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Abstract

We provide theoretical guarantees for recursive feasibility and practical exponential stability of the closed-loop system of a feedback linearizable nonlinear system when controlled by a robust data-driven nonlinear predictive control scheme. This technical report serves as a supplementary material to \([1]\). The arguments shown in this report follow similar steps to those presented in \([2]\), since we consider feedback linearizable systems which are linear in transformed coordinates. However, the proof was suitably adapted to match the nonlinear setting under consideration, and the differences are emphasized throughout the proof.

I. INTRODUCTION

In \([1]\), we considered general discrete-time multi-input multi-output (DT-MIMO) feedback linearizable nonlinear systems and provided a data-based representation of their trajectories using a single input-output trajectory and using a dictionary of known basis functions that only depend on input-output data. As pointed out there, the choice of basis functions generally only serves as an approximation and not as an exact decomposition of the unknown nonlinearities. Therefore, we proposed a robust data-driven nonlinear predictive control scheme under unknown, but uniformly bounded, function approximation error \([1]\) Section V-B. In this supplementary report, we provide the theoretical analysis of recursive feasibility and practical exponential stability of such scheme. This proof follows similar steps to the one presented in \([2]\), but is rigorously adjusted to match the nonlinear setting presented in \([1]\). The root of similarity is that a discrete-time nonlinear feedback linearizable system is linear in transformed coordinates (cf. \([3]\)).

Consider a DT feedback linearizable nonlinear system of the form

\[
\begin{align*}
  x_{k+1} &= f(x_k, u_k), \\
  y_k &= h(x_k),
\end{align*}
\]

with \(x_k \in \mathbb{R}^n, u_k, y_k \in \mathbb{R}^m\), being the state, input and output vectors at time \(k\) respectively, and \(f: \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^n, h: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^m\), with \(f(0, 0) = 0, h(0) = 0\), being analytic functions. Since the system is feedback linearizable, there exists, under suitable assumptions (cf. \([1]\) Assumptions 1-4), a feedback linearizing control law \(u_k = \gamma(x_k, v_k)\) and an invertible coordinate transformation \(\Xi_k = T(x_k)\) such that the system (1) is linear in transformed coordinates \([3]\). Specifically (1) is transformed into the form,

\[
\begin{align*}
  \Xi_{k+1} &= A\Xi_k + Bv_k, \\
  y_k &= C\Xi_k,
\end{align*}
\]

where \(A, B, C\) are in the block-Brunovsky canonical form (which are a controllable and observable triplet) and

\[
\Xi_k = \begin{bmatrix}
  y_1, [k, k + d_1 - 1] & \cdots & y_m, [k, k + d_m - 1]
\end{bmatrix}^T,
\]

with \(d_i\) denoting the relative degrees of the \(i\)-th output (see \([3], [4]\)). The block-Brunovsky form is defined as

\[
\begin{align*}
  A := \begin{bmatrix}
    A_1 & \cdots & 0 \\
    \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
    0 & \cdots & A_m
  \end{bmatrix}, \quad
  B := \begin{bmatrix}
    B_1 & \cdots & 0 \\
    \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
    0 & \cdots & B_m
  \end{bmatrix}, \quad
  C := \begin{bmatrix}
    C_1 & \cdots & 0 \\
    \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
    0 & \cdots & C_m
  \end{bmatrix},
\end{align*}
\]

with each \(A_i, B_i, C_i\) for \(i \in \mathbb{Z}_{[1,m]}\) defined as

\[
\begin{align*}
  A_i := \begin{bmatrix}
    0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\
    \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\
    \vdots & \ddots & 1 & \cdots \\
    0 & \cdots & 0 & 1
  \end{bmatrix}, \quad
  B_i := \begin{bmatrix}
    0 \\
    \vdots \\
    0 \\
    1
  \end{bmatrix}, \quad
  C_i := \begin{bmatrix}
    1 & 0 & \cdots & 0
  \end{bmatrix}.
\end{align*}
\]

\(^1\)Leibniz University Hannover, Institute of Automatic Control, 30167 Hannover, Germany. E-mail: \{alsalti,lopez,mueller\}@irt.uni-hannover.de
\(^2\)University of Stuttgart, Institute for Systems Theory and Automatic Control, 70550 Stuttgart, Germany. E-mail: \{julian.berberich,frank.allgower\}@ist.uni-stuttgart.de

This work has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 948679). This work was also funded by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany’s Excellence Strategy - EXC 2075 - 390740016 and under grant 468094890. We acknowledge the support by the Stuttgart Center for Simulation Science (SimTech).

\(^\ast\)Similar notation to \([1]\) is used here. In particular, a vector \(z_k \in \mathbb{R}^p\) is defined as \(z_k = (z_{1,k} \cdots z_{p,k})^T\).
Recall from [3], that the synthetic input \( v_k \) is an iterated composition of the analytic functions \( f(\cdot, \cdot) \) and \( h(\cdot) \) (and hence (locally) Lipschitz continuous) of the form

\[
v_k = \begin{bmatrix} v_{1,k} \\ \vdots \\ v_{m,k} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} h_1 \left( f^d_0 \left( f(x_k, u_k) \right) \right) \\ \vdots \\ h_1 \left( f^d_m \left( f(x_k, u_k) \right) \right) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \phi_1(u_k, x_k) \\ \vdots \\ \phi_m(u_k, x_k) \end{bmatrix} = \Phi(u_k, x_k),
\]

which is an unknown nonlinear function \( \Phi : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^m \). Notice that, due to the special structure of the block-Brunovsky form, the outputs satisfy the following relationship

\[
y_{i,k+d_i} = v_{i,k} = \phi_i(u_k, \Xi_k), \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}[1,m]
\]

As in [1], [4], we use a dictionary of known, linearly independent basis functions to approximate the unknown nonlinearity. Specifically,

\[
v_k = \Phi(u_k, \Xi_k) = \begin{bmatrix} \phi_1(u_k, \Xi_k) \\ \vdots \\ \phi_m(u_k, \Xi_k) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon_1(u_k, \Xi_k) \\ \vdots \\ \epsilon_m(u_k, \Xi_k) \end{bmatrix},
\]

where \( \Psi(u_k, \Xi_k) \) is the stacked vector of \( r \in \mathbb{N} \) basis functions, \( \epsilon(u_k, \Xi_k) \) is the stacked vector of basis functions approximation errors and \( G \) is the matrix of unknown coefficients which can be defined in the following manner

\[
G := \arg \min_{G} (\Phi(s_1, s_2) - G \Psi(s_1, s_2), \Phi(s_1, s_2) - G \Psi(s_1, s_2)),
\]

with \( \langle \rho_1(s_1, s_2) \rangle = \int_{\Omega} \rho_1(s_1, s_2) ds_1 ds_2 \) for some \( \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n \). Similar to [1], the matrix \( G \) is assumed to have full row rank. Substituting (6) back in (2) results in

\[
\Xi_{k+1} = \mathcal{A} \Xi_{k} + \mathcal{B} \left( G \Psi(u_k, \Xi_k) + \epsilon(u_k, \Xi_k) \right),
\]

\[
y_k = \mathcal{C} \Xi_{k},
\]

and taking \( G \) as a common factor results in

\[
\Xi_{k+1} = \mathcal{A} \Xi_{k} + \mathcal{B} \left( \Psi(u_k, \Xi_k) + E(u_k, \Xi_k) \right),
\]

\[
y_k = \mathcal{C} \Xi_{k},
\]

where \( E(u_k, \Xi_k) := G^\dagger \epsilon(u_k, \Xi_k) \) and \( G^\dagger := (GG^\top)^{-1} \) is a right inverse of \( G \) which exists since \( G \) is assumed to be full row rank. We now introduce the following notation which will be used throughout this report

\[
\hat{\Psi}_k(u, \Xi) := \Psi(u_k, \Xi_k), \quad \hat{\epsilon}_k(u, \Xi) := \epsilon(u_k, \Xi_k),
\]

\[
\hat{\epsilon}_{i,k}(u, \Xi) := \epsilon_{i}(u_k, \Xi_k), \quad \hat{E}_k(u, \Xi) := E(u_k, \Xi_k).
\]

The following relationships are also important and will be used at various points throughout the proof

\[
\epsilon(u_k, \Xi_k) = G \epsilon(u_k, \Xi_k),
\]

\[
\hat{\epsilon}_k(u, \Xi) = G \hat{E}_k(u, \Xi),
\]

\[
\hat{\epsilon}_{i,k}(u, \Xi) = g_{i} \hat{E}_{i,k}(u, \Xi),
\]

Using the notation in (10), (9) can be written as

\[
\Xi_{k+1} = \mathcal{A} \Xi_{k} + \mathcal{B} \left( \hat{\Psi}_k(u, \Xi) + \hat{E}_k(u, \Xi) \right),
\]

\[
y_k = \mathcal{C} \Xi_{k}.
\]

Similar to [1 Assumption 5], we assume that the previously collected trajectory evolve in a compact subset of the input-state space \( \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n \). This, along with local Lipschitz continuity properties of the function \( \Phi(u_k, \Xi_k) \) (cf. [3] and the discussion above it), and assuming continuity of the chosen set of basis functions, guarantee a uniform upper bound on the approximation error \( \epsilon(u_k, \Xi_k) \) for all \( (u_k, \Xi_k) \in \Omega \). Later, in the main result of this technical report (Theorem 2), it will be shown that the closed-loop trajectories also evolve in a compact subset of the input-state space. In particular, the set of initial states for which the predictive control scheme is initially feasible serves as the guaranteed region of attraction of the closed-loop system and, since it is \((d_{\text{max-step}}) \) invariant as shown in Theorem 2, the closed-loop trajectories evolve in a compact subset of the input-state space. This assumption is summarized as follows.

\[2\]The components of \( \Phi(\cdot, \cdot) \) are scalar valued functions \( \phi_i(\cdot, \cdot) \) that are defined as \( \phi : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R} \).

\[3\]Notice that we do not evaluate the minimization problem in (7) throughout the report.
Assumption 1. The error in the basis function approximation \( \epsilon_k(u, \Xi) \) is uniformly upper bounded by \( \varepsilon^* > 0 \), i.e., \( \| \epsilon_k(u, \Xi) \|_\infty \leq \varepsilon^* \), for all \( (u_k, \Xi_k) \in \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n \), where \( \Omega \) is a compact subset of the input-state space.

Remark 1. Since \( \mathcal{G} \) has full row rank, Assumption 7 implies that
\[
\|E(u_k, \Xi_k)\|_\infty \leq \|\mathcal{G}^\top\|_\infty \|\epsilon(u_k, \Xi_k)\|_\infty \leq \|\mathcal{G}^\top\|_\infty \varepsilon^*,
\]
with \( \mathcal{G}^\top = \mathcal{G}^\top (\mathcal{G}^\top)^{-1} \).

Consider the input-state-output sequence \( \{u_k\}_{k=0}^{N-1}, \{\Xi_k\}_{k=0}^{N}, \{y_i,k\}_{k=0}^{N+d_{\max}^*} \) collected from system (11), with \( \Xi_k \) composed from the output sequence \( y_i,k \) for \( i \in \mathbb{Z}_{[1,m]} \) as in (3). According to [1, Theorem 3], if the input to System (11), i.e., \( \{\hat{\Psi}_k(u, \Xi) + \hat{E}_k(u, \Xi)\}_{k=0}^{L-1} \), is persistently exciting of order \( L + n \), then any \( \{\hat{\Psi}_k(u, \Xi) + \hat{E}_k(u, \Xi)\}_{k=0}^{L-1}, \{\bar{y}_i,k\}_{k=0}^{L+d_{\max}^*} \) are an input-output trajectory of the system if and only if there exists an \( \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{N-L+1} \) such that the following holds
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
H_L(\hat{\Psi}(u, \Xi) + \hat{E}(u, \Xi)) \\
H_L+1(\Xi)
\end{bmatrix} \alpha = \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{\Psi} (\bar{u}, \Xi) + \hat{E}(\bar{u}, \Xi) \\
\Xi
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

In the next section, we use (13) to propose a robust data-driven nonlinear predictive control scheme and later prove that it results in recursive feasibility and practical exponential stability of the closed-loop system. This is done using only input-output data of the nonlinear system (1) and assuming that the basis functions approximation error in [6] is uniformly upper bounded as in Assumption 1.

II. Robust nonlinear predictive control scheme

Using the data-based representation (13) of all the trajectories of the nonlinear system (1), we presented in [1, Theorem 9] a data-driven \( d_{\max} \) -step robust nonlinear predictive control scheme, where \( d_{\max} \) is the maximum relative degree of all outputs. This scheme is inherently an output feedback nonlinear predictive controller and only uses a single persistently exciting input-output trajectory of System (11). In particular, the minimization problem (14) below is solved at each time \( t \). Then, once a solution is obtained, we apply the first \( d_{\max} \) -instances of the optimal predicted input to the system, i.e., \( \bar{u}_{[0,d_{\max}^*]}(t) \). Finally, the prediction horizon is shifted \( d_{\max} \) -steps to the future and the process is repeated again at time \( t + d_{\max} \). The optimal control problem at time \( t \) takes the form

\[
\begin{align*}
J_t^* &= \min_{\alpha(t), \sigma(t)} \sum_{k=0}^{L-1} \ell(\bar{u}_k(t), \bar{y}_k(t)) + \lambda_\alpha \varepsilon^* \|\alpha(t)\|_2^2 + \lambda_\sigma \|\sigma(t)\|_2^2 \\
\text{s.t.} \quad &\begin{bmatrix}
\hat{\Psi}(\bar{u}(t), \Xi(t)) + \sigma(t) \\
\Xi(t)
\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix}
H_{L+d_{\max}^*}(\hat{\Psi}(u_{\max}, \Xi_{\max})) \\
H_{L+d_{\max}^*+1}(\Xi_{\max})
\end{bmatrix} \alpha(t), \\
\bar{u}_{[-d_{\max}^*, -1]}(t) &= \left[ \bar{u}_{[-d_{\max}^*, -1]}^T(t) \right], \\
\bar{y}_{[-d_{\max}^*, -1]}(t) &= \left[ \bar{y}_{[-d_{\max}^*, -1]}^T(t) \right], \\
\bar{y}_{[L+d_{\max}^*, -1]}(t) &= 0, \\
\hat{\Psi}(\bar{u}(t), \Xi(t)) &= \begin{bmatrix}
\psi_2(\bar{u}_k(t), \Xi_k(t)) \\
\vdots \\
\psi_p(\bar{u}_k(t), \Xi_k(t))
\end{bmatrix}, \\
\Xi_k(t) &= \left[ \bar{y}_{[k,k+d_{\max}^*]}^T(t) \cdots \bar{y}_{[k,k+d_{\max}^*]}^T(t) \right]^T, \\
\|\sigma_k(t)\|_\infty &\leq \|\mathcal{G}^\top\|_\infty \varepsilon^* (1 + \|\alpha(t)\|_2), \\
\bar{u}_k(t) &\in \mathcal{U}, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[-d_{\max}^*, -1]}, \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}_{[1,m]}.
\end{align*}
\]

The decision variables in (14) are the following
\[
\bar{u}_{[-d_{\max}^*, -1]}(t), \quad \bar{y}_{[-d_{\max}^*, -1]}(t), \quad \alpha(t), \quad \sigma(t),
\]
where the predicted outputs also constitute the predicted state \( \hat{\Xi}_{[-d_{\max}^*, -1]}(t) \). The stage cost function is one that penalizes the deviation from an a priori known constant set point \( (u^*, y^*) \). In particular, the stage cost function in (14a) takes the form
\[
\ell(\bar{u}_k(t), \bar{y}_k(t)) = \|\bar{u}_k(t) - u^*\|_R^2 + \|\bar{y}_k(t) - y^*\|_Q^2.
\]

In particular, the input-output data are collected such that \( H_{L+d_{\max}^*} (\hat{\Psi}(u, \Xi) + \hat{E}(u, \Xi)) \) has rank full row rank.

3Wherever necessary, we use the notation \( 0 \) to denote a vector of zeros or appropriate dimensions.
for $Q, R \succ 0$. The notation used in (14) and the remainder of this report was presented in (1). For completeness, we give a summary of the notation in Table I. As discussed in Section VI, the first constraint (14a) represents the prediction “model”. The slack variable $\sigma(t)$ was introduced since, otherwise, the equation would not necessarily hold (see (13)). The slack variable is upper bounded by (14a), which is needed to show recursive feasibility later on. Notice that $\bar{G}$ is unknown, but as shown in Lemma 3, one can obtain upper bounds on it by knowledge of the basis functions and a rough upper bound on $v_k$. For linear systems, it was shown in (5) that this constraint can be relaxed. The same can possibly be applied here but is not be discussed in this report. The initial outputs in (14c) are used to implicitly fix the state at time $t$ through their effect on the outputs $y_{i,k}(t)$ (see (5)). The terminal constraints (14a) are used to explicitly fix the predicted terminal state $\Xi_{L,T}(t) = \left[ y_{1,L+1}, \ldots, y_{m,L+1} \right]^T$. Finally, the basis functions are defined in (14e). Similar to Section IV-B, we require that one of the basis functions is equal to the input vector $\bar{u}_k(t)$.

The goal of this report is to show that the control scheme (14) is recursively feasible and results in practical exponential stability of the closed-loop system. Similar to [2], the proof is divided into four parts. First, an error bound similar to those derived in Theorem 5.7 is provided in Lemma 1. Second, we propose a Lyapunov function candidate and show that it is lower and upper bounded locally. Third, we show recursive feasibility of the predictive control scheme. Finally, we show practical stability and exponential convergence of the Lyapunov function to a region whose size depends on the approximation error bound $\varepsilon^*$.

In order to show practical exponential stability of the equilibrium point $\Xi^* = 0$ of the closed-loop system, we make the following assumptions.

**Assumption 2.** The input-output data $(u^{\text{ins}}, y^{\text{obs}})$ are collected such that $\{\hat{\Psi}_k(u^{\text{ins}}, \Xi^{\text{obs}})\}_{k=0}^{N-1}$ is persistently exciting of order $L + d_{\text{max}} + n$.

**Remark 2.** For sufficiently small $\varepsilon^*$, persistency of excitation of $\{\hat{\Psi}_k(u^{\text{ins}}, \Xi^{\text{obs}})\}_{k=0}^{N-1}$ implies that of $\{\hat{\Psi}_k(u^{\text{ins}}, \Xi^{\text{obs}}) + \tilde{E}_k(u^{\text{ins}}, \Xi^{\text{obs}})\}_{k=0}^{N-1}$ of the same order.

**Assumption 3.** The prediction horizon satisfies $L \geq 2d_{\text{max}}$.

Let $\tilde{y}_{i,k}$ and $\bar{y}_{i,k}$ be the state and output of the system resulting from applying $u_{[0,L-1]}^*(t)$ to the system (1) at time $t$. In the following lemma, we provide a bound on the difference between the predicted output $\tilde{y}_{i,k}^*(t)$ and the true output of the system $\bar{y}_{i,k}$ which would have been obtained when applying $u_{[0,L-1]}^*(t)$ to the system at time $t$. It is important to reiterate here that we are providing the error bound for the difference between $\bar{y}_{i,k} - \tilde{y}_{i,k}^*$.

**Lemma 1.** Let $\tilde{y}_{i,k}^*(t), \bar{y}_{i,k}^*(t), \alpha^*(t), \sigma^*(t)$ be solutions of (14) at time $t$, and let $\bar{y}_{i,k}(t)$ be the output response of (1) when $u_{[0,L-1]}^*(t)$ is applied to the system at time $t$. Then, the following holds

$$\|\bar{y}_{i,k} - \tilde{y}_{i,k}^*(t)\| \leq P^k(K\Xi + \|y^T\|_\infty\|G\|_\infty) (1 + \|\alpha^*(t)\|_1)\varepsilon^*, \quad (16)$$

6Recall Definition 6 for the data-driven definition of an equilibrium point of the system (1). Throughout the report, we will study the case when $\Xi^* = 0$ and hence $y^* = u^* = 0$ as well. For non-zero equilibrium points, similar arguments as in this report can be followed and would result in small changes of the structure of some constants, see [2].

---

**TABLE I: Summary of notation used throughout the report**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expression</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$u^*$</td>
<td>User-specified input equilibrium point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$y^*$</td>
<td>User-specified output equilibrium point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$u_{\text{ins}}$</td>
<td>Previously collected input data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$y_{\text{obs}}$</td>
<td>Previously collected output data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$u_t$</td>
<td>Online input data at time $t$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$y_{k,t}$</td>
<td>Online output data at time $t$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{u}_k(t)$</td>
<td>The $k$-th instant of the predicted input sequence, predicted at time $t$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tilde{y}_k(t)$</td>
<td>The $k$-th instant of the predicted output sequence, predicted at time $t$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{y}_{i,k}(t)$</td>
<td>The $k$-th instant of the output obtained when applying the optimal predicted input sequence predicted at time $t$, i.e., $u^*(t)$ to the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Xi_{k,t}$</td>
<td>The $k$-th instant of the predicted state sequence, predicted at time $t$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L$</td>
<td>Prediction horizon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{U}$</td>
<td>Input constraint set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$J^*$</td>
<td>Optimal open-loop cost at time $t$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\ell_t$</td>
<td>Open-loop cost at time $t$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\ell((\bar{u}_k(t), \tilde{y}_k(t)))$</td>
<td>Stage cost function at time $t$.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
where $K_\Xi$ is the Lipschitz continuity constant of $\Phi(\cdot, \cdot)$ w.r.t. $\Xi$ and $P^k(K_\Xi)$ is a polynomial in $K_\Xi$ of order $k$ of the form $P^k(K_\Xi) = (K_\Xi)^k + (K_\Xi)^{k-1} + \cdots + K_\Xi + 1$.

**Proof.** For each output, the first $d_i$ instances are implicitly fixed by the past $d_i$ instances of the input, i.e., $u_{[t-d_i,t_i]}$, which are not part of $\tilde{u}_{[0,L-1]}(t)$. Therefore, we will split this proof in two steps:

(i) For $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,d_i-1]}$, the following holds

$$y_{i,t+k} = \phi_k(\mathbf{u}_{t+k-d_i}, \Xi_{t+k-d_i}),$$

while the predicted outputs at those instances are

$$\hat{y}_{i,t+k} = \hat{\phi}_k(\mathbf{u}_{t+k-d_i}, \Xi_{t+k-d_i}).$$

(ii) For the instances for $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[d_i,L+d_i-1]}$, we have

$$y_{i,t+k} - \hat{y}_{i,t+k} = \phi_k(\mathbf{u}_{t+k-d_i}, \Xi_{t+k-d_i}) - \hat{\phi}_k(\mathbf{u}_{t+k-d_i}, \Xi_{t+k-d_i}) - \bar{\epsilon}_i(\mathbf{u}_{t+k-d_i}, \Xi_{t+k-d_i}) - \epsilon_i(\mathbf{u}_{t+k-d_i}, \Xi_{t+k-d_i})$$

$$= \phi_k(\mathbf{u}_{t+k-d_i}, \Xi_{t+k-d_i}) - \bar{\epsilon}_i(\mathbf{u}_{t+k-d_i}, \Xi_{t+k-d_i}) + \epsilon_i(\mathbf{u}_{t+k-d_i}, \Xi_{t+k-d_i}) - \bar{\epsilon}_i(\mathbf{u}_{t+k-d_i}, \Xi_{t+k-d_i}) - \epsilon_i(\mathbf{u}_{t+k-d_i}, \Xi_{t+k-d_i}).$$

Using Assumption 1 and continuity of $\phi_k(\cdot, \cdot)$, this difference can now be upper bounded by

$$|y_{i,t+k} - \hat{y}_{i,t+k}| \leq \epsilon^* + \|\phi_k(\mathbf{u}_{t+k-d_i}, \Xi_{t+k-d_i}) - \bar{\epsilon}_i(\mathbf{u}_{t+k-d_i}, \Xi_{t+k-d_i}) - \epsilon_i(\mathbf{u}_{t+k-d_i}, \Xi_{t+k-d_i})|,$$

$$\leq (1 + \|\phi_k(\mathbf{u}_{t+k-d_i}, \Xi_{t+k-d_i}) - \bar{\epsilon}_i(\mathbf{u}_{t+k-d_i}, \Xi_{t+k-d_i}) - \epsilon_i(\mathbf{u}_{t+k-d_i}, \Xi_{t+k-d_i})|).$$

Taking (18) into account, we can express the bound on the difference between $y_{i,t+k} - \hat{y}_{i,t+k}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,L+d_i-1]}$ as

$$|y_{i,t+k} - \hat{y}_{i,t+k}| \leq P^k(K_\Xi)(1 + \|\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{u}_{t+k-d_i}, \Xi_{t+k-d_i}) \|_\infty) (1 + \|\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{u}_{t+k-d_i}, \Xi_{t+k-d_i}) \|_\infty).$$

From here, it can be seen that the following constitutes an upper bound for the two above

$$|y_{i,t+k} - \hat{y}_{i,t+k}| \leq \mathbb{P}^k(K_\Xi)(1 + \|\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{u}_{t+k-d_i}, \Xi_{t+k-d_i}) \|_\infty) (1 + \|\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{u}_{t+k-d_i}, \Xi_{t+k-d_i}) \|_\infty),$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,L+d_i-1]}$ as in (16), which completes the proof. \hfill \Box

**Remark 3.** Notice that the bound in (16) increases as $k$ increases. This is due to the polynomial term in $K_\Xi$. For that reason, when appropriate, we will use the bound on the last instant as the upper bound for the whole output difference sequence, i.e.,

$$|y_{i,t+L+d_i-1} - \hat{y}_{i,t+L+d_i-1}| \leq P^L(K_\Xi)(1 + \|\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{u}_{t+k-d_i}, \Xi_{t+k-d_i}) \|_\infty) (1 + \|\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{u}_{t+k-d_i}, \Xi_{t+k-d_i}) \|_\infty).$$

Furthermore, if $K_\Xi < 1$, then the bound converges for increasing $L$. \hfill \Box

---

\textsuperscript{7}Equations (17) and (19) differ in that the arguments to $\phi_k(\cdot, \cdot)$ in (19) are no longer the same and hence do not cancel out.


III. LYAPUNOV FUNCTION CANDIDATE

In this section, we propose a Lyapunov function candidate and show that it is both lower and upper bounded. First, note that the system in (2) is a controllable and observable system (since \( A, B, C \) are in block-Brunovsky canonical form). Hence, there exists a matrix \( P > 0 \) such that \( W_t = \|\Xi_t\|^2_P \) is an input-output-to-state stability (IOSS) Lyapunov function \([6]\) that satisfies

\[
W_{t+d_{\text{max}}} - W_t \leq -\frac{1}{2} \|\Xi_{t+d_{\text{max}}-1}\|^2 + c_1 \|v_{t+d_{\text{max}}-1}\|^2 + c_2 \|y_{t+d_{\text{max}}-1}\|^2,
\]

for \( c_1, c_2 > 0 \). Similar to \([2, \text{Lemma 1}]\), we consider the following Lyapunov function candidate \( V_t = J_t^* + c_3 W_t \), for some \( c_3 > 0 \). Clearly, the following lower bound holds

\[
V_t = J_t^* + c_3 \rightarrow \begin{array}{c}
\geq 0 \\
\leq \lambda_{\text{max}}(P)\|\Xi_t\|^2_P \\
\leq \sum_{k=0}^{L-1} \ell(\bar{u}'(t), \bar{y}'(t)) + \lambda_\alpha e^\gamma (\|\alpha'(t)\|^2 + \|\sigma'(t)\|^2) + c_3 \lambda_{\text{max}}(P)\|\Xi_t\|^2_P.
\end{array}
\]

Next, we propose candidate solutions for \( \bar{u}'_{t-d_{\text{max}},L-1}(t), \bar{y}'_{t-d_{\text{max}},L-d_{\text{max}}-1}(t), \alpha'(t), \sigma'(t) \). By the initial condition constraints \((14c)\), we have that

\[
\bar{u}'_{t-d_{\text{max}},-1}(t) = u_{t-d_{\text{max}},t-1}, \quad \bar{y}'_{t-d_{\text{max}},-1}(t) = y_{t,t-d_{\text{max}},t-1}.
\]

Since \( L \geq 2d_{\text{max}} \) and assuming that \( 0 \in \text{int}(\mathcal{U}) \), then by controllability of System (2), there exists a \( \delta > 0 \) such that for any state \( \Xi_t \in \mathbb{B}_\delta := \{\Xi_t \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \|\Xi_t\| \leq \delta\} \), there exists a control input \( v_{t+L-1} \), and hence \( u_k := \gamma(T^{-1}(\Xi_k), v_k) \) for \( k \in \mathbb{Z}_{t+L-1} \) by \([3, \text{Proposition 3.1}]\), with \( u_k \in \mathcal{U} \), which brings the state \( \Xi_{t+L-1} \) and corresponding outputs \( y_{i,t+L-d_{\text{max}}-1} \) to zero in \( L - d_{\text{max}} \) steps, while satisfying (for some \( \Gamma_v \geq 0 \))

\[
\left\| v_{t+L-1} \right\|^2 = \left\| y_{i,t+L-d_{\text{max}}-1} \right\|^2 \leq \Gamma_v \|\Xi_t\|^2_P.
\]

Furthermore, notice that the function \( \gamma(\cdot, \cdot) \) is (locally) Lipschitz continuous \([3]\). Therefore, by continuity of \( \gamma(\cdot, \cdot) \) we have that \( \|u_k\|^2 \leq K_\gamma \left( \|v_k\|^2 + \|\Xi_k\|^2_P \right) \) for some \( K_\gamma > 0 \), or

\[
\|u_{t+L-1}\|^2 \leq K_\gamma \left( \|v_{t+L-1}\|^2 + \|\Xi_{t+L-1}\|^2_P \right) = K_\gamma \|v_{t+L-1}\|^2 \leq K_\gamma \Gamma_v \|\Xi_t\|^2_P.
\]

We choose the input sequence \( u_{t+L-1} \) (discussed above) to be the candidate input solution for the remaining instances as follows

\[
\bar{u}'_{t-d_{\text{max}},-1}(t) = u_{t-d_{\text{max}},t-1}, \quad \bar{u}'_{0,L-1}(t) = u_{t+L-1}.
\]

Since the system is in Brunovsky form, the effect of the input only appears in the \( i \)-th output \( d_i \)-instances afterwards (cf. \([5]\)). With that in mind and enforcing the terminal constraints in \((14d)\), we finally get the following candidate solutions for the input and output sequences at time \( t \)

\[
\begin{align*}
\bar{u}'_{t-d_{\text{max}},-1}(t) &= u_{t-d_{\text{max}},t-1}, \\
\bar{y}'_{t-d_{\text{max}},-1}(t) &= y_{t,t-d_{\text{max}},t-1}, \\
\bar{y}'_{0,L-1}(t) &= u_{t+L-1}, \\
\bar{y}'_{t-d_{\text{max}},L-1}(t) &= y_{t,t-d_{\text{max}},t-1}, \\
\bar{y}'_{0,L-d_{\text{max}}-1}(t) &= y_{t,t-d_{\text{max}},t-1} = y_{t,t+L-1}, \\
\bar{y}'_{t-L-d_{\text{max}}-1}(t) &= 0.
\end{align*}
\]

\(^\dagger\) Notice that \( d_{\text{max}} \) is the controllability index of System \([3]\).

\(^\dagger\dagger\) This result is a by-product of the implicit function theorem which was used to show the existence of the feedback linearizing controller \( u_k \) (cf. \([3]\)).
Next, we choose a candidate solution for \( \alpha'(t) \), \( \sigma'(t) \). For \( \alpha'(t) \) we choose

\[
\alpha'(t) = \left[ H_{L+d_{\text{max}}} (\hat{\Psi}(u^{\text{na}}, \Xi) + \hat{E}(u^{\text{na}}, \Xi)) \right]_t \left[ \hat{\Psi}(\vec{u}'(t), \vec{z}'(t)) + \hat{E}(\vec{u}'(t), \vec{z}'(t)) \right]_{t-d_{\text{max}}},
\]

which, according to Assumption 2 and Remark 2 exists and satisfies

\[
\left[ H_{L+d_{\text{max}}} (\hat{\Psi}(u^{\text{na}}, \Xi) + \hat{E}(u^{\text{na}}, \Xi)) \right] \alpha'(t) = \left[ \hat{\Psi}(\vec{u}'(t), \vec{z}'(t)) + \hat{E}(\vec{u}'(t), \vec{z}'(t)) \right]_{t-d_{\text{max}}, L-1}(t),
\]

where the state \( \Xi_{t-d_{\text{max}}} \) is

\[
\Xi_{t-d_{\text{max}}} := \begin{bmatrix} y_{1,t-d_{\text{max}},t-d_{\text{max}}+d_{1}-1} & \cdots & y_{m,t-d_{\text{max}},t-d_{\text{max}}+d_{m}-1} \end{bmatrix}^T,
\]

and \( \vec{z}'(t) \) denotes the candidate state sequence, predicted at time \( t \), of the form

\[
\vec{z}'(t) := \begin{bmatrix} y'_{1,k,k+d_{1}-1}(t)^T & \cdots & y'_{m,k,k+d_{m}-1}(t)^T \end{bmatrix}^T, \quad \forall k \in [0,d_{\text{max}}, L].
\]

Finally, the choice of a candidate solution for \( \sigma'(t) \) comes from plugging the candidate solution of \( \alpha'(t) \) from (28) into (14b) and comparing it to (29). This is given by

\[
\sigma'(t) = \hat{E}(\bar{u}'(t), \vec{z}'(t)) - H_{L+d_{\text{max}}} (\hat{E}(u^{\text{na}}, \Xi)) \alpha'(t).
\]

Now we can start deriving the desired upper bounds for the terms in (24). Before that, we reiterate that for the purpose of this proof, we are considering stage costs function that penalize the deviation from \( u^* = y^* = 0 \). Therefore, the summation term in (24) can be expressed as

\[
\sum_{k=0}^{L-1} \ell(\bar{u}'_k(t), \bar{y}'_k(t)) = \sum_{k=0}^{L-1} \left( \|\bar{u}'_k(t)\|_2^2 + \|\bar{y}'_k(t)\|_Q^2 \right) \leq \lambda_{\text{max}}(Q, R) \left\| \bar{u}'_{[0, L-1]}(t) \right\|_2^2,
\]

and

\[
\|\alpha'(t)\|_2^2 \leq \lambda_{\text{max}}(Q, R) \left( K_\gamma \|\bar{u}'_{[0, L-1]}(t)\|_2^2 + \|\bar{y}'_{[0, L-1]}(t)\|_Q^2 \right),
\]

For an upper bound on \( \|\alpha'(t)\|_2^2 \), we use (28) as follows

\[
\alpha'(t) = \left[ H_{L+d_{\text{max}}} (\hat{\Psi}(u^{\text{na}}, \Xi) + \hat{E}(u^{\text{na}}, \Xi)) \right]_t \left[ \hat{\Psi}(\vec{u}'(t), \vec{z}'(t)) + \hat{E}(\vec{u}'(t), \vec{z}'(t)) \right]_{t-d_{\text{max}}},
\]

\[
\|\alpha'(t)\|_2^2 \leq \left[ H_{L+d_{\text{max}}} (\hat{\Psi}(u^{\text{na}}, \Xi) + \hat{E}(u^{\text{na}}, \Xi)) \right]_t \| \left[ \hat{\Psi}(\vec{u}'(t), \vec{z}'(t)) + \hat{E}(\vec{u}'(t), \vec{z}'(t)) \right]_{t-d_{\text{max}}} \|_2^2.
\]

As we will see later in the proof, the constant \( c_{pe} \) is desired to be small. In [2], it was observed that high magnitudes of \( u^{\text{na}} \) correspond to smaller values of \( c_{pe} \). Such observation cannot, in general, be made in the current nonlinear setting since this
depends on the choice of basis functions. However, for some choice, e.g., if there is a direct relationship between \( \Psi(\cdot, \cdot) \) and \( \mathbf{u} \), such behavior was observed. To obtain a bound on \( \| \alpha'(t) \|_2 \), we rewrite the rightmost term on the RHS of (32) as the minimum norm solution of the following equation\(^{[10]}\)

\[
M \left[ \hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{u}'(t), \Xi'(t)) + \hat{E}(\mathbf{u}'(t), \Xi'(t)) \right] = \left[ \mathbf{v}_{[t-d_{\max}, t+L-1]} \right],
\]

i.e.,

\[
M \left[ \hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{u}'(t), \Xi'(t)) + \hat{E}(\mathbf{u}'(t), \Xi'(t)) \right] = M^\dagger \left[ \mathbf{v}_{[t-d_{\max}, t+L-1]} \right],
\]

where

\[
M := \begin{bmatrix}
I \otimes \mathcal{G} & 0 \\
M_{21} & M_{22}
\end{bmatrix}, \\
M_{21} := \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\
\mathcal{A} \mathcal{B} \mathcal{G} & \mathcal{B} \mathcal{G} & \ldots & 0 \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\mathcal{A}^{t+L-2} \mathcal{B} \mathcal{G} & \mathcal{A}^{t+L-3} \mathcal{B} \mathcal{G} & \ldots & 0
\end{bmatrix}, \\
M_{22} := \begin{bmatrix}
I \\
\mathcal{A} \\
\vdots \\
\mathcal{A}^{t+L-1}
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

Since \( \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C} \) are in the Brunovksy form and \( \mathcal{G} \) has full row rank, \( M \) is also full row rank\(^{[1]}\) and hence the right inverse of \( M \) in (35) exists. The following lemma shows that the RHS of (35) is the minimum norm solution of (34).

**Lemma 2.** The term \( M^\dagger \left[ \mathbf{v}_{[t-d_{\max}, t+L-1]} \right] \) is the minimum norm solution of (34).

**Proof.** We start by writing the following constrained minimization problem

\[
\min_z \| z \|_2 \\
\text{s.t. } \Xi_{k+1} = \mathcal{A} \Xi_k + \mathcal{B} \mathcal{G} \left( \hat{\Psi}_k(\mathbf{u}'(t), \Xi'(t)) + \hat{E}_k(\mathbf{u}'(t), \Xi'(t)) \right), \\
\mathbf{v}_{t+k} = \mathcal{G} \left( \hat{\Psi}_k(\mathbf{u}'(t), \Xi'(t)) + \hat{E}_k(\mathbf{u}'(t), \Xi'(t)) \right), \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[-d_{\max}, L-1]},
\]

with \( z = \left( \hat{\Psi}(\mathbf{u}'(t), \Xi'(t)) + \hat{E}(\mathbf{u}'(t), \Xi'(t)) \right)^\top \Xi_{-d_{\max}} \). Next, we rewrite the constraints as a linear system of equations as follows

\[
\min_z \| z \|_2 \\
\text{s.t. } M z = \mu,
\]

with \( \mu = \left[ \mathbf{v}_{[t-d_{\max}, t+L-1]} \Xi_{[t-d_{\max}, t+L-1]} \right]^\top \). Using Lagrange multipliers, we reformulate the above minimization problem into an unconstrained one

\[
\min_{z, \lambda} \frac{z^\top z}{2} + \lambda^\top (M z - \mu).
\]

To solve this, we differentiate with respect to each decision variable and set it to zero

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{d}{dz} \left( \frac{z^\top z}{2} + \lambda^\top (M z - \mu) \right) &= z^\top + \lambda^\top M = z + M^\top \lambda = 0 \quad \text{(40a)} \\
\frac{d}{d\lambda} \left( \frac{z^\top z}{2} + \lambda^\top (M z - \mu) \right) &= M z - \mu = 0. \quad \text{(40b)}
\end{align*}
\]

Equation (40a) gives \( z = -M^\top \lambda \), which when plugged into (40b) yields

\[
M (-M^\top \lambda) = -\mu \\
-M M^\top \lambda = \mu \\
\lambda = -(M M^\top)^{-1} \mu \\
z = MM^\top (M M^\top)^{-1} \mu
\]

\[^{[10]}\text{It can be seen from the choice of candidate solutions in (27) that } \Phi(\mathbf{u}'_k(t), \Xi_k(t)) = \Phi(\mathbf{u}_{t+k}, \Xi_{t+k}) = \mathbf{v}_{t+k} \text{ for } k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[-d_{\max}, L-1]}.\]

\[^{[1]}\text{The matrix } M \text{ in general has more columns than rows. However, if } r \leq m + \frac{L_{d_{\max}} - 1}{L+d_{\max}}, \text{ then } M \text{ has more rows than columns and would then have full column rank for which case the solution of (34) is unique.}\]
Plugging back (35) into (33) results in
\[
\|\alpha'(t)\|_2^2 \leq c_{pe} \|M^f\|_2^2 \left( \left\| \frac{\nabla[t-d_{\text{max}}, t+L-1]}{L[t-d_{\text{max}}, t+L-1]} \right\|_2^2 + \left\| \frac{\nabla[t-d_{\text{max}}, t-1]}{L[t-d_{\text{max}}, t-1]} \right\|_2^2 \right). 
\] 
(41)

By linearity, there exists a \( \Gamma_\Xi > 0 \) such that
\[
\left\| \frac{\nabla[t-d_{\text{max}}, t-1]}{L[t-d_{\text{max}}, t-1]} \right\|_2^2 \leq \Gamma_\Xi \|\Xi\|_2^2. 
\] 
(42)

Plugging (42) back into (41), one can write the upper bound on \( \alpha'(t) \) as
\[
\|\alpha'(t)\|_2^2 \leq c_{pe} \|M^f\|_2^2 \left( \Gamma_\xi + \Gamma_\Xi \right) \|\Xi\|_2^2. 
\] 
(43)

Before providing an upper bound on \( \sigma'(t) \), recall from Remark [1] that
\[
\left\| \frac{E_k(u, \Xi)}{\|G\|_{\infty}} \right\|_{\infty} \leq \|G\|_{\infty} \varepsilon^*.
\] 
Then, by applying the triangle inequality to (30), the candidate solution of the slack variable satisfies the following constraint for all \( k \in \mathbb{Z}[t-d_{\text{max}}, t-1] \)
\[
\|\sigma_k'(t)\|_{\infty} \leq \left\| \frac{E_k(\bar{u}(t), \bar{\Xi}(t))}{\|G\|_{\infty}} + \left\| H_1(\hat{E}[k, k+N-L-d_{\text{max}}](u^{\text{data}}, \Xi^{\text{data}}))\alpha'(t) \right\|_{\infty} \right. 
\]
\[
\leq \left\| \|G\|_{\infty} \varepsilon^*(1 + \|\alpha'(t)\|_1) \right. 
\] 
(44)

and hence satisfies (144). As for the whole vector \( \sigma'(t) \), we again use the triangular inequality along with (30) to get
\[
\|\sigma'(t)\|_2^2 \leq \left\| \frac{E_k(\bar{u}(t), \bar{\Xi}(t))}{\|G\|_{\infty}} + \left\| H_{L+d_{\text{max}}}(E(\bar{u}^{\text{data}}, \Xi^{\text{data}}))\right\|_2 \|\alpha'(t)\|_2, 
\] 
(45)

\[
\|\sigma'(t)\|_2^2 \leq 2 \left\| \frac{E_k(\bar{u}(t), \bar{\Xi}(t))}{\|G\|_{\infty}} + \left\| H_{L+d_{\text{max}}}(E(\bar{u}^{\text{data}}, \Xi^{\text{data}}))\right\|_2 \|\alpha'(t)\|_2^2, 
\] 
(46)

where (46) was obtained by using the inequality \((a+b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2\) for \(a, b > 0\). By norm equivalence, and since \(E_k(\cdot, \cdot)\) is \(r\)-dimensional, one can write \( \left\| \frac{E_k(\cdot, \cdot)}{\|G\|_{\infty}} \right\|_{\infty} \leq \sqrt{\|G\|_{\infty}} \varepsilon^* \). Therefore
\[
\left\| \frac{E_k(\bar{u}(t), \bar{\Xi}(t))}{\|G\|_{\infty}} \right\|_2 \leq \sqrt{r(L+d_{\text{max}}-1)} \left\| \frac{E_k(\bar{u}(t), \bar{\Xi}(t))}{\|G\|_{\infty}} \right\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{r(L+d_{\text{max}}-1)} \|G\|_{\infty} \varepsilon^*, 
\] 
(47)

and
\[
\left\| \frac{H_{L+d_{\text{max}}}(E(\bar{u}^{\text{data}}, \Xi^{\text{data}}))}{\|G\|_{\infty}} \right\|_2 \leq r(N-L-d_{\text{max}} + 1)(L+d_{\text{max}}-1)(\varepsilon^*)^2 \|G\|_{\infty}^2. 
\] 
(48)

Substituting (47), (48) into (46) results in
\[
\|\sigma'(t)\|_2^2 \leq 2r(L+d_{\text{max}}-1)(\varepsilon^*)^2 \|G\|_{\infty}^2 \left( 1 + \|N-L-d_{\text{max}} + 1\|\alpha'(t)\|_2^2 \right). 
\] 
(49)

Finally, we substitute (31), (43), (49) back into (24) to obtain the following result
\[
V_t \leq c_4 \|\Xi_t\|_2^2 + c_5 
\] 
(50)

where
\[
c_4 := \lambda_{\text{max}}(Q, R)(\|K\|_1 + \Gamma_\xi + 1) + \lambda_{\text{max}}(P) 
\] 
\[
+ \left( \lambda_{\alpha} \varepsilon^* + 2r\lambda_{\alpha}(N-L-d_{\text{max}} + 1)(L+d_{\text{max}}-1)(\varepsilon^*)^2 \|G\|_{\infty}^2 \right) c_{pe} \|M^f\|_2^2 \left( \Gamma_\xi + \Gamma_\Xi \right), 
\]
\[
c_5 := 2\lambda_{\sigma}r(L+d_{\text{max}}-1)(\varepsilon^*)^2 \|G\|_{\infty}^2. 
\]
Notice that \(c_5\) has the property that it goes to zero as \(\varepsilon^* \rightarrow 0\).

\[\text{The bound in (48) was obtained using similar arguments as in [2] Eqn. 18.} \]
IV. Recursive feasibility

In this section, we show that if the robust data-driven nonlinear predictive control scheme (14) is feasible at time $t$, then it is feasible at time $t + d_{\text{max}}$, given that the uniform error bound $\varepsilon^*$ is small enough. Theorem 1 below follows similar ideas as in [2] Proposition 1).

Theorem 1. For any $V_{\text{ROA}} > 0$, there exists an $\bar{\varepsilon} > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon^* \leq \bar{\varepsilon}$, if $V_i \leq V_{\text{ROA}}$ for some $i \geq 0$, then the optimization problem (14) is feasible at time $t + d_{\text{max}}$.

Proof. Since $V_i \leq V_{\text{ROA}}$, then $J^*_i \leq V_{\text{ROA}}$ (and hence feasible at time $t$) with $\bar{u}^*_i(t), \bar{y}^*_i(t), \alpha^*_i(t), \sigma^*_i(t)$ being the optimal solution of (14) at time $t$. We propose the following candidate solution for the input sequence at time $t + d_{\text{max}}$ for a $d_{\text{max}}$-step MPC scheme

$$
\begin{align*}
\begin{bmatrix} 
\bar{u}_{[L-d_{\text{max}}, -1]}^*(t + d_{\text{max}}) \\
\bar{u}_{[0, L-d_{\text{max}}-1]}^*(t + d_{\text{max}})
\end{bmatrix} &= 
\begin{bmatrix} 
\bar{u}_{[0, d_{\text{max}}-1]}^*(t) \\
\bar{u}_{[d_{\text{max}}, L-1]}^*(t)
\end{bmatrix},
\end{align*}
$$

(51)

where the instances $[-d_{\text{max}}, -1]$ are fixed by the initial conditions (14) at $t + d_{\text{max}}$, while the instances from $[0, L - d_{\text{max}} - 1]$ are specified as the shifted, previously optimal, input sequence. As for the candidate output sequence, we use the output which would have been obtained by applying $\bar{u}^*_{[0, L-1]}(t)$ at time $t$ to the system, i.e., $\bar{y}_{i,[t+t+L+d_{\text{max}}]}$. as follows

$$
\begin{align*}
\begin{bmatrix} 
\bar{y}_{i,[L-d_{\text{max}}, L+d_{\text{max}}-1]}^*(t + d_{\text{max}}) \\
\bar{y}_{i,[L-d_{\text{max}}, -1]}^*(t + d_{\text{max}})
\end{bmatrix} &= 
\begin{bmatrix} 
\bar{y}_{i,[t+t+L+d_{\text{max}}-1]} \\
\bar{y}_{i,[t+L+d_{\text{max}}-1]}
\end{bmatrix},
\end{align*}
$$

(52)

Recall that $\bar{y}_{i,[L-d_{\text{max}}, L+d_{\text{max}}-1]}^*(t + d_{\text{max}}) = 0$ by the terminal constraints of the previous MPC iteration. Therefore, the following inequality holds by Lemma 1

$$
|\bar{y}_{i,t+k}| \leq P^k(K\bar{\varepsilon}) \left(1 + \left\|g_i^T\right\|_\infty \left\|G_i^T\right\|_\infty \right) (1 + \|\alpha^*(t)\|_1)\varepsilon^*, \quad \text{for } k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[L, L+d_{\text{max}}-1]}.
$$

(53)

As $\varepsilon^* \to 0$, the RHS of (53) goes to zero as well since $\|\alpha^*(t)\|_1$ remains bounded by $\lambda_{\alpha} \varepsilon^*\|\alpha^*(t)\|_2 \leq J^*(t) \leq V_{\text{ROA}}$, i.e.,

$$
\|\alpha^*(t)\|_1 \leq \sqrt{N - L - d_{\text{max}} + 1}\varepsilon^*, \quad \|\alpha^*(t)\|_2 \leq \sqrt{N - L - d_{\text{max}} + 1}\varepsilon^*.
$$

This implies that the corresponding state $\bar{z}_{t+L} = \begin{bmatrix} y_{1,[t+L+t+L+L+d_{\text{max}}-1]} & \cdots & y_{m,[t+L+L+d_{\text{max}}-1]} \end{bmatrix}^T$ approaches zero as $\varepsilon^* \to 0$. Denote by $\bar{y}_{i,k}(t + d_{\text{max}})$ the candidate state at time $k$, predicted at time $t + d_{\text{max}}$, and notice that the choice of candidate outputs $\bar{y}_{i,[L-d_{\text{max}}, L+d_{\text{max}}-1]}(t + d_{\text{max}}) = \bar{y}_{i,[t+L+L+d_{\text{max}}-1]}$ implies that the state satisfies $\bar{z}_{L-d_{\text{max}}}(t + d_{\text{max}}) = \bar{z}_{t+L}$, and hence $\bar{y}_{i,[L-d_{\text{max}}, L+d_{\text{max}}-1]}(t + d_{\text{max}})$ also approaches zero as $\varepsilon^* \to 0$. Since System 3 is controllable, there exists a control input $v_{i,[L-d_{\text{max}}, L+L+d_{\text{max}}-1]}$ which brings the state $\bar{z}_{L-d_{\text{max}}}(t + d_{\text{max}})$ and the corresponding outputs $\bar{y}_{i,[L-d_{\text{max}}, L+d_{\text{max}}-2]}(t + d_{\text{max}})$ to zero in $d_{\text{max}}$ steps while satisfying the following inequality (cf. (25))

$$
\left\|\bar{y}_{i,[L-d_{\text{max}}, L+d_{\text{max}}-2]}(t + d_{\text{max}})\right\|_2 \leq K_7 \left\|v_{i,[L-d_{\text{max}}, L+L+d_{\text{max}}-1]}(t + d_{\text{max}})\right\|_2 \leq K_7 \Gamma_v \left\|\bar{z}_{t+L}\right\|_2.
$$

(54)

Notice that the effect of this deadbeat controller, i.e., $\bar{u}_{i,[L-d_{\text{max}}, L+d_{\text{max}}-1]}(t + d_{\text{max}})$, appears at the $i-$th output $d_i$ instances afterwards. However, it only affect those outputs for which $d_i \neq d_{\text{max}}$. In particular

$$
\begin{bmatrix} 
\phi_i(\bar{u}_{L-d_{\text{max}}}(t + d_{\text{max}}), \bar{z}_{L-d_{\text{max}}}(t + d_{\text{max}})) \\
\vdots \\
\phi_i(\bar{u}_{L-d_{\text{max}}}(t + d_{\text{max}}), \bar{z}_{L-d_{\text{max}}}(t + d_{\text{max}}))
\end{bmatrix} = v_{i,[L-d_{\text{max}}, L-d_{\text{max}}-1]}(t + d_{\text{max}}).
$$

(55)

13The notation $v_{i}(t + d_{\text{max}})$ is defined as $v_{j}(t + d_{\text{max}}) = \Phi(\bar{u}_{j}(t + d_{\text{max}}), \bar{z}_{j}(t + d_{\text{max}}))$. 

\[\text{RAW TEXT END}\]
As for the outputs for which \( d_i \neq d_{\text{max}} \), the instants \( [L+d_i-d_{\text{max}}, L-1] \) are affected by the input from \((51)\). Finally, the terminal constraints fix the last \( d_i \) instances of each output according to \((14d)\). To sum up, the candidate solutions for the input and output sequences at time \( t+d_{\text{max}} \) take the following form

\[
\begin{align*}
\bar{u}_{[−d_{\text{max}},−1]}(t+d_{\text{max}}) = &\; \bar{u}^{*}_{[0,d_{\text{max}}−1]}(t) = u(t,t+d_{\text{max}}−1), \\
\bar{u}_{[0,L−d_{\text{max}}−1]}(t+d_{\text{max}}) = &\; \bar{u}^{*}_{[d_{\text{max}},−1]}(t), \\
\bar{u}_{[L−d_{\text{max}},L−1]}(t+d_{\text{max}}) = &\; \text{deadbeat controller that satisfies (54),} \\
\bar{y}_{[−d_{\text{max}},−1]}(t+d_{\text{max}}) = &\; \bar{y}^{*}_{[0,d_{\text{max}}−1]}(t) = y(t,t+d_{\text{max}}−1), \\
\bar{y}_{[0,L−d_{\text{max}}−1]}(t+d_{\text{max}}) = &\; \bar{y}^{*}_{[d_{\text{max}},−1]}(t), \\
\bar{y}_{[L−d_{\text{max}},L−1]}(t+d_{\text{max}}) = &\; \bar{y}^{*}_{[L−d_{\text{max}},L−d_{i}−1]}(t+d_{\text{max}}), \quad \text{for } d_i \neq d_{\text{max}}, \\
\bar{y}_{[L−d_{\text{max}},L−d_{i}−1]}(t+d_{\text{max}}) = &\; 0.
\end{align*}
\]

Next, we choose \( \alpha'(t+d_{\text{max}}) \) as

\[
\alpha'(t+d_{\text{max}}) = \left[\frac{H_L+d_{\text{max}}(\bar{\Psi}(\bar{u}^{\text{data}},\Xi^{\text{data}}) + \dot{\bar{E}}(\bar{u}^{\text{data}},\Xi^{\text{data}}))}{H_1(\Xi^{\text{data}})}\right]^T \bar{\Psi}(\bar{u}'(t+d_{\text{max}}),\Xi^{\text{data}}) + \dot{\bar{E}}(\bar{u}'(t+d_{\text{max}}),\Xi^{\text{data}}) \Xi_t,
\]

which exists by Assumption \(2\) and Remark \(2\) and satisfies \((14b)\). Finally we choose for \( \sigma'(t+d_{\text{max}}) \)

\[
\sigma'(t+d_{\text{max}}) = \dot{\bar{E}}(\bar{u}'(t+d_{\text{max}}),\Xi^{\text{data}}) - H_L+d_{\text{max}}(\dot{E}(\bar{u}^{\text{data}},\Xi^{\text{data}}))\alpha'(t+d_{\text{max}}),
\]

which satisfies \((14g)\) by applying the triangular inequality on \((58)\). Specifically, for \( k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[−d_{\text{max}}, L−1]} \), the following is true

\[
\|\sigma'_k(t+d_{\text{max}})\|_{\infty} \leq \left\| \hat{E}_k(\bar{u}'(t+d_{\text{max}}),\Xi^{\text{data}}) \right\|_{\infty} + \|H_1(\hat{E}_k,k,N−L−d_{\text{max}})(\bar{u}^{\text{data}},\Xi^{\text{data}})\alpha'(t+d_{\text{max}})\|_{\infty} \leq \|G'\|_{\infty} \varepsilon'(1+\|\alpha'(t+d_{\text{max}})\|_1).
\]

In \((56)\) \((58)\), candidate solutions were shown to exist and satisfy the constraints \((14b)\) \((14g)\) at the subsequent iteration \((t+d_{\text{max}})\) of the MPC scheme given that the previous iteration \((t)\) was feasible, which completes the proof.

Theorem \(1\) showed that for any \( V_{ROA} > 0 \), there exists an \( \bar{\varepsilon} \) such that for any \( \varepsilon^* \leq \bar{\varepsilon} \) and any state \( \Xi_t \) starting from the sub-level set \( \mathbb{V} := \{ \Xi \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid V_t \leq V_{ROA} \} \), if the \( d_{\text{max}} \)-step predictive control scheme \((14)\) is feasible at time \( t \), then it is feasible at time \( t+d_{\text{max}} \). Similar to \((2)\), as the size of the sub-level set \( \mathbb{V} \) increases, the bound \( \varepsilon \) decreases, and vice versa. This is explained by the fact that a larger sub-level set \( \mathbb{V} \) includes states \( \Xi_t \) that are farther away from the origin. Starting from such states makes the task of stabilizing the origin more difficult if the noise bound \( \varepsilon^* \leq \bar{\varepsilon} \) is large, and hence \( \varepsilon^* \leq \bar{\varepsilon} \) must decrease for the results in Theorem \(1\) to hold.

This does not yet imply recursive feasibility of the predictive control scheme for all time (cf. \((2)\)). To show that, we must show that the sub-level set \( \mathbb{V} \) is invariant. This is presented in the next section along with the main result of practical stability.

V. Practical Stability

In the final section of this report, we combine all of the above arguments and present the main result of practical stability and exponential convergence of the Lyapunov function to a region whose size depends on the approximation error bound \( \varepsilon^* \). Again, the results shown below follow similar arguments as in \((2)\) Theorem 3, that are carefully adjusted for the nonlinear system \((1)\) under consideration.

Theorem 2. Let Assumptions \(7\) \((3)\) hold. Then, for any \( V_{ROA} > 0 \), there exist \( \alpha, \bar{\alpha}, \delta, \delta > 0 \) such that for all \( \alpha, \delta, \) satisfying

\[
\begin{align*}
\lambda_{\alpha} &\leq \alpha \leq \bar{\lambda}_{\alpha}, \\
\lambda_{\delta} &\leq \delta \leq \bar{\lambda}_{\delta},
\end{align*}
\]

there exists constants \( \bar{\varepsilon}, \bar{c}_{pe} > 0 \) as well as a continuous, strictly increasing function \( \beta : [0,\bar{\varepsilon}] \to [0, V_{ROA}] \) with \( \beta(0) = 0 \), such that for all \( \varepsilon^* \), \( c_{pe} \varepsilon^* \leq \bar{c}_{pe} \)

the sub-level set \( \mathbb{V} \) is invariant and \( V_t \) converges exponentially to \( V_t \leq \beta(\varepsilon^*) \) in closed-loop with \( d_{\text{max}} \)-step MPC scheme for all initial conditions for which \( V_0 \leq V_{ROA} \).
Proof. Let $\varepsilon^* \leq \bar{\varepsilon}$ be small enough such that Theorem 1 holds and that Problem 14 is feasible at time $t + d_{\text{max}}$. Then by optimality,
\[
J^*_{t+d_{\text{max}}} \leq J_{t+L-1}
\]
\[
= \sum_{k=0}^{L-1} \ell(\bar{u}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}}), \bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}})) + \lambda_\alpha \varepsilon^* ||\alpha(t + d_{\text{max}})||^2_2 + \lambda_\sigma ||\sigma(t + d_{\text{max}})||^2_2
\]
\[
+ J^*_1 - \sum_{k=0}^{L-1} \ell(\bar{u}_k, \bar{y}_k) - \lambda_\alpha \varepsilon^* ||\alpha(t)||^2_2 - \lambda_\sigma ||\sigma(t)||^2_2,
\]
where the last four terms were obtained by adding and subtracting the optimal value function at time $t$. We start by considering the summation terms in (59)
\[
\sum_{k=0}^{L-1} \ell(\bar{u}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}}), \bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}})) - \sum_{k=0}^{L-1} \ell(\bar{u}_k^* (t), \bar{y}_k^* (t)) = \sum_{k=0}^{L-d_{\text{max}}-1} \ell(\bar{u}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}}), \bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}}))
\]
\[
+ \sum_{k=L-d_{\text{max}}}^{L-1} \ell(\bar{u}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}}), \bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}})) + \sum_{k=0}^{d_{\text{max}}-1} \ell(\bar{u}_k^* (t), \bar{y}_k^* (t)) - \sum_{k=0}^{L-1} \ell(\bar{u}_k^* (t), \bar{y}_k^* (t)).
\]
Notice that by rearranging the summation limits, one obtains
\[
\sum_{k=d_{\text{max}}}^{L-1} \ell(\bar{u}_k^* (t), \bar{y}_k^* (t)) = \sum_{k=0}^{L-d_{\text{max}}-1} \ell(\bar{u}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}}), \bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}})).
\]
Therefore
\[
\sum_{k=0}^{L-1} \ell(\bar{u}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}}), \bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}})) - \sum_{k=0}^{L-1} \ell(\bar{u}_k^* (t), \bar{y}_k^* (t))
\]
\[
= \sum_{k=0}^{L-d_{\text{max}}-1} \ell(\bar{u}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}}), \bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}})) - \ell(\bar{u}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}}), \bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}}))
\]
\[
+ \sum_{k=L-d_{\text{max}}}^{L-1} \ell(\bar{u}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}}), \bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}})) - \sum_{k=0}^{d_{\text{max}}-1} \ell(\bar{u}_k^* (t), \bar{y}_k^* (t)).
\]
Notice that the inputs in the first summation term on the RHS of (62) are the same, i.e., $\bar{u}_{[0,L-d_{\text{max}}-1]}(t + d_{\text{max}}) = \bar{u}_{[d_{\text{max}}, L-1]}(t)$ by (56). Therefore, the stage costs in that term are simply
\[
\ell(\bar{u}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}}), \bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}})) - \ell(\bar{u}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}}), \bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}}))
\]
\[
= ||\bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}})||^2_Q - ||\bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}})||^2_Q
\]
\[
= \|\bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}}) - \bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}}) + \bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}})\|^2_Q - ||\bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}})||^2_Q
\]
\[
= \|\bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}}) - \bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}})\|^2_Q + 2(\bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}}) - \bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}}))^T Q \bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}})
\]
\[
\leq \|\bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}}) - \bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}})\|^2_Q + 2\|\bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}}) - \bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}})\|^2_Q (1 + V_{\text{ROA}}).
\]
Since $J^*_1 \leq V(t) \leq V_{\text{ROA}}$, it holds that $||\bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}})\|^2_Q \leq J^*_1 \leq V_{\text{ROA}}$, and using the inequality $2a \leq 1 + a^2$ for $a \in \mathbb{R}$ one can write $2\|\bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}})\|^2_Q \leq 1 + \|\bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}})\|^2_Q \leq 1 + V_{\text{ROA}}$. Therefore, an upper bound on the first summation term on the RHS of (62) is expressed as
\[
\sum_{k=0}^{L-d_{\text{max}}-1} \ell(\bar{u}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}}), \bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}})) - \ell(\bar{u}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}}), \bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}}))
\]
\[
\leq \sum_{k=0}^{L-d_{\text{max}}-1} \left( \|\bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}}) - \bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}})\|^2_Q + \|\bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}}) - \bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}})\|^2_Q (1 + V_{\text{ROA}}) \right).
Note that, for \( k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,L-d_{\text{max}}-1]} \), the following holds
\[
||\tilde{y}_k(t + d_{\text{max}}) - \tilde{y}_{k+d_{\text{max}}}(t)||^2_Q = \left[ \begin{array}{c} \tilde{y}_{1,k}(t + d_{\text{max}}) - \tilde{y}_{1,k+d_{\text{max}}}(t) \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{y}_{m,k}(t + d_{\text{max}}) - \tilde{y}_{m,k+d_{\text{max}}}(t) \end{array} \right]^2.
\] (65)

Furthermore, note from (56) that \( \tilde{y}_{i,[0,L-d_{\text{max}}-1]}(t + d_{\text{max}}) = \tilde{y}_{i,[t+d_{\text{max}},t+L-1]} \). Therefore, one can re-write (65) as
\[
\leq \lambda_{\text{max}}(Q) \left( \begin{array}{c} \tilde{y}_{1,t+k+d_{\text{max}}}(t) - \tilde{y}_{1,k+d_{\text{max}}}(t) \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{y}_{m,t+k+d_{\text{max}}}(t) - \tilde{y}_{m,k+d_{\text{max}}}(t) \end{array} \right)^2 \leq m\lambda_{\text{max}}(Q) \text{ } \left[ \begin{array}{c} \tilde{y}_{1,t+k+d_{\text{max}}}(t) - \tilde{y}_{1,k+d_{\text{max}}}(t) \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{y}_{m,t+k+d_{\text{max}}}(t) - \tilde{y}_{m,k+d_{\text{max}}}(t) \end{array} \right]^2 \leq m\lambda_{\text{max}}(Q) \max_{i} |\tilde{y}_{i,t+k+d_{\text{max}}}(t) - \tilde{y}_{i,k+d_{\text{max}}}(t)|^2 \]
(66)

From (66), it also holds that
\[
||\tilde{y}_k(t + d_{\text{max}}) - \tilde{y}_{k+d_{\text{max}}}(t)||^2_Q \leq \sqrt{m\lambda_{\text{max}}(Q) \text{ } \max_{i} \left[ \mathcal{P}^{k+d_{\text{max}}}(K_{\Xi}) (1 + ||g_i^T||_{\infty} ||G_i^T||_{\infty}) (1 + ||\alpha^*(t)||_1) \epsilon^* \right]^2} .
\] (67)

for \( k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,L-d_{\text{max}}-1]} \). Substituting (66) and (67) in (64) we obtain
\[
\sum_{k=0}^{L-d_{\text{max}}-1} \ell \left( \tilde{u}_k(t + d_{\text{max}}), \tilde{y}_k(t + d_{\text{max}}) \right) - \ell \left( \tilde{u}_{k+d_{\text{max}}}(t), \tilde{y}_{k+d_{\text{max}}}(t) \right) \leq \lambda_{\text{max}}(Q) \text{ } \max_{i} \left[ \mathcal{P}^{k+d_{\text{max}}}(K_{\Xi}) (1 + ||g_i^T||_{\infty} ||G_i^T||_{\infty}) (1 + ||\alpha^*(t)||_1) \epsilon^* \right]^2 \]
(68)

The second summation term in (62) can be bounded by
\[
\sum_{k=L-d_{\text{max}}}^{L-1} \ell \left( \tilde{u}_k(t + d_{\text{max}}), \tilde{y}_k(t + d_{\text{max}}) \right) \leq \lambda_{\text{max}}(Q, R) \left[ \tilde{u}_{L-d_{\text{max}},L-1}(t + d_{\text{max}}) \right]^2 .
\] (69)

By (14d), \( \tilde{y}_{i,[L+L+d_i-1]}(t + d_{\text{max}}) = 0 \). Hence,
\[
\sum_{k=L-d_{\text{max}}}^{L-1} \ell \left( \tilde{u}_k(t + d_{\text{max}}), \tilde{y}_k(t + d_{\text{max}}) \right) \leq \lambda_{\text{max}}(Q, R) \left[ \begin{array}{c} \tilde{u}_{L-d_{\text{max}},L-1}(t + d_{\text{max}}) \\ \tilde{y}_{i,[L-d_{\text{max}},L+d_i-2]}(t + d_{\text{max}}) \end{array} \right]^2 \leq \lambda_{\text{max}}(Q, R) \right[ \begin{array}{c} \tilde{u}_{L-d_{\text{max}},L-1}(t + d_{\text{max}}) \\ \Xi_{[L-d_{\text{max}},L-1]}(t + d_{\text{max}}) \end{array} \right]^2 \leq \lambda_{\text{max}}(Q, R)(K_{\Xi} + 1) \Gamma \left[ \begin{array}{c} \Xi_{L+d} \\ 2 \end{array} \right] \leq \lambda_{\text{max}}(Q, R)(K_{\Xi} + 1) \Gamma \left[ \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \leq 1 \end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c} \Xi_{L+d} \\ \leq 1 \end{array} \right] (L + 1) \Gamma \left[ \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \leq 1 \end{array} \right].
\] (70)

Recall that \( \tilde{y}_{i,[L+L+d_i-1]}(t) = 0 \) are fixed by the terminal constraints of the previous MPC iteration, and hence, by Lemma[1] the instances \( \tilde{y}_{i,[t+L+L+d_i-1]} \) for all \( i \in \mathbb{Z}_{[1,m]} \) satisfy the following inequality for all \( k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[L,L+d_i-1]} \)
\[
||\tilde{y}_{i,t+k}||^2 \leq \mathcal{P}^{k}(K_{\Xi}) (1 + ||g_i^T||_{\infty} ||G_i^T||_{\infty}) (1 + ||\alpha^*(t)||_1) \epsilon^*.
\]
Therefore, \( \| \tilde{\Xi}_{t+L} \|_2^2 \) in (70) can be expressed as
\[
\| \tilde{\Xi}_{t+L} \|_2^2 = \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{y}_1, [t+L, t+L+d_1-1] \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{y}_m, [t+L, t+L+d_m-1] \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2^2 \leq m \max_i \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{y}_i, [t+L, t+L+d_i-1] \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{y}_m, [t+L, t+L+d_m-1] \end{bmatrix} \right\|_\infty
\]
and the following bound for (69) is obtained
\[
\frac{L-1}{d_m} \sum_{k=0}^{L-d_m-1} \ell(\bar{u}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}}), \bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}})) \leq \lambda_{\text{max}}(Q, R) (K_\gamma + 1) \Gamma_\epsilon \max_t \left[ P^{L+d_\epsilon-1}(K_\Xi) \left( 1 + \| g_1^T \|_\infty \| g_1^T \|_\infty \right) (1 + \| \alpha^*(t) \|_1) \epsilon^* \right]^2.
\] (72)
Finally, substituting (72) and (69) in (62) results in
\[
\frac{L-1}{d_m} \sum_{k=0}^{L-d_m-1} \ell(\bar{u}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}}), \bar{y}_k^* (t + d_{\text{max}})) - \ell(\bar{u}_k^* (t), \bar{y}_k^* (t)) \leq m \lambda_{\text{max}}(Q) \max_t \left[ P^{k+d_\epsilon}(K_\Xi) \left( 1 + \| g_1^T \|_\infty \| g_1^T \|_\infty \right) (1 + \| \alpha^*(t) \|_1) \epsilon^* \right]^2
\]
\[
+ \sqrt{m} \lambda_{\text{max}}(Q) \max_i \left[ P^{k+d_\epsilon}(K_\Xi) \left( 1 + \| g_1^T \|_\infty \| g_1^T \|_\infty \right) (1 + \| \alpha^*(t) \|_1) \epsilon^* \right] (1 + V_{ROA})
\]
\[
+ \lambda_{\text{max}}(Q, R) (K_\gamma + 1) \Gamma_\epsilon \max_t \left[ P^{L+d_\epsilon-1}(K_\Xi) \left( 1 + \| g_1^T \|_\infty \| g_1^T \|_\infty \right) (1 + \| \alpha^*(t) \|_1) \epsilon^* \right]^2
\]
\[
- \sum_{k=0}^{d_m-1} \ell(\bar{u}_k^* (t), \bar{y}_k^* (t)).
\] (73)
At this point, we have obtained upper bounds for the candidate solutions of the input and the output in the summation terms of (59). Next, we wish to find suitable upper bounds for \( \sigma'(t + d_{\text{max}}) \) and \( \alpha'(t + d_{\text{max}}) \). For \( \sigma'(t + d_{\text{max}}) \), we apply the triangular inequality on (58) and obtain
\[
\| \sigma'(t + d_{\text{max}}) \|_2 \leq \| \tilde{E}(\bar{u}'(t + d_{\text{max}}), \Xi'(t + d_{\text{max}})) \|_2 + \| H_{L+d_{\text{max}}} (\tilde{E}(\bar{u}'(t_{\text{data}}, \Xi_{\text{data}}))) \alpha'(t + d_{\text{max}}) \|_2.
\] (74)
Next, we apply the inequality \( (a + b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2 \) to the RHS of (74) to get
\[
\| \sigma'(t + d_{\text{max}}) \|_2 \leq 2 \| \tilde{E}(\bar{u}'(t + d_{\text{max}}), \Xi'(t + d_{\text{max}})) \|_2 + 2 \| H_{L+d_{\text{max}}} (\tilde{E}(\bar{u}'(t_{\text{data}}, \Xi_{\text{data}}))) \alpha'(t + d_{\text{max}}) \|_2
\]
\[
\leq 2m (L + d_{\text{max}} - 1) \| g_1 \|_\infty^2 (\epsilon^*)^2 + 2m (L + d_{\text{max}} - 1) (N - L - d_{\text{max}} + 1) \| g_1 \|_\infty^2 (\epsilon^*)^2 \| \alpha'(t + d_{\text{max}}) \|_2
\] (75)
As for \( \| \alpha'(t + d_{\text{max}}) \|_2 \), we also apply the triangle inequality to (57) to obtain
\[
\| \alpha'(t + d_{\text{max}}) \|_2 \leq \left\| \begin{bmatrix} H_{L+d_{\text{max}}} (\tilde{E}(\bar{u}'(t_{\text{data}}, \Xi_{\text{data}})) + \tilde{E}(\bar{u}'(t_{\text{data}}, \Xi_{\text{data}}))) \Xi(t + d_{\text{max}}) \Xi(t + d_{\text{max}}) \\ \Xi(t + d_{\text{max}}) \Xi(t + d_{\text{max}}) \Xi(t + d_{\text{max}}) \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2
\]
\[
\leq \left\| \begin{bmatrix} H_{L+d_{\text{max}}} (\tilde{E}(\bar{u}'(t_{\text{data}}, \Xi_{\text{data}})) + \tilde{E}(\bar{u}'(t_{\text{data}}, \Xi_{\text{data}}))) \Xi(t + d_{\text{max}}) \Xi(t + d_{\text{max}}) \\ \Xi(t + d_{\text{max}}) \Xi(t + d_{\text{max}}) \Xi(t + d_{\text{max}}) \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2.
\] (76)
We then rewrite the rightmost term in (76) as
\[
\left( H_{L+d_{\text{max}}} (\tilde{E}(\bar{u}'(t_{\text{data}}, \Xi_{\text{data}})) + \tilde{E}(\bar{u}'(t_{\text{data}}, \Xi_{\text{data}}))) \Xi(t + d_{\text{max}}) \Xi(t + d_{\text{max}}) \right) = M \left[ \begin{bmatrix} \bar{v}'(t_{\text{data}}, -d_{\text{max}}, L-1) & (t + d_{\text{max}}) \\ \Xi(t_{\text{data}}, -d_{\text{max}}, L-1) & (t + d_{\text{max}}) \end{bmatrix} \Xi(t + d_{\text{max}}) \right],
\] (77)
where \( M \) is defined as in (56). By plugging (77) back into (76), we get
\[
\| \alpha'(t + d_{\text{max}}) \|_2 \leq \left\| \begin{bmatrix} H_{L+d_{\text{max}}} (\tilde{E}(\bar{u}'(t_{\text{data}}, \Xi_{\text{data}})) + \tilde{E}(\bar{u}'(t_{\text{data}}, \Xi_{\text{data}}))) \Xi(t + d_{\text{max}}) \Xi(t + d_{\text{max}}) \\ \Xi(t + d_{\text{max}}) \Xi(t + d_{\text{max}}) \Xi(t + d_{\text{max}}) \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2 M^T \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \bar{v}'(t_{\text{data}}, -d_{\text{max}}, L-1) & (t + d_{\text{max}}) \\ \Xi(t_{\text{data}}, -d_{\text{max}}, L-1) & (t + d_{\text{max}}) \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2.
\] (78)
Notice that the rightmost term on the RHS of (78) can be rewritten as

\[
\left\| \frac{v'_{t-d_{\text{max}}, L-1}(t + d_{\text{max}})}{\Xi_{t-1}^{[t-d_{\text{max}}, L-1]}(t + d_{\text{max}})} \right\|_2^2 \leq \left\| H_{L+d_{\text{max}}} \left( \tilde{\Psi}(u_{\text{data}}, \Xi_{\text{data}}) + \tilde{E}(u_{\text{data}}, \Xi_{\text{data}}) \right) \right\|_2^2 \leq \tilde{c}_{\text{ve}} \left\| M^T \right\|_2^2 \left( \frac{2\parallel \Xi_t \parallel_2^2 + \parallel v'_{t-d_{\text{max}}, L-1}(t + d_{\text{max}}) \parallel_2^2}{\parallel \Xi_t \parallel_2^2} + \parallel v'_{t-d_{\text{max}}, L-1}(t + d_{\text{max}}) \parallel_2^2 + K_{\gamma} \Gamma_v \parallel \tilde{\Xi}_{t+1} \parallel_2^2 + \parallel \tilde{y}_{t+1} \parallel_2^2 \right) \leq (K_{\gamma} \Gamma_v + 1) \max_i \parallel y_i \parallel_{\infty} \parallel \tilde{y}_{t+1} \parallel_2^2 + (K_{\gamma} \Gamma_v + 1) m \max_i \parallel y_i \parallel_{\infty} \parallel \tilde{y}_{t+1} \parallel_2^2 \leq \tilde{c}_{\text{ve}} \left( K_{\gamma} \Gamma_v + 1 \right) \max_i \parallel y_i \parallel_{\infty} \parallel \tilde{y}_{t+1} \parallel_2^2 + (K_{\gamma} \Gamma_v + 1) m \max_i \parallel y_i \parallel_{\infty} \parallel \tilde{y}_{t+1} \parallel_2^2 \right) \]

Next, we plug (79) back into (78) to deduce

\[
\left\| \alpha' (t + d_{\text{max}}) \right\|_2^2 
\leq \frac{2\parallel \Xi_t \parallel_2^2 + \parallel v'_{t-d_{\text{max}}, L-1}(t + d_{\text{max}}) \parallel_2^2}{\parallel \Xi_t \parallel_2^2} + \parallel v'_{t-d_{\text{max}}, L-1}(t + d_{\text{max}}) \parallel_2^2 + \parallel \tilde{y}_{t+1} \parallel_2^2 + \parallel \tilde{y}_{t+1} \parallel_2^2 \right) \leq (K_{\gamma} \Gamma_v + 1) \max_i \parallel y_i \parallel_{\infty} \parallel \tilde{y}_{t+1} \parallel_2^2 + (K_{\gamma} \Gamma_v + 1) m \max_i \parallel y_i \parallel_{\infty} \parallel \tilde{y}_{t+1} \parallel_2^2 \leq \tilde{c}_{\text{ve}} \left( K_{\gamma} \Gamma_v + 1 \right) \max_i \parallel y_i \parallel_{\infty} \parallel \tilde{y}_{t+1} \parallel_2^2 + (K_{\gamma} \Gamma_v + 1) m \max_i \parallel y_i \parallel_{\infty} \parallel \tilde{y}_{t+1} \parallel_2^2 \right) \]

(81)
Recall from the notation that was introduced in (54) that
\[
\mathbf{v}_{[-d_{\max}, L-d_{\max}-1]}(t + d_{\max}) = \begin{bmatrix}
\Phi(\bar{u}_{-d_{\max}}(t + d_{\max}), \bar{\Xi}_{-d_{\max}}(t + d_{\max})) \\
\vdots \\
\Phi(\bar{u}_{L-d_{\max}-1}(t + d_{\max}), \bar{\Xi}_{L-d_{\max}-1}(t + d_{\max}))
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

Therefore, by (local) Lipschitz continuity of $\Phi(\cdot, \cdot)$ with continuity constant $K_\Phi$, the following bound can be obtained:

\[
\left\| \mathbf{v}_{[-d_{\max}, L-d_{\max}-1]}(t + d_{\max}) \right\|^2_2 \leq K_\Phi \left( \left\| \bar{u}_{[-d_{\max}, L-d_{\max}-1]}^*(t) \right\|^2_2 + \left\| \bar{\Xi}_{[-d_{\max}, L-d_{\max}-1]}(t + d_{\max}) \right\|^2_2 \right)
\]

\[
\leq K_\Phi \left( \left\| \bar{u}_{[0, L-1]}^*(t) \right\|^2_2 + \left\| \bar{\Xi}_{[0, L-1]}(t + d_{\max}) \right\|^2_2 \right)
\]

\[
= K_\Phi \left( \left\| \bar{u}_{[0, L-1]}^*(t) \right\|^2_2 + \left( \left\| \bar{\Xi}_{[0, L-1]}(t) \right\|^2_2 \right) \right).
\]

where the instances $\bar{y}_{i,[L-d_{\max}-1]}^*(t)$ were dropped as they are zero by (14d). Finally, we plug (82) into (81) to get

\[
\left\| \alpha^*(t + d_{\max}) \right\|^2_2 \leq c_{pe} \left\| M^1 \right\|^2_2 \left( \left\| \Xi \right\|^2_2 + 2K_\Phi \left\| \bar{u}_{[0, L-1]}^*(t) \right\|^2_2 \right)
\]

\[
+ (K_\gamma \Gamma_v + 2K_\Phi + 1)m \max_i \left[ \mathcal{P}^{L-d_{\max}-1}(K\Xi) \left( 1 + \left\| g_i^\top \right\|_\infty \left\| G_i^\top \right\|_\infty \right) \left( 1 + \left\| \alpha^*(t) \right\|_1 \varepsilon^* \right)^2 \right].
\]

At this point, we have provided suitable upper bounds for the candidate solutions at $t + d_{\max}$. Before plugging them back into (59), we use the following bound on $\sigma^*(t)$ from the MPC previous iteration (cf. (49))

\[
\left\| \sigma^*(t) \right\|^2_2 \leq 2m(L + d_{\max} - 1)\left\| G^\top \right\|_\infty^2\varepsilon^2 + 2m(L + d_{\max} - 1)(N - L - d_{\max} + 1)\left\| G^\top \right\|_\infty^2\varepsilon^2\left\| \alpha^*(t) \right\|_2^2
\]

\[14\text{Recall from (3) that } \Phi(\cdot, \cdot) \text{ is equal to iterated composition of the continuous functions } f(\cdot, \cdot), h(\cdot, \cdot) \text{ and, hence, is itself (locally) Lipschitz continuous.}
We can now plug (73, 75, 83) into (59) to obtain

\[ J_{t, d_{\text{max}}}^* \leq \sum_{k=0}^{d_{\text{max}}-1} \left\{ m \lambda_{\text{max}}(Q) \max_i \left[ \mathcal{P}^{k+d_{\text{max}}}(K_{\Xi}) \left( 1 + \left\| g^i_{\text{T}} \right\|_{\infty} \left\| G^i_{\text{T}} \right\|_{\infty} \right) (1 + \| \alpha^*(t) \|_1) \varepsilon^* \right]^2 \\
+ \sqrt{m \lambda_{\text{max}}(Q) \max_i \left[ \mathcal{P}^{k+d_{\text{max}}}(K_{\Xi}) \left( 1 + \left\| g^i_{\text{T}} \right\|_{\infty} \left\| G^i_{\text{T}} \right\|_{\infty} \right) (1 + \| \alpha^*(t) \|_1) \varepsilon^* \right]} (1 + V_{\text{ROA}}) \right\} \\
+ \lambda_{\text{max}}(Q, R)(K_{\gamma} + 1) \Gamma v \max_i \left[ \mathcal{P}^{L+d_{\text{max}}-1}(K_{\Xi}) \left( 1 + \left\| g^i_{\text{T}} \right\|_{\infty} \left\| G^i_{\text{T}} \right\|_{\infty} \right) (1 + \| \alpha^*(t) \|_1) \varepsilon^* \right]^2 \\
- \sum_{k=0}^{d_{\text{max}}-1} \left( \varepsilon_0 \left( \mathbf{u}^*_k(t), \mathbf{v}^*_k(t) \right) + \lambda_\alpha \varepsilon^* \| \alpha'(t + d_{\text{max}}) \|_2^2 - \lambda_\alpha \varepsilon^* \| \alpha^*(t) \|_2^2 \right) \\
+ 2m \lambda_v (L + d_{\text{max}} - 1) \| G^i_{\text{T}} \|_{\infty} (\varepsilon^*)^2 + 2m \lambda_v (L + d_{\text{max}} - 1)(N - L - d_{\text{max}} + 1) \| G^i_{\text{T}} \|_{\infty} (\varepsilon^*)^2 \| \alpha'(t + d_{\text{max}}) \|_2^2 \\
- 2m \lambda_v (L + d_{\text{max}} - 1) \| G^i_{\text{T}} \|_{\infty} (\varepsilon^*)^2 - 2m \lambda_v (L + d_{\text{max}} - 1)(N - L - d_{\text{max}} + 1) \| G^i_{\text{T}} \|_{\infty} (\varepsilon^*)^2 \| \alpha^*(t) \|_2^2, \]

\[ J_{t, d_{\text{max}}}^* \leq J_t^* + m \lambda_{\text{max}}(Q) \left( (1 + \left\| g^i_{\text{T}} \right\|_{\infty} \left\| G^i_{\text{T}} \right\|_{\infty} \varepsilon^* \right)^2 \left( \sum_{k=0}^{L-d_{\text{max}}-1} \max_i \left[ \mathcal{P}^{k+d_{\text{max}}}(K_{\Xi}) \right] ^2 \right) (1 + \| \alpha^*(t) \|_1) \varepsilon^* \right)^2 \\
+ \sqrt{m \lambda_{\text{max}}(Q) \left( (1 + \left\| g^i_{\text{T}} \right\|_{\infty} \left\| G^i_{\text{T}} \right\|_{\infty} \varepsilon^* \right)^2 \left( \sum_{k=0}^{L-d_{\text{max}}-1} \max_i \left[ \mathcal{P}^{k+d_{\text{max}}}(K_{\Xi}) \right] ^2 \right) (1 + \| \alpha^*(t) \|_1) \varepsilon^* \right)} (1 + V_{\text{ROA}}) \left( \sum_{k=0}^{L-d_{\text{max}}-1} \max_i \left[ \mathcal{P}^{k+d_{\text{max}}}(K_{\Xi}) \right] ^2 \right) (1 + \| \alpha^*(t) \|_1) \varepsilon^* \right) \\
+ \lambda_{\text{max}}(Q, R)(K_{\gamma} + 1) \Gamma v \max_i \left[ \mathcal{P}^{L+d_{\text{max}}-1}(K_{\Xi}) \left( 1 + \left\| g^i_{\text{T}} \right\|_{\infty} \left\| G^i_{\text{T}} \right\|_{\infty} \varepsilon^* \right)^2 \right)^2 (1 + \| \alpha^*(t) \|_1) \varepsilon^* \right)^2 \\
+ \left( \lambda_\alpha \varepsilon^* + 2m \lambda_v (L + d_{\text{max}} - 1)(N - L - d_{\text{max}} + 1) \| G^i_{\text{T}} \|_{\infty} (\varepsilon^*)^2 \| \alpha'(t + d_{\text{max}}) \|_2^2 \\
- c_9 \| \alpha^*(t) \|_2^2 - \sum_{k=0}^{d_{\text{max}}-1} \left( \varepsilon_0 \left( \mathbf{u}^*_k(t), \mathbf{v}^*_k(t) \right) \right), \]

\[ J_{t, d_{\text{max}}}^* \leq J_t^* + (c_6 + c_8)(1 + \| \alpha^*(t) \|_1)^2 + c_7(1 + \| \alpha^*(t) \|_1) - c_9 \| \alpha^*(t) \|_2^2 - \sum_{k=0}^{d_{\text{max}}-1} \left( \varepsilon_0 \left( \mathbf{u}^*_k(t), \mathbf{v}^*_k(t) \right) \right) \\
+ c_9 \| \alpha^*(t) \|_2^2 + c_9 \| \alpha^*(t) \|_2^2 + c_9 \| \alpha^*(t) \|_2^2 + 2K \phi \left\| \mathbf{u}^*_{[0, L-1]}(t) \right\|_2^2 + c_9 \| \alpha^*(t) \|_2^2 + c_9 \| \alpha^*(t) \|_2^2 + 2K \phi \left\| \mathbf{y}^*_{[0, L-1]}(t) \right\|_2^2 \\
+ c_9 \| \alpha^*(t) \|_2^2 (K_{\gamma} + 2K_{\phi} + 1) m \max_i \left[ \mathcal{P}^{L+d_{\text{max}}-1}(K_{\Xi}) \left( 1 + \left\| g^i_{\text{T}} \right\|_{\infty} \left\| G^i_{\text{T}} \right\|_{\infty} \varepsilon^* \right)^2 \right)^2 (1 + \| \alpha^*(t) \|_1)^2 \]

Compactly, this is written as

\[ J_{t+d_{\text{max}}}^* \leq J_t^* + (c_6 + c_8 + c_{12})(1 + \| \alpha^*(t) \|_1)^2 + c_7(1 + \| \alpha^*(t) \|_1) - c_9 \| \alpha^*(t) \|_2^2 - \sum_{k=0}^{d_{\text{max}}-1} \left( \varepsilon_0 \left( \mathbf{u}^*_k(t), \mathbf{v}^*_k(t) \right) \right) \]

\[ + c_9 \| \alpha^*(t) \|_2^2 + c_{11} \left\| \mathbf{u}^*_{[0, L-1]}(t) \right\|_2^2 + c_{11} \left\| \mathbf{y}^*_{[0, L-1]}(t) \right\|_2^2 \]

(86)

Next, notice that

\[ (1 + \| \alpha^*(t) \|_1)^2 = (1 + 2\| \alpha^*(t) \|_1)^2 \]

\[ \leq 1 + (1 + \| \alpha^*(t) \|_1)^2 \]

\[ \leq 2(1 + \| \alpha^*(t) \|_1^2) \]

\[ \leq 2(1 + (N - L - d_{\text{max}} + 1)\| \alpha^*(t) \|_2^2), \]

where the second step was obtained by using the inequality \(2a \leq 1 + a^2\) for \(a \in \mathbb{R}\) and the last step was obtained by norm equivalence. Similarly, one can write

\[ (1 + \| \alpha^*(t) \|_1) \leq (1.5 + 0.5(N - L - d_{\text{max}} + 1)\| \alpha^*(t) \|_2^2). \]

(88)
With this in mind, we can rewrite (86) as

\[ J_{t+d_{\text{max}}}^* \leq J_t^* + \left( 2(c_6 + c_8 + c_{12}) + 0.5c_7 \right) (N - L - d_{\text{max}} + 1) \| \alpha^*(t) \|^2_2 \\
- c_3 \| \alpha^*(t) \|^2_2 - \sum_{k=0}^{d_{\text{max}} - 1} (\ell(k \hat{u}_k(t), \hat{y}_k(t))) + c_{10} \| \Xi \|^2_2 + c_{11} \left\| \frac{\hat{u}_{[0,L-1]}^*(t)}{\hat{y}_{[0,L-1]}^*(t)} \right\|^2_2 + 2(c_6 + c_8 + c_{12}) + 1.5c_7 \]  

\[ (89) \]

\[ J_{t+d_{\text{max}}}^* - J_t^* \leq - \sum_{k=0}^{d_{\text{max}} - 1} (\ell(k \hat{u}_k(t), \hat{y}_k(t))) + (c_{13} - c_3) \| \alpha^*(t) \|^2_2 + c_{10} \| \Xi \|^2_2 + c_{11} \left\| \frac{\hat{u}_{[0,L-1]}^*(t)}{\hat{y}_{[0,L-1]}^*(t)} \right\|^2_2 + c_{14} \]

Now, the goal is to show that the Lyapunov function candidate satisfies a useful decay bound. The successive difference in the Lyapunov function is

\[ V_{t+d_{\text{max}}} - V_t = \underbrace{V_{t+d_{\text{max}}} - J_t^*}_{\text{see (86)}} + c_3 \left( W_{t+d_{\text{max}}} - W_t \right) \],

which is bounded by

\[ V_{t+d_{\text{max}}} - V_t \leq - \sum_{k=0}^{d_{\text{max}} - 1} (\ell(k \hat{u}_k(t), \hat{y}_k(t))) + c_{10} \| \Xi \|^2_2 + c_{11} \left\| \frac{\hat{u}_{[0,L-1]}^*(t)}{\hat{y}_{[0,L-1]}^*(t)} \right\|^2_2 + (c_{13} - c_3) \| \alpha^*(t) \|^2_2 + c_{14} \\
+ c_3 \left( \frac{1}{2} \| \Xi(t+d_{\text{max}}-1) \|^2_2 + c_1 \| v(t+d_{\text{max}}-1) \|^2_2 + c_2 \| y(t+d_{\text{max}}-1) \|^2_2 \right) \].

Rewrite the term

\[ \| y(t+d_{\text{max}}-1) - \hat{y}_{[0,d_{\text{max}}-1]}^*(t) \|^2_2 \leq 2 \| y(t+d_{\text{max}}-1) - \hat{y}_{[0,d_{\text{max}}-1]}(t) \|^2_2 + 2 \| \hat{y}_{[0,d_{\text{max}}-1]}(t) \|^2_2 \]

using \( (a + b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2 \) for \( a, b \geq 0 \) and plug back into (90) to get

\[ V_{t+d_{\text{max}}} - V_t \leq - \sum_{k=0}^{d_{\text{max}} - 1} (\ell(k \hat{u}_k(t), \hat{y}_k(t))) + c_{10} \| \Xi \|^2_2 + c_{11} \left\| \frac{\hat{u}_{[0,L-1]}^*(t)}{\hat{y}_{[0,L-1]}^*(t)} \right\|^2_2 + (c_{13} - c_3) \| \alpha^*(t) \|^2_2 + c_{14} \\
+ c_3 \left( \frac{1}{2} \| \Xi(t+d_{\text{max}}-1) \|^2_2 + c_1 \| v(t+d_{\text{max}}-1) \|^2_2 \right) \\
+ 2c_2c_3 \left( \| y(t+d_{\text{max}}-1) - \hat{y}_{[0,d_{\text{max}}-1]}(t) \|^2_2 + \| \hat{y}_{[0,d_{\text{max}}-1]}(t) \|^2_2 \right) \].

Recall from (86) that \( y(t+d_{\text{max}}-1) = \tilde{y}(t+d_{\text{max}}-1) \). This means that

\[ \| y(t+d_{\text{max}}-1) - \hat{y}_{[0,d_{\text{max}}-1]}^*(t) \|^2_2 = \| \tilde{y}(t+d_{\text{max}}-1) - \hat{y}_{[0,d_{\text{max}}-1]}(t) \|^2_2 \]

\[ = \left\| \begin{array}{c} \tilde{y}_1(t+d_{\text{max}}-1) - \tilde{y}_1([0,d_{\text{max}}-1]) \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{y}_m(t+d_{\text{max}}-1) - \tilde{y}_m([0,d_{\text{max}}-1]) \\ \end{array} \right\|_2^2 \]

\[ \leq m \max_i \| \tilde{y}_i(t+d_{\text{max}}-1) - \tilde{y}_i([0,d_{\text{max}}-1]) \|_\infty^2 \]

\[ \leq m \max_i \left[ \rho^{d_{\text{max}}-1}(K_{\Xi}) (1 + \| g_i^\top \|_\infty \| G^\top \|_\infty) \varepsilon^* \right] \| \alpha^*(t) \|_1^2 \]

Plugging back into (91) and using (87) results in

\[ V_{t+d_{\text{max}}} - V_t \leq - \sum_{k=0}^{d_{\text{max}} - 1} (\ell(k \hat{u}_k(t), \hat{y}_k(t))) + c_{10} \| \Xi \|^2_2 + c_{11} \left\| \frac{\hat{u}_{[0,L-1]}^*(t)}{\hat{y}_{[0,L-1]}^*(t)} \right\|^2_2 + (c_{13} - c_3) \| \alpha^*(t) \|^2_2 + c_{14} \\
+ c_3 \left( \frac{1}{2} \| \Xi(t+d_{\text{max}}-1) \|^2_2 + c_1 \| v(t+d_{\text{max}}-1) \|^2_2 \right) \\
+ 2c_2c_3 \left[ \rho^{d_{\text{max}}-1}(K_{\Xi}) (1 + \| g_i^\top \|_\infty \| G^\top \|_\infty) \varepsilon^* \right] \| \alpha^*(t) \|_1^2 \]

\[ + 4c_2c_3 m \max_i \left[ \rho^{d_{\text{max}}-1}(K_{\Xi}) (1 + \| g_i^\top \|_\infty \| G^\top \|_\infty) \varepsilon^* \right] \| \alpha^*(t) \|_1^2 \]

\[ \| \alpha^*(t) \|_1^2 \]
\[ V_{t+d_{\text{max}}} - V_t \leq - \sum_{k=0}^{d_{\text{max}}-1} (\ell (\bar{u}_k^*(t), \bar{y}_k^*(t))) + c_{10} \| \Xi_t \|^2_2 + c_{11} \left\| \bar{u}^{[0,L-1]}_k(t) \right\|^2_2 + (c_{13} + c_{15} - c_9) \| \alpha^*(t) \|^2_2 + c_{16} \\
+ c_3 \left( - \frac{1}{2} \| \Xi_{[t,t+d_{\text{max}}-1]} \|^2_2 + c_1 \| v_{[t,t+d_{\text{max}}-1]} \|^2_2 \right) + 2c_2c_3 \left\| \bar{y}^{[0,d_{\text{max}}-1]}_{0}(t) \right\|^2_2, \]
where
\[ c_{15} := 4c_2c_3m \max_i [\mathcal{P}^{d_{\text{max}}-1}(K_\Xi) \left( 1 + \| g^\top_i \|_\infty \| g_i \|_\infty \right) \varepsilon^*]^2 (N - L - d_{\text{max}} + 1), \]
\[ c_{16} := c_{14} + 4c_2c_3m \max_i [\mathcal{P}^{d_{\text{max}}-1}(K_\Xi) \left( 1 + \| g^\top_i \|_\infty \| g_i \|_\infty \right) \varepsilon^*]^2. \]

By choosing \( \lambda_\alpha, \lambda_\sigma \) in \( c_9 \) large enough and with \( c_{\text{pe}}, \varepsilon^* \) being sufficiently small in \( c_{13}, c_{15} \), one can cancel out the fourth term on the RHS of (92), i.e., \( (c_{13} + c_{15} - c_9) \| \alpha^*(t) \|^2_2 \), and obtain
\[ V_{t+d_{\text{max}}} - V_t \leq - \sum_{k=0}^{d_{\text{max}}-1} (\ell (\bar{u}_k^*(t), \bar{y}_k^*(t))) + c_{10} \| \Xi_t \|^2_2 + c_{11} \left\| \bar{u}^{[0,L-1]}_k(t) \right\|^2_2 + c_{16} \\
+ c_3 \left( - \frac{1}{2} \| \Xi_{[t,t+d_{\text{max}}-1]} \|^2_2 + c_1 \| v_{[t,t+d_{\text{max}}-1]} \|^2_2 \right) + 2c_2c_3 \left\| \bar{y}^{[0,d_{\text{max}}-1]}_{0}(t) \right\|^2_2. \]

By the (local) Lipschitz continuity of the function \( \Phi(\cdot, \cdot) \), we can bound
\[ \left\| v_{[t,t+d_{\text{max}}-1]} \right\|^2_2 \leq K_{\Phi} \left( \left\| u_{[t,t+d_{\text{max}}-1]} \right\|^2_2 + \left\| y_{[t,t+d_{\text{max}}-1]} \right\|^2_2 \right). \]
Furthermore, notice that \(- \frac{1}{2} \| \Xi_{[t,t+d_{\text{max}}-1]} \|^2_2 \leq - \frac{1}{2} \| \Xi_t \|^2_2 \) and, hence,
\[ V_{t+d_{\text{max}}} - V_t \leq - \sum_{k=0}^{d_{\text{max}}-1} (\ell (\bar{u}_k^*(t), \bar{y}_k^*(t))) + (c_{10} - 0.5c_3) \| \Xi_t \|^2_2 + c_{11} \left\| \bar{u}^{[0,L-1]}_k(t) \right\|^2_2 + c_{16} \\
+ c_3 \left( c_1 K_{\Phi} \left\| u^{*[0,d_{\text{max}}-1]}_{0}(t) \right\|^2_2 + (2c_2 + c_1 K_{\Phi}) \left\| \bar{y}^{*[0,d_{\text{max}}-1]}_{0}(t) \right\|^2_2 \right). \]

By choosing \( c_3 = \frac{\lambda_{\text{min}}(Q,R)}{\max(c_1 K_{\Phi}, (2c_2 + c_1 K_{\Phi}))} \) one can obtain the following
\[ c_3 \left( c_1 K_{\Phi} \left\| u^{*[0,d_{\text{max}}-1]}_{0}(t) \right\|^2_2 + (2c_2 + c_1 K_{\Phi}) \left\| \bar{y}^{*[0,d_{\text{max}}-1]}_{0}(t) \right\|^2_2 \right) \leq \sum_{k=0}^{d_{\text{max}}-1} (\ell (\bar{u}_k^*(t), \bar{y}_k^*(t))), \]
which cancels out the first term on the RHS of (94) and results in
\[ V_{t+d_{\text{max}}} - V_t \leq (c_{10} - 0.5c_3) \| \Xi_t \|^2_2 + c_{11} \left\| \bar{u}^{[0,L-1]}_k(t) \right\|^2_2 + c_{16} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{d_{\text{max}}-1} (\ell (\bar{u}_k^*(t), \bar{y}_k^*(t))), \]

Finally, note that by the definition of \( J^*_t \) one can write
\[ \lambda_{\text{min}}(Q,R) \left( \left\| \bar{u}^{*[0,L-1]}_t(t) \right\|^2_2 + \left\| \bar{y}^{*[0,L-1]}_t(t) \right\|^2_2 \right) \leq V_t \]
\[ \Rightarrow \quad c_{11} \left\| \bar{u}^{[0,L-1]}_k(t) \right\|^2_2 + c_{11} \left\| \bar{y}^{[0,L-1]}_k(t) \right\|^2_2 \leq \frac{c_{11}}{\lambda_{\text{min}}(Q,R)} V_t, \]
Substituting back into (95) results in
\[ V_{t+d_{\text{max}}} - V_t \leq \frac{c_{11}}{\lambda_{\text{min}}(Q,R)} V_t + (c_{10} - 0.5c_3) \| \Xi_t \|^2_2 + c_{16} \].
We now construct the following function \( \beta(\varepsilon^*) \). Notice that for any \( \Xi_t \in \mathbb{B}_\delta \) with \( V_t \leq V_{\text{ROA}} \), the following holds by (50)
\[ V_t \leq \max \left\{ c_4, \frac{V_{\text{ROA}} - c_5}{\delta^2} \right\} \| \Xi_t \|^2_2 + c_5. \]
Similar to (2), we will start by building the function \( \beta(\varepsilon^*) \) and show its characteristics and that \( V_t \) converges to it, for a specific fixed choice of \( V_{\text{ROA}} \). Then, we will generalize the result for any fixed value of \( V_{\text{ROA}} \). Let \( V_{\text{ROA}} = \delta^2 c_4 + c_5 \) and thus,
\[ V_t \leq c_4 \| \Xi_t \|^2_2 + c_5 \]
Now we define the function $\beta(\varepsilon^*)$ as
\[
\beta(\varepsilon^*) := \frac{c_5(0.5c_3 - c_{10}) + c_4c_{11}}{0.5c_3 - c_{10} - \frac{c_4c_{11}}{\lambda_{\text{min}}(Q,R)}},
\]
for any sufficiently small $\varepsilon^*$ for which the denominator of (99) is positive, i.e., $0.5c_3 - c_{10} - \frac{c_4c_{11}}{\lambda_{\text{min}}(Q,R)} > 0$. Now we show that $\beta(\varepsilon^*)$ is in fact positive if $\varepsilon^*$ is sufficiently small. Notice from the definitions of $c_{10}$, $c_{11}$
\[
c_{10} = \left(\lambda_\alpha\varepsilon^* + 2m\lambda_\sigma(L + d_{\text{max}} - 1)(N - L - d_{\text{max}} + 1)\|G^1\|_\infty^2(\varepsilon^*)^2\right)c_{\text{pe}}\|M^1\|_2^2,
\]
\[
c_{11} = c_{10}K_F,
\]
that if $\lambda_\alpha \leq \bar{\lambda}_\alpha$, $\lambda_\sigma \leq \bar{\lambda}_\sigma$ where $\bar{\lambda}_\alpha$, $\bar{\lambda}_\sigma$ are arbitrary but fixed upper bounds as in (2), and if $c_{\text{pe}}$, $\varepsilon^*$ are sufficiently small, then $0.5c_3 - c_{10} - \frac{c_4c_{11}}{\lambda_{\text{min}}(Q,R)} > 0$. The function $\beta(\varepsilon^*)$ has the following characteristics:

(i) It is continuous in $\varepsilon^*$ by the definition of $c_i$ for $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{[1,16]}$.

(ii) It satisfies $\beta(0) = 0$. This can be seen from the definition of $c_i$ for $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{[1,16]}$.

(iii) The function is strictly increasing since the numerator increases as $\varepsilon^*$ increases, while the denominator decreases (notice that the term $0.5c_3$ is independent of $\varepsilon^*$ and the other two terms are negative, if $0.5c_3 - c_{10} - \frac{c_4c_{11}}{\lambda_{\text{min}}(Q,R)} > 0$.

Next, we show invariance and exponential convergence of $V_t$ to (99). We start by considering (96) again and proceed with the following manipulations
\[
V_{t+d_{\text{max}}} - V_t \leq \frac{c_{11}}{\lambda_{\text{min}}(Q,R)}V_t + (c_{10} - 0.5c_3)\|\tilde{\varepsilon}_t\|_2^2 + c_{16}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
V_{t+d_{\text{max}}} &\leq \left(1 + \frac{c_{11}}{\lambda_{\text{min}}(Q,R)}\right)V_t + (c_{10} - 0.5c_3)\|\tilde{\varepsilon}_t\|_2^2 + c_{16} + \frac{1}{c_4}(c_{10} - 0.5c_3)V_t - \frac{1}{c_4}(c_{10} - 0.5c_3)V_t \\
&\leq \left(1 + \frac{c_{11}}{\lambda_{\text{min}}(Q,R)} + \frac{1}{c_4}(c_{10} - 0.5c_3)\right)V_t + (c_{10} - 0.5c_3)\|\tilde{\varepsilon}_t\|_2^2 - (c_{10} - 0.5c_3)\|\tilde{\varepsilon}_t\|_2^2 \\
&+ c_{16} - \frac{c_5}{c_4}(c_{10} - 0.5c_3)
\end{align*}
\]
\[
(100)
\]
\[
V_{t+d_{\text{max}}} - \beta(\varepsilon^*) \leq \left(1 + \frac{c_{11}}{\lambda_{\text{min}}(Q,R)} + \frac{1}{c_4}(c_{10} - 0.5c_3)\right)\beta(\varepsilon^*) + \left(1 + \frac{c_{11}}{\lambda_{\text{min}}(Q,R)} + \frac{1}{c_4}(c_{10} - 0.5c_3)\right)\beta(\varepsilon^*)
\]
\[
(101)
\]
\[
V_{t+d_{\text{max}}} \leq \left(1 + \frac{c_{11}}{\lambda_{\text{min}}(Q,R)} + \frac{1}{c_4}(c_{10} - 0.5c_3)\right)\beta(\varepsilon^*) + \left(1 + \frac{c_{11}}{\lambda_{\text{min}}(Q,R)} + \frac{1}{c_4}(c_{10} - 0.5c_3)\right)\beta(\varepsilon^*)
\]
\[
(102)
\]
The remaining terms cancel out as well and the result is the following contraction property
\[
V_{t+d_{\text{max}}} \leq \left(1 + \frac{c_{11}}{\lambda_{\text{min}}(Q,R)} + \frac{1}{c_4}(c_{10} - 0.5c_3)\right)\beta(\varepsilon^*)
\]
\[
(103)
\]
To show that the factor above is in fact less than one and that the contraction holds, we recall that the denominator of $\beta(\varepsilon^*)$ in (99) is strictly positive for $\lambda_\alpha \leq \bar{\lambda}_\alpha$, $\lambda_\sigma \leq \bar{\lambda}_\sigma$ and sufficiently small $c_{\text{pe}}$, $\varepsilon^*$. Therefore
\[
0.5c_3 - c_{10} - \frac{c_4c_{11}}{\lambda_{\text{min}}(Q,R)} > 0
\]
\[
-0.5c_3 + c_{10} + \frac{c_4c_{11}}{\lambda_{\text{min}}(Q,R)} < 0
\]
\[
\frac{1}{c_4}(c_{10} - 0.5c_3) + \frac{c_{11}}{\lambda_{\text{min}}(Q,R)} < 0,
\]
and hence the quantity under question in (102) is less than 1.
We have shown that for the specific choice of $V_{ROA} = \delta^2 c_4 + c_5$ the Lyapunov function converges to $\beta(\varepsilon^*)$. However, the same can be shown for other fixed choices of $V_{ROA}$ where the denominators of $\beta(\varepsilon^*)$ take the following form

$$0.5c_3 - c_{10} - \frac{c_{11}}{\lambda_{\min}(Q,R)} \max \left\{ c_4, \frac{V_{ROA} - c_5}{\delta^2} \right\}$$

By following similar arguments as above, it can be shown that the same contraction property in (102) holds for sufficiently small $c_{pe}, \varepsilon^*$ (cf. [2]).
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