

Closed-loop Performance Optimization of Model Predictive Control with Robustness Guarantees

Riccardo Zuliani, Efe C. Balta, and John Lygeros

Abstract—Model mismatch and process noise are two frequently occurring phenomena that can drastically affect the performance of model predictive control (MPC) in practical applications. We propose a principled way to tune the cost function and the constraints of linear MPC schemes to improve the closed-loop performance and robust constraint satisfaction on uncertain nonlinear dynamics with additive noise. The tuning is performed using a novel MPC tuning algorithm based on backpropagation developed in our earlier work. Using the scenario approach, we provide probabilistic bounds on the likelihood of closed-loop constraint violation over a finite horizon. We showcase the effectiveness of the proposed method on linear and nonlinear simulation examples.

I. INTRODUCTION

Model predictive control (MPC) is a model-based control technique that can efficiently solve challenging control tasks under input and process constraints by solving, at each time step, a receding horizon optimization problem. The mismatch between the nominal model used by the MPC and the true dynamics poses an important challenge in maintaining good closed-loop performance and ensuring constraint satisfaction. Many robust MPC methods have been developed in the literature, often relying on constraint tightening or probabilistic satisfaction guarantees. However, most existing methods can be conservative since tightenings are generally designed without explicitly accounting for the receding horizon aspect of MPC. Here, we study the MPC problem with model uncertainty and provide a structured way to design constraint tightenings tailored to closed-loop operation, thus reducing conservatism.

Tube MPC is a principled way to robustify MPC schemes whenever the process dynamics are unknown or subject to disturbances [1]. This strategy tightens the MPC constraints so that the resulting closed-loop state-input trajectory satisfies the nominal constraints. The tightening is generally designed based on the support of the uncertainty/noise set, which is assumed to be bounded [2]. Tube MPC schemes have been developed for linear systems subject to bounded additive noise [2], multiplicative uncertainty [3], and parametric uncertainty [4]. Moreover, extensions to nonlinear Tube MPC to deal with additive noise [1] and model uncertainty [5] have been developed. Despite its popularity, Tube MPC can be conservative, since constraint tightening is often

designed for the worst-case uncertainty realization, which is unlikely to occur in many practical applications, leading to cautious MPC designs. Moreover, nonlinear tube-based solutions can be cumbersome to implement numerically and may require significant tuning effort [6].

A way to reduce conservatism is to construct a representation of the uncertain elements (either implicitly or explicitly) using data and derive probabilistic bounds on the likelihood of constraint satisfaction. A notable example is the *scenario approach* [7], where samples of the uncertain parameters (called scenarios) are used to obtain a control scheme with good out-of-sample performance. Unlike tube MPC, the scenario approach can be applied without accurate knowledge of the underlying uncertainty distribution or support. However, constraint satisfaction is guaranteed only in probability instead of in the worst case, where a smaller constraint violation probability will likely produce a more conservative performance. For example, [8] proposes a scenario approach-based MPC design for uncertain linear systems subject to additive disturbances and shows guarantees on the closed-loop probability of constraint violation at each time step. The scheme of [9], under a similar setting, is guaranteed to have a small average constraint violation. The scenario approach can also be used in settings where the model dynamics are completely unknown [10]. Existing methods, however, are almost exclusively limited to linear system dynamics, or have guarantees for single time-steps, providing little insight into the behavior over closed-loop trajectories.

In this paper, we design the cost and the constraints of an MPC scheme to maximize closed-loop performance while ensuring robust constraint satisfaction. Our contribution is twofold: i) we provide a novel approach for optimal closed-loop tuning of robust nonlinear MPC problems and ii) we use the scenario approach to provide sample-efficient guarantees on the closed-loop probability of constraint violation. The tuned MPC can be formulated as a convex quadratic program even for nonlinear dynamics, hence can be solved efficiently and reliably with specialized software. The design parameters are the terminal cost and the input cost of the MPC, as well as linear constraint tightenings. All variables are tuned using the recently proposed *BackPropagation-MPC (BP-MPC)* algorithm [11], which can achieve optimal closed-loop MPC designs using a sensitivity-based procedure. Since the sensitivity information involves the closed-loop trajectory, our method greatly reduces the conservatism compared to existing offline-designed tube-based techniques.

Notation: We use $\mathbb{Z}_{[a,b]} = \mathbb{Z} \cap [a,b]$ where \mathbb{Z} is the set of integers. We use $x \sim \mathcal{P}$ to say that x is drawn from

Corresponding author: R. Zuliani. This work was supported as a part of NCCR Automation, a National Centre of Competence in Research, funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation (grant number 51NF40.225155). All authors are with the Automatic Control Laboratory (IfA), ETH Zürich, 8092 Zürich, Switzerland {rzuliani,lygeros}@ethz.ch. E. C. Balta is also with inspire AG, 8005 Zürich, Switzerland. efe.balta@inspire.ch

the probability distribution \mathcal{P} . $\mathbb{E}[x]$ and $\mathbb{P}[x]$ denote the expectation and probability of the random variable x .

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

We consider an uncertain nonlinear system subject to additive disturbances

$$x_{t+1} = f(x_t, u_t, d) + w_t, \quad x_0 \sim \mathcal{P}_{x_0}, \quad (1)$$

where $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ and $u_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ denote the state and input at time t , respectively, and \mathcal{P}_{x_0} is an unknown distribution with known mean \bar{x}_0 . The parameter $d \in \mathbb{R}^{n_d}$ is a random variable representing model uncertainty with unknown distribution \mathcal{P}_d . The additive noise $w_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w}$ is drawn i.i.d. for every t from the unknown distribution \mathcal{P}_w . The system needs to satisfy the following state and input constraints for all t

$$H_x x_t \leq h_x, \quad H_u u_t \leq h_u. \quad (2)$$

We consider the case where the input u_t is determined online by an MPC policy $u_t = \text{MPC}(x_t, p, \eta)$, where p and η are design parameters to be defined shortly. The closed-loop dynamics are then given by

$$x_{t+1} = f(x_t, \text{MPC}(x_t, p, \eta), d) + w_t \quad (3)$$

The nominal dynamics can be obtained from (3) by setting $w_t = 0$ and d to some nominal value that (without loss of generality) we denote by $d = 0$, leading to

$$\bar{x}_{t+1} = f(\bar{x}_t, \text{MPC}(\bar{x}_t, p, \eta)) \quad (4)$$

where we overload notation by setting $f(\bar{x}_t, \bar{u}_t) := f(\bar{x}_t, \bar{u}_t, 0)$, and \bar{x}_t and $\bar{u}_t = \text{MPC}(\bar{x}_t, p, \eta)$ denote the nominal state and the nominal input, respectively.

Our goal is to design an MPC policy that steers the system to the origin while satisfying (2) for all possible $w_t \sim \mathcal{P}_w$, $d \sim \mathcal{P}_d$, and $x_0 \sim \mathcal{P}_{x_0}$ within a finite time horizon $T \gg 0$. Both these objectives are captured by the following optimization problem.

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{p, \eta, x, u}{\text{minimize}} && \mathbb{E}_{w, d, x_0} \left[\sum_{t=0}^T \|x_t\|_{Q_x}^2 \right] \\ & \text{subject to} && x_{t+1} = f(x_t, u_t, d) + w_t, \\ & && u_t = \text{MPC}(x_t, p, \eta), \\ & && H_x x_t \leq h_x, \quad H_u u_t \leq h_u, \\ & && \forall w_t, d, x_0, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0, T]}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $Q_x > 0$ and $w := (w_0, \dots, w_T)$. Our framework can easily allow for more complex cost functions. For simplicity, we limit \mathcal{C} to be a quadratic function of x , and refer the reader to [11, Section VI-C] for the more general case.

We focus on MPC policies that can be expressed as strongly convex quadratic programs. Specifically, given two design parameters $p := (P, R)$, with $P, R > 0$ (terminal and input cost), and $\eta := (\eta_x, \eta_u)$ (state and input constraint

tightenings), we choose $\text{MPC}(x_t, p, \eta) = v_{0|t}$ by solving

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{z_t, v_t} && \|z_{N|t}\|_P^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \|z_{k|t}\|_{Q_x}^2 + \|v_{k|t}\|_R^2 \\ & \text{s.t.} && z_{k+1|t} = A_{k|t} z_{k|t} + B_{k|t} v_{k|t} + c_{k|t}, \quad z_{0|t} = x_t, \\ & && H_x z_{k|t} \leq h_x - \eta_{x,k}^2, \quad H_u v_{k|t} \leq h_u - \eta_{u,k}^2, \\ & && \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0, N-1]}, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $z_t := (z_{0|t}, \dots, z_{N|t})$, $v_t := (v_{0|t}, \dots, v_{N-1|t})$, $\eta_x := (\eta_{x,0}, \dots, \eta_{x,N})$, $\eta_u := (\eta_{u,0}, \dots, \eta_{u,N-1})$, and the square in the tightenings is applied elementwise. The prediction horizon N of the MPC is generally much smaller than T . Since (6) may become infeasible in practice, we relax the state constraints with the technique of [11, Section VI-D].

The equality constraints in (6) should be designed to ensure that $A_{k|t} z_{k|t} + B_{k|t} v_{k|t} + c_{k|t} \approx f(z_{k|t}, v_{k|t})$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0, N-1]}$. To this end, denoting with (z_{t-1}, v_{t-1}) the optimal state-input trajectory obtained by solving (6) at time-step $t-1$, we set

$$\begin{aligned} A_{k|t} &= \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(z_{k+1|t-1}, v_{k+1|t-1}), \quad B_{k|t} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial u}(z_{k+1|t-1}, v_{k+1|t-1}), \\ c_{k|t} &= f(z_{k+1|t-1}, v_{k+1|t-1}) - A_{k|t} z_{k+1|t-1} - B_{k|t} v_{k+1|t-1}. \end{aligned}$$

For simplicity, we assume that $A_{k|t} \equiv A$, $B_{k|t} \equiv B$ and $c_{k|t} \equiv 0$ and refer the reader to [11, Section VI-A]. Observe that linear dynamics are only used within the MPC problem (6), whereas the true nonlinear dynamics (1) are used in (5).

III. IMPROVING NOMINAL PERFORMANCE

To solve (5), we first design $\theta := (p, \eta)$ to minimize the cost in (5) for the nominal dynamics (4) by solving

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\theta, \bar{x}}{\text{minimize}} && \sum_{t=0}^T \|\bar{x}_t\|_{Q_x}^2 \\ & \text{subject to} && \bar{x}_{t+1} = f(\bar{x}_t, \text{MPC}(\bar{x}_t, \theta)), \quad \bar{x}_0 \text{ given}, \\ & && H_x \bar{x}_t \leq h_x, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0, T]}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

We omit the input constraints since the MPC policy (6) satisfies them by design. For simplicity, let $x(\theta) := (\bar{x}_0(\theta), \dots, \bar{x}_T(\theta))$ be the function mapping θ to the nominal closed-loop trajectory $\bar{x}(\theta)$ obtained by setting $\bar{x}_0(\theta) = \bar{x}_0$ and by iterating the nominal dynamics $\bar{x}_{t+1} = f(\bar{x}_t, \text{MPC}(\bar{x}_t, \theta))$ until time-step T . Using an exact penalty function, we can reformulate (7) as the unconstrained minimization problem

$$\underset{\theta}{\text{minimize}} \quad \ell(\bar{x}(\theta)) := \sum_{t=0}^T \|x_t(\theta)\|_{Q_x}^2 + c_1 \gamma(x_t(\theta)), \quad (8)$$

where $\gamma(x) := \|\max\{H_x x - h_x, 0\}\|_1$, $c_1 > 0$, and max is applied elementwise. If (7) is sufficiently well-behaved, and c_1 is large enough, we can prove that (8) and (7) are equivalent.

Given any θ^* such that $H_x x_t(\theta^*) \leq h_x$ for all t , Problem (7) is calm at θ^* if for some $\bar{\alpha} \geq 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\sum_{t=0}^T \|x_t(\theta)\|_{Q_x}^2 + \bar{\alpha} \gamma(x_t(\theta)) \geq \sum_{t=0}^T \|x_t(\theta^*)\|_{Q_x}^2,$$

for all $\|\theta - \theta^*\| \leq \epsilon$. Calmness is a weak constraint qualification that is verified in many situations. For more details, we refer the reader to [12].

Lemma 1 ([12, Theorem 2.1]): The set of calm local minima of (7) coincide with the set of local minima of (8) provided that c_1 is chosen at least as large as the calmness modulus.

For practical purposes, we can reasonably expect θ^* to be a local minimizer of (7) if c_1 is chosen large enough.

A. Conservative Jacobians

Problem (8) can be solved using a simple gradient-based scheme. However, since the cost function in (8) is typically nondifferentiable, a more general notion of gradient is needed. To this end, we use the concept of conservative Jacobians [13].

Definition 1 ([13, Section 2]): Let $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ be a locally Lipschitz function. We say that the set-valued function $\mathcal{J}_\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^m$ is a *conservative Jacobian* for φ , if \mathcal{J}_φ is nonempty-valued, outer semicontinuous, locally bounded, and for all paths¹ $\rho : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and almost all $t \in [0, 1]$

$$\frac{d\varphi}{dt}(\rho(t)) = \langle v, \dot{\rho}(t) \rangle, \quad \forall v \in \mathcal{J}_\varphi(\rho(t)).$$

The function φ is *path-differentiable* if it admits a conservative Jacobian.

Given two path-differentiable functions $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\chi : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$, the function $\psi := \chi \circ \varphi$ is path-differentiable with $\mathcal{J}_\psi(z) = \mathcal{J}_\chi(\varphi(z))\mathcal{J}_\varphi(z)$. Importantly, not all locally Lipschitz functions are path-differentiable. In this paper, we focus on the class of definable functions.

Definition 2 ([14, Definitions 1.4 and 1.5]): A collection $\mathcal{O} = (\mathcal{O}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, where each \mathcal{O}_n contains subsets of \mathbb{R}^n , is an *o-minimal structure* on $(\mathbb{R}, +, \cdot)$ if

- 1) all semialgebraic subsets of \mathbb{R}^n belong to \mathcal{O}_n ;
- 2) the elements of \mathcal{O}_1 are precisely the finite unions of points and intervals;
- 3) \mathcal{O}_n is a boolean subalgebra of the powerset of \mathbb{R}^n ;
- 4) if $A \in \mathcal{O}_n$ and $B \in \mathcal{O}_m$, then $A \times B \in \mathcal{O}_{n+m}$;
- 5) if $A \in \mathcal{O}_{n+1}$, then the set containing the elements of A projected onto their first n coordinates belongs to \mathcal{O}_n .

A subset of \mathbb{R}^n which belongs to \mathcal{O} is said to be *definable* (in the o-minimal structure). A function $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ is *definable* if its graph $\{(x, v) : v = \varphi(x)\}$ is definable.

Locally Lipschitz definable functions are ubiquitous in control and optimization, and admit a conservative Jacobian. Moreover, they can be minimized (locally) with Algorithm 1, which is guaranteed to converge to a critical point for a suitable choice of step sizes.

Lemma 2 ([15, Theorem 6.2]): Let φ be locally Lipschitz and definable in some o-minimal structure, assume that

¹A *path* is an absolutely continuous function $\rho : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ admitting a derivative $\dot{\rho}$ for almost every $t \in [0, 1]$ and for which the Lebesgue integral of $\dot{\rho}$ between 0 and any $t \in [0, 1]$ equals $\rho(t) - \rho(0)$.

Algorithm 1 Minimization of path-differentiable function

Input: $x^0, \{\alpha_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}, \text{tol} > 0$.
1: **for** $k = 1$ to ∞ **do**
2: Compute any $p^k \in \mathcal{J}_\varphi(x^k)$
3: $x^{k+1} = x^k - \alpha_k p^k$
4: **If** $\|x^k - x^{k-1}\|_2 < \text{tol}$ **return** $x^* = x^{k+1}$
5: **end for**

$\sup_k \|x^k\|_2 < \infty$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k = \infty, \quad \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \alpha_k^2 < \infty. \quad (9)$$

Then $\{x^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ obtained with Algorithm 1 converges to some x^* satisfying $0 \in \mathcal{J}_\varphi(x^*)$.

One way to guarantee bounded iterates x^k is to introduce a projection to a large enough polytopic set \mathcal{X} in the gradient descent update, i.e., $x^{k+1} = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X}}[x^k - \alpha_k p^k]$ (see discussion in [15, Section 6.1]). To guarantee (9) one can choose

$$\alpha_k = \frac{c}{k^\zeta} \quad c > 0, \quad \zeta \in (0.5, 1]. \quad (10)$$

In the remainder of this paper we consider a fixed o-minimal structure \mathcal{O} and assume that all definable functions are definable in \mathcal{O} .

To ensure that (8) can be solved with Algorithm 1, we need $\ell(\bar{x}(\theta))$ to be locally Lipschitz and definable. This is the case if ℓ and \bar{x} are locally Lipschitz definable, as both these properties are preserved by composition.

Assumption 1: The cost ℓ is locally Lipschitz definable.

B. The BP-MPC algorithm

The BP-MPC algorithm [11] uses backpropagation to efficiently construct \mathcal{J}_x for a given d recursively

$$\mathcal{J}_{x_{t+1}}(\theta) = \mathcal{J}_{f,u}(x_t, u_t, d) \left[\mathcal{J}_{\text{MPC},x_t}(x_t, \theta) \mathcal{J}_{x_t}(p) + \mathcal{J}_{\text{MPC},\theta}(x_t, \theta) \right] + \mathcal{J}_{f,x}(x_t, u_t, d) \mathcal{J}_{x_t}(p), \quad (11)$$

where $\mathcal{J}_{f,x}$ and $\mathcal{J}_{f,u}$ are the partial conservative Jacobians of f with respect to its arguments (and similarly for $\mathcal{J}_{\text{MPC},x_t}$ and $\mathcal{J}_{\text{MPC},\theta}$), and $\mathcal{J}_x(\theta) = 0$, since x_0 is independent of θ . We provide here a general algorithm that works for any value of w, d , and x_0 , and later consider the nominal case. To apply (11) we require the following.

Assumption 2: The function f is locally Lipschitz and definable in (x, u) for all $d \sim \mathcal{P}_d$.

To compute the conservative Jacobian \mathcal{J}_{MPC} of the MPC map, we rewrite (6) as a quadratic program in standard form

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{y}{\text{minimize}} && \frac{1}{2} y^\top Q(p) y + q(x_t, p)^\top y \\ & \text{subject to} && G(p) y \leq g(x_t, p, \eta), \\ & && F(p) y = \phi(x_t, p), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

and obtain its Lagrange dual

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{z}{\text{minimize}} && \frac{1}{2} z^\top H(p) z + h(x_t, p, \eta)^\top z \\ & \text{subject to} && z = (\lambda, \mu) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\text{in}}} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_{\text{eq}}}, \lambda \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Note that both problems (12) and (13) do not depend on the choice of d and w , since the MPC (6) utilizes an approximation of the nominal dynamics (4). The solution $y(\bar{p})$ of (12), where $\bar{p} := (x_t, p, \eta)$, is obtained from the solution $z(\bar{p})$ of (13) as $y(\bar{p}) = \mathcal{G}(z(\bar{p}), \bar{p})$, where

$$\mathcal{G}(z(\bar{p}), \bar{p}) := -Q(p)^{-1} ([G(p) \ F(p)]^\top z(\bar{p}) + q(\bar{p})).$$

The existence of \mathcal{J}_y can be guaranteed under the following assumptions.

Assumption 3: The maps $Q(p)$, $q(\bar{p})$, $G(p)$, $g(\bar{p})$, $F(p)$, and $\phi(\bar{p})$ are locally Lipschitz definable. Moreover, $Q^{-1}(p)$ is locally Lipschitz.

Assumption 4: For all values of x_t , p , and η , problem (12) is feasible, strongly convex, and satisfies the linear independence constraint qualification (LICQ).

Assumption 3 is not restrictive in practice, as the class of locally Lipschitz definable functions comprises most functions commonly used in control and optimization (e.g., semi-algebraic, trigonometric restricted to a compact definable domain, exponential function). The feasibility assumption is not restrictive as state constraints can be relaxed using the technique of [11, Section VI-D]. The LICQ assumption holds e.g. if the constraints in (2) are box constraints $x_{\min} \leq x_t \leq x_{\max}$, $u_{\min} \leq u_t \leq u_{\max}$. The convexity assumption can be ensured by design with a suitable parameterization of Q . Note that problem (5) remains nonconvex despite Assumption 4.

Proposition 1 ([11, Theorem 1]): Under Assumptions 3 and 4, the optimizer $z(\bar{p})$ of (13) is unique and locally Lipschitz definable. Its conservative Jacobian $\mathcal{J}_z(\bar{p})$ contains elements of the form $-U^{-1}V$, where

$$\begin{aligned} U &\in T(I - \gamma H(p)) - I, \\ V &\in -\gamma T(Az + B), \\ T &= \text{diag}(\text{sign}(\lambda_1), \dots, \text{sign}(\lambda_{n_m}), 1, \dots, 1), \end{aligned}$$

where $z = (\lambda, \mu)$, $A \in \mathcal{J}_H(p)$, $B \in \mathcal{J}_h(\bar{p})$, and γ is any positive constant. Moreover, the optimizer $y(\bar{p})$ of (12) is unique and locally Lipschitz definable with conservative Jacobian

$$W - Q(p)^\top [G(p)^\top \ F(p)^\top] Z \in \mathcal{J}_y(\bar{p}),$$

where $Z \in \mathcal{J}_z(\bar{p})$ and $W \in \mathcal{J}_{G, \bar{p}}(z(\bar{p}), \bar{p})$.

Proposition 1 provides a way to compute the conservative Jacobian \mathcal{J}_{MPC} of the MPC map. Combining with (11), we can iteratively construct the conservative Jacobian \mathcal{J}_x of the closed-loop trajectory x for any value of w , d , x_0 . The procedure is summarized in Algorithm 2.

To compute the conservative Jacobian of \bar{x} for a given θ it suffices to set $w = 0$, $d = 0$, and $x_0 = \bar{x}_0$ in Algorithm 2.

C. A gradient-based solution

Once the conservative Jacobian of the closed-loop trajectory \bar{x} is available, we can obtain the conservative Jacobian of the objective in (8) using the chain rule $\mathcal{J}_\ell(\theta) = \mathcal{J}_\ell(\bar{x}) \mathcal{J}_{\bar{x}}(\theta)$. Combining this with Algorithms 1 and 2, we obtain Algorithm 3, which converges to a critical point of (8).

Algorithm 2 Conservative Jacobian computation

Input: θ , w , d , x_0 .

Init: $\mathcal{J}_{x_0}(\theta) = 0$.

- 1: **for** $t = 0$ to T **do**
 - 2: Solve (6) and set $u_t = \text{MPC}(x_t, \theta)$.
 - 3: Compute $\mathcal{J}_{x_{t+1}}(\theta)$ using (11) and Proposition 1.
 - 4: Compute next state $x_{t+1} = f(x_t, u_t, d) + w_t$.
 - 5: **end for**
 - 6: **return** $\mathcal{J}_x(\theta)$
-

Algorithm 3 BP-MPC for Nominal Performance

Input: θ^0 , $\{\alpha_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\text{tol} > 0$.

- 1: **for** $k = 0$ to ∞ **do**
 - 2: Compute $J_1^k \in \mathcal{J}_{\bar{x}}(\theta^k)$ with Algorithm 2.
 - 3: Compute any $J_2^k \in \mathcal{J}_\ell(\bar{x})$.
 - 4: Compute $J^k = J_2^k J_1^k$.
 - 5: Update $\theta^{k+1} = \theta^k - \alpha_k J^k$.
 - 6: **If** $\|\theta^{k+1} - \theta^k\|_2 < \text{tol}$ **return** $\theta^* = \theta^{k+1}$
 - 7: **end for**
-

Theorem 1: Suppose that Assumptions 1, 2, 3, and 4 hold, that $\{\alpha_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfy (9), and that $\sup_k \|p^k\|_2 < \infty$. Then $\{\theta^k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ obtained with Algorithm 3 converges to a critical point θ^* of (8). Moreover, if (7) is calm at θ^* , and c_1 in (8) is chosen at least as large as the calmness modulus, then θ^* is also a local minimizer of (7).

Proof: The first part follows immediately by recognizing that Algorithm 3 is implementing a gradient-descent rule equivalent to that in Algorithm 1, and by applying Lemma 2. The second follows from Lemma 1. \blacksquare

IV. ROBUST CONSTRAINT SATISFACTION

We now focus on ensuring robust constraint satisfaction by solving the problem

$$\begin{aligned} &\underset{\tilde{\theta}, x, u}{\text{minimize}} && \|\tilde{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2^2 \\ &\text{subject to} && x_{t+1} = f(x_t, u_t, d) + w_t, \\ & && u_t = \text{MPC}(x_t, \tilde{\theta}), \\ & && H_x x_t \leq h_x, \ H_u u_t \leq h_u, \\ & && \forall w_t, d, x_0, \ \forall t \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0, T]}, \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where θ^* is the solution of (7) obtained with Algorithm 3. By penalizing the difference between $\tilde{\theta}$ and θ^* , we ensure that $\tilde{\theta}^* \approx \theta^*$ while satisfying the constraints.

A. Robust constraint satisfaction using BP-MPC

To solve (14), we assume that a set of i.i.d. samples is available:

$$\mathcal{S} := \{(w^j, d^j, x_0^j)_{j=1}^M : w^j \sim \mathcal{P}_w^T, d^j \sim \mathcal{P}_d, x_0^j \sim \mathcal{P}_{x_0}\}.$$

Denoting $\delta = (w, d, x_0) \in \mathcal{S}$, Problem (14) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\tilde{\theta}, x^\delta, u^\delta, \delta \in \mathcal{S}}{\text{minimize}} && \|\tilde{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2^2 \\ & \text{subject to} && x_{t+1}^\delta = f(x_t^\delta, u_t^\delta, d) + w_t, \\ & && u_t^\delta = \text{MPC}(x_t^\delta, \tilde{\theta}), \\ & && H_x x_t^\delta \leq h_x, \forall \delta = (w, d, x_0) \in \mathcal{S}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

With the same strategy as in Section III, we can remove all constraints from (15) using a penalty function

$$\min_{\tilde{\theta}} \|\tilde{\theta} - \theta^*\|_2^2 + c_1 \sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{t=0}^T \gamma(x_t^\delta(\tilde{\theta})), \quad (16)$$

where $x^\delta(\tilde{\theta}) := (x_0^\delta(\tilde{\theta}), \dots, x_T^\delta(\tilde{\theta}))$ is the function mapping $\tilde{\theta}$ to the closed-loop trajectory $x^\delta(\tilde{\theta})$ obtained by setting $x_0^\delta(\tilde{\theta}) = x_0$ and by iterating (1) until time-step T with parameters $\tilde{\theta}$, w , and d , with $\delta = (w, d, x_0)$.

To facilitate the task of quantifying the robustness of the solution, we solve (16) using the Pick2Learn (P2L) algorithm [16], outlined in Algorithm 4. P2L converges to a local solution of (15) under appropriate calmness assumptions.

Algorithm 4 BP-MPC for Robust Constraint Satisfaction

Input: θ^* , \mathcal{S} ,

Init: $\tilde{\theta}^0 = \theta^*$, $\mathcal{T}^0 = \emptyset$, $\mathcal{E}^0 = \mathcal{S}$, $k = 0$, converged = False.

```

1: while not converged do
2:   For all  $\delta \in \mathcal{E}^k$ , compute  $\gamma^\delta := \sum_{t=0}^T \gamma(x_t^\delta(\tilde{\theta}^k))$ .
3:   if  $\gamma^\delta > 0$  for some  $\delta \in \mathcal{E}^k$  then
4:     | Select  $\bar{\delta} = \text{argmax}_{\delta} \gamma^\delta$ .
5:   else if  $\sum_{t=0}^T \mathcal{J}_\gamma(x_t^\delta(\tilde{\theta}^k)) \neq \{0\}$  for some  $\delta \in \mathcal{E}^k$  then
6:     | Select any  $\bar{\delta}$  with  $\sum_{t=0}^T \mathcal{J}_\gamma(x_t^{\bar{\delta}}(\tilde{\theta}^k)) \neq \{0\}$ .
7:   else
8:     | converged  $\leftarrow$  True
9:   end if
10:  Update  $\mathcal{T}^{k+1} = \mathcal{T}^k \cup \{\bar{\delta}\}$ ,  $\mathcal{E}^{k+1} = \mathcal{E}^k \setminus \{\bar{\delta}\}$ .
11:  Solve (16) with  $\mathcal{T}^{k+1}$  instead of  $\mathcal{S}$  and obtain  $\tilde{\theta}^{k+1}$ .
12:   $k \leftarrow k + 1$ 
13: end while
14: return  $\tilde{\theta}^* = \tilde{\theta}^k$  and  $\mathcal{T}^* = \mathcal{T}^k$ .

```

P2L requires solving (16) several times for (much) smaller datasets \mathcal{T}^k replacing \mathcal{S} . To do so, we use the scheme in Algorithm 5. Note that generally $|\mathcal{T}^*| \ll |\mathcal{S}|$ [17].

Algorithm 5 GD algorithm to solve (16)

Input: $\tilde{\theta}^k$, $\{\alpha_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\max_it \in \mathbb{N}$, \mathcal{T}^k ,

Init: $\tilde{\theta}^{k,0} = \tilde{\theta}^k$.

```

1: for  $j = 0$  to  $\max\_it$  do
2:   for  $\delta \in \mathcal{T}^k$  do
3:     | Compute  $J_1^\delta \in \mathcal{J}_{x^\delta}(\tilde{\theta}^{k,j})$  with Algorithm 2.
4:     | Compute any  $J_2^\delta \in \sum_{t=0}^T \mathcal{J}_\gamma(x_t^\delta(\tilde{\theta}^{k,j}))$ .
5:   end for
6:   Compute gradient  $J^{k,j} = 2(\tilde{\theta}^{k,j} - \theta^*) + \sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{T}^k} J_2^\delta J_1^\delta$ 
7:   Update  $\tilde{\theta}^{k,j+1} = \tilde{\theta}^{k,j} - \alpha_j J^{k,j}$ .
8: end for
9: return  $\tilde{\theta}^{k+1} = \tilde{\theta}^{k,j+1}$ .

```

Theorem 2: Suppose that Assumptions 2, 3, and 4 hold, that $\{\alpha_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfy (9), and that in Algorithm 5, for any \mathcal{T}^k , $\sup_j \|\tilde{\theta}^{k,j}\|_2 < \infty$. Then $\tilde{\theta}^*$ as obtained in Algorithm 4 converges to a critical point $\tilde{\theta}^*$ of (16). Moreover, if (15) is calm at $\tilde{\theta}^*$, and c_1 in (16) is chosen at least as large as the calmness modulus, then $\tilde{\theta}^*$ is a local minimizer of (15).

Proof: By [13, Theorem 3], we have that Algorithm 5 converges to a critical point of (16) for any set of samples \mathcal{S} . Next, Algorithm 4 must always converge in at most $|\mathcal{S}|$ iterations (as $\mathcal{E}^{|\mathcal{S}|} = \emptyset$). If Algorithm 4 terminates after $k = |\mathcal{S}|$ iterations, then $\tilde{\theta}^*$ trivially solves (16). If the algorithm terminates after $k < |\mathcal{S}|$ iterations, then $\tilde{\theta}^*$ satisfies

$$\tilde{\theta}^* - \theta^* + c_1 \sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{T}^*} \sum_{t=0}^T \mathcal{J}_\gamma(x_t^\delta(\tilde{\theta}^*)) \ni 0.$$

Since for all $\delta \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{T}^*$ we have $\mathcal{J}_\delta(\tilde{\theta}^*) = \{0\}$ for all t , $\tilde{\theta}^*$ also satisfies

$$\tilde{\theta}^* - \theta^* + c_1 \sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{t=0}^T \mathcal{J}_\gamma(x_t^\delta(\tilde{\theta}^*)) \ni 0,$$

meaning that $\tilde{\theta}^*$ is a critical point of (16). If the calmness assumption is met, then $\tilde{\theta}^*$ is a local minimizer of (15) by Lemma 1. \blacksquare

B. Out-of-sample constraint satisfaction

In this section, we study how well $\tilde{\theta}^*$ performs on unseen samples obtained from \mathcal{P}_w , \mathcal{P}_d , \mathcal{P}_{x_0} (that is, assuming no distribution shift) by adapting the results of [17]. We want to ensure that the constraint violation probability

$$V(\tilde{\theta}^*) := \mathbb{P}_{w,d,x_0} \{H_x x_t(\tilde{\theta}^*, w, d, x_0) > h_x \forall t \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0,T]}\}.$$

is smaller than a certain tolerance $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. Here $x(\tilde{\theta}^*, w, d, x_0)$ denotes the closed-loop trajectory obtained from (1) starting from x_0 with parameters w , d , and θ , and the probability is with respect to $\mathcal{P}_w^T \times \mathcal{P}_d \times \mathcal{P}_{x_0}$. Due to the probabilistic choice of \mathcal{S} , this statement is made with confidence $1 - \beta$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{S}} \{V(\tilde{\theta}^*) > \epsilon\} \leq \beta \quad (17)$$

with $\beta \in (0, 1)$. In (17) the probability is with respect to the multi-sample \mathcal{S} in (15), which is drawn from $(\mathcal{P}_w^T \times \mathcal{P}_d \times \mathcal{P}_{x_0})^M$. If (17) is satisfied for very small values of β , we can practically guarantee $V(\tilde{\theta}^*) \leq \epsilon$ [17].

The guarantees make use of the following notion.

Definition 3 (Support subsample): Given a collection of samples $\mathcal{S} = \{\delta^j, j \in \mathbb{Z}_{[1,M]}\}$, a *support subsample* is a collection of k elements $\mathcal{D} = \{\delta^{j_i} : i \in \mathbb{Z}_{[1,k]}\}$, with $j_1 < \dots < j_k$, such that solving (15) with \mathcal{S} replaced with \mathcal{D} produces the same solution.

Note that the set \mathcal{T}^* returned by Algorithm 4 is a support sub-sample of \mathcal{S} . The simplicity with which one can identify a support subsample, enabled by the P2L algorithm, is the primary reason why we decided to solve (14) using Algorithm 4 instead of Algorithm 5 with $\mathcal{T}^k = \mathcal{S}$. Using Algorithm 5 directly might require less training time, but identifying a support subsample may be very challenging.




Figure 1: Summary of the entire algorithm.

We further require the following assumption, which is verified if the calmness constraint qualification is satisfied and c_1 in (16) is chosen large enough.

Assumption 5: For all $\delta \in \mathcal{S}$, $H_x x_t^\delta(\tilde{\theta}^*) \leq h_x$, where $\tilde{\theta}^*$ is obtained with Algorithm 4.

Theorem 3 ([17, Theorem 1]): Let Assumption 5 hold, and let $\beta \in (0, 1)$. Let $\epsilon : \{0, M\} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be any function satisfying $\epsilon(M) = 1$ and $\sum_{k=0}^M \binom{M}{k} (1 - \epsilon(k))^{M-k} = \beta$. Then $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{S}}\{V(\tilde{\theta}^*) > \epsilon(k^*)\} \leq \beta$, where $k^* = \lceil T^* \rceil$.

An example of function satisfying the condition in Theorem 3 is $\epsilon(k) = 1 - \sqrt[M-k]{\beta / \binom{M}{k}}$ for $k \neq M$, and $\epsilon(M) = 1$. Figure 1 provides a brief summary of the complete algorithmic procedure proposed in this paper.

V. SIMULATION EXAMPLE

A. Cart pendulum example

We test our method on the pendulum on a cart of [18], whose state is $(x, \dot{x}, \phi, \dot{\phi})$ and its dynamics are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{\phi}(t) &= \frac{m\mu g \sin(\phi) - \mu \cos(\phi)(u + \mu \dot{\phi}^2 \sin(\phi))}{mJ - \mu^2 \cos(\phi)^2}, \\ \ddot{x}(t) &= \frac{J(u + \mu \dot{\phi}^2 \sin(\phi)) - \mu^2 g \sin(\phi) \cos(\phi)}{mJ - \mu^2 \cos(\phi)^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where x and \dot{x} are the linear position and velocity of the cart, and ϕ and $\dot{\phi}$ are the angular position and velocity of the pendulum, respectively. The input u is the force applied to the cart. We use Runge-Kutta 4 with a sample time of 0.05 seconds to obtain discrete time dynamics, and impose the constraints $|u(t)| \leq 0.75$, $|\phi(t)| \leq 0.2$, $|\dot{x}(t)| \leq 0.8$. Note that the constraint on the angle ϕ requires the pendulum to remain near the upright position: this is challenging to satisfy, as the cart must move quickly to reach the origin, but not too quickly to avoid violating the constraint. To retain definability, we reduce the domain of the trigonometric functions to a finite interval, and set the functions to zero outside. The mass m , the inertia J and the coefficient μ of the system are given by $m = \bar{m}(1 + d_1)$, $J = \bar{J}(1 + d_2)$, $\mu = \bar{\mu}(1 + d_3)$, where \bar{m} , \bar{J} , $\bar{\mu}$ are known nominal values of [18], and $d = (d_1, d_2, d_3)$ is a random variable uniformly distributed in the set $[-0.05, 0.05]^3$. The noise w_t is sampled uniformly from the set $\{0\} \times [-0.01, 0.01] \times \{0\} \times [-0.1, 0.1]$. The initial condition is $x_0 = \bar{x}_0 + (0, \omega_1, 0, \omega_2)$, with $\bar{x}_0 = (-3, 0, 0, 0)$ and ω_1, ω_2 are sampled independently and uniformly from the interval $[-0.3, 0.3]$; note that in all cases only the velocity and angular velocity are affected by the uncertainty. We use the linearization scheme described in [11] to obtain linear dynamics for (6). Moreover, we choose a short horizon $N = 5$ (whereas $T = 120$) and $Q_x = \text{diag}(1, 0.001, 1, 0.001)$.

	Average cost	Violation		
		Ratio	Total	Relative
MPC($\cdot, \tilde{\theta}^*$)	330.163	0%	0	0%
MPC(\cdot, θ^*)	293.482	100%	0.646	15.984%
Nonlinear MPC	299.992	100%	10.772	111.259%

Table I: Closed-loop cost and constraint violation, cart pendulum




Figure 2: Average (solid line) and range (shaded area) of 1000 closed-loop angular position and linear velocity (solid line) of the nominal and the tuned MPC schemes. The dashed red line represents the state constraints.

After running Algorithm 3 to obtain θ^* , we run Algorithm 4 with a set \mathcal{S} of 1000 samples (where each problem is solved with 1000 GD iterations) choosing $c_1 = 40$, and $c = 0.1$, $\zeta = 0.6$ in (10). We additionally add a squared 2-norm penalty on the constraint violation to the cost of (16), multiplied by the factor $c_2 = 40$. This introduces an additional degree of freedom for tuning the algorithm without compromising the results of Theorem 2. After Algorithm 4 terminates, we obtain $|\mathcal{T}^*| = 3$, which provides a theoretical bound of $V_{\mathcal{S}}(\tilde{\theta}^*) \leq 0.0407$ with confidence $\beta = 10^{-6}$.

Then, for cross-validation, we test the tuned MPC policy $\text{MPC}(\cdot, \tilde{\theta}^*)$ on 1000 unseen samples of (w, d, x_0) . Table I compares the performance of our method against the nominal MPC with θ^* obtained by Algorithm 3, and against a nonlinear MPC controller utilizing the nominal nonlinear model (18) for its dynamics and terminal state cost equal to the stage cost $\|\cdot\|_{Q_x}$. To improve the performance of the nonlinear MPC while maintaining a reasonable computational complexity, we increase its prediction horizon to $N = 15$. Both these alternatives fail to satisfy the constraints on almost every scenario, whereas our method does not violate any constraints for the unseen samples.

Figure 2 shows the averaged closed loop trajectories (solid line) and the range spanned by 1000 trajectories (shaded) of the linear position and velocity over time for the nominal MPC θ^* and the tuned MPC $\tilde{\theta}^*$. Note how the nominal MPC (in orange) is more aggressive in the earlier time-steps and therefore fails to guarantee constraint satisfaction under disturbances. The tuned MPC, on the other hand, manages to reduce the speed of the cart just enough to ensure safety.

	Average cost	Violation		
		Ratio	Total	Relative
MPC($\cdot, \tilde{\theta}^*$)	283.590	0%	0	0
MPC(\cdot, θ^*)	282.536	100%	0.392	2.18%
MPC of [19]	300.604	0%	0	0

Table II: Closed-loop cost and constraint violation, quadrotor

	Average cost	Total Violation
MPC($\cdot, \tilde{\theta}^*$)	215.645	0
Tube MPC of [20]	435.124	0

Table III: Closed-loop cost and constraint violation, linear

B. Quadrotor example

Next, we compare with the nonlinear tube MPC of [19], which we were not able to use in Subsection V-A as the LMI (44) in [19], necessary to obtain the shape of the tubes, was infeasible. When simulating our scheme, we consider the system dynamics and constraints of [19], with the difference that the constraint on pitch and roll are tightened to $|\phi_i| \leq \pi/6$. We consider a larger additive noise $\|w\|^2 \leq 2$ and uncertainty on n_0 and d_0 spanning the $\pm 20\%$ range. When simulating the robust MPC of [19], however, we reduced the uncertainty to the range $\pm 11.5\%$ and removed the noise, as this was required to ensure the feasibility of the scheme.

The simulation results on 1000 unseen samples are shown in Table II. Note that, despite operating with no noise and less uncertainty, the scheme in [19] performs 6% worse than our scheme, whereas both satisfied the constraints on all samples. Note that the performance of the nominal scheme θ^* is not much different from that of the robust scheme $\tilde{\theta}^*$, indicating that this problem may not be particularly challenging, even after increasing the uncertainty range, the noise magnitude, and reducing the constraints from [19]. In this case, the P2L algorithm here terminated with $|\mathcal{T}^*| = 2$, guaranteeing with confidence $1 - 10^{-6}$ that $V_S(\tilde{\theta}^*) \leq 0.034$.

C. Linear example

We further compare our method to the Tube MPC of [20] on the linear system of [20]. In this setting, the model is known, but subject to additive noise. Following [20], we use $N = 15$ for the tube MPC, but chose a shorter horizon $N = 5$ for our scheme to better highlight its superior performance. By utilizing the same procedure described in Section V-A, we draw 500 samples to construct \mathcal{S} and obtain $V_S(\tilde{\theta}^*) \leq 0.063$ with confidence $1 - 10^{-6}$ ($|\mathcal{T}^*| = 2$). The results (obtained by simulating with 1000 unseen samples) are reported in Table III. Note that we achieve a 50% closed-loop performance improvement without ever violating the constraints, highlighting the utility of the proposed framework in reducing conservatism.

VI. CONCLUSION

We proposed a principled way to design the cost and the constraint tightenings of an MPC scheme to improve good closed-loop performance and constraint satisfaction under noise and uncertainty on nonlinear systems. We used the

scenario approach to provide a probabilistic bound on the closed-loop constraint violation. The resulting MPC problem is a QP that be solved efficiently with specialized software. Future work will focus on developing a design strategy where the constraint violation chance is user-defined.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Q. Mayne, E. C. Kerrigan, E. Van Wyk, and P. Falugi, "Tube-based robust nonlinear model predictive control," *International journal of robust and nonlinear control*, vol. 21, no. 11, pp. 1341–1353, 2011.
- [2] L. Chisci, J. A. Rossiter, and G. Zappa, "Systems with persistent disturbances: predictive control with restricted constraints," *Automatica*, vol. 37, no. 7, pp. 1019–1028, 2001.
- [3] J. Fleming, B. Kouvaritakis, and M. Cannon, "Robust tube mpc for linear systems with multiplicative uncertainty," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 60, no. 4, pp. 1087–1092, 2014.
- [4] M. Bujarbaruah, X. Zhang, M. Tanaskovic, and F. Borrelli, "Adaptive mpc under time varying uncertainty: Robust and stochastic," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.13473*, 2019.
- [5] 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*, vol. 66, no. 2, pp. 794–801, 2020.
- [6] I. M. Ross, Q. Gong, M. Karpenko, and R. Proulx, "Scaling and balancing for high-performance computation of optimal controls," *Journal of Guidance, Control, and Dynamics*, vol. 41, no. 10, pp. 2086–2097, 2018.
- [7] G. C. Calafiore and M. C. Campi, "The scenario approach to robust control design," *IEEE Transactions on automatic control*, vol. 51, no. 5, pp. 742–753, 2006.
- [8] G. C. Calafiore and L. Fagiano, "Robust model predictive control via scenario optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 219–224, 2012.
- [9] G. Schildbach, L. Fagiano, C. Frei, and M. Morari, "The scenario approach for stochastic model predictive control with bounds on closed-loop constraint violations," *Automatica*, vol. 50, no. 12, pp. 3009–3018, 2014.
- [10] F. Micheli and J. Lygeros, "Scenario-based stochastic mpc for systems with uncertain dynamics," in *2022 European Control Conference (ECC)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 833–838.
- [11] R. Zuliani, E. C. Balta, and J. Lygeros, "BP-MPC: Optimizing Closed-Loop Performance of MPC using BackPropagation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.15521*, 2023.
- [12] J. V. Burke, "An exact penalization viewpoint of constrained optimization," *SIAM Journal on control and optimization*, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 968–998, 1991.
- [13] J. Bolte, T. Le, E. Pauwels, and T. Silveti-Falls, "Nonsmooth implicit differentiation for machine-learning and optimization," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 34, pp. 13 537–13 549, 2021.
- [14] M. Coste, *Introduction to α -minimal geometry*. Rennes, France: Institut de recherche mathématique de Rennes (IRMAR), 1999.
- [15] D. Davis, D. Drusvyatskiy, S. Kakade, and J. D. Lee, "Stochastic subgradient method converges on tame functions," *Foundations of computational mathematics*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 119–154, 2020.
- [16] D. Paccagnan, M. Campi, and S. Garatti, "The pick-to-learn algorithm: Empowering compression for tight generalization bounds and improved post-training performance," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, 2024.
- [17] M. C. Campi, S. Garatti, and F. A. Ramponi, "A general scenario theory for nonconvex optimization and decision making," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 63, no. 12, pp. 4067–4078, 2018.
- [18] K. Guemghar, B. Srinivasan, P. Mullhaupt, and D. Bonvin, "Predictive control of fast unstable and nonminimum-phase nonlinear systems," in *Proceedings of the 2002 American Control Conference*, vol. 6. IEEE, 2002, pp. 4764–4769.
- [19] J. Köhler, R. Soloperto, M. A. Müller, and F. Allgöwer, "A computationally efficient robust model predictive control framework for uncertain nonlinear systems—extended version," *arXiv e-prints*, pp. arXiv–1910, 2019.
- [20] D. Q. Mayne, M. M. Seron, and S. Raković, "Robust model predictive control of constrained linear systems with bounded disturbances," *Automatica*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 219–224, 2005.