

# Robust Funnel MPC for nonlinear systems with relative degree one\*

Thomas Berger<sup>†</sup>    Dario Dennstädt<sup>†</sup>    Lukas Lanza<sup>‡</sup>    Karl Worthmann<sup>‡</sup>

February 6, 2023

## Abstract

We propose a novel Model Predictive Control scheme for robust output reference tracking with prescribed performance for nonlinear multi-input multi-output systems of relative degree one with stable internal dynamics. Combining funnel MPC with the model-free adaptive funnel controller, the new *robust funnel MPC* algorithm guarantees output tracking of reference signals within predefined boundaries even in the presence of unknown disturbances and a structural model-plant mismatch. Initial and recursive feasibility of the control scheme is shown without imposing terminal conditions or requirements on the length of the prediction horizon. To this end, we propose a proper initialization strategy; and to ensure that the feedback controller does not contribute unnecessarily much, we introduce an activation function for the latter.

**Key words:** model predictive control, funnel control, nonlinear systems, reference tracking, robustness, model-plant mismatch

**AMS subject classifications:** 93B45, 93C40, 93B51, 93B52

## 1 Introduction

Model Predictive Control (MPC) is a well-established control technique for linear and nonlinear systems due to its ability to handle multi-input multi-output systems under control and state constraints, see the textbooks [17, 29] and the references therein. Given a model of the system, the idea is to predict the future system behavior on a finite-time horizon and, based on the predictions, solve a respective Optimal Control Problem (OCP) to apply the first portion of the computed optimal control (function) before repeating this process ad infinitum. Although MPC is nowadays widely used and has seen various applications, see e.g. [27], there are two main obstacles: On the one hand a sufficiently accurate model is required to predict the system behavior and compute the optimal control. On the other hand, initial and recursive feasibility have to be ensured. The latter means that one has to guarantee the solvability of the OCP at every time instant of the MPC algorithm, provided that initial feasibility, i.e., solvability at the initial time, holds. This is a non-trivial task and usually requires either some controllability properties like, e.g., cost controllability [14], in combination with a sufficiently long prediction horizon, see e.g. [11] and [15] for discrete and continuous-time systems, or the construction of suitable terminal conditions, see e.g. [29] and the references therein. Especially in the presence of time-varying state or output constraints, this task becomes even more challenging as, e.g., the extension [1] to time-varying reference signals has shown.

*Funnel MPC* (FMPC), a novel approach to guarantee initial and recursive feasibility for a large class of systems, was proposed in [6]. Using a stage cost design inspired by *funnel control*, which is a model-free adaptive feedback controller first proposed in [18], this novel MPC scheme allows output tracking of a given reference signal within predefined error boundaries. Incorporating output constraints in the OCP, initial and recursive feasibility were proven if the system satisfies the output constraints at the initial time only, i.e., without imposing additional terminal conditions and independent of the length of the prediction horizon. Moreover, it was then shown in [3] that, for systems with relative degree one and, in a certain sense, input-to-state stable internal dynamics, the funnel-inspired stage costs automatically ensure (initial and recursive) feasibility – even

\***Funding:** We gratefully acknowledge funding by the German Research Foundation (DFG; project number 471539468).

<sup>†</sup>Institut für Mathematik, Universität Paderborn, Warburger Str. 100, 33098 Paderborn ([thomas.berger@math.upd.de](mailto:thomas.berger@math.upd.de), [dario.dennstaedt@uni-paderborn.de](mailto:dario.dennstaedt@uni-paderborn.de)).

<sup>‡</sup>Institut für Mathematik, Technische Universität Ilmenau, Weimarer Straße 25, 98693 Ilmenau, Germany ([lukas.lanza@tu-ilmenau.de](mailto:lukas.lanza@tu-ilmenau.de), [karl.worthmann@tu-ilmenau.de](mailto:karl.worthmann@tu-ilmenau.de)).

without imposing the output constraints. Utilizing so called *feasibility constraints*, applicability of funnel MPC to systems with arbitrary relative degree was shown in [2].

In the context of a simulation study, learning of unknown system parameters in order to apply funnel MPC was discussed in [6]. Beyond this, research into FMPC, so far, assumes the system to be precisely known and does not account for a structural model-plant mismatch or disturbances. However, every model, no matter how good, deviates from the actual system and disturbances are omnipresent. Furthermore, utilizing a highly detailed model is oftentimes not even desired. Instead, one wants to use a simplified and lower dimensional model or approximation of the system (e.g. a discretized model for a system of partial differential equations) in order to reduce complexity and computational effort, see e.g. [30]. To account for external disturbances and model-plant mismatches we propose *robust funnel MPC*, a combination of funnel MPC and the model-free adaptive high-gain funnel control technique. The funnel MPC control signal, computed with the aid of a (potentially inaccurate) model, is applied to the real system. Then the funnel controller, computing its signal using the instantaneous measurement data, rejects disturbances and compensates model-plant mismatches.

The funnel controller is inherently robust and allows for reference tracking with prescribed performance of the tracking error for a fairly large class of systems, see also [5] for a comprehensive literature overview. In contrast to MPC, funnel control does not use a model of the system and the control input is solely determined by the instantaneous values of the system output, the reference signal, and the funnel function. Therefore, the controller cannot “plan ahead” and this often results in high control values and a rapidly changing control signal with peaks. Furthermore, the controller requires a high sampling rate to stay feasible, which results in quite demanding hardware requirements. Numerical simulations in [6] and [3] show that FMPC exhibits a considerably better controller performance than funnel control.

While funnel MPC guarantees that the system output evolves within predefined boundaries, previous works on reference tracking with MPC mostly focus on ensuring asymptotic stability of the tracking error, see e.g. [1, 23]. To this end, terminal sets around the reference signal and corresponding costs are introduced, resulting in so-called terminal conditions. In [22] tracking is achieved while avoiding such terminal constraints by assuming a sufficiently long prediction horizon. Tube-based MPC schemes construct tubes around the reference signal, which always contain the actual system output in order to ensure reference tracking in the presence of disturbances or uncertainties, see e.g. [26] for linear systems and [16, 24, 28] for nonlinear systems. These tubes, however, usually cannot be arbitrarily chosen since they have to encompass the uncertainties of the system. To guarantee that the system output evolves within these tubes, terminal conditions are added to the optimization problem. The tracking of a reference signal within constant bounds is studied in [13] for linear systems. Hereby, so-called robust control invariant sets are calculated in order to achieve that performance, input, and state constraints are met. The calculation of these robust control invariant sets, however, requires a lot of computational effort and, more important, in general it cannot be ensured that the algorithm proposed in [13] terminates in finite time. In [35] the aforementioned approach was extended to systems with external disturbances. A close relative of funnel MPC is barrier-function-based MPC, cf. [34, 36, 37]. Here, the cost function involves a term (the barrier function) which diverges, if the tracking error approaches the boundary of a given set. However, this approach relies on imposing terminal constraints as well as terminal costs to ensure recursive feasibility. Contrary to the aforementioned approaches, funnel MPC uses a different cost function and thereby circumvents the mentioned drawbacks.

**Nomenclature:** In the following let  $\mathbb{N}$  denote the natural numbers,  $\mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ , and  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} = [0, \infty)$ . By  $\|x\| = \sqrt{\langle x, x \rangle}$  we denote the Euclidean norm of  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .  $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{R})$  is the group of invertible  $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  matrices. For some interval  $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $L^\infty(I, \mathbb{R}^n)$  ( $L^\infty_{\text{loc}}(I, \mathbb{R}^n)$ ) is the Lebesgue space of measurable, (locally) essentially bounded functions  $f: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  with norm  $\|f\|_\infty = \text{ess sup}_{t \in I} \|f(t)\|$ .  $W^{k, \infty}(I, \mathbb{R}^n)$  is the Sobolev space of all functions  $f: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  with  $k$ -th order weak derivative  $f^{(k)}$  and  $f, f^{(1)}, \dots, f^{(k)} \in L^\infty(I, \mathbb{R}^n)$ . For some  $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$  we denote by  $\mathcal{C}^k(V, \mathbb{R}^n)$  the set of  $k$ -times continuously differentiable functions  $f: V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ , and for brevity  $\mathcal{C}(V, \mathbb{R}^n) := \mathcal{C}^0(V, \mathbb{R}^n)$ . Furthermore,  $\mathcal{R}(I, \mathbb{R}^n)$  is the space of all regulated functions  $f: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ , i.e., the left and right limits  $f(t-)$  and  $f(t+)$  exist for all interior points  $t \in I$  and  $f(a-)$  and  $f(b+)$  exist whenever  $a = \inf I \in I$  or  $b = \sup I \in I$ .

## 2 Problem formulation

Before we establish the problem formulation and the control objective, we emphasize the following terminology used throughout the article. The term *system* refers to the actual plant to be controlled. By *model* we mean

a model given by the designer, which will be used to compute predictions. We consider nonlinear multi-input multi-output control systems of the form

$$\dot{y}(t) = F(d(t), \mathbf{T}(y)(t), u(t)), \quad y|_{[-\sigma, 0]} = y^0 \in \mathcal{C}([-h, 0], \mathbb{R}^m), \quad (1)$$

with input  $u \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R}^m)$  and output  $y(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$  at time  $t \geq 0$ . Note that  $u$  and  $y$  have the same dimension  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . The system consists of the *unknown* nonlinear function  $F \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^q \times \mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^m)$ , *unknown* nonlinear operator  $\mathbf{T} : \mathcal{C}([-\sigma, \infty), \mathbb{R}^m) \rightarrow L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R}^q)$ , and may incorporate bounded disturbances  $d \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R}^p)$ . The operator  $\mathbf{T}$  is assumed to be causal, locally Lipschitz, and to fulfill a bounded-input bounded-output property. Such systems encompass, among other things, nonlinear control affine systems with strict relative degree one and stable internal dynamics. Moreover, physical effects such as *backlash*, *relay hysteresis*, and *nonlinear time delays* can be represented by the operator  $\mathbf{T}$ . Then, the constant  $\sigma \geq 0$  quantifies the “memory” of the system. Later, in Definition 3.11 we precisely specify the properties of the operator  $\mathbf{T}$  in (1) and properly introduce the system class under consideration.

For a control input  $u \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R}^m)$ , the system (1) has a solution in the sense of *Carathéodory*, meaning a function  $y : [-\sigma, \omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $\omega > 0$ , with  $y|_{[-\sigma, 0]} = y^0$  such that  $y|_{[0, \omega)}$  is absolutely continuous and satisfies the ODE (1) for almost all  $t \in [0, \omega)$ . A solution  $y$  is said to be *maximal*, if it has no right extension that is also a solution.

As a surrogate for the unknown system (1), we consider a control-affine model of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= f(x(t)) + g(x(t))u(t), & x(0) &= x^0, \\ y_M(t) &= h(x(t)), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

with  $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and *known* functions  $f \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^n)$ ,  $g \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^{n \times m})$  and  $h \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m)$ . Note that, in many situations, systems of the form (2) can be written in the form (1). Since the right-hand side of (2) is locally Lipschitz in  $x$ , there exists a unique maximal solution of (2) for any  $u \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R}^m)$ , cf. [33, § 10 Thm. XX]. This maximal solution is denoted by  $x(\cdot; 0, x^0, u)$ . Contrary to the actual system (1), the model (2) lays out its states  $x$  in an explicit way. The model is used to make predictions about the future system output and, based on them, to compute optimal control signals. The discrepancies between the model predictions  $y_M(t)$  and the actual system output  $y(t)$  is described by the model-plant mismatch

$$e_S(t) := y(t) - y_M(t).$$

## 2.1 Control objective

The objective is to design a combination of a model predictive control scheme with a feedback controller (based on the measurement  $y(t)$ ) which, if applied to system (1), allows for reference tracking of a given trajectory  $y_{\text{ref}} \in W^{1, \infty}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R}^m)$  within predefined boundaries. To be precise, the tracking error  $t \mapsto e(t) := y(t) - y_{\text{ref}}(t)$  shall evolve within the prescribed performance funnel

$$\mathcal{F}_\psi := \{ (t, e) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}^m \mid \|e\| < \psi(t) \},$$

see Figure 1.




Figure 1: Error evolution in a funnel  $\mathcal{F}_\psi$  with boundary  $\psi$ .

The funnel  $\mathcal{F}_\psi$  is determined by the choice of  $\psi$  belonging to the following set of bounded functions with bounded weak derivative

$$\mathcal{G} = \left\{ \psi \in W^{1, \infty}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R}) \mid \inf_{t \geq 0} \psi(t) > 0 \right\}.$$

The specific application usually dictates the constraints on the tracking error and thus indicates suitable choices for  $\psi$ . Note that signals evolving in  $\mathcal{F}_\psi$  are not forced to asymptotically converge to 0. To achieve that the tracking error  $e$  remains within  $\mathcal{F}_\psi$ , it is necessary that the output  $y(t)$  of the system (1) at time  $t \geq 0$  is an element of the set

$$\mathcal{D}_t := \{ y \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid \|y - y_{\text{ref}}(t)\| < \psi(t) \}.$$

## 2.2 Funnel MPC and funnel control

To solve the problem of tracking a reference signal  $y_{\text{ref}} \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R}^m)$  within pre-defined funnel boundaries  $\psi \in \mathcal{G}$  for the model (2) with MPC, *funnel MPC* was proposed in [3]. Assuming system and model to be identical, perfectly known, and of form (2), the *stage cost*  $\ell : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$  defined by

$$\ell(t, x, u) = \begin{cases} \frac{\|h(x) - y_{\text{ref}}(t)\|^2}{\psi(t)^2 - \|h(x) - y_{\text{ref}}(t)\|^2} + \lambda_u \|u\|^2, & \|h(x) - y_{\text{ref}}(t)\| \neq \psi(t) \\ \infty, & \text{else,} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

with design parameter  $\lambda_u \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  was proposed. To further ensure a bounded control signal with a maximal pre-defined control value  $M > 0$ , the constraint  $\|u\|_\infty \leq M$  has been added as an additional constraint to the OCP. Using this stage cost and given a sufficiently large  $M > 0$ , it was shown that the following funnel MPC Algorithm 2.1 is initially and recursively feasible and applying this control scheme to a model of the form (2) guarantees  $\|y_M(t) - y_{\text{ref}}(t)\| < \psi(t)$  for all  $t \in [0, \infty)$ , provided that  $\|y_M(0) - y_{\text{ref}}(0)\| < \psi(0)$  holds, see [3, Thm. 2.10].

**Algorithm 2.1** (Funnel MPC).

**Given:** Model (2), reference signal  $y_{\text{ref}} \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R}^m)$ , funnel function  $\psi \in \mathcal{G}$ , control bound  $M > 0$ , initial state  $x^0$  such that  $h(x^0) \in \mathcal{D}_0$ , and stage cost function  $\ell$  as in (3).

**Set** time shift  $\delta > 0$ , prediction horizon  $T \geq \delta$ , define the time sequence  $(t_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  by  $t_k := k\delta$  and set the current index  $k = 0$ .

**Steps:**

- (a) Obtain a measurement of the state  $x$  of (2) at time  $t_k$  and set  $\hat{x} := x(t_k)$ .
- (b) Compute a solution  $u^* \in L^\infty([t_k, t_k + T], \mathbb{R}^m)$  of

$$\underset{\substack{u \in L^\infty([t_k, t_k + T], \mathbb{R}^m), \\ \|u\|_\infty \leq M}}{\text{minimize}} \quad \int_{t_k}^{t_k + T} \ell(t, x(t; t_k, \hat{x}, u), u(t)) \, dt.$$

- (c) Apply the time-varying feedback law

$$\mu : [t_k, t_{k+1}) \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m, \quad \mu(t, \hat{x}) = u^*(t)$$

to the model (2). Increment  $k$  by 1 and go to Step (a).

**Remark 2.2.** The cost function (3) used in the funnel MPC Algorithm 2.1 is inspired by the *funnel controller*. For systems (1) and given reference trajectory  $y_{\text{ref}} \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R}^m)$  it was shown in [5, Thm. 1.9] that the tracking error  $e(t) := y(t) - y_{\text{ref}}(t)$  always evolves within the performance funnel  $\mathcal{F}_\psi$  by applying the control signal

$$u(t) = (N \circ \alpha)(\|e(t)/\psi(t)\|^2)e(t)/\psi(t), \quad (4)$$

where  $N \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R})$  is a surjection and  $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}([0, 1], [1, \infty))$  is a bijection. A simple (and often used) feasible choice is  $\alpha(s) = 1/(1 - s)$  and  $N(s) = s \sin(s)$ .

## 3 Robust funnel MPC

We present in detail the idea of how to combine the funnel MPC Algorithm 2.1, see also [2, 3, 6], with results on the *model-free* funnel controller to achieve the control objective in the presence of a mismatch between the




Figure 2: Structure of the robust FMPC scheme

system (1) and the model (2). The idea is depicted in Figure 2. The left block with red background contains the model (2), the FMPC Algorithm 2.1 and a given reference trajectory  $y_{ref}$ . We emphasize that the model is given by the designer and hence it is known. FMPC achieves, for given  $\psi \in \mathcal{G}$ , that the model's output  $y_M$  tracks the reference with predefined accuracy, i.e.,  $\|e_M(t)\| = \|y_M(t) - y_{ref}(t)\| < \psi(t)$  for all  $t \geq 0$ , while the control input  $u_{FMPC}$  minimizes the stage cost (3), cf. [3].

The right block contains the system to be controlled, and a funnel control feedback loop. Given a reference signal  $\rho \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R}^m)$  and a funnel function  $\varphi \in \mathcal{G}$ , funnel control (4) achieves that the system's output  $y$  tracks the reference with predefined accuracy, i.e.,  $\|y(t) - \rho(t)\| < \varphi(t)$  for all  $t \geq 0$ , cf. [5, 7, 18]. Note that this control scheme is model free, i.e., besides some structural assumptions, no knowledge of the system's parameters is assumed; given any system of the form (1) satisfying some structural properties and an initial error inside the funnel, the control (4) ensures feasibility.

The advantage of FMPC is that the control input  $u_{FMPC}$  is optimal in the sense of minimizing a given cost function. The advantage of funnel control is that it does not require the knowledge of a model and is hence inherently robust. We admit that by combining both control strategies we loose both: the combination is neither model-free, nor is the control signal optimal. The main idea is to *robustify* the FMPC scheme w.r.t. uncertainties and disturbances, which is indeed guaranteed by the funnel controller component. However, the funnel controller should remain inactive as long as the prediction  $y_M$  by the model of the system output  $y$  is sufficiently accurate. It should only be active when the system is, according to the model, in a critical state, meaning that the predicted error  $e_M$  is close to the funnel boundary  $\psi$ . In this case the funnel controller achieves that system and model behave similarly. Therefore,  $\varphi = \psi - \|e_M\|$  is chosen as funnel function for the funnel controller. This approach ensures that the funnel controller only compensates disturbances when necessary and hence the combined control signal  $u = u_{FMPC} + u_{FC}$  deviates from the optimal control  $u_{FMPC}$  as slightly as possible.

Let us give a more precise description of the controller structure depicted in Figure 2: On the left hand side (red box), FMPC computes the control signal  $u_{FMPC}(t)$ ,  $t \in [t_k, t_k + \delta)$ , and the corresponding output is  $y_M(t)$ ,  $t \in [t_k, t_k + \delta)$ , which is handed over to the funnel controller on the right side of Figure 2 (blue box) and serves as a reference signal for system (1). Via the application of the funnel control  $u_{FC}$  the system's output  $y$  follows the model's output  $y_M$  with pre-defined accuracy, i.e.,  $\|e_S(t)\| = \|y(t) - y_M(t)\| < \varphi(t)$ , where  $\varphi = \psi - \|e_M\|$  as mentioned above. The control signal  $u = u_{FMPC} + u_{FC}$  is applied to the system, which has the following consequence: If the model and the system coincide and are initialized equally, then the application of the control  $u_{FMPC}$  has the same effect on both dynamics, and so the system's output  $y$  equals the model's output  $y_M$ , i.e.,  $\|y(t) - y_{ref}(t)\| = \|y_M(t) - y_{ref}(t)\| < \psi(t)$ . Invoking (4), this in particular means  $u_{FC} = 0$ . If, however, the model does not match the system, then  $e_S(t) \neq 0$  and  $u_{FC}(t) \neq 0$ . Roughly speaking, the more model and system differ, the more the funnel controller has to compensate; and the better the model matches the system, the more the control  $u_{FMPC}$  can contribute to the tracking task.

Since  $u_{FMPC}$  is a (piecewise) optimal control calculated using the model (2), the aim is to keep  $u_{FC}$  as small as possible while achieving the tracking objective. When the OCP is solved in FMPC at time instance  $t_k$ ,

it is necessary to update the initial value  $x(t_k)$  of the model (2), if there is a mismatch between  $y(t_k)$  and  $y_M(t_k)$ . One has to find a *proper initialization* for the model, meaning, based on the information of  $y(t_k)$ , it is necessary to find a starting configuration of the model such that its output  $y_M(t_k)$  is close to the system's output  $y(t_k)$  in order to calculate a control signal  $u_{\text{FMPC}}$  for the next time interval  $[t_k, t_{k+1}]$ , which contributes to the tracking task. Otherwise, due to deviation between system and model, it might be possible, that the control signal  $u_{\text{FMPC}}$  is unsuitable and needs to be compensated by  $u_{\text{FC}}$ .

The remainder of this section is organized as follows. In Section 3.1 we introduce the class of models to be used in the robust funnel MPC Algorithm 3.7. Then in Section 3.2 we discuss in detail the controller's structure. To prove recursive feasibility of the proposed MPC algorithm, we introduce a *proper initialization strategy* in Definition 3.5. In order to avoid that the funnel feedback controller unnecessarily compensates small model-plant mismatches, we introduce an *activation function* in Definition 3.6. In Section 3.3 we introduce the class of (real) systems to be controlled; in particular, the operator  $\mathbf{T}$  is presented in detail. With the introductory work at hand, we finally establish the main result in Section 3.4.

### 3.1 Model class

We stress that the model (2) itself is, in its essence, a controller design parameter – the better the model, the better the controller performance. But we will be able to show that even with a very poor model the robust FMPC Algorithm 3.7 achieves the control objective. Since in the later analysis we utilize the so-called *Byrnes-Isidori form*, we make the following assumptions about the model (2) throughout this work.

**Assumption 3.1.** The model (2) has global relative degree  $r = 1$ , i.e., the *high-gain matrix*  $\Gamma(x) := (h'g)(x)$  is invertible for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , where  $h'$  denotes the Jacobian of  $h$ . Additionally,  $h^{-1}(0)$  is diffeomorphic to  $\mathbb{R}^{n-m}$  and the mapping  $x \mapsto G(x) := \text{im } g(x)$  is involutive, i.e., for all smooth vector fields  $V_i : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  with  $V_i(x) \in G(x)$ ,  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , we have that the Lie bracket  $[V_1, V_2](x) = V_1'(x)V_2(x) - V_2'(x)V_1(x)$  satisfies  $[V_1, V_2](x) \in G(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Then, by [12, Cor. 5.7] there exists a diffeomorphism  $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  such that the coordinate transformation  $(y_M(t), \eta(t)) = \Phi(x(t))$  puts the model (2) into Byrnes-Isidori form

$$\dot{y}_M(t) = p(y_M(t), \eta(t)) + \Gamma(\Phi^{-1}(y_M(t), \eta(t))) u(t), \quad (y_M(0), \eta(0)) = (y_M^0, \eta^0) = \Phi(x^0), \quad (5a)$$

$$\dot{\eta}(t) = q(y_M(t), \eta(t)), \quad (5b)$$

where  $p \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^{n-m}, \mathbb{R}^m)$  and  $q \in \mathcal{C}^1(\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^{n-m}, \mathbb{R}^{n-m})$ . Here, equation (5b) describes the so-called *internal dynamics*.

**Remark 3.2.** Finding the diffeomorphism  $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is in general a hard task, cf. [21]. In [25] an approach is presented to compute  $\Phi$  algorithmically. In the simple but relevant case of linear output  $h(x) = Hx$ ,  $H \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ , and constant input distribution  $g(x) = G \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$  such that  $HG$  is invertible, the assumptions of [12, Cor. 5.7] are satisfied and following the derivations in [25], the transformation can be written as

$$\begin{pmatrix} y \\ \eta \end{pmatrix} = \Phi(x) = \begin{bmatrix} H \\ V^\dagger(I_n - G(HG)^{-1}H) \end{bmatrix} x, \quad V \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n-m)} \text{ with } \text{im } V = \ker H, \quad (6)$$

where  $V^\dagger \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-m) \times n}$  denotes the pseudoinverse of  $V$ . In this particular case the inverse transformation is given by  $x = \Phi^{-1}(y, \eta) = G(HG)^{-1}y + V\eta$ . Then equations (5) read

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{y}_M(t) &= f(G(HG)^{-1}y_M(t) + V\eta(t)) + HGu(t), \\ \dot{\eta}(t) &= V^\dagger(I_n - G(HG)^{-1}H)f(G(HG)^{-1}y_M(t) + V\eta(t)). \end{aligned}$$

Since we want to ensure that the internal dynamics do not destabilize the system during control, we make the following assumption. Note that this assumption ensures that the maximal solution  $\eta(\cdot; 0, \eta^0, \zeta)$  can be extended to a global solution.

**Assumption 3.3.** The internal dynamics (5b) satisfy the following *bounded-input, bounded-state* (BIBS) condition:

$$\forall c_0 > 0 \exists c_1 > 0 \forall \eta^0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n-m} \forall \zeta \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R}^m) : \|\eta^0\| + \|\zeta\|_\infty \leq c_0 \implies \|\eta(\cdot; 0, \eta^0, \zeta)\|_\infty \leq c_1, \quad (7)$$

where  $\eta(\cdot; 0, \eta^0, \zeta) : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n-m}$  denotes the unique global solution of (5b) when  $y_M$  is substituted by  $\zeta$ .

With the definitions made above, we may now introduce the class of models to be considered.

**Definition 3.4.** We say that a model (2) belongs to the model class  $\mathcal{M}^m$ , written  $(f, g, h) \in \mathcal{M}^m$ , if it satisfies Assumptions 3.1 and 3.3.

Since in many applications the usage of a linear model is reasonable, we emphasize that linear systems of the form

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}(t) &= Ax(t) + Bu(t), \\ y_M(t) &= Cx(t),\end{aligned}$$

with  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  and  $C, B^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  belong to  $\mathcal{M}^m$ , provided that  $CB$  is invertible and

$$\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \text{ with } \operatorname{Re} \lambda \geq 0 : \det \begin{bmatrix} \lambda I - A & B \\ C & 0 \end{bmatrix} \neq 0. \quad (8)$$

### 3.2 Controller structure

Before we establish the main result, we informally introduce some aspects of the robust funnel MPC algorithm.

**Model Predictive Control.** While the model (2) lays out its system states in an explicit way, the internal states of the system (1) are unknown. Moreover, only the measurement of the system output  $y$  is available. However, the measurement of the current state of the model in Step (a) of Algorithm 2.1 (FMPC) is essential for its functioning. When applying the control resulting from MPC to system (1), it is therefore necessary to initialize the current model state  $\hat{x}$  based on the measured system output  $\hat{y}$  and the previous prediction of the model state  $x^{\text{pre}} = x(t_{k+1}; t_k, \hat{x}_k, u_{\text{FMPC}})$  in a more sophisticated way. There are two reasonable possibilities to initialize  $\hat{x}$ . One option is to choose the model output such that it coincides with the system output, i.e.,

$$h(\hat{x}) = \hat{y}.$$

However, since we cannot measure the internal state of the system, there are two ways to treat the internal dynamics (5b) of the model. Either, we set  $\hat{x}$  such that we do not manipulate the internal dynamics, i.e.,

$$[0, I_{n-m}] \Phi(\hat{x}) = [0, I_{n-m}] \Phi(x^{\text{pre}}),$$

or we “reset” the internal dynamics of the model, i.e., for a fixed a priori defined bound  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  for the internal dynamics, we initialize  $\hat{x}$  such that

$$\|[0, I_{n-m}] \Phi(\hat{x})\| \leq \xi.$$

The other option to initialize the model is to allow for a (temporary) open-loop operation of Algorithm 2.1, meaning that we allow initializing the current model state  $\hat{x}$  with the previous prediction  $x^{\text{pre}}$ . The following definition formalizes these possibilities.

**Definition 3.5.** Let a model  $(f, g, h) \in \mathcal{M}^m$  be given and let  $\Phi$  be the diffeomorphism from Assumption 3.1. For  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ ,  $x^{\text{pre}} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\hat{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  define the set

$$\Omega_\xi(x^{\text{pre}}, \hat{y}) := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \begin{array}{l} h(x) = \hat{y}, \\ [0, I_{n-m}] \Phi(x) = [0, I_{n-m}] \Phi(x^{\text{pre}}) \text{ or } \|[0, I_{n-m}] \Phi(x)\| \leq \xi \end{array} \right\} \cup \{x^{\text{pre}}\}.$$

We call  $\hat{x} \in \Omega_\xi(x^{\text{pre}}, \hat{y})$  a proper initialization and a function  $\kappa_\xi : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  with  $\kappa_\xi(x, y) \in \Omega_\xi(x, y)$  for all  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$  a proper initialization strategy.

We emphasize that, for  $x^{\text{pre}} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\hat{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , there always exists a proper initialization since  $x^{\text{pre}} \in \Omega_\xi(x^{\text{pre}}, \hat{y})$ .

**Funnel control.** In Algorithm 3.7 (robust FMPC) we choose the funnel function for the funnel controller very specifically. Namely, we use  $\varphi = \psi - \|e_M\|$ , where  $e_M = y_M - y_{\text{ref}}$ . This choice reflects the following idea: If the error  $e_M$  is small, then the funnel boundary  $\varphi$  is approximately given by the MPC funnel boundary  $\psi$ . If, however, the error  $e_M$  is close to  $\psi$ , then  $\varphi$  becomes tight, such that the system’s output is forced to be very close to the model’s output. This means, whenever the tracking is critical, the system is forced to behave very

similar to the model such that even in critical situations it is reasonable to use *model* predictive control. The choice of  $\varphi$  ensures that the tracking error evolves within the funnel  $\psi$ , i.e., we have

$$\forall t \geq 0 : \|y(t) - y_{\text{ref}}(t)\| < \psi(t).$$

Besides the particular choice of  $\varphi$  we will utilize an *activation function*  $\beta : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \beta^+]$ ,  $\beta^+ > 0$ , in order to determine when the funnel control signal  $u_{\text{FC}}$  will be nonzero. Since very small deviations between  $y(t)$  and  $y_{\text{M}}(t)$  can be neglected, we use the term  $\beta(\|e_{\text{S}}(t)/\varphi(t)\|)$ , where  $e_{\text{S}} = y - y_{\text{M}}$ , which can be set to zero when  $e_{\text{S}}$  is small. A reasonable and simple choice would be

$$\beta(s) = \begin{cases} 0, & s \leq S_{\text{crit}}, \\ s - S_{\text{crit}}, & s \geq S_{\text{crit}}, \end{cases}$$

for  $S_{\text{crit}} \in (0, 1)$ . In this particular case we may set  $\beta^+ = 1 - S_{\text{crit}}$ . In the context of machine learning, in particular, artificial neural networks, this type of functions is known as *rectified linear unit* (ReLU). Note that  $\beta$  defined above satisfies  $\beta(S_{\text{crit}}) = 0$ , whereby it is a continuous function and thus the funnel controller contributes continuously to the overall control signal.

**Definition 3.6.** For  $\beta^+ > 0$ , we call a function  $\beta \in \mathcal{C}([0, 1], [0, \beta^+])$  an activation function, if  $\beta(1) = \beta^+$ .

With the definitions and concepts introduced so far at hand, we are in the position to establish the *robust funnel MPC algorithm*.

**Algorithm 3.7** (Robust funnel MPC).

**Given:**

- instantaneous measurements of the output  $y(t)$  of system (1), reference signal  $y_{\text{ref}} \in W^{1, \infty}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R}^m)$ , funnel function  $\psi \in \mathcal{G}$ ,
- model (2) with  $(f, g, h) \in \mathcal{M}^m$  and diffeomorphism  $\Phi$  as in Assumption 3.1, stage cost function  $\ell$  as in (3),  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , a proper initialization strategy  $\kappa_{\xi} : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  as in Definition 3.5, bound  $M > 0$  for the MPC control signal, and the initial value  $x^0$  of the model's state such that

$$x^0 \in X^0 := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \begin{array}{l} \|h(x) - y_{\text{ref}}(0)\| < \psi(0), \\ \|y(0) - h(x)\| < \psi(0) - \|h(x) - y_{\text{ref}}(0)\|, \\ \|[0, I_{n-m}]\Phi(x)\| \leq \xi \end{array} \right\}, \quad (9)$$

- a surjection  $N \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R})$ , a bijection  $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}([0, 1], [1, \infty))$ , and an activation function  $\beta \in \mathcal{C}([0, 1], [0, \beta^+])$  with  $\beta^+ > 0$ .

**Set** time shift  $\delta > 0$ , prediction horizon  $T \geq \delta$ , and index  $k := 0$ .

**Define** the time sequence  $(t_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  by  $t_k := k\delta$  and the first element of the sequence of predicted states  $(x_k^{\text{pre}})_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  by  $x_0^{\text{pre}} := x^0$ .

**Steps:**

- Obtain a measurement  $y(t_k) =: \hat{y}_k$  of the system output  $y$  at time  $t_k$ , and choose a *proper initialization*  $\hat{x}_k = \kappa_{\xi}(x_k^{\text{pre}}, \hat{y}_k) \in \Omega_{\xi}(x_k^{\text{pre}}, \hat{y}_k)$  for the model.
- Compute a solution  $u_{\text{FMPC}} \in L^{\infty}([t_k, t_k + T], \mathbb{R}^m)$  of the optimization problem

$$\underset{\substack{u \in L^{\infty}([t_k, t_k + T], \mathbb{R}^m), \\ \|u\|_{\infty} \leq M}}{\text{minimize}} \int_{t_k}^{t_k + T} \ell(t, x(t; t_k, \hat{x}_k, u), u(t)) dt. \quad (10)$$

- Predict the output  $y_{\text{M}}$  of the model (2) on the interval  $[t_k, t_{k+1}]$

$$y_{\text{M}}(t) = h(x(t; t_k, \hat{x}_k, u_{\text{FMPC}})),$$

and define the adaptive funnel  $\varphi : [t_k, t_{k+1}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  by

$$\varphi(t) := \psi(t) - \|e_{\text{M}}(t)\| \quad \text{with } e_{\text{M}}(t) = y_{\text{M}}(t) - y_{\text{ref}}(t). \quad (11)$$



(d) Define the funnel control law as in (4) with  $y_M$  and funnel function  $\varphi$  as in (11) by

$$u_{\text{FC}}(t) := \beta(\|e_S(t)/\varphi(t)\|)(N \circ \alpha)(\|e_S(t)/\varphi(t)\|^2)e_S(t)/\varphi(t) \quad \text{with} \quad e_S(t) = y(t) - y_M(t). \quad (12)$$

(e) Apply the feedback law

$$\mu : [t_k, t_{k+1}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m, \quad \mu(t) = u_{\text{FMPC}}(t) + u_{\text{FC}}(t) \quad (13)$$

to system (1). Set the predicted state  $x_{k+1}^{\text{pre}} = x(t_{k+1}; t_k, \hat{x}_k, u_{\text{FMPC}})$ , then increment  $k$  by 1 and go to Step (a).

**Remark 3.8.** Since  $\hat{x}_k$  is chosen via the the proper initialization strategy  $\kappa_\xi(x_k^{\text{pre}}, \hat{y}_k)$  at every time instant  $t_k$  for  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , in general  $\hat{x}_k \neq x_k^{\text{pre}}$ . In particular, it is possible that  $\hat{x}_0 \neq x^0$ .

Before we show how the robust funnel MPC Algorithm 3.7 achieves the control objective in the presence of a model-plant mismatch and disturbances, we introduce the class of systems, for which our approach guarantees output tracking with predefined behavior of the error while continuously balancing tracking performance and control effort by adhering to funnel MPC whenever possible.

### 3.3 System class

We introduce the class of systems, to which the *real* system to be controlled is assumed to belong. We consider systems, which are given by

$$\dot{y}(t) = F(d(t), \mathbf{T}(y)(t), u(t)), \quad y|_{[-\sigma, 0]} = y^0, \quad (14)$$

where for  $\sigma \geq 0$  an initial history function  $y^0 \in \mathcal{C}([-\sigma, 0], \mathbb{R}^m)$  is given. System (14) consists of the unknown nonlinear function  $F \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^q \times \mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^m)$ , the bounded disturbance  $d \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R}^p)$  and unknown nonlinear operator  $\mathbf{T} : \mathcal{C}([-\sigma, \infty), \mathbb{R}^m) \rightarrow L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R}^q)$ , where the structural properties of  $F$  and  $\mathbf{T}$  are specified in the subsequent paragraph. First, we introduce the operator class  $\mathcal{T}$  to which the operator  $\mathbf{T}$  in (14) belongs.

**Definition 3.9.** For  $m, q \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\sigma \geq 0$ , the set  $\mathcal{T}$  denotes the class of operators  $\mathbf{T} : \mathcal{C}([-\sigma, \infty), \mathbb{R}^m) \rightarrow L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R}^q)$  for which the following properties hold:

- *Causality:*  $\forall y_1, y_2 \in \mathcal{C}([-\sigma, \infty), \mathbb{R}^m) \quad \forall t \geq 0:$

$$y_1|_{[-\sigma, t]} = y_2|_{[-\sigma, t]} \implies \mathbf{T}(y_1)|_{[0, t]} = \mathbf{T}(y_2)|_{[0, t]}.$$

- *Local Lipschitz:*  $\forall t \geq 0 \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{C}([-\sigma, t]; \mathbb{R}^m) \quad \exists \Delta, \delta, c > 0 \quad \forall y_1, y_2 \in \mathcal{C}([-\sigma, \infty); \mathbb{R}^m)$  with  $y_1|_{[-\sigma, t]} = y$ ,  $y_2|_{[-\sigma, t]} = y$  and  $\|y_1(s) - y_2(s)\| < \delta$ ,  $\|y_2(s) - y(t)\| < \delta$  for all  $s \in [t, t + \Delta]$ :

$$\text{ess sup}_{s \in [t, t + \Delta]} \|\mathbf{T}(y_1)(s) - \mathbf{T}(y_2)(s)\| \leq c \sup_{s \in [t, t + \Delta]} \|y_1(s) - y_2(s)\|.$$

- *Bounded-input bounded-output (BIBO):*  $\forall c_0 > 0 \quad \exists c_1 > 0 \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{C}([-\sigma, \infty), \mathbb{R}^m):$

$$\sup_{t \in [-\sigma, \infty)} \|y(t)\| \leq c_0 \implies \sup_{t \in [0, \infty)} \|\mathbf{T}(y)(t)\| \leq c_1.$$

In order to have a familiar picture in mind, we briefly discuss a special instance of the operator  $\mathbf{T}$ . Consider a linear system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= Ax(t) + Bu(t), & x(0) &= x^0 \\ y(t) &= Cx(t), \end{aligned}$$

with  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  and  $C, B^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  satisfying (8) and  $CB$  is positive definite. Then, invoking the findings in [20], there exists an invertible  $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  such that with  $(y^\top, \eta^\top)^\top = Ux$  the above system can be transformed into

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{y}(t) &= Ry(t) + S\eta(t) + \Gamma u(t), \\ \dot{\eta}(t) &= Q\eta(t) + Py(t), \end{aligned}$$

where  $R \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ ,  $S, P^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times (n-m)}$ ,  $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-m) \times (n-m)}$ ,  $\Gamma = CB$ , and  $\operatorname{Re} \lambda < 0$  for all eigenvalues  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  of  $Q$ . Defining the linear integral operator

$$L : y(\cdot) \mapsto \left( t \mapsto \int_0^t e^{Q(t-s)} P y(s) ds \right),$$

and setting  $d(\cdot) := S e^{Q \cdot} [0, I_{n-m}] U x^0$ , the above system can be written as

$$\dot{y}(t) = d(t) + \mathbf{T}(y)(t) + \Gamma u(t),$$

where  $\mathbf{T} : y(\cdot) \mapsto (t \mapsto R y(t) + S L(y)(t))$ .

We emphasize that the operator class  $\mathcal{T}$  encompasses a large number of operators appearing in modelling processes, such as nonlinear delay operators, backlash and relay hysteresis operators, as well as solution operators for infinite dimensional dynamical systems, cf. [5, 9, 18]. While the first property (causality) introduced in Definition 3.9 is quite intuitive, the second (locally Lipschitz) is of a more technical nature, required to guarantee existence and uniqueness of solutions, and the third property (BIBO) can be motivated from a practical point of view. Namely, the latter is an infinite-dimensional extension of the BIBS property (7) of the internal dynamics.

Next, we introduce a version of the so-called *high-gain* property, which is essential in high-gain adaptive control. Roughly speaking this property guarantees that, if a large enough input is applied, the system reacts sufficiently fast. The definition is in virtue of [5, Def. 1.2].

**Definition 3.10.** For  $p, q, m \in \mathbb{N}$  a function  $F \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^q \times \mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^m)$  is said to have the perturbation high-gain property, if for every compact set  $K_m \subset \mathbb{R}^m$  there exists  $\nu \in (0, 1)$  such that for every compact sets  $K_p \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ ,  $K_q \subset \mathbb{R}^q$  the function

$$\chi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad s \mapsto \min \{ \langle v, F(\delta, z, \Delta - sv) \rangle \mid \delta \in K_p, \Delta \in K_m, z \in K_q, v \in \mathbb{R}^m, \nu \leq \|v\| \leq 1 \}$$

satisfies  $\sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \chi(s) = \infty$ .

Note that the perturbation high-gain property introduced in Definition 3.10 is, at first glance, stronger than the high-gain property defined in [5, Def. 1.2]. In order to account for possible bounded perturbations of the input, we require this modified property. Although it is clear that control affine systems satisfy both properties, it is an open problem whether the perturbation high-gain property and the high-gain property are equivalent.

With Definitions 3.9 and 3.10 at hand, we may formally introduce the class of systems under consideration.

**Definition 3.11.** We say that the system (14) belongs to the system class  $\mathcal{N}^m$ , written  $(d, F, \mathbf{T}) \in \mathcal{N}^m$ , if, for some  $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\sigma \geq 0$ , the following holds:  $d \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R}^p)$ ,  $F \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^q \times \mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^m)$  has the perturbation high-gain property from Definition 3.10 and  $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{T}$ .

**Remark 3.12.** We comment on the system class and on the model class.

- (i) The system class  $\mathcal{N}^m$  encompasses control affine systems with relative degree one, (perturbation) high-gain property and stable internal dynamics. In particular, linear minimum-phase systems are contained in the system class.
- (ii) Although there are many systems belonging to both the model class  $\mathcal{M}^m$  and the system class  $\mathcal{N}^m$ , neither the set of admissible models  $\mathcal{M}^m$  is a subset of all considered systems  $\mathcal{N}^m$  nor the opposite is true. As an example for a model belonging to  $\mathcal{M}^m$  but not to  $\mathcal{N}^m$  consider  $(f, g, h) \in \mathcal{M}^m$  with high-gain matrix  $\Gamma = h'g = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ . On the other hand, every system  $(d, F, \mathbf{T}) \in \mathcal{N}^m$  which involves a time delay, e.g.  $\mathbf{T}(y)(t) = y(t - \sigma)$  with  $\sigma > 0$ , cannot belong to  $\mathcal{M}^m$ .
- (iii) Note that the operator  $\mathbf{T}$  in (14) can be the solution operator of an infinite dimensional dynamical system, e.g. a partial differential equation. This situation was studied in [10], where a moving water tank was subject to funnel control, and the water in the tank was modelled by the linearized Saint-Venant equations.

### 3.4 Main result

In the following main result we show that the robust funnel MPC Algorithm 3.7 is initially and recursively feasible and achieves tracking of a given reference signal with prescribed behavior.

**Theorem 3.13.** Consider a system (14) with  $(d, F, T) \in \mathcal{N}^m$  and choose a model (2) with  $(f, g, h) \in \mathcal{M}^m$ . Let  $\psi \in \mathcal{G}$  and  $y_{\text{ref}} \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R}^m)$  be given. Let  $y^0 \in \mathcal{C}([-\sigma, 0], \mathbb{R}^m)$  with  $\sigma \geq 0$  be an initial history function for system (14) with  $y^0(0) \in \mathcal{D}_0$ . Then, for any  $\xi \geq 0$ , the set  $X^0$  in (9) is non-empty and there exists  $M > 0$  such that the robust funnel MPC Algorithm 3.7 with  $\delta > 0$  and  $T \geq \delta$  is initially and recursively feasible for every  $x^0 \in X^0$ , i.e.,

- at every time instance  $t_k := k\delta$  for  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$  the OCP (10) has a solution  $u_k^* \in L^\infty([t_k, t_k + T], \mathbb{R}^m)$ , and
- the closed-loop system consisting of the system (14) and the feedback law (13) has a global solution  $y : [-\sigma, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ .

Each global solution  $y$  satisfies that

- all signals are bounded, in particular,  $u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R}^m)$  and  $y \in L^\infty([-\sigma, \infty), \mathbb{R}^m)$ ,
- the tracking error between the system's output and the reference evolves within prescribed boundaries, i.e.,

$$\forall t \geq 0 : \|y(t) - y_{\text{ref}}(t)\| < \psi(t).$$

The proof is relegated to Section 5.

**Remark 3.14.** With Theorem 3.13 at hand we comment on the difference between the proposed control scheme and a straightforward combination of a MPC scheme with a feedback control law.

- The combination of feedforward control with feedback control, i.e., the two degree of freedom controller design [31], is a popular approach. The specific combination of funnel control with feedforward control methods was investigated in [4, 8]. In a similar fashion it is possible to combine a MPC scheme, in particular, a FMPC scheme, with an additional feedback controller. This possibility (i.e., no feedback between FMPC and the actual system) is realized in the robust FMPC Algorithm 3.7 by allowing that the initialization at the beginning of a MPC cycle consists only of the previous prediction  $x_k^{\text{pre}}$  of the current model state such that  $\hat{x}_k := x_k^{\text{pre}}$ , which is a special instance of *proper initialization*. In this case, the FMPC control signal  $u_{\text{FMPC}}$  can be computed offline using the given model. Then it is applied to the system as an open-loop control and the additional feedback control compensates errors, which occur due to deviations between the model and the system. This situation is illustrated as the second scenario in the simulation in Section 4, cf. Figure 4.
- The alternative to the open-loop operation of Algorithm 3.7 is a feedback induced by the utilization of measurements of the system output  $\hat{y}_k := y(t_k)$ . Then, initializing the model properly with  $\hat{x}_k \in \Omega_\xi(x_k^{\text{pre}}, \hat{y}_k)$  ensures recursive feasibility of the MPC scheme on the one hand, and on the other hand, the state  $\hat{x}_k$  is chosen such that the model's output  $h(\hat{x}_k)$  equals the system's output  $\hat{y}_k$ , i.e.,  $h(\hat{x}_k) = \hat{y}_k$ . With this re-initialization at the beginning of the MPC cycle, the influence of the control signal  $u_{\text{FMPC}}$  to the system is taken into account, and moreover, since the error between the model's and the system's output is zero, the optimal control signal may have a better effect on the system's tracking behavior. This situation is illustrated in the third scenario in the simulation in Section 4, cf. Figure 5.

**Remark 3.15.** If the model (5) and the system (14) coincide up to an additive bounded disturbance, then we may derive an explicit bound for the overall control input  $u = u_{\text{FMPC}} + u_{\text{FC}}$  a priori. Consider a model (5) and let the system be given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{y}(t) &= p(y(t), \eta_S(t)) + \Gamma(\Phi^{-1}(y(t), \eta_S(t))) u(t) + d(t), & y(0) &= y^0, \\ \dot{\eta}_S(t) &= q(y(t), \eta_S(t)), & \eta_S(0) &= \eta_S^0, \end{aligned}$$

where  $d \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R}^m)$  and the high-gain matrix satisfies  $\Gamma(x) + \Gamma(x)^\top > 0$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . In this case the surjection in the funnel controller can be replaced with the function  $N(s) = -s$ , whereby the funnel control law simplifies to  $u_{\text{FC}}(\cdot) = -\beta(\|w(\cdot)\|)\alpha(\|w(\cdot)\|^2)w(\cdot)$ ,  $w := (y - y_M)/\varphi$ , cf. [5, Rem. 1.8]. Let  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  be the smallest number such that

$$\beta(\varepsilon)\alpha(\varepsilon^2)\varepsilon^2 = \frac{\|\dot{\psi}\|_\infty + 3 \max_{(y,\eta) \in K} \|p(y,\eta)\| + 3 \max_{(y,\eta) \in K} \|\Gamma(\Phi^{-1}(y,\eta))\| M + \|d\|_\infty}{\lambda_\Gamma},$$

where  $\lambda_\Gamma > 0$  is the smallest eigenvalue of  $\Gamma(\cdot) + \Gamma(\cdot)^\top$  on  $\Phi^{-1}(K)$ , and the compact set  $K$  is given in the proof of Proposition 5.1. Then, invoking the same arguments as in *Step three* in the proof of Theorem 3.13, the overall control satisfies

$$\|u\|_\infty \leq M + \beta(\varepsilon)\alpha(\varepsilon^2).$$

Note that although the bound on the control  $u$  is explicitly given, this bound involves some non-trivial computations such as deriving the compact set  $K$  in Proposition 5.1 explicitly and computing the maximal values of the system parameters on this compact set. Moreover, the bound is conservative in the sense that in applications the maximal input will typically be much smaller.

## 4 Simulation

We illustrate the application of the proposed control strategy in Algorithm 3.7 by a numerical simulation. To this end, we consider a continuous chemical reactor and concentrate on the control goal to steer the reactor's temperature to a certain given value  $\bar{y} = y_{\text{ref}}(t)$ . In the reactor the first order and exothermic reaction Substance-1  $\rightarrow$  Substance-2 takes place. Such a reactor can be modelled by the following system of equations, cf. [32]

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{y}(t) &= bp(x_1(t), x_2(t), y(t)) - qy(t) + u(t), \\ \dot{x}_1(t) &= c_1p(x_1(t), x_2(t), y(t)) + d(x_1^{\text{in}} - x_1(t)), \\ \dot{x}_2(t) &= c_2p(x_1(t), x_2(t), y(t)) + d(x_2^{\text{in}} - x_2(t)), \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where  $x_1$  is the concentration of the reactant Substance-1,  $x_2$  the concentration of the product Substance-2 and  $y$  describes the reactor temperature;  $u$  is the feed temperature/coolant control input. The value  $x_i^{\text{in}}$  is the (positive) concentration of Substance- $i$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) in the feed flow. Further, the constant  $b > 0$  describes the exothermicity of the reaction,  $d > 0$  is associated with the dilution rate and  $q > 0$  is a constant consisting of the combination of the dilution rate and the heat transfer rate. Further,  $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}$  are the stoichiometric coefficients and  $p: \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  is the reaction heat; here the latter involves the Arrhenius function and is assumed to be given as

$$p(x_1, x_2, y) = k_0 e^{-\frac{k_1}{y}} x_1,$$

where  $k_0, k_1$  are positive parameters. As a model for this nonlinear reaction process we consider a linearization of system (15), obtained by linearizing the Arrhenius function around the desired final temperature  $\bar{y} = 337.1K$  and  $x_1 = \frac{1}{2}x_1^{\text{in}}$ . This results in

$$p_{\text{lin}}(x_1, x_2, y) = k_0 e^{-\frac{k_1}{\bar{y}}} x_1 + \frac{k_0 k_1 e^{-\frac{k_1}{\bar{y}}}}{\bar{y}^2} \frac{x_1^{\text{in}}}{2} (y - \bar{y}).$$

We set  $a_1 := \frac{k_0 k_1 e^{-\frac{k_1}{\bar{y}}}}{\bar{y}^2} \frac{x_1^{\text{in}}}{2}$ ,  $a_2 := k_0 e^{-\frac{k_1}{\bar{y}}}$  and define the expressions

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} ba_1 - q & ba_2 & 0 \\ c_1 a_1 & c_1 a_2 - d & 0 \\ c_2 a_1 & c_2 a_2 & -d \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}, \quad D = \begin{bmatrix} -ba_1 \bar{y} \\ c_1 a_2 \bar{y} + dx_{1,M}^{\text{in}} \\ dx_{2,M}^{\text{in}} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^3.$$

Then, with  $x := (y_M, x_{1,M}, x_{2,M})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^3$  the model is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= Ax(t) + Bu_{\text{FMPC}}(t) + D, \\ y_M(t) &= Cx(t), \end{aligned}$$

where  $C = B^\top = [1, 0, 0] \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times 3}$ . We run the simulation on an interval of  $[0, 4]$  minutes, and choose according to [19, 32] the following values for the parameters:  $c_1 = -1 = -c_2$ ,  $k_0 = e^{25}$ ,  $k_1 = 8700$ ,  $d = 1.1$ ,  $q = 1.25$ ,  $x_1^{\text{in}} = 1$ ,  $x_2^{\text{in}} = 0$  and  $b = 209.2$ . We simulate the following scenarios:

- *Case 1:* FMPC without robustification, i.e.,  $u_{\text{FMPC}}$  is computed via Algorithm 2.1 and applied to the system without an additional funnel control loop; this is shown in Figure 3.
- *Case 2:* RFMPC with trivial proper re-initialization, i.e.,  $\hat{x}_k = x_k^{\text{pre}}$  in Step (a) of Algorithm 3.7; this is depicted in Figure 4.

- *Case 3:* RFMPC with proper initialization according to the system's output, i.e.,  $\hat{x}_k \in \Omega_\xi(x_k^{\text{pre}}, \hat{y}_k)$  such that  $h(\hat{x}_k) = \hat{y}_k$  in Step (a) of Algorithm 3.7; this is shown in Figure 5.

As activation function we take the ReLU-like map

$$\beta(s) = \begin{cases} 0, & s \leq S_{\text{crit}}, \\ s - S_{\text{crit}}, & s \geq S_{\text{crit}}, \end{cases}$$

where we choose  $S_{\text{crit}} = 0.4$ , i.e., the funnel controller becomes active, if the error  $y - y_M$  exceeds 40% of the maximal distance to its funnel boundary. In this example, we restrict the MPC control signal to  $\|u_{\text{FMPC}}\|_\infty \leq 600$ . Further, we choose the design parameters  $\lambda_u = 10^{-4}$ , prediction horizon  $T = 0.5$ , and time shift  $\delta = 0.05$ . In the following figures, the control signal generated via funnel MPC is labeled with the subscript FMCP ( $u_{\text{FMPC}}$ ); the signal generated by the additional funnel controller is labeled with the subscript FC ( $u_{\text{FC}}$ ).




Figure 3: Application of the control computed by FMPC without re-initialization and without additional funnel control feedback loop.

Figure 3 shows the application of the control signal computed with FMPC (Algorithm 2.1) in Case 1 to the system without an additional funnel control feedback loop. The error  $e_M(t) = y_M(t) - \bar{y}$  between the model's output  $y_M(t)$  and the reference  $\bar{y}$  evolves within the funnel boundaries  $\psi(t)$ . However, the control signal computed with FMPC using the linear model is not sufficient to achieve that the tracking error  $e(t) = y(t) - \bar{y}$  evolves within the funnel boundaries  $\psi(t)$ . Obviously, the deviation is induced during the initial phase. After about one minute, the system is in a state which is close to the linearized model and hence the latter is a good approximation of the system. In this region, the control  $u_{\text{FMPC}}$  has a similar effect on both dynamics; however, the error  $y(t) - \bar{y}$  already evolves outside the funnel boundaries  $\psi(t)$ . Figure 4 shows the application of the




Figure 4: Application of the control computed by robust FMPC with additional funnel control feedback loop, without re-initialization.

control signal computed with robust funnel MPC (Algorithm 3.7) in Case 2, i.e., besides the FMPC control signal the additional funnel controller is applied in order to guarantee that the error  $y(t) - \bar{y}$  evolves within the boundaries  $\psi(t)$ . Since the model and the system do not coincide, the system evolves differently and hence the funnel controller has to compensate the model-plant mismatch.




Figure 5: Application of the control computed by robust FMPC with additional funnel control feedback loop and with re-initialization.

Figure 5 shows the application of Algorithm 3.7 in Case 3. Besides the additional application of the funnel controller, the model's state is updated with  $h(\hat{x}_k) = \hat{y}_k$  at the beginning of every MPC cycle. Note that in Figure 5 the funnel controller is inactive most of the time, i.e., the applied control signal can be viewed to be close to *optimal* with respect to the cost function (3) (i.e., optimal in the sense of the OCP (10)).

## 5 Auxiliary results and proofs

Before we present the main proof, we establish some auxiliary results. In Section 5.1 we show the existence of a solution of the OPC (10). In Section 5.2 we state some results concerning the application and combination of the funnel controller with the MPC scheme. Finally in Section 5.3 we provide a proof of the main result Theorem 3.13.

### 5.1 Existence of an optimal control

The first proposition concerns the existence of a solution of the OCP (10).

**Proposition 5.1.** *Consider the model (2) with  $(f, g, h) \in \mathcal{M}^m$ . Let  $\delta > 0$ ,  $\xi \geq 0$ ,  $\psi \in \mathcal{G}$ ,  $y_{\text{ref}} \in W^{1,\infty}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R}^m)$  and a proper initialization strategy  $\kappa_\xi : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  be given. Let the sequence  $(t_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  be defined by  $t_k = k\delta$  and  $(\hat{y}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  be an arbitrary sequence with  $\hat{y}_k \in \mathcal{D}_{t_k}$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . Then there exists  $M > 0$ , independent of  $\delta$ , such that for all  $T \geq \delta$  and all  $x_0^{\text{pre}} \in \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid h(x) \in \mathcal{D}_{t_0}, \|[0, I_{n-m}]\Phi(x)\| \leq \xi\}$  the OCP*

$$\underset{\substack{u \in L^\infty([t_k, t_k+T], \mathbb{R}^m), \\ \|u\|_\infty \leq M}}{\text{minimize}} \int_{t_k}^{t_k+T} \ell(t, x(t; t_k, \kappa_\xi(x_0^{\text{pre}}, \hat{y}_k), u), u(t)) dt \quad (16)$$

has a solution  $u_k^* \in L^\infty([t_k, t_k+T], \mathbb{R}^m)$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , where  $(x_k^{\text{pre}})_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  is defined by

$$x_{k+1}^{\text{pre}} := x(t_{k+1}; t_k, \kappa_\xi(x_k^{\text{pre}}, \hat{y}_k), u_k^*).$$

Moreover, the piecewise continuous function

$$y_M : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m, \quad t \mapsto \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} h(x(t; t_k, \kappa_\xi(x_k^{\text{pre}}, \hat{y}_k), u_k^*))|_{[t_k, t_{k+1})}$$

satisfies  $y_M(t) \in \mathcal{D}_t$  for all  $t \geq 0$  and there exists  $\bar{\lambda} > 0$  such that  $\text{ess sup}_{t \geq 0} \|\dot{y}_M(t)\| \leq \bar{\lambda}$ . The bound  $\bar{\lambda}$  is independent of  $(\hat{y}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ ,  $\delta$ ,  $x_0^{\text{pre}}$  and  $\kappa_\xi$ .

*Proof. Step one.* We introduce some notation. We denote by  $\mathcal{Y}_{\hat{\zeta}}(I)$  the set of all functions  $\zeta \in \mathcal{R}(I, \mathbb{R}^m)$  which start at  $\hat{\zeta} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  and  $\zeta - y_{\text{ref}}$  evolves within the funnel given by  $\psi$  on an interval  $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  of the form  $I = [a, b]$  with  $b \in (a, \infty)$  or  $I = [a, b]$  with  $b = \infty$ :

$$\mathcal{Y}_{\hat{\zeta}}(I) := \left\{ \zeta \in \mathcal{R}(I, \mathbb{R}^m) \mid \zeta(\inf I) = \hat{\zeta}, \quad \forall t \in I : \zeta(t) \in \mathcal{D}_t \right\}.$$

Recall that for  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ,  $\hat{\eta} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-m}$  and  $\zeta \in \mathcal{R}([t_k, \infty), \mathbb{R}^m)$ ,  $\eta(\cdot; t_k, \hat{\eta}, \zeta) : [t_k, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n-m}$  denotes the global solution of the initial value problem (5b),  $\eta(t_k) = \hat{\eta}$ , where  $y_M$  is substituted by  $\zeta$ . Define for  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and  $t \geq t_k$  the set

$$N_{t_k}^t := \left\{ \eta(t; t_k, \hat{\eta}, \zeta) \mid (\hat{\zeta}, \hat{\eta}) \in \mathcal{D}_{t_k} \times \mathbb{B}_{\xi}, \zeta \in \mathcal{Y}_{\hat{\zeta}}([t_k, \infty)) \right\},$$

where  $\mathbb{B}_{\xi} := \{ z \in \mathbb{R}^{n-m} \mid \|z\| \leq \xi \}$ . Finally, define the set

$$\mathcal{U}(t_k, \hat{x}) := \left\{ u \in L^{\infty}([t_k, t_k + T], \mathbb{R}^m) \mid \begin{array}{l} \|u\|_{\infty} \leq M, \\ \forall t \in [t_k, t_k + T] : h(x(t; t_k, \hat{x}, u)) \in \mathcal{D}_t \end{array} \right\}$$

of all  $L^{\infty}$ -controls  $u$  bounded by  $M > 0$  which, if applied to the model (2), guarantee that the error  $e_M = y_M - y_{\text{ref}}$  evolves within the funnel  $\mathcal{F}_{\psi}$  on the interval  $[t_k, t_{k+1}]$ .

*Step two.* For arbitrary  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , we make three observations:

- (i) Since  $\kappa_{\xi}$  is a proper initialization strategy and  $\hat{y}_k \in \mathcal{D}_{t_k}$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , the following holds:

$$x_k^{\text{pre}} \in \Phi^{-1} \left( \mathcal{D}_{t_k} \times \bigcup_{i=0}^k N_{t_i}^{t_k} \right) \implies \kappa_{\xi}(x_k^{\text{pre}}, \hat{y}_k) \in \Phi^{-1} \left( \mathcal{D}_{t_k} \times \bigcup_{i=0}^k N_{t_i}^{t_k} \right).$$

- (ii) If, for  $\hat{x} \in \Phi^{-1} \left( \mathcal{D}_{t_k} \times \bigcup_{i=0}^k N_{t_i}^{t_k} \right)$ , the set  $\mathcal{U}(t_k, \hat{x})$  is non-empty and an element  $u \in \mathcal{U}(t_k, \hat{x})$  is applied to the model (2), then

$$x(t_{k+1}; t_k, \hat{x}, u) \in \Phi^{-1} \left( \mathcal{D}_{t_{k+1}} \times \bigcup_{i=0}^{k+1} N_{t_i}^{t_{k+1}} \right).$$

- (iii) If, for  $\hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , the set  $\mathcal{U}(t_k, \hat{x})$  is non-empty, then the OCP

$$\underset{\substack{u \in L^{\infty}([t_k, t_k + T], \mathbb{R}^m), \\ \|u\|_{\infty} \leq M}}{\text{minimize}} \int_{t_k}^{t_k + T} \ell(t, x(t; t_k, \hat{x}), u(t)) \, dt$$

has a solution  $u_k^* \in \mathcal{U}(t_k, \hat{x})$  according to [3, Thm. 4.6].

For (i) observe that  $[I_m, 0]\Phi(x) = h(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . To see (ii), let  $\hat{x} \in \Phi^{-1} \left( \mathcal{D}_{t_k} \times \bigcup_{i=0}^k N_{t_i}^{t_k} \right)$  be such that  $\mathcal{U}(t_k, \hat{x})$  is non-empty. If  $u \in \mathcal{U}(t_k, \hat{x})$  is applied to the model (2), then  $h(x(t; t_k, \hat{x}, u)) \in \mathcal{D}_t$  for all  $t \in [t_k, t_k + T]$ , in particular  $h(x(t_{k+1}; t_k, \hat{x}, u)) \in \mathcal{D}_{t_{k+1}}$ . Furthermore, there exists  $i \leq k$  such that  $[0, I_{n-m}]\Phi(\hat{x}) \in N_{t_i}^{t_k}$  and hence there exist  $(\hat{\zeta}, \hat{\eta}) \in \mathcal{D}_{t_i} \times \mathbb{B}_{\xi}$  and  $\zeta \in \mathcal{Y}_{\hat{\zeta}}([t_i, \infty))$  with  $[0, I_{n-m}]\Phi(\hat{x}) = \eta(t_k; t_i, \hat{\eta}, \zeta)$ . Define  $\tilde{\zeta} : [t_i, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  by

$$\tilde{\zeta}(t) := \begin{cases} h(x(t; t_k, \hat{x}, u)), & t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}] \\ \zeta(t), & t \in [t_i, t_k) \cup (t_{k+1}, \infty). \end{cases}$$

Then,  $\tilde{\zeta} \in \mathcal{Y}_{\hat{\zeta}}([t_i, \infty))$  and  $\eta(t_{k+1}; t_i, \hat{\eta}, \tilde{\zeta}) \in N_{t_i}^{t_{k+1}}$ . Thus,

$$\Phi(x(t_{k+1}; t_k, \hat{x}, u)) = \begin{pmatrix} h(x(t_{k+1}; t_k, \hat{x}, u)) \\ [0, I_{n-m}]\Phi(x(t_{k+1}; t_k, \hat{x}, u)) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} h(x(t_{k+1}; t_k, \hat{x}, u)) \\ \eta(t_{k+1}; t_i, \hat{\eta}, \tilde{\zeta}) \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{D}_{t_{k+1}} \times N_{t_i}^{t_{k+1}}.$$

*Step three.* Since  $\psi \in W^{1, \infty}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R})$  and  $y_{\text{ref}} \in W^{1, \infty}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R}^m)$  are bounded, the set  $O := \bigcup_{t \geq 0} \mathcal{D}_t$  is bounded. Thus, for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and all  $\hat{\zeta} \in \mathcal{D}_{t_k}$  every function  $\zeta \in \mathcal{Y}_{\hat{\zeta}}([t_k, \infty))$  is bounded. Since  $O \times \mathbb{B}_{\xi}$  is bounded,

it follows from the BIBS condition (7) that the set  $N := \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} \bigcup_{t \geq t_k} N_{t_k}^t$  is also bounded. Then the set  $K := \overline{O \times N}$  is compact and

$$\forall T > 0 \forall k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \forall (\hat{\zeta}, \hat{\eta}) \in \mathcal{D}_{t_k} \times \bigcup_{i=0}^k N_{t_i}^{t_k} \forall \zeta \in \mathcal{Y}_{\hat{\zeta}}([t_k, t_k + T]) \forall t \in [t_k, t_k + T]: (\zeta(t), \eta(t; t_k, \hat{\eta}, \zeta)) \in K.$$

To see this, let  $T > 0$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , and  $(\hat{\zeta}, \hat{\eta}) \in \mathcal{D}_{t_k} \times \bigcup_{i=0}^k N_{t_i}^{t_k}$  be arbitrarily given. Then, there exists  $i \leq k$  with  $\hat{\eta} \in N_{t_i}^{t_k}$ . By definition of  $N_{t_i}^{t_k}$ , there exist  $(\hat{\zeta}_0, \hat{\eta}_0) \in \mathcal{D}_{t_i} \times \mathbb{B}_{\xi}$  and  $\zeta_0 \in \mathcal{Y}_{\hat{\zeta}_0}([t_i, \infty))$  such that  $\hat{\eta} = \eta(t_k; t_i, \hat{\eta}_0, \zeta_0)$ . Let  $\zeta \in \mathcal{Y}_{\hat{\zeta}}([t_k, t_k + T])$ , then  $\zeta(t) \in \mathcal{D}_t \subseteq O$  for all  $t \in [t_k, t_k + T]$ . Define  $\tilde{\zeta}: [t_i, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  by

$$\tilde{\zeta}(t) := \begin{cases} \zeta(t), & t \in [t_k, t_k + T], \\ \zeta_0(t), & t \in [t_i, t_k) \cup (t_k + T, \infty). \end{cases}$$

Then,  $\tilde{\zeta} \in \mathcal{Y}_{\hat{\zeta}_0}([t_i, \infty))$  and for  $t \in [t_k, t_k + T]$  we have

$$\eta(t; t_k, \hat{\eta}, \zeta) = \eta(t; t_k, \eta(t_k; t_i, \hat{\eta}_0, \zeta_0), \zeta) = \eta(t; t_i, \hat{\eta}_0, \tilde{\zeta}) \in N_{t_k}^t \subseteq N.$$

*Step four.* A straightforward adaption of [3, Prop. 4.9], using the constructed compact set  $K$ , yields the existence of  $M > 0$  such that for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$  the set  $\mathcal{U}(t_k, \hat{x})$  is non-empty if  $\hat{x} \in \Phi^{-1} \left( \mathcal{D}_{t_k} \times \bigcup_{i=0}^k N_{t_i}^{t_k} \right)$ .

*Step five.* We show by induction that

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N}_0: x_k^{\text{pre}} \in \Phi^{-1} \left( \mathcal{D}_{t_k} \times \bigcup_{i=0}^k N_{t_i}^{t_k} \right)$$

and

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \forall t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]: h(x(t; t_k, \kappa_{\xi}(x_k^{\text{pre}}, \hat{y}_k), u_k^*)) \in \mathcal{D}_t.$$

Since  $x_0^{\text{pre}} \in \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid h(x) \in \mathcal{D}_{t_0}, \|[0, I_{n-m}] \Phi(x)\| \leq \xi\}$  by assumption,  $x_0^{\text{pre}} \in \Phi^{-1}(\mathcal{D}_{t_0} \times N_{t_0}^{t_0})$ . Due to observation (i) of Step two,  $\kappa_{\xi}(x_0^{\text{pre}}, \hat{y}_0) \in \Phi^{-1}(\mathcal{D}_{t_0} \times N_{t_0}^{t_0})$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{U}(t_0, \kappa_{\xi}(x_0^{\text{pre}}, \hat{y}_0)) \neq \emptyset$  according to Step four. The optimization problem (16) has a solution  $u_0^* \in \mathcal{U}(t_0, \kappa_{\xi}(x_0^{\text{pre}}, \hat{y}_0))$  because of observation (iii) in Step two. Due to the definition of  $\mathcal{U}(t_0, \kappa_{\xi}(x_0^{\text{pre}}, \hat{y}_0))$ , this implies in particular  $h(x(t; t_0, \kappa_{\xi}(x_0^{\text{pre}}, \hat{y}_0), u_0^*)) \in \mathcal{D}_t$  for all  $t \in [t_0, t_1]$  and

$$x_1^{\text{pre}} = x(t_1; t_0, \kappa_{\xi}(x_0^{\text{pre}}, \hat{y}_0), u_0^*) \in \Phi^{-1} \left( \mathcal{D}_{t_1} \times \bigcup_{i=0}^1 N_{t_i}^{t_1} \right)$$

according to observation (ii) in Step two.

If  $x_k^{\text{pre}} \in \Phi^{-1} \left( \mathcal{D}_{t_k} \times \bigcup_{i=0}^k N_{t_i}^{t_k} \right)$  for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $\kappa_{\xi}(x_k^{\text{pre}}, \hat{y}_k) \in \Phi^{-1} \left( \mathcal{D}_{t_k} \times \bigcup_{i=0}^k N_{t_i}^{t_k} \right)$  due to observation (i) in Step two. Thus,  $\mathcal{U}(t_k, \kappa_{\xi}(x_k^{\text{pre}}, \hat{y}_k)) \neq \emptyset$  according to Step four. Because of observation (iii) in Step two, the OCP (16) has a solution  $u_k^* \in \mathcal{U}(t_k, \kappa_{\xi}(x_k^{\text{pre}}, \hat{y}_k))$ . By definition of  $\mathcal{U}(t_k, \kappa_{\xi}(x_k^{\text{pre}}, \hat{y}_k))$ , this results in  $h(x(t; t_k, \kappa_{\xi}(x_k^{\text{pre}}, \hat{y}_k), u_k^*)) \in \mathcal{D}_t$  for all  $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]$  and

$$x_{k+1}^{\text{pre}} = x(t_{k+1}; t_k, \kappa_{\xi}(x_k^{\text{pre}}, \hat{y}_k), u_k^*) \in \Phi^{-1} \left( \mathcal{D}_{t_{k+1}} \times \bigcup_{i=0}^{k+1} N_{t_i}^{t_{k+1}} \right)$$

according to observation (ii) in Step two.

*Step six.* It follows from Step five that  $y_M(t) \in \mathcal{D}_t$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ . Define  $y_{M,k} := y_M|_{[t_k, t_{k+1}]}$  and  $\hat{\eta}_k := [0, I_{n-m}] \Phi(\kappa_{\xi}(x_k^{\text{pre}}, \hat{y}_k))$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . Due to the definition of the compact set  $K$  and since  $y_{M,k} \in \mathcal{Y}_{y_{M,k}(t_k)}([t_k, t_{k+1}])$ , we have  $(y_{M,k}(t), \eta(t; t_k, \hat{\eta}_k, y_{M,k})) \in K$  for all  $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]$  and all  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . The functions  $y_{M,k}$  and  $\eta(\cdot; t_k, \hat{\eta}_k, y_{M,k})$  satisfy the differential equation (5) on the interval  $[t_k, t_{k+1}]$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , thus

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ess sup}_{t \geq 0} \|\dot{y}_M(t)\| &\leq \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} \text{ess sup}_{t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]} \|\dot{y}_{M,k}(t)\| \\ &= \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} \text{ess sup}_{t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]} \left\| p(y_{M,k}(t), \eta(t_k; t_k, \hat{\eta}_k, y_{M,k})) + \Gamma(\Phi^{-1}(y_{M,k}(t), \eta(t; t_k, \hat{\eta}_k, y_{M,k}))) u_k^*(t) \right\| \\ &\leq \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} \text{ess sup}_{t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]} \left\| p(y_{M,k}(t), \eta(t; t_k, \hat{\eta}_k, y_{M,k})) \right\| + \left\| \Gamma(\Phi^{-1}(y_{M,k}(t), \eta(t; t_k, \hat{\eta}_k, y_{M,k}))) \right\| \|u_k^*\|_{\infty} \\ &\leq \max_{(y, \eta) \in K} \|p(y, \eta)\| + M \max_{(y, \eta) \in K} \left\| \Gamma(\Phi^{-1}(y, \eta)) \right\| =: \bar{\lambda}. \end{aligned}$$



The last inequality holds for all choices of  $(\hat{y}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ ,  $\delta$ ,  $x_0^{\text{pre}}$ , and  $\kappa_\xi$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

## 5.2 Auxiliary funnel control results

Concerning the application of funnel control, we state the following results.

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $N \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R})$  be a surjection,  $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}([0, 1], [1, \infty))$  be a bijection, and  $\beta \in \mathcal{C}([0, 1], [0, \beta^+])$  be an activation function with  $\beta^+ > 0$ . Then  $\tilde{N} := (\beta \circ \sqrt{\alpha^{-1}}) \cdot N \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R})$  is surjective.*

*Proof.*  $N \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R})$  being a surjection is equivalent to  $\limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} N(s) = \infty$  and  $\liminf_{s \rightarrow \infty} N(s) = -\infty$ . Since  $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} (\beta \circ \sqrt{\alpha^{-1}})(s) = \beta^+ > 0$ , we have

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{N}(s) = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{s \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{N}(s) = -\infty.$$

This implies that  $\tilde{N} = (\beta \circ \sqrt{\alpha^{-1}}) \cdot N \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R})$  is surjective as well.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.3.** *Consider a system (14) with  $(d, F, \mathbf{T}) \in \mathcal{N}^m$ . Let  $y^0 \in \mathcal{C}([-\sigma, 0], \mathbb{R}^m)$ ,  $\sigma \geq 0$ ,  $D \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R}^m)$ ,  $\beta \in \mathcal{C}([0, 1], [0, \beta^+])$  be an activation function with  $\beta^+ > 0$ ,  $\rho \in W^{1, \infty}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R}^m)$  and  $\varphi \in \mathcal{G}$  be given such that  $\|y^0(0) - \rho(0)\| < \varphi(0)$ . Then the application of*

$$u(t) = \beta(\|e(t)/\varphi(t)\|)(N \circ \alpha)(\|e(t)/\varphi(t)\|^2)e(t)/\varphi(t), \quad e(t) := y(t) - \rho(t),$$

to the system

$$\dot{y}(t) = F(d(t), \mathbf{T}(y)(t), D(t) + u(t)), \quad y|_{[-\sigma, 0]} = y^0,$$

yields a closed-loop initial value problem, which has a solution, every solution can be maximally extended, and every maximal solution  $y : [0, \omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  has the following properties

- (i) the solution is global, i.e.,  $\omega = \infty$ ,
- (ii) all signals are bounded, in particular,  $u, \dot{y} \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbb{R}^m)$  and  $y \in L^\infty([-\sigma, \infty), \mathbb{R}^m)$ ,
- (iii) the tracking error evolves within prescribed error bounds, i.e.,

$$\forall t \geq 0 : \|y(t) - \rho(t)\| < \varphi(t).$$

*Proof.* Using lemma 5.2 and the perturbation high-gain property from definition 3.10 it is a straightforward modification of the proof of [5, Thm. 1.9], using the perturbation high-gain property instead of the high-gain property, similar as in Step four of the proof of Theorem 3.13.  $\square$

## 5.3 Proof of the main result

Now we are in the position to present the proof of the main result Theorem 3.13.

**Proof of Theorem 3.13.** Let  $\Phi$  be a diffeomorphism associated with the model  $(f, g, h)$  according to Assumption 3.1.

*Step one.* We show that the set  $X^0$  of initial values for the model is non-empty. To this end, let  $z := \Phi^{-1}(y^0(0), 0_{n-m})$ . Then, recalling  $[I_m, 0]\Phi(\cdot) = h(\cdot)$ , we have  $h(z) = y^0(0)$ . Therefore,  $\|h(z) - y_{\text{ref}}(0)\| = \|y^0(0) - y_{\text{ref}}(0)\| < \psi(0)$  because  $y^0(0) \in \mathcal{D}_0$ . Further,  $\|y(0) - h(z)\| = 0$  and  $\|[0, I_{n-m}]\Phi(z)\| = \|[0, I_{n-m}]\Phi(\Phi^{-1}(y^0(0), 0_{n-m}))\| = 0 \leq \xi$ . Thus,  $z \in X^0$ .

*Step two.* According to Proposition 5.1 there exists  $M > 0$  such that, for every  $\hat{x}_0 \in X^0$  and every possible sequence of measurements  $(\hat{y}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0}$  with  $\hat{y}_k \in \mathcal{D}_{t_k}$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , the OCP (10) has a solution  $u_{k, \text{FMPC}}$  for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and initialization  $\hat{x}_k = \kappa_\xi(x_k^{\text{pre}}, \hat{y}_k)$  of the model (2), where  $x_{k+1}^{\text{pre}} = x(t_{k+1}; t_k, \hat{x}_k, u_{k, \text{FMPC}})$ .

*Step three.* Now we turn towards the part where the funnel controller (12) is involved. On each interval  $[t_k, t_{k+1}]$  the system's dynamics are given by

$$\dot{y}_k(t) = F(d(t), \mathbf{T}(y_k)(t), u_k(t)), \quad y_k|_{[-\sigma, t_k]} = y_{k-1}|_{[-\sigma, t_k]}, \quad (17)$$

where  $y_{-1}|_{[-\sigma,0]} := y^0$ , and in particular  $y_k(t_k) = y_{k-1}(t_k)$ , i.e., although the model's state is updated at  $t = t_k$ , the system is not re-initialized at the time instances  $t_k$ . The funnel control signal is, for  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and  $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]$ , given by

$$u_{k,\text{FC}}(t) = \beta(\|y_k(t) - y_{k,\text{M}}(t)\|/\varphi_k(t))(N \circ \alpha)(\|(y_k(t) - y_{k,\text{M}}(t))/\varphi_k(t)\|^2)(y_k(t) - y_{k,\text{M}}(t))/\varphi_k(t),$$

where  $y_{k,\text{M}}(t) = h(x(t; t_k, \kappa_\xi(x_k^{\text{pre}}, y_k(t_k)), u_{k,\text{FMPC}}))$  for  $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]$  and the funnel function for the funnel control law is piecewise defined by

$$\varphi_k : [t_k, t_{k+1}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad t \mapsto \psi(t) - \|y_{k,\text{M}}(t) - y_{\text{ref}}(t)\|, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Invoking Proposition 5.1, we have  $y_{k,\text{M}}(t) \in \mathcal{D}_t$  for all  $t \in [t_k, t_k + T]$ , by which  $\varphi_k$  satisfy  $0 < \varphi_k(t) \leq \psi(t)$  for all  $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]$  and all  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . Every  $\varphi_k$  can smoothly be extended to the left and right such that the extension  $\tilde{\varphi}_k$  satisfies  $\tilde{\varphi}_k \in \mathcal{G}$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . We show that the control law

$$u_k(t) = u_{k,\text{FMPC}}(t) + u_{k,\text{FC}}(t) \tag{18}$$

applied to the system (17) for  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , leads to a closed-loop system which has a global solution with the properties as in Proposition 5.3. Special attention is required since  $y_{k,\text{M}}(t_k) \neq y_{k-1,\text{M}}(t_k)$  and hence also  $\varphi_k(t_k) \neq \varphi_{k-1}(t_k)$  is possible. We observe that for  $x^0 \in X^0$  we have either

$$\begin{aligned} \|y_{0,\text{M}}(0) - y_0(0)\| &= \|h(x^0) - y_0(0)\| < \psi(0) - \|h(x^0) - y_{\text{ref}}(0)\| = \varphi_0(0) \\ \text{or } \|y_{0,\text{M}}(0) - y_0(0)\| &= 0 < \psi(0) - \|h(x^0) - y_{\text{ref}}(0)\| = \varphi_0(0), \end{aligned}$$

and so  $y_0(0) \in \mathcal{D}_0$ . Then Proposition 5.1 yields  $\|u_{0,\text{FMPC}}\|_\infty \leq M$ . Thus, in both cases the feasibility result Proposition 5.3 for the funnel controller is applicable and yields the existence of a solution  $y_0 : [0, t_1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  of the closed-loop problem (17), (18) for  $k = 0$ , with  $\|y_{0,\text{M}}(t) - y_0(t)\| < \varphi_0(t)$  for all  $t \in [0, t_1]$ . Then, choosing  $\hat{x}_1 = \kappa_\xi(x_1^{\text{pre}}, y_0(t_1)) \in \Omega_\xi(x_1^{\text{pre}}, y_0(t_1))$ , at  $t = t_1$  we have either  $\hat{x}_1 = x_1^{\text{pre}}$ , which gives  $y_{1,\text{M}}(t_1) = y_{0,\text{M}}(t_1)$  and thus

$$\|y_{1,\text{M}}(t_1) - y_1(t_1)\| = \|y_{0,\text{M}}(t_1) - y_0(t_1)\| < \varphi_0(t_1) = \psi(t_1) - \|y_{0,\text{M}}(t_1) - y_{\text{ref}}(t_1)\| = \varphi_1(t_1),$$

or  $y_{1,\text{M}}(t_1) = h(\hat{x}_1) = y_0(t_1) = y_1(t_1)$  and the estimation above is valid as well, thus  $y_1(t_1) \in \mathcal{D}_{t_1}$ . Proposition 5.1 yields  $\|y_{1,\text{M}}(t) - y_{\text{ref}}(t)\| < \psi(t)$  for  $t \in [t_1, t_2]$  with  $\|u_{1,\text{FMPC}}\|_\infty \leq M$ , by which the conditions to reapply Proposition 5.3 are satisfied at  $t = t_1$ , by which a solution  $y_1 : [t_1, t_2] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  of the closed-loop problem (17), (18) exists for  $k = 1$ , with  $\|y_{1,\text{M}}(t) - y_1(t)\| < \varphi_1(t)$  for all  $t \in [t_1, t_2]$ . Repeating this line of arguments we successively obtain, for each  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , a solution  $y_k : [t_k, t_{k+1}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  of the closed-loop problem (17), (18) with  $\|y_{k,\text{M}}(t) - y_k(t)\| < \varphi_k(t)$  for all  $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]$ .

*Step four.* By defining  $y : [-\sigma, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  via  $y|_{[-\sigma,0]} = y^0$ ,  $y|_{[t_k, t_{k+1}]} = y_k$  for  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$  we obtain a global solution of (14), (13) which satisfies  $\|y_{\text{M}}(t) - y(t)\| < \psi(t) - \|y_{\text{M}}(t) - y(t)\| = \varphi(t)$  for all  $t \geq 0$ , where  $y_{\text{M}}(t) := y_{k,\text{M}}(t)$  and  $\varphi(t) := \varphi_k(t)$  for  $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . It remains to show that the overall control

$$u(t) := u_k(t), \quad t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}], \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

is bounded, which we prove by showing that there exists  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  such that  $\|y(t) - y_{\text{M}}(t)\| \leq \varepsilon \varphi(t)$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . For the sake of better legibility, we introduce the variable  $w(t) := (y(t) - y_{\text{M}}(t))/\varphi(t)$ . Choose compact sets  $K_p \subset \mathbb{R}^p$  and  $K_q \subset \mathbb{R}^q$  such that  $d(t) \in K_p$  and  $\mathbf{T}(y)(t) \in K_q$  for  $t \geq 0$ . Further, for  $K_m := \{D \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid \|D\| \leq M\}$ ,  $\nu \in (0, 1)$  and  $V := \{v \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid \nu \leq \|v\| \leq 1\}$  we recall the continuous function from Definition 3.10

$$\chi(s) = \min \{ \langle v, F(\delta, \zeta, \Delta - sv) \rangle \mid \delta \in K_p, \zeta \in K_q, \Delta \in K_m, v \in V \}.$$

$F$  has the perturbation high-gain property and hence the function  $\chi$  is unbounded from above for a suitable  $\nu \in (0, 1)$ . We note that  $\|w(0)\| < 1$  as shown in Step three, and with  $\lambda := \|\dot{\psi}\|_\infty + \|\dot{y}_{\text{ref}}\|_\infty$  and  $\bar{\lambda} \geq \|\dot{y}_{\text{M}}\|_\infty$  from Proposition 5.1, we choose  $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$  large enough such that  $\varepsilon > \max\{\nu, \|w(0)\|\}$  and

$$\chi(\beta(\varepsilon)(N \circ \alpha)(\varepsilon^2)) \geq 4\bar{\lambda} + 2\lambda,$$

which is possible because of the properties of  $\beta, N, \alpha$  and  $\tilde{\chi}$ . We show that

$$\forall t \geq 0 : \|w(t)\| \leq \varepsilon. \tag{19}$$

Unlike the standard funnel control framework, the funnel function  $\varphi$  may have discontinuities at the time instances  $t_k$  when the model is re-initialized with  $\hat{x}_k \in \Omega_\xi(x_k^{\text{pre}}, y(t_k))$  such that  $h(\hat{x}_k) = y(t_k)$ . This fact requires particular attention when proving (19). We observe that  $\varphi$  is continuous on  $[t_k, t_{k+1}]$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and satisfies, by Proposition 5.1,

$$|\dot{\varphi}(t)| \leq |\dot{\psi}(t)| + \|\dot{y}_M\| + \|\dot{y}_{\text{ref}}(t)\| \leq \lambda + \bar{\lambda}$$

for almost all  $t \geq 0$ , independent of  $k$ . Now fix an arbitrary  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and consider two cases.

*Case 1 :* If  $\hat{x}_k \in \Omega_\xi(x_k^{\text{pre}}, y_{k-1}(t_k))$  is such that  $h(\hat{x}_k) = y_{k-1}(t_k)$ , then  $y_M(t_k) = y(t_k)$  and hence  $\|w(t_k)\| = 0 < \varepsilon$ . Seeking a contradiction, we suppose that there exists  $t^* \in (t_k, t_{k+1}]$  such that  $\|w(t^*)\| > \varepsilon$ , and invoking continuity of  $w$  on  $[t_k, t_{k+1}]$  we set

$$t_* := \sup \{ t \in [t_k, t^*) \mid \|w(t)\| = \varepsilon \} < t^*.$$

Then we have  $\|w(t)\| \geq \varepsilon \geq \nu$  (and hence  $w(t) \in V$ ) for all  $t \in [t_*, t^*]$  and, since  $\|w(t_*)\| = \varepsilon$ ,

$$\chi(\beta(\|w(t_*)\|)(N \circ \alpha)(\|w(t_*)\|^2)) \geq 4\bar{\lambda} + 2\lambda.$$

Therefore, there exists  $t^{**} \in (t_*, t^*]$  such that

$$\forall t \in [t_*, t^{**}] : \chi(\beta(\|w(t)\|)(N \circ \alpha)(\|w(t)\|^2)) \geq 2\bar{\lambda} + \lambda.$$

Then we calculate that, for almost all  $t \in [t_*, t^{**}]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \frac{1}{2} \|w(t)\|^2 &= \langle w(t), \dot{w}(t) \rangle = \left\langle w(t), \frac{-\dot{\varphi}(t)(y(t) - y_M(t)) + \varphi(t)(\dot{y}(t) - \dot{y}_M(t))}{\varphi(t)^2} \right\rangle \\ &= -\frac{\dot{\varphi}(t)}{\varphi(t)} \langle w(t), w(t) \rangle - \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} \langle w(t), \dot{y}_M(t) \rangle + \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} \langle w(t), F(d(t), \mathbf{T}(y)(t), u(t)) \rangle \\ &< \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} \left( |\dot{\varphi}(t)| + \|\dot{y}_M(t)\| + \langle w(t), F(d(t), \mathbf{T}(y)(t), u(t)) \rangle \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} (\lambda + 2\bar{\lambda}) + \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} \langle w(t), F(d(t), \mathbf{T}(y)(t), u_{k,\text{FMPC}}(t) + u_{k,\text{FC}}(t)) \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} (\lambda + 2\bar{\lambda}) + \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} \langle w(t), F(d(t), \mathbf{T}(y)(t), u_{k,\text{FMPC}}(t) + \beta(\|w(t)\|)(N \circ \alpha)(\|w(t)\|^2)w(t)) \rangle \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} (\lambda + 2\bar{\lambda}) - \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} \min \{ \langle v, F(\delta, \zeta, \Delta - \beta(\|w(t)\|)(N \circ \alpha)(\|w(t)\|^2)v) \rangle \mid \delta \in K_p, \zeta \in K_q, \Delta \in K_m, v \in V \} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\varphi(t)} \left( \lambda + 2\bar{\lambda} - \chi(\beta(\|w(t)\|)(N \circ \alpha)(\|w(t)\|^2)) \right) \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

which upon integration, and invoking the definition of  $t^* < t^{**}$ , gives  $\varepsilon < \|w(t^{**})\| \leq \|w(t_*)\| = \varepsilon$ , a contradiction. Therefore,  $\|w(t)\| \leq \varepsilon$  for all  $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]$ .

*Case 2 :* If  $\hat{x}_k = x_k^{\text{pre}}$ , then  $\varphi_{k-1}(t_k) = \varphi_k(t_k)$  and thus the funnel function  $\varphi$  is continuous and weakly differentiable on the interval  $[t_{k-1}, t_{k+1}]$ . In this case, it follows that  $\|w(t)\| \leq \varepsilon$  for all  $t \in [t_{k-1}, t_{k+1}]$  with the same arguments as in Case 1.

Overall, we have shown that  $\|w(t)\| \leq \varepsilon$  for all  $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]$  and all  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , independent of the initialization strategy. Therefore,  $\|u\|_\infty \leq M + \beta^+ |(N \circ \alpha)(\varepsilon^2)|$  and this proves assertion (i).

*Step five.* Finally, a simple calculation yields that for  $t \geq 0$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|y(t) - y_{\text{ref}}(t)\| &= \|y(t) - y_M(t) + y_M(t) - y_{\text{ref}}(t)\| \leq \|y(t) - y_M(t)\| + \|y_M(t) - y_{\text{ref}}(t)\| \\ &< \varphi(t) + \|y_M(t) - y_{\text{ref}}(t)\| = \psi(t) - \|y_M(t) - y_{\text{ref}}(t)\| + \|y_M(t) - y_{\text{ref}}(t)\| = \psi(t), \end{aligned}$$

which is assertion (ii). This completes the proof.  $\square$

## References

- [1] E. AYDINER, M. A. MÜLLER, AND F. ALLGÖWER, *Periodic reference tracking for nonlinear systems via model predictive control*, in 2016 European Control Conference (ECC), IEEE, 2016, <https://doi.org/10.1109/ecc.2016.7810682>.
- [2] T. BERGER AND D. DENNSTÄDT, *Funnel MPC with feasibility constraints for nonlinear systems with arbitrary relative degree*, IEEE Control Systems Letters, 6 (2022), pp. 2804–2809, <https://doi.org/10.1109/lcsys.2022.3178478>.

- [3] T. BERGER, D. DENNSTÄDT, A. ILCHMANN, AND K. WORTHMANN, *Funnel Model Predictive Control for nonlinear systems with relative degree one*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 60 (2022), pp. 3358–3383, <https://doi.org/10.1137/21m1431655>.
- [4] T. BERGER, S. DRÜCKER, L. LANZA, T. REIS, AND R. SEIFRIED, *Tracking control for underactuated non-minimum phase multibody systems*, Nonlinear Dynamics, 104 (2021), pp. 3671–3699, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11071-021-06458-4>.
- [5] T. BERGER, A. ILCHMANN, AND E. P. RYAN, *Funnel control of nonlinear systems*, Mathematics of Control, Signals, and Systems, 33 (2021), pp. 151–194, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00498-021-00277-z>.
- [6] T. BERGER, C. KÄSTNER, AND K. WORTHMANN, *Learning-based Funnel-MPC for output-constrained nonlinear systems*, IFAC-PapersOnLine, 53 (2020), pp. 5177–5182. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifacol.2020.12.1186>
- [7] T. BERGER, H. H. LÊ, AND T. REIS, *Funnel control for nonlinear systems with known strict relative degree*, Automatica, 87 (2018), pp. 345–357, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.automatica.2017.10.017>.
- [8] T. BERGER, S. OTTO, T. REIS, AND R. SEIFRIED, *Combined open-loop and funnel control for underactuated multibody systems*, Nonlinear Dynamics, 95 (2019), pp. 1977–1998, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11071-018-4672-5>.
- [9] T. BERGER, M. PUCHE, AND F. L. SCHWENNINGER, *Funnel control in the presence of infinite-dimensional internal dynamics*, Systems & Control Letters, 139 (2020), Article 104678. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sysconle.2020.104678>
- [10] T. BERGER, M. PUCHE, AND F. L. SCHWENNINGER, *Funnel control for a moving water tank*, Automatica, 135 (2022), Article 109999, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.automatica.2021.109999>.
- [11] A. BOCCIA, L. GRÜNE, AND K. WORTHMANN, *Stability and feasibility of state constrained MPC without stabilizing terminal constraints*, Systems & Control Letters, 72 (2014), pp. 14–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sysconle.2014.08.002>
- [12] C. I. BYRNES AND A. ISIDORI, *Asymptotic stabilization of minimum phase nonlinear systems*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 36 (1991), pp. 1122–1137. <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/90226>
- [13] S. D. CAIRANO AND F. BORRELLI, *Reference tracking with guaranteed error bound for constrained linear systems*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 61 (2016), pp. 2245–2250, <https://doi.org/10.1109/tac.2015.2491738>.
- [14] J.-M. CORON, L. GRÜNE, AND K. WORTHMANN, *Model predictive control, cost controllability, and homogeneity*, SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization, 58 (2020), pp. 2979–2996. <https://doi.org/10.1137/19M1265995>
- [15] W. ESTERHUIZEN, K. WORTHMANN, AND S. STREIF, *Recursive feasibility of continuous-time model predictive control without stabilising constraints*, IEEE Control Systems Letters, 5 (2020), pp. 265–270. <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/9113701>
- [16] P. FALUGI AND D. Q. MAYNE, *Getting robustness against unstructured uncertainty: A tube-based MPC approach*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 59 (2014), pp. 1290–1295, <https://doi.org/10.1109/tac.2013.2287727>.
- [17] L. GRÜNE AND J. PANNEK, *Nonlinear Model Predictive Control: Theory and Algorithms*, Communications and Control Engineering Series, Springer-Verlag, London, 2011. ISBN=978-0-85729-501-9
- [18] A. ILCHMANN, E. P. RYAN, AND C. J. SANGWIN, *Tracking with prescribed transient behavior*, ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations, 7 (2002), pp. 471–493. <https://doi.org/10.1051/cocv:2002064>
- [19] A. ILCHMANN AND S. TRENN, *Input constrained funnel control with applications to chemical reactor models*, Systems & Control Letters, 53 (2004), pp. 361–375. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sysconle.2004.05.014>
- [20] A. ILCHMANN AND F. WIRTH, *On minimum phase*, Automatisierungstechnik, 12 (2013), pp. 805–817. <https://doi.org/10.1524/auto.2013.1002>
- [21] A. ISIDORI, *Nonlinear Control Systems*, Communications and Control Engineering Series, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 3rd ed., 1995. ISBN=978-1-84628-615-5
- [22] J. KÖHLER, M. A. MÜLLER, AND F. ALLGÖWER, *Nonlinear reference tracking: An economic model predictive control perspective*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 64 (2019), pp. 254–269, <https://doi.org/10.1109/tac.2018.2800789>.
- [23] J. KÖHLER, M. A. MÜLLER, AND F. ALLGÖWER, *A nonlinear model predictive control framework using reference generic terminal ingredients*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 65 (2020), pp. 3576–3583, <https://doi.org/10.1109/tac.2019.2949350>.
- [24] J. KÖHLER, R. SOLOPERTO, M. A. MÜLLER, AND F. ALLGÖWER, *A computationally efficient robust model predictive control framework for uncertain nonlinear systems*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 66 (2021), pp. 794–801, <https://doi.org/10.1109/tac.2020.2982585>.
- [25] L. LANZA, *Internal dynamics of multibody systems*, Systems & Control Letters, 152 (2021), p. 104931, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sysconle.2021.104931>.
- [26] D. MAYNE, M. SERON, AND S. RAKOVIĆ, *Robust model predictive control of constrained linear systems with bounded disturbances*, Automatica, 41 (2005), pp. 219–224, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.automatica.2004.08.019>.
- [27] S. J. QIN AND T. A. BADGWELL, *A survey of industrial model predictive control technology*, Control engineering practice, 11 (2003), pp. 733–764. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0967-0661\(02\)00186-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0967-0661(02)00186-7)
- [28] S. V. RAKOVIĆ, L. DAI, AND Y. XIA, *Homothetic tube model predictive control for nonlinear systems*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, (2022). <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/9894690>
- [29] J. B. RAWLINGS, D. Q. MAYNE, AND M. DIEHL, *Model predictive control: theory, computation, and design*, vol. 2, Nob Hill Publishing Madison, WI, 2017. ISBN=978-0975937709
- [30] W. H. SCHILDERS, H. A. VAN DER VORST, AND J. ROMMES, *Model order reduction: theory, research aspects and applications*, vol. 13, Springer, 2008. ISBN= 978-3-540-78841-6

- [31] S. SKOGESTAD AND I. POSTLETHWAITE, *Multivariable Feedback Control: Analysis and Design*, John Wiley and Sons Inc., Chichester, 2nd ed., 2005. ISBN= 978-0470011676
- [32] F. VIEL, F. JADOT, AND G. BASTIN, *Robust feedback stabilization of chemical reactors*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 42 (1997), pp. 473–481, <https://doi.org/10.1109/9.566657>.
- [33] W. WALTER, *Ordinary Differential Equations*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998. ISBN=978-1-4612-0601-9
- [34] A. G. WILLS AND W. P. HEATH, *Barrier function based model predictive control*, Automatica, 40 (2004), pp. 1415–1422, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.automatica.2004.03.002>.
- [35] M. YUAN, C. MANZIE, M. GOOD, I. SHAMES, F. KEYNEJAD, AND T. ROBINETTE, *Bounded error tracking control for contouring systems with end effector measurements*, in 2019 IEEE International Conference on Industrial Technology (ICIT), IEEE, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1109/icit.2019.8755064>.
- [36] F. PFITZ, X. HU, AND C. EBENBAUER, *Relaxed barrier mpc for path following in constrained environments*, in 2021 29th Mediterranean Conference on Control and Automation (MED), 2021, pp. 872–879, <https://doi.org/10.1109/MED51440.2021.9480329>.
- [37] C. FELLER, M. OUERGI, AND C. EBENBAUER, *Robust output feedback model predictive control based on relaxed barrier functions*, in 2016 IEEE 55th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), 2016, pp. 1477–1483, <https://doi.org/10.1109/CDC.2016.7798475>.