \( S_c \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times n} \). We refer to [19] for more details about the computation of the matrices. Each of the first \( r \) inequalities in (7) corresponds to one of the vertices \( \text{Ver}(D_N) \). At the optimum \((Z^*, \gamma^*)\) at least one of these \( r \) constraints is active, i.e. fulfilled with equality. The second \( q \) inequalities collect the state and input constraints. Note that problem (7) in strictly convex because \( H > 0 \) and \( \gamma \) is the maximum of a set of linear functions [19]. Thus, the optimizer \((Z^*, \gamma^*)\) is unique.

3 An event-triggered robust MPC approach

In this section the event-triggered MPC approach from [10] is robustified by replacing the underlying classical MPC problem with the problem (5) respectively (7). We explain the new robust event-triggered MPC algorithm at the end of this section. We introduce some technical details in preparation of Lemma 1 which constitutes the basis of our new approach. Using the augmented decision variable

\[
\epsilon = [Z', \gamma']
\]

problem (7) can be rewritten as

\[
\min_{\epsilon} \frac{1}{2} \epsilon' \hat{H} \epsilon + \epsilon'
\]

s.t. \( G\epsilon \leq W + Sx \)

with the block matrices

\[
\hat{H} = \begin{pmatrix} H & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \epsilon' = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}
\]

and \( G, H \in \mathbb{R}^{(q+r) \times (mN+1)}, W \in \mathbb{R}^{(q+r)} \) and \( S \in \mathbb{R}^{(q+r) \times n} \).

Note that \( \hat{H} \) is a singular matrix, because \( \gamma \) enters only linearly (cf. [19]). Consequently, \( \hat{H} \) is not invertible and a feedback law and its polytope must be computed with the null space method [17, 21].

We introduce the sets of active, inactive and weakly active constraints

\[
\mathcal{A}(x) = \{ i \in \mathcal{Q} \mid G^i\epsilon^i(x) - W^i - S^i x = 0 \},
\]

\[
\mathcal{I}(x) = \{ i \in \mathcal{Q} \mid G^i\epsilon^i(x) - W^i - S^i x < 0 \}, \quad (12)
\]

\[
\mathcal{W}(x) = \{ i \in \mathcal{A}(x) \mid \lambda^i(x) = 0 \}
\]

with \( \mathcal{I}(x) = \mathcal{Q} \setminus \mathcal{A}(x) \), where \( \mathcal{Q} = \{ 1, \ldots, r+q \} \) is the set of all constraint indices and \( \lambda \) are the Lagrange multipliers. The following lemma is based on the results in [21].

**Lemma 1** Let \( x \in X_f \) be arbitrary and \( A(x) \) the corresponding active set. Assume the matrix \( G^A \) has full row rank and let \( (G^A)' = \begin{bmatrix} E & J \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} F' \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \) be a QR factorization of \( (G^A)' \). Let

\[
K_e = E\Theta S^A - J\Psi J' \hat{H} E\Theta S^A,
\]

\[
b_e = (E - J\Psi J' \hat{H} E)\Theta W^A - J\Psi J' \epsilon,
\]

\[
K_\lambda = -\Theta E'(\hat{H} K_e),
\]

\[
b_\lambda = -\Theta E'(\hat{H} b_e + c),
\]

where \( \Psi = (J' \hat{H} J)^{-1} \) and \( \Theta = (G^A E)^{-1} \) exist by construction. Then \( \epsilon^i(x) = K_e x + b_e \) is the affine optimizer and \( \lambda^A = K_\lambda x + b_\lambda \) are the corresponding active Lagrange multipliers on the polytope \( P = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid Tx \leq d \} \) with

\[
T = \begin{pmatrix} G^T & -S^T \\ -K_\lambda & b_\lambda \end{pmatrix}, \quad d = \begin{pmatrix} W^T \quad G^T b_e \end{pmatrix}.
\]

In preparation of Corollary 1 we introduce \( K = \begin{bmatrix} K_v^M & -K_x \end{bmatrix}, \quad K_v = K_v^N - H^{-1} F', b = b_v^M \) and \( b_v = b_v^N \) with \( M = \{ 1, \ldots, m \} \) and \( N = \{ 1, \ldots, mN \} \).

**Corollary 1** Let \( x \in X_f \) be arbitrary and \( A(x) \) the corresponding active set. Let the assumptions from Lemma 2 hold. Then \( u^* = K_x + b \) is the optimal affine feedback law for all states \( x \in P \).

3
Proof 1 By combining (8), (5) and (13) the optimal correction control input sequence can be expressed as

\[ V^* = K_V x + b_V \] (15)

with \( K_V = K_N^C - H^{-1} F' \) and \( b_V = b_N^C \). Substituting the first \( m \) elements of (15) in (5) results in the robust optimal affine feedback law

\[ u^* = K x + b \] (16)

with \( K = K_N^M - K_x \) and \( b = b_N^M \).

Lemma 1 and Corollary 1 can be used in an event-triggered MPC approach as follows: As in (10), Problem (10) is solved for the current state \( x \), and the set of active constraints \( A(x) \) is determined according to (12). Then a robust feedback law \( u^* = K x + b \) and its polytope \( P \) are computed according to Lemma 1 and Corollary 1. The feedback law can be reused until its polytope has been left. When leaving the polytope, (5) must be solved again. If the rank condition \( G^A \) for a state \( x \) is not met, problem (5) must be solved in the next time step.

3.1 Accelerating min-max regional MPC with active set updates

The new event-triggered approach presented in the previous section can be extended by active set updates as proposed in (11). Note that the optimizer \( e^*(x) \) and the Lagrange multipliers \( \lambda^i(x) \) are piecewise affine functions of the parameter \( x \) and \( e^*(x) \) is continuous and uniquely defined due to \( H > 0 \) (see (19) (4)). Thus, all requirements are met to apply the active set update approach (see (11) Lemma 1). The extended approach can be described as follows: After leaving the current polytope the active set is updated along a line connecting the current and the previous state. This is done by analyzing the crossed facets of neighboring polytopes along the line. In doing so, several feedback laws and their polytopes along the line can be computed from the updated active sets without solving (5). A new optimization problem has to be solved only if the active rows of the matrix \( G \) on a crossed facet do not have full row rank or the weakly active set on a crossed facet consists of more than one constraint. For more details we refer to (11).

3.2 Accelerating min-max regional MPC with suboptimality

The new event-triggered MPC approach can also be improved by exploiting suboptimality as proposed in (20). The region \( P \) in Lemma 1 and Corollary 1 is the intersection of two regions \( C \) (first rows in (14)) and \( O \) (last rows in (14)) that guarantee constraint satisfaction and optimality of the input resulting from \( K x + b \). If \( x \notin P = C \cap O \) but \( x \in C \) then \( K x + b \) yields not an optimal input but a feasible one, i.e., an input that satisfies the constraints in (2). The idea is to reuse a feedback law even outside the current polytope \( P \) as long as it is feasible and stabilizes the system. For that, a feedback law is reused as long as the system is located inside \( C \). Stability can be guaranteed by switching irreversibly to a point-by-point solution of problem (5) if the RPI set is not reached after a user-defined number of \( M \) steps. For more details, we refer to (20).

4 Illustrative example

We consider a double integrator taken from (4) that results in a system of the form (11) with

\[ A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad D = \begin{pmatrix} 0.1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \]

The system must respect the state and input constraints \(-10 \leq x_i \leq 10, i = 1, 2 \) and \(-1 \leq u_1 \leq 1 \), respectively, and the uncertainty is bounded by \(-1 \leq w_1 \leq 1 \). We choose the horizon \( N = 5 \) and the weighting matrices \( Q = \text{diag}(1, 1) \) and \( R = 10 \). The weighting \( P \) is chosen as the solution of the discrete-time algebraic Riccati equation. The terminal set \( T \) is computed according to (8). The RPI set \( R \) is computed with the
procedure from [18]. The example results in a QP with $q = 68$ inequalities and 5 optimization variables.

Figure 1 shows the results of the controlled system for a random initial state. The proposed min-max event-triggered MPC approach (a) and its extensions exploiting active set updates (b) and suboptimality (c) are compared to each other. The upper plots show the state-space trajectories along with the computed polytopes (red). The bottom plots show the trajectories of the states $x(k)$, the inputs $u(k)$, the disturbances $w(k)$ and the indicator function $e(k)$ with $e(k) = 1$ if a QP is solved and $e(k) = 0$ otherwise. Constraints are depicted with black dashed lines.

All three approaches regulate the system into the robust positively invariant set around the origin as expected. With approach (a) nine QPs and thus nine polytopes and affine feedback laws must be calculated. Applying approach (b) results in 15 polytopes and feedback laws by solving only a single QP. The same polytopes as in (a) are calculated but also polytopes in between. With approach (c) the system can be regulated to the RPI set with eight affine feedback laws and polytopes. Some of the polytopes are larger than the polytopes in (a) due to suboptimality. Because of this, a QP can be saved in time steps one and three.

Table I shows the results for 500 random initial states. It shows the results for the new min-max regional MPC approach and its extensions exploiting active set updates and suboptimality. For sake of comparison, we also give the results for the tube-based regional MPC approach and the classical regional MPC approach both also extended by active set updates and suboptimality. We refer to the corresponding publications [10, 11, 20] for more details. For every control
Table 1: The table compares the new min-max, the tube-based and the classical regional MPC approach. It also shows the results for the approaches extended by active set updates and suboptimality. The suboptimal approaches have been executed with $M = 15$ steps (see Section 3.2 for details).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>approach</th>
<th>extension</th>
<th>steps</th>
<th>avoided QPs</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>min-max regional MPC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>29.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>active set updates</td>
<td>10.36</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>89.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suboptimality</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>39.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tube-based regional MPC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>15.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>active set updates</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>91.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suboptimality</td>
<td>11.38</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>76.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regional MPC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>26.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>active set updates</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>73.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suboptimality</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>55.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

scheme, we simulated trajectories of the controlled system until we reached $T$ (regional MPC approach) respectively $R$ (tube-based and min-max regional MPC approach). We applied randomly chosen disturbances to the system while simulating the tube-based and the min-max approach. The classical regional MPC approach was simulated without disturbances. The table states the average number of steps up to the set $T$ (respectively $R$) and the average number of avoided QPs per trajectory. We stopped the simulation in $T$ (respectively $R$) since the unconstrained LQR can be used inside these sets without solving additional QPs.

In the new min-max regional MPC approach the system requires approximately 10 steps on average to reach the set $R$. Along a trajectory 29.98% of the QPs can be avoided without using extensions. The reduction can be further increased to 39.92% by exploiting suboptimality and 89.93% by exploiting active set updates. In the tube-based regional MPC approach, the system needs about eleven steps to reach the set $R$ and achieves a reduction of 15.72% without extensions. Note that the reduction in the min-max approach is almost twice as high without extensions. By using extensions the tube-based approach achieves a reduction of 76.51% by using suboptimality and 91.22% by using active set updates. Note that these reductions are higher than in the min-max approach. In the classical regional MPC approach (without disturbances) the system requires 3.78 steps on average to reach the terminal set $T$. The reduction in the number of online optimizations is 26.43% without extensions, 55.39% by exploiting suboptimality and 73.57% by using active set updates.

5 Conclusions

We developed a new robust event-triggered MPC approach. In the new approach, a robust affine feedback law is computed from the solution at the current state and reused for subsequent states, to reduce the number of online optimizations. We extended the new approach with two techniques to reduce the computational effort further.
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