

Robust tube-based model predictive control with Koopman operators

Zhang, Xinglong; Pan, Wei; Scattolini, Riccardo; Yu, Shuyou; Xu, Xin

DOI

[10.1016/j.automatica.2021.110114](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.automatica.2021.110114)

Publication date

2022

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Automatica

Citation (APA)

Zhang, X., Pan, W., Scattolini, R., Yu, S., & Xu, X. (2022). Robust tube-based model predictive control with Koopman operators. *Automatica*, 137, Article 110114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.automatica.2021.110114>

Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).
Please check the document version above.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights.
We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Green Open Access added to TU Delft Institutional Repository

'You share, we take care!' - Taverne project

<https://www.openaccess.nl/en/you-share-we-take-care>

Otherwise as indicated in the copyright section: the publisher is the copyright holder of this work and the author uses the Dutch legislation to make this work public.



Brief paper

Robust tube-based model predictive control with Koopman operators[☆]Xinglong Zhang^a, Wei Pan^b, Riccardo Scattolini^c, Shuyou Yu^d, Xin Xu^{a,*}^a College of Intelligence Science and Technology, National University of Defense Technology, Changsha 410073, China^b Department of Cognitive Robotics, Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands^c Dipartimento di Eletttronica, Informazione e Bioingegneria, Politecnico di Milano, Milan 20133, Italy^d Department of Control Science and Engineering, Jilin University at NanLing, Changchun 130025, China

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 11 April 2021

Received in revised form 3 September 2021

Accepted 3 November 2021

Available online 7 January 2022

Keywords:

Model predictive control

Koopman operators

Nonlinear systems

Robustness

Convergence

ABSTRACT

Koopman operators are of infinite dimension and capture the characteristics of nonlinear dynamics in a lifted global linear manner. The finite data-driven approximation of Koopman operators results in a class of linear predictors, useful for formulating linear model predictive control (MPC) of nonlinear dynamical systems with reduced computational complexity. However, the robustness of the closed-loop Koopman MPC under modeling approximation errors and possible exogenous disturbances is still a crucial issue to be resolved. Aiming at the above problem, this paper presents a robust tube-based MPC solution with Koopman operators, i.e., r-KMPC, for nonlinear discrete-time dynamical systems with additive disturbances. The proposed controller is composed of a nominal MPC using a lifted Koopman model and an off-line nonlinear feedback policy. The proposed approach does not assume the convergence of the approximated Koopman operator, which allows using a Koopman model with a limited order for controller design. Fundamental properties, e.g., stabilizability, observability, of the Koopman model are derived under standard assumptions with which, the closed-loop robustness and nominal point-wise convergence are proven. Simulated examples are illustrated to verify the effectiveness of the proposed approach.

© 2021 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Model predictive control (MPC), is employed as an effective control tool for control of numerous applications, such as robotics and industrial plants, see Mayne, Rawlings, Rao, and Sokaert (2000) and Qin and Badgwell (2003). In MPC, a prediction model is typically required, with which many MPC algorithms can be formulated, e.g., stabilizing MPC for nominal models in Rawlings and Mayne (2009) and the references therein, and robust MPC such as min-max MPC in Bemporad, Borrelli, and Morari (2003) or tube-based MPC in Mayne, Seron, and Raković (2005) and Mayne, Kerrigan, Van Wyk, and Falugi (2011) for systems under model uncertainties and disturbances. Focusing on building well-performed prediction models, designing MPC using data-driven

models has been noted as a promising direction. Many works on this aspect have been developed, see Piga, Formentin, and Bemporad (2017), Carron et al. (2019), Terzi, Fagiano, Farina, and Scattolini (2019), Peitz, Otto, and Rowley (2020), Bujarbaruah, Zhang, Tanaskovic, and Borrelli (2019) and Köhler, Andina, Soloperto, Müller, and Allgöwer (2019) and the references therein. Among them, a unitary learning-based predictive controller for linear systems was addressed in Terzi et al. (2019), where set membership was adopted to estimate a multi-step linear prediction model to be used for designing a robust MPC. Similarly, resorting to the set membership identification, adaptive MPC algorithms for uncertain time-varying systems were proposed in Lorenzen, Allgöwer, and Cannon (2017) and Fagiano, Schildbach, Tanaskovic, and Morari (2015) for reducing the conservativity caused by robust MPC. Relying on the main idea from iterative learning control, a data-driven learning MPC for repetitive tasks was studied in Rosolia and Borrelli (2017) with terminal constraints updated iteratively. In these approaches, a linear robust (or stabilizing) MPC problem is to be solved online since the considered model is linear.

In the control of nonlinear systems, the derivation of a nonlinear prediction model could be a nontrivial task. In Limon, Calliess, and Maciejowski (2017), a nonlinear MPC algorithm using a machine learning-based model estimation was proposed

[☆] The work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 61825305, 62003361, and the National Key R&D Program of China 2018YFB1305105. W. Pan acknowledged the support from HUAWEI. The material in this paper was not presented at any conference. This paper was recommended for publication in revised form by Associate Editor Martin Monnigmann under the direction of Editor Ian R. Petersen.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: zhangxinglong18@nudt.edu.cn (X. Zhang), wei.pan@tudelft.nl (W. Pan), riccardo.scattolini@polimi.it (R. Scattolini), shuyou@jlu.edu.cn (S. Yu), xinxu@nudt.edu.cn (X. Xu).

with stability property guarantees. However, nonlinear MPC results in nonlinear, even nonconvex, optimization problems, which can be computationally intensive for systems with high nonlinearity. To reduce the computational load, a supervised machine learning algorithm was used to approximate the nonlinear MPC law in Hertneck, Köhler, Trimpe, and Allgöwer (2018). The robustness was guaranteed under bounded control approximation errors with verified statistic empirical risk.

In another line, Koopman operators have been noted to be effective to represent the internal dynamics of nonlinear systems (Arbabi, Korda, & Mezić, 2018; Korda & Mezić, 2018b). Specifically, the Koopman operator is typically with infinite dimension, capturing the nonlinear dynamical characteristics through a linear dynamic evolution on a lifted observable function of states. In Korda and Mezić (2018a), a finite-dimensional truncation of the Koopman operator was used to form a linear predictor of nonlinear dynamics for designing a linear MPC. This approach paves the way to linear MPC formulations of nonlinear systems with a linear predictor that represents a wide operation range. Among the most related works, the extension to an MPC algorithm using the integrated Koopman operator was addressed in Peitz et al. (2020), and MPC methods using a deep learning-based Koopman model were developed in Lian, Wang, and Jones (2021) and Han, Hao, and Vaidya (2020). The application of Koopman MPC to flow control was addressed in Arbabi et al. (2018). In Narasingam and Kwon (2020), a Lyapunov-based Koopman MPC was developed for the feedback stabilization of nonlinear systems.

Note that, the presence of modeling errors is almost inevitable in lifted Koopman models, due to the data-driven finite-dimensional approximation of Koopman operators and exogenous disturbances, see Korda and Mezić (2018a) and Williams, Kevrekidis, and Rowley (2015). An interesting offset-free Koopman MPC extension of Narasingam and Kwon (2020) was presented in Son, Narasingam, and Kwon (2020) for handling model-mismatch with an estimator. However, the satisfaction of hard state constraints and closed-loop robustness under both non-negligible approximating errors and unknown additive disturbances are crucial concerns, which were not addressed in the previous Koopman-based MPC (Korda & Mezić, 2018a; Lian et al., 2021; Narasingam & Kwon, 2020; Peitz et al., 2020; Son et al., 2020). This motivated our research work.

In this paper, we present a robust MPC solution with Koopman operators in the framework of tube-based MPC (Mayne et al., 2011, 2005). The contributions are twofold. The first contribution is a linear robust Koopman-based MPC design methodology for nonlinear systems with unknown dynamics and additive disturbances. As opposed to the classic tube-based MPC (Mayne et al., 2011, 2005), our approach allows designing robust MPC from measured data, and no explicit model information is required; also, our approach results in a nonlinear MPC law by a linear robust MPC design. The second contribution is the analysis of the closed-loop theoretical guarantees for Koopman-based MPC under modeling errors and additive disturbances. This is achieved via imposing standard prior conditions on the lifting observable functions, allowing for using a truncated Koopman model with a limited system order in the controller design.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the considered control problem and preliminary solutions. In Section 2 the main idea of the proposed r-KMPC and the associated theoretical results are obtained. Section 4 shows the simulation results obtained by applying the proposed approach to nontrivial simulated systems, while some conclusions are drawn in Section 5. The ingredients for estimating the uncertainty terms are given in Appendix.

Notation: We denote $\mathbb{N}$ as the set of positive natural numbers and $\mathbb{N}_l^l$ as the numbers $1, \dots, l$. Given the variable r , we use $\mathbf{r}_{k:k+N}$

to denote the sequence $r_k \dots r_{k+N}$ and $\mathbf{r}_k$ to denote $\mathbf{r}_{k:k+N}$ after its first appearance, where k is the discrete time index and N is a positive integer. For a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we use $\|x\|_Q^2$ to stand for $x^\top Q x$, $\|x\|$ to denote its Euclidean norm; while for a matrix $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, we denote $\|x\|_F$ as the Frobenius norm. Given two sets $\mathcal{Z}$ and $\mathcal{V}$, their Minkowski sum is represented by $\mathcal{Z} \oplus \mathcal{V} = \{z + v | z \in \mathcal{Z}, v \in \mathcal{V}\}$. For a given set of variables $z_i \in \mathbb{R}^{q_i}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, M$, we define the vector whose vector-components are z_i in the following compact form: $(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_M) = [z_1^\top z_2^\top \dots z_M^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^q$, where $q = \sum_{i=1}^M q_i$.

2. Control problem and preliminaries

2.1. Control problem

Consider a class of nonlinear discrete-time systems with additive disturbances described by

$$x^+ = f(x, u) + w_o, \quad (1)$$

where $x \in \mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $u \in \mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ are the state and control variables, x^+ is the successor state at the next discrete-time instant, $w_o \in \mathcal{W}_o$ is an additive bounded noise which can be unknown and not measurable, $\mathcal{W}_o$ is a compact set containing the origin, $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{U}$ are convex sets containing the origin in their interiors, f is the state transition function which can be partially or completely unknown. It is assumed that $f(0, 0) = 0$, $f(x, u)$ is C^∞ on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{U}$, and $\|f(x, u)\| < +\infty$ for all $x \times u \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{U}$. The state x is measurable.

Starting from any initial condition $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$, the control objective is to minimize a quadratic cost of type $J = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \|x_k\|_Q^2 + \|u_k\|_R^2$, where $Q = Q^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $R = R^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, $Q, R \succ 0$.

Definition 1 (Local Stabilizability (Bacciotti, 1988)). Model $x_{k+1} = f(x_k, u_k)$ is stabilizable on the domain $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{U}$ if, for any $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$, there exists a feedback function $u(x_k) \in \mathcal{U}$, $u(0) = 0$, such that state x_k of the corresponding closed-loop system asymptotically converges to the origin.

Definition 2 (Generalized Gradient (Clarke, 1975)). The generalized gradient of a Lipschitzian function $h(x) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$ at x , denoted as $\nabla h(x)$, is the convex hull of all matrices of the form $M = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \nabla h(x + \delta x_i)$, where $\delta x_i \rightarrow 0$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$.

Definition 3 (Maximal Rank (Clarke, 1976)). The generalized gradient $\nabla h(x)$ is of maximal rank, if for every $M \in \nabla h(x)$, $\text{rank}(M) = \min\{n, q\}$.

2.2. Preliminary Koopman MPC

We first review the Koopman operator theory for autonomous dynamical systems and its extension to dynamical systems with controls.

Let us introduce the so-called observable of x defined by a scalar-valued function $\phi(x) : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ and denote $\mathcal{F}$ as a given space of observables. For an autonomous model $x^+ = f(x, 0)$, i.e. model (1) with $u, w_o = 0$, the Koopman operator $\mathcal{K} : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ is defined by Arbabi et al. (2018) and Korda and Mezić (2018b)

$$\mathcal{K}\phi(x) = \phi(x) \circ f(x, 0), \quad (2)$$

for every observable $\phi(x) \in \mathcal{F}$ ($\mathcal{F}$ is invariant under the action of the Koopman operator), $\circ$ is the composition operator, i.e., $\mathcal{K}\phi(x) = \phi(f(x, 0))$. For any discrete-time instant $k \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds that

$$\phi(x_k) = \mathcal{K}\phi(x_{k-1}) = \dots = \mathcal{K}^k \phi(x_0),$$

which captures the dynamical characteristics of the original nonlinear dynamics. For a detailed introduction of the Koopman operator please refer to [Klus, Nüske, and Hamzi \(2020\)](#), [Klus, Nüske, Peitz, et al. \(2020\)](#) and [Korda and Mezić \(2018b\)](#).

The Koopman operator for $x^+ = f(x, 0)$ can be generalized to systems with controls (i.e. model (1)) in several ways, see e.g. [Williams, Hemati, Dawson, Kevrekidis, and Rowley \(2016\)](#), [Proctor, Brunton, and Kutz \(2018\)](#) and [Korda and Mezić \(2018a\)](#). In our study, we adopt the practical and rigorous scheme in [Korda and Mezić \(2018a\)](#), which relies upon an extended state space $\mathcal{X} \times \ell(\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{W}_0)$, where $\ell(\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{W}_0)$ is the space of all the sequences composed of the control and disturbance, i.e. $\mathbf{u}_w := \{u_w(i)\}_{i=0}^\infty$ with $u_w(i) = (u(i), w_o(i)) \in \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{W}_0$. Letting $f_w(x, u_w) := f(x, u) + w_o$ and $\mathbf{u}_w(i)$ be the i th element of $\mathbf{u}_w$, one can write the dynamics of the extended state $\chi = (x, \mathbf{u}_w)$ as

$$\chi^+ = F(\chi) := (f_w(x, \mathbf{u}_w(0)), \Gamma \mathbf{u}_w), \quad (3)$$

where Γ is a left shift operator such that $\mathbf{u}_w(i+1) = \Gamma \mathbf{u}_w(i)$. In this way, the Koopman operator $\mathcal{K} : \mathcal{F}_e \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_e$ associated with (3) is given by [Korda and Mezić \(2018a\)](#)

$$\mathcal{K}\phi(\chi) = \phi(\chi) \circ F(\chi) \quad (4)$$

where $\phi(\chi) : \mathcal{X} \times \ell(\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{W}_0) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ belongs to the extended observable space $\mathcal{F}_e$, which contains observable functions on arguments x and $\mathbf{u}_w$.

A finite-dimensional numerical approximation of $\mathcal{K}$ in (4) is of interest for controller design, which can be computed by resorting to the extended dynamic mode decomposition (EDMD) method in a data-driven manner, see [Korda and Mezić \(2018a\)](#). Let a finite-dimensional approximation of $\mathcal{K}$ be $\mathcal{K}_{N_\phi} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_\phi \times N_\phi}$, associated with an observable vector $\Phi(\chi) = (\phi_1(\chi), \dots, \phi_{N_\phi}(\chi))$. The goal in EDMD is to compute $\mathcal{K}_{N_\phi}$ via minimizing $\|\Phi(\chi^+) - \mathcal{K}_{N_\phi} \Phi(\chi)\|^2$. Note however that $\chi = (x, \mathbf{u}_w)$ is of infinite-dimension, which can be problematic from the computational viewpoint. Hence, we choose a computable observable function as

$$\Phi(x, \mathbf{u}_w) = (\Psi(x), \mathbf{u}_w(0)), \quad (5)$$

where $N_\phi = n_\psi + m + n$, $n_\psi > n$,

$$\Psi(x) := (\psi_1(x), \dots, \psi_{n_\psi}(x)),$$

and $\psi_i, i \in \mathbb{N}_1^{n_\psi}$, can be chosen as some basis functions or neural networks ([Lian et al., 2021](#)).

To compute $\mathcal{K}_{N_\phi}$ with EDMD, let us assume to have collected M input-state datasets $\{(u_i, \hat{w}_{o,i}, x_i, x_i^+)\}_{i=1}^M$ satisfying $x_i^+ = f(x_i, u_i) + w_{o,i}$, where $\hat{w}_{o,i}$ is the estimation of $w_{o,i}$ which can be computed by resorting to a nonlinear estimation technique or a Koopman operator-based estimator ([Surana & Banaszuk, 2016](#)).

The following condition is assumed to hold ([Klus, Nüske, & Hamzi, 2020](#); [Klus, Nüske, Peitz, et al., 2020](#); [Korda & Mezić, 2018b](#)).

Assumption 1. The data points $\{(u_i, x_i)\}_{i=1}^M$ are drawn independently according to a non-negative probability distribution μ .

This condition can also be replaced with the assumption that $\{(u_i, x_i)\}_{i=1}^M$ are ergodic in $\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{X}$ with respect to μ , which can be generated by integrating a stochastic dynamics, see [Korda and Mezić \(2018b\)](#) and [Klus, Nüske, and Hamzi \(2020\)](#).

Let the first n_ψ rows of $\mathcal{K}_{N_\phi}$ be $[\mathcal{K}_{N_\phi}]_{1:n_\psi} = [ABD] \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\psi \times n_\phi}$, where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\psi \times n_\psi}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\psi \times m}$, and $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\psi \times n}$. Since we are only interested in predicting $\Psi(x^+)$ with $\Psi(x)$ and the estimation of $\mathbf{u}_w(0)$ (due to $\hat{w}_o$), the following regularized least squares problem can be stated:

$$\min_{[\mathcal{K}_{N_\phi}]_{1:n_\psi}} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^M \left\| [\mathcal{K}_{N_\phi}]_{1:n_\psi} (\Psi(x_i), \hat{w}_{o,i}) - \Psi(x_i^+) \right\|^2 + \alpha \left\| [\mathcal{K}_{N_\phi}]_{1:n_\psi} \right\|_F^2 \right\} =: V_{\mathcal{K}} \quad (6)$$

where $\hat{w}_{o,i} = (u_i, \hat{w}_{o,i})$, $\alpha > 0$ is a tuning parameter on the Frobenius norm regularization of $[\mathcal{K}_{N_\phi}]_{1:n_\psi}$. To recover x using $\Psi(x)$, a linear matrix $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n_\psi}$ is optimized according to the following problem ([Folkestad et al., 2020](#); [Korda & Mezić, 2018a](#); [Williams et al., 2015](#)):

$$\min_C \sum_{i=1}^M \|C\Psi(x_i) - x_i\|^2 + \beta \|C\|_F^2, \quad (7)$$

where $\beta > 0$ is a tuning parameter. By solving (6) and (7), a linear Koopman predictor of (1) can be obtained, i.e.,

$$\begin{cases} \hat{s}^+ = A\hat{s} + B\hat{u} \\ \hat{x} = C\hat{s}. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

Note that, in (8), a new (abstract) variable $\hat{s}$ serves as the state due to the lifted observable construction, while the predicted value of the original state, i.e., $\hat{x}$, becomes the output variable through the mapping matrix C from the observable space.

With (8), a linear Koopman MPC (KMPC) problem similar to [Korda and Mezić \(2018a\)](#) can be stated as follows:

$$\min_{\mathbf{u}_{k:k+N-1}} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} (\|\hat{x}_{k+i}\|_Q^2 + \|u_{k+i}\|_R^2) + \|\hat{x}_{k+N}\|_{Q_N}^2 \quad (9)$$

subject to model (8) with $\hat{s}_k = \Psi(x_k)$, state constraint $C\hat{s}_{k+i} \in \mathcal{X}$, $\forall i \in \mathbb{N}_1^N$, and control constraint $u_{k+i} = \hat{u}_{k+i} \in \mathcal{U}$, $\forall i \in \mathbb{N}_0^{N-1}$, where $Q_N = Q_N^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $Q_N > 0$.

Because of the characteristics of Koopman operators, a merit of KMPC lies in the linear property of the built model (8), leading to a linear MPC problem instead of a nonlinear one. However, the derivation of (8) with (5) by (6) and (7) could bring modeling errors, see [Korda and Mezić \(2018a\)](#), [Folkestad et al. \(2020\)](#) and [Williams et al. \(2015\)](#), whose property and possible (negative) influences on the closed-loop control performance is not yet analyzed. As a consequence, the closed-loop property under modeling errors and additive disturbances remains still a crucial issue, which was not addressed in the prescribed Koopman-based MPC ([Korda & Mezić, 2018a](#); [Lian et al., 2021](#); [Narasimam & Kwon, 2020](#); [Peitz et al., 2020](#); [Son et al., 2020](#)). Peculiarly, with KMPC in [Korda and Mezić \(2018a\)](#), the constraint satisfaction $x \in \mathcal{X}$ might not be fulfilled by $C\hat{s} \in \mathcal{X}$ and the closed-loop robustness of the Koopman MPC might not be verified under modeling errors and disturbances. Aiming at this problem, in the following section we propose a robust tube-based MPC using Koopman operators with theoretical guarantees.

3. Robust Koopman MPC

In this section, the proposed robust MPC solution using Koopman operators, i.e., r-KMPC, is presented. First, a Koopman model with approximation errors is derived and its stabilizability and observability properties are proven under standard assumptions. Then, the proposed r-KMPC algorithm using the Koopman model is presented. Finally, the closed-loop theoretical properties of r-KMPC are proven.

3.1. Koopman model for robust MPC

As described in [Korda and Mezić \(2018a\)](#), it is not guaranteed that $\mathcal{K}_{N_\phi}$ converges to $\mathcal{K}$ as $N_\phi, M \rightarrow +\infty$ even if w_o is measurable and $\{w_{o,i}\}_{i=1}^M$ are ergodic samples, because the adopted observable function (5) does not form an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{F}_e$. Hence, the presence of modeling errors of (8) with (5) is inevitable also due to the existence of estimation errors of w_o and to the practical design with $\alpha, \beta \neq 0$ in (6) and (7).

Nonetheless, as pointed out in [Otto and Rowley \(2021\)](#), the model structure like (8) is of interest from the control viewpoint because it could still be effective for approximating (1) in a large state space region; also, it permits a linear MPC implementation for nonlinear systems, leading to a computational load reduction compared with the approaches using complex bilinear models and switched models ([Peitz & Klus, 2019](#); [Peitz et al., 2020](#)). The consideration of using bilinear or switched models is left for further investigation.

To derive a robust Koopman MPC solution with (8), the fundamental boundedness property of the overall uncertainty caused by multiple sources is required. To this end, letting $s = \Psi(x)$, one can first write an equivalent Koopman model of (1) considering the effects of model uncertainties, that is

$$\begin{cases} s^+ = As + Bu + \bar{w}(s, u, w_o, \hat{w}_o) \\ x = Cs + v(s), \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

where $\bar{w} = D\hat{w}_o + w(s, u, w_o, \hat{w}_o) \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}$, $w(s, u, w_o, \hat{w}_o) \in \mathcal{W}$ and $v(s) \in \mathcal{V}$ are the modeling errors, where $\mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ are convex sets containing the origin; $\bar{\mathcal{W}} = D\hat{\mathcal{W}}_o \oplus \mathcal{W}$, $\hat{\mathcal{W}}_o$ is a computable convex set where $\hat{w}_o$ lies in. It is assumed that $\hat{\mathcal{W}}_o$ is bounded. A discussion on the boundedness property of sets $\bar{\mathcal{W}}$ (i.e., $\mathcal{W}$) and $\mathcal{V}$ is deferred to [Proposition 2](#). To this end, we first introduce the following assumption about $\Psi(x)$.

Assumption 2.

- (a) The lifted function $\Psi(x)$ is Lipschitz continuous.
- (b) $\{\psi_i(x)\}_{i=1}^{n_\psi}$ are linearly independent.

The verification of the above assumption is easy since many adopted basis functions (BF) such as Gaussian kernel functions, polyharmonic splines, and thinplate splines are in fact C^∞ and linearly independent.

Lemma 1 (Existence of Inverse Maps ([Clarke, 1976](#))). Letting S_Ψ be the set such that $S_\Psi = \{s \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\psi} | s = \Psi(x), x \in \mathcal{X}\}$, if $\nabla \Psi(x)$ is of maximal rank, i.e., $\text{rank}(\nabla \Psi(x)) = n$, there exists a Lipschitzian function $\Psi^{-1} : S_\Psi \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ such that $\Psi^{-1}(\Psi(x)) = x$ for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

In the following proposition, taking a special type of Gaussian kernels as an example of basis functions, we show indeed that multiple solutions of Ψ^{-1} can be found.

Proposition 1 (Multiple choices of Ψ^{-1}). Letting $\psi_i(x) = e^{-\|x - c_i\|^2}$, $c_i \in \mathcal{X}$, $i = 1, \dots, n_\psi$, a group of any $n + 1$ basis functions of $\Psi(x)$ can surely define a choice of Ψ^{-1} if and only if [Assumption 2.\(b\)](#) holds.

Proof. Since $\psi_i(x)$, $i \in \mathbb{N}_1^{n_\psi}$ are Gaussian kernels, the resulting Ψ is continuous differentiable. In this case the generalized gradient $\nabla \Psi(x)$ coincides with the exact gradient $\partial \Psi(x)$. For a generic $n \in \mathbb{N}$, select a group of any $n + 1$ basis functions such that $\|x - c_i\|^2 = -\log \psi_i(x)$, $\forall i \in \mathbb{N}_1^{n+1}$. Letting $\bar{\psi}(x) = (\psi_1(x), \dots, \psi_{n+1}(x))$, the corresponding gradient $\partial \bar{\psi}(x)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \partial \bar{\psi}(x) &= -2 \begin{bmatrix} \psi_1(x) \cdot (x - c_1) & \dots & \psi_{n+1}(x) \cdot (x - c_{n+1}) \end{bmatrix}^\top \\ &= -2 \text{diag}\{\bar{\psi}(x)\} \begin{bmatrix} (x - c_1) & \dots & (x - c_{n+1}) \end{bmatrix}^\top, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $\text{diag}\{\bar{\psi}(x)\} = \text{diag}\{\psi_1(x), \dots, \psi_{n+1}(x)\}$. As $\text{diag}\{\bar{\psi}(x)\}$ is full rank in view of the property of $\psi_i(x)$, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rank}(\partial \bar{\psi}(x)) &= \text{rank}\left(\begin{bmatrix} (x - c_1) & \dots & (x - c_{n+1}) \end{bmatrix}^\top\right) \\ &= n, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

if and only if $c_1, \dots, c_{n+1}$ are linearly independent, where the worst testing scenario is $x = c_i$, $i \in \mathbb{N}_1^{n+1}$. $\square$

Remark 1. [Proposition 1](#) implies that, with prescribed Gaussian kernels, one can find $\sum_{i=1}^{n_\psi} \frac{n_\psi!}{(n_\psi - i)!}$ combinations of basis functions (choices of Ψ^{-1}). In this peculiar case, determining x using multiple ψ_i 's, can be stated as a feasibility problem with multiple quadratic equality constraints, while its dual problem does not fulfill the Slater condition that ensures strong duality property, see [Boyd and Vandenberghe \(2004\)](#).

We recall that (cf. [Korda and Mezić \(2018a\)](#)), a straightforward and well-performed choice of $\Psi(x)$ can be of type $\Psi(x) = (x, \bar{\Psi}(x))$, i.e., with the original state x being included. With this choice, one can promptly find a candidate $\Psi^{-1}(s) = [I_n \ 0]$ such that $\Psi^{-1}(\Psi(x)) = x$.

Now, it is possible to state the boundedness property of sets $\bar{\mathcal{W}}$ (i.e., $\mathcal{W}$) and $\mathcal{V}$ in the following proposition.

Proposition 2. If $\Psi(x)$ is such that set S_Ψ is bounded, then $\bar{\mathcal{W}}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ are bounded.

Proof. To first prove $\bar{\mathcal{W}}$ is bounded, in view of (1) and (10) and recalling that $s = \Psi(x)$, one has that the modeling uncertainty is $w(s, u, w_o, \hat{w}_o) = \Psi(f(\Psi^{-1}(s), u) + w_o) - As - Bu - D\hat{w}_o$. Letting $\delta w = w_o - \hat{w}_o$, for all $s \in S_\Psi$, $u \in \mathcal{U}$, $\hat{w}_o \in \hat{\mathcal{W}}_o$, and $w_o \in \mathcal{W}_o$, it is convenient to write the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \|w(s, u, w_o, \hat{w}_o)\| &\leq L_s \|s\| + L_u \|u\| + L_{\delta w} \|\delta w_o\| + \\ &\quad L_{\hat{w}} \|\hat{w}_o\| < +\infty, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where L_s , L_u , $L_{\delta w}$, and $L_{\hat{w}}$ are bounded Lipschitz constants and the last inequality holds since $\mathcal{X}$, $\mathcal{U}$, $\hat{\mathcal{W}}_o$, and $\mathcal{W}_o$ are bounded. Hence, $\bar{\mathcal{W}}$ is bounded, leading to $\bar{\mathcal{W}}$ being bounded. As for $\mathcal{V}$, it follows from (10) that $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{X} \ominus CS_\Psi$, which is also bounded. $\square$

Indeed, the boundedness (instead of convergence) of $\bar{w}$ and v from [Proposition 2](#) is sufficient for theoretical guarantees of the proposed r-KMPC, which allows us to reduce the dimension of the approximated Koopman model in (10). It can also be observed through (13) that, the range of $\bar{w}$ (i.e., w) and v hinges upon the Lipschitz constants L_s , L_u , and $L_{\hat{w}}$. To further reduce the size of $\mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{V}$, it is convenient to minimize L_s , L_u , and $L_{\hat{w}}$ or their estimations in the modeling phase by modifying the optimization problem (6) as

$$\min_{[\mathcal{K}_{N_\phi}]_{1:n_\psi, L_s, L_u, L_{\hat{w}}}} V_K + \alpha_s L_s + \alpha_u L_u + \alpha_w L_{\hat{w}} \quad (14)$$

subject to $L_s, L_u, L_{\hat{w}} \geq 0$ and

$$\|Y_i - Y_j\| \leq L_s \|s_i - s_j\| + L_u \|u_i - u_j\| + L_{\hat{w}} \|\hat{w}_{o,i} - \hat{w}_{o,j}\|,$$

$i, j \in \mathbb{N}_1^M$, where $Y_i = [\mathcal{K}_{N_\phi}]_{1:n_\psi}(\Psi(x_i), \hat{u}_{w,i}) - \Psi(x_i^+)$, $\alpha_s, \alpha_u, \alpha_w > 0$ are tuning parameters.

In the case that $w_o = 0$, one also has $\hat{w}_o = 0$. Letting $s_r = \Psi(0)$ and $\bar{A} = [I - A^\top \ C^\top]^\top$, the triple $(u, s, x) = (0, s_r, 0)$ is an equilibrium of model (10) if and only if

$$(w(s_r, 0, 0, 0), v(s_r)) = \bar{A}s_r, \quad (15)$$

which results in a prior knowledge of w and v , since $s_r = \Psi(0)$ is available. In principle, it is convenient to define an MPC prediction model using (10) with $\bar{w}$ replaced by $w(s_r, 0, 0, 0)$. However, for the case that w_o is time-varying, the computation of $w(s_r, 0, 0, 0)$ can be nontrivial because $w_o, \hat{w}_o = 0$ might not be accessible or even exist. As a consequence, (10) with $\bar{w} = w(s_r, 0, 0, 0)$ is no longer suitable for prediction in the MPC algorithm. To solve this issue, we first introduce the following proposition.

Proposition 3 (Equilibrium). $(w(s_r, 0, 0, 0), v(s_r)) = 0$ if and only if

$$s_r \subseteq \text{Ker } \bar{A} \quad \text{or} \quad s_r = 0; \quad (16)$$

moreover, if the pair (A, C) is observable, condition (16) is reduced to

$$s_r = 0. \quad (17)$$

Proof. Condition (16) follows directly from (15) by linear algebra.

Remark 2. Condition (16) implies that two choices can be chosen for guaranteeing $(w(s_r, 0, 0, 0), v(s_r)) = 0$. A choice is to allow $s_r \neq 0$, i.e., to enforce $s_r \subseteq \text{Ker } \bar{A}$, which can be imposed by $s_r = As_r$ and $Cs_r = 0$. The derivation of the above condition requires to include in the optimization problem (6) the constraint $As_r = s_r$ and in (7) the constraint $Cs_r = 0$. The resulting problems can be solved since s_r , i.e., $\Psi(0)$ can be chosen a priori. Note however that the resulting model is not observable if there exist eigenvalues of A being 1, in view of the Popov–Belevitch–Hautus (PBH) test.

Also, provided that (A, C) is observable, (16) is equivalent to

$$Cs_r = CAs_r = \dots = CA^{n_\psi-1}s_r = 0 \quad (18)$$

since $s_r = As_r = A^2s_r, \dots$ from $s_r = As_r$, leading to the unique solution $s_r = 0$.

Hence, a simple and elegant way is to choose $s_r = 0$ for verifying (15) (see (17)), which allows to avoid the reformulation of problems (6) (or (14)), and (7). $\square$

We now give the following basic assumption.

Assumption 3. The lifted function is constructed such that $\psi(0) = 0$.

Remark 3. Assumption 3 can be easily verified since, for the lifted function being selected as $\Psi'(x) = (\psi'_1(x), \dots, \psi'_{n_\psi}(x))$ with $\Psi'(0) \neq 0$, a coordinate transformation can be used to define a new function $\Psi(x) = \Psi'(x) - \Psi'(0)$, leading to $\Psi(0) = 0$, consequently to verification of (15). Take the prescribed Gaussian kernels as an example. Let $\psi'_i(x) = e^{-\|x-c_i\|^2}$, $i \in \mathbb{N}_1^{n_\psi}$, then it holds that $\psi_i(x) = \psi'_i(x) - \psi'_i(0) = e^{-\|x-c_i\|^2} - e^{-\|0-c_i\|^2}$ with $\psi_i(0) = 0$. Hence the resulting $\Psi(x)$ satisfies $\Psi(0) = 0$. With this choice, Proposition 1 can still be verified because $\partial\psi(x)$ becomes $\partial\psi(x) = -2\text{diag}\{\psi'_1(x), \dots, \psi'_{n_\psi}(x)\}[(x-c_1) \dots (x-c_{n+1})]^T$, where $\psi'_i(x) = (\psi'_1(x), \dots, \psi'_{n_\psi}(x))$.

Proposition 4 (Local Stabilizability). Under Assumption 3, model (10) with $w_o = 0$ is stabilizable on the set $S_\psi \times \mathcal{U}$, if and only if $f(x, u)$ is stabilizable on the domain $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{U}$.

Proof. (i) Sufficient condition: as $f(x, u)$ is stabilizable on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{U}$, there exists a feedback law $u(x) \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $x = 0$ is asymptotically stable, under model $x^+ = f(x, u)$. In view of the fact that (10) with $w_o = 0$ is equivalent to $x^+ = f(x, u)$, it holds that $s = \Psi(x)$ converges to the origin asymptotically under $u(x)$, since x converges to the origin asymptotically and $\Psi(0) = 0$. Hence, model (10) is stabilizable on $S_\psi \times \mathcal{U}$.

(ii) Necessary condition: likewise, starting with the stabilizability of model (10) on $S_\psi \times \mathcal{U}$, one has s converging to the origin asymptotically under $u(x) \in \mathcal{U}$. The stabilizability of $f(x, u)$ on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{U}$ follows since $x = Cs + v(s) \rightarrow 0 + v(0) = 0$ asymptotically. $\square$

Remark 4. Proposition 4 implies that, in the unperturbed case, i.e., $w_o = 0$, there exists a control law such that the point-wise

convergence of the closed-loop evolution of s and x under (10) can be guaranteed, which is a fundamental hint for the result stated in Theorem 3 (deferred in Section 3.3).

In a class of MPC problems such as (9) where the penalization on the output is used in the cost function, the observability property could be a prior condition in deriving the closed-loop theoretical property. In the following, we also analyze the observability property of (10).

Definition 4 (Local Observability (Albertini & D'Alessandro, 1996)). System (10) under $w_o = 0$ is locally observable on S_ψ if, for each $s_{a,0}, s_{b,0} \in S_\psi$, the corresponding future states $x_{a,j} \in \mathcal{X}$, $x_{b,j} \in \mathcal{X}$, under the same control sequence, $u_0, \dots, u_j \in \mathcal{U}^{j+1}$, $j \geq 1$, are such that $x_{a,j} = x_{b,j}$ implies $s_{a,0} = s_{b,0}$.

Proposition 5 (Local Observability). System (10) is locally observable on S_ψ if

$$\frac{\partial \{f(x_j, u_j) \circ \dots \circ f(x_0, u_0)\}}{\partial x_0} = n, \quad (19a)$$

for each $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$, $u_i \in \mathcal{U}$, $\forall i \in \mathbb{N}_0^j$ satisfying $f(x_i, u_i) \in \mathcal{X}$, $\forall i \in \mathbb{N}_0^j$, and

$$\Psi(x_a) \neq \Psi(x_b), \forall x_a \neq x_b, x_a, x_b \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (19b)$$

Proof. In view of the argument in Albertini and D'Alessandro (1996), if condition (19a) is satisfied, it promptly holds that $x_{a,j} = x_{b,j}$ implies $x_{a,0} = x_{b,0}$. Also, $x_{a,0} = x_{b,0}$ implies $\Psi(x_{a,0}) = \Psi(x_{b,0})$ since (19b) holds. Finally, $x_{a,j} = x_{b,j}$ implies $s_{a,0} = s_{b,0}$ due to $s_{a,0} = \Psi(x_{a,0})$ and $s_{b,0} = \Psi(x_{b,0})$. Hence, in view of Definition 4, (10) under $w_o = 0$ is locally observable on S_ψ . $\square$

In view of Proposition 3 and Assumption 3, (8) becomes the nominal model of (10) and is used as the predictor in the online MPC deferred in Section 3.2. It is also observed that the pair $(\hat{u}, \hat{s}, \hat{x}) = (0, 0, 0)$ is an equilibrium of model (8).

Remark 5. One can conclude from Propositions 4 and 5 that (A, B) is stabilizable and (A, C) is observable, if the infimum of Lipschitz constants L_s, L_u , i.e., $\underline{L}_s, \underline{L}_u \rightarrow 0$ (which leads to $w, v \rightarrow 0$), since model (10) under $w_o = 0$ is equivalent to (8) in this peculiar case. If $\underline{L}_s, \underline{L}_u$ are nonzeros, Assumption 4 might not be directly derived using Propositions 4 and 5. For instance, consider a special Koopman model of type:

$$\begin{cases} s_{k+1} = \text{diag}\{1.01, 1\}s_k + [0 \ 1]^T u_k + w_k \\ x_k = [0 \ 1]s_k + v_k, \end{cases}$$

where $w = -0.02s$, $v = [0.01 \ 0]s$; which is stabilizable and observable. However, its nominal model is neither stabilizable nor observable.

Hence, we also require the following assumption about (8).

Assumption 4. The pair (A, B) is stabilizable and the pair (A, C) is observable.

Note that, once (6) and (7) are solved, one can verify the above assumption via calculating the stabilizability and observability matrices using the computed A, B , and C .

3.2. Robust Koopman MPC design

Inline with classic tube-based MPC, the proposed control action to Koopman model (10) relies on the feedback term of the state error correction:

$$u = \hat{u} + K(s - \hat{s}), \quad (20)$$

where K is a gain matrix such that $F = A + BK$ is Schur stable, $\hat{u}$ and $\hat{s}$ are decision variables computed with a standard MPC (deferred in (22)) with respect to (8).

Remark 6. Different from classic tube-based MPC for linear systems (Mayne et al., 2005), $\hat{u}$ and $K(\Psi(x) - \hat{s})$ in (20) are both nonlinear control laws on the original state x since $\hat{u}$ depends on $\hat{s}$ and $\hat{s}$ is related to $s = \Psi(x)$, see (25c).

From (10) and (20), the error $e_s := s - \hat{s}$ evolves according to the following unforced system (10):

$$\begin{cases} e_s^+ = Fe_s + \bar{w} \\ e_x = Ce_s + v, \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

where $e_x = x - \hat{x}$. Let $\mathcal{Z}_s$ be a robust positively invariant set of e_s such that $\mathcal{Z}_s \subseteq F\mathcal{Z}_s \oplus \bar{\mathcal{W}}$, then it holds that $e_x \in C\mathcal{Z}_s \oplus \mathcal{V} := \mathcal{Z}_x$.

Now we are ready to state the nominal MPC problem to compute $\hat{u}$ and $\hat{s}$ in (20). At any time instant k , the following online quadratic optimization problem is to be solved:

$$\min_{\hat{s}_k, \hat{u}_k} V(\hat{s}_k, \hat{u}_k) \quad (22)$$

where

$$V(\hat{s}_k, \hat{u}_k) = \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} (\|\hat{x}_{k+i}\|_Q^2 + \|\hat{u}_{k+i}\|_R^2) + V_f(\hat{s}_{k+N}), \quad (23)$$

and $\hat{s}_k, \hat{u}_k$ are the decision variables, $V_f(\hat{s})$ is the terminal cost with respect to the nominal lifted state $\hat{s}$ and it is chosen as $V_f(\hat{s}) = \hat{s}^T P \hat{s}$, where the symmetric positive-definite matrix P is the solution to the Lyapunov equation

$$F^T P F - P = -(\bar{Q} + K^T R K) \quad (24)$$

and $\bar{Q} = C^T Q C$.

The optimization problem (22) with (23) is performed subject to the following constraints:

- (1) The nominal Koopman model (8).
- (2) Tighter state and control constraints:

$$\hat{s}_{k+i} \in \mathcal{S}, \quad i = 0, \dots, N-1 \quad (25a)$$

$$\hat{u}_{k+i} \in \hat{\mathcal{U}}, \quad i = 0, \dots, N-1, \quad (25b)$$

where $\mathcal{S} = \{\hat{s} | C\hat{s} \in \mathcal{X} \ominus \mathcal{Z}_x\}$, $\hat{\mathcal{U}} = \mathcal{U} \ominus K\mathcal{Z}_s$.

- (3) The initial and terminal state constraints

$$s_k - \hat{s}_k \in \mathcal{Z}_s \quad (25c)$$

$$\hat{s}_{k+N} \in \mathcal{S}_f, \quad (25d)$$

where $\mathcal{S}_f$ is a positive invariant set of (8) under state and control constraints such that $(A + BK)\mathcal{S}_f \subseteq \mathcal{S}_f$.

Assume that, at any time instant k the optimal solution of $\hat{s}_k$ and $\hat{u}_k^*$ can be found and is denoted by $\hat{s}_{k|k}$ and $\hat{u}_{k|k}^*$, then the final control applied to system (1) is given as

$$u_k = \hat{u}_{k|k}^* + K(s_k - \hat{s}_{k|k}). \quad (26)$$

In summary, the pseudocode of the proposed r-KMPC is described in Algorithm 1.

3.3. Closed-loop property analysis

Assumption 5. The computed nominal control and lifted state constraints are non-empty and contain the origin in their interiors, i.e., $\{\mathbf{0}\} \subset \hat{\mathcal{U}}$, $\{\mathbf{0}\} \subset \mathcal{S}$.

Under Assumptions 1 and 2, to satisfy the above condition, one can choose a proper observable function $\Psi(x)$ and a proper number of samples M used in (6) and (7).

Algorithm 1 Pseudocode of r-KMPC

Off-line designs:

- 1) Select $\Psi(x)$ such that Assumption 2 is verified.
- 2) Compute A, B, C , and D with (6) (or (14)) and (7), and check that Assumption 4 is verified.
- 3) Calculate $\bar{\mathcal{W}}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ according to Algorithm 2 described in Appendix.
- 4) Compute K and P with (24) and calculate the robust positively invariant set $\mathcal{Z}_s, \mathcal{Z}_x$ with K .
- 5) Compute $\mathcal{S}, \hat{\mathcal{U}}$ and check that Assumption 5 is verified (see Section 3.3); calculate the terminal set $\mathcal{S}_f$ with K .

On-line procedures:

At each discrete-time step $k = 1, 2, \dots$

- 1) Measure x_k and set the lifted state $s_k = \Psi(x_k)$.
- 2) Solve (22) with (23) and obtain $\hat{u}_{k|k}^*, \hat{s}_{k|k}$.
- 3) Set u_k with (26) and apply it to the nonlinear system (1).

Theorem 1 (Recursive Feasibility). Under Assumptions 1–5, if the optimization problem (22) is feasible at the initial time $k = 0$, then it is recursively feasible at all times $k \in \mathbb{N}_1^\infty$, i.e., the recursive feasibility of r-KMPC is guaranteed.

Proof. Assume at any time instant k , an optimal decision sequence of (22) with (23), i.e., $\hat{s}_{k|k}, \hat{u}_{k|k}^*$, have been found associated with the optimal cost, denoted as V_k^* , such that the state and control constraints $\hat{s}_{k+i} \in \mathcal{S}, \hat{u}_{k+i} \in \hat{\mathcal{U}}, \forall i \in \mathbb{N}_0^{N-1}$, and the terminal constraint $\hat{s}_{k+N|k} \in \mathcal{S}_f$ is fulfilled. Hence, it holds that the real state and control constraints are verified, i.e., $x_{t|k} \in \mathcal{X}$ and $u_{t|k} \in \mathcal{U}$ for all $t \geq k$. At the next time instant $k+1$, choose $\hat{s}_{k+1|k+1} = \hat{s}_{k+1|k}, \hat{u}_{k+1}^* = \hat{u}_{k+1:k+N-1|k}^*, K\hat{s}_{k+N|k}$ as a candidate sub-optimal solution, under which it follows that $Cs_{k+1} + v_{k+1} \in \mathcal{X}, \hat{s}_{k+1|k} \in \mathcal{S}$, leading to $s_{k+1} - \hat{s}_{k+1|k} \in \mathcal{Z}_s, \hat{s}_{k+j|k+1} \in \mathcal{S}, \forall j \in \mathbb{N}_1^N$, through inheritance, and $\hat{s}_{k+N+1|k+1} \in \mathcal{S}_f$ in view of the definition of $\mathcal{S}_f$. Hence, (22) is feasible at time $k+1$ under $\hat{s}_{k+1|k}, \hat{u}_{k+1}^*$, associated with a sub-optimal cost V_{k+1}^s . The recursive feasibility of r-KMPC holds. $\square$

Under Theorem 1, one can state the following theoretical results.

Theorem 2 (Closed-loop Robustness). Under Assumptions 1–5, it holds that:

- (a) the lifted nominal system (8) using $\hat{s}_k, \hat{u}_k$ computed with (22) converges to the origin asymptotically, i.e., $\hat{s}_k, \hat{x}_k$, and $\hat{u}_k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$;
- (b) the state s and the control u of the closed-loop system (10) with (20) are such that $s_k \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_s$ and $u_k \rightarrow K\mathcal{Z}_s$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$; and $x_k \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_x$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$.

Proof. To prove the closed-loop robustness property, first note that the optimal cost V_k^* associated with the optimal solution $\hat{s}_{k|k}, \hat{u}_{k|k}^*$ (cf. Theorem 1), satisfies $V_k^* \geq \|\hat{x}_k\|_Q^2$ for all $\hat{x}_k \oplus \mathcal{Z}_x \in \mathcal{X}$. Also, iterating (24) leads to $V_k^* \leq \hat{s}_k^T P \hat{s}_k$ for $\hat{s}_k \in \mathcal{S}_f$. Considering the fact that $V_{k+1}^* \leq V_{k+1}^s$, where V_{k+1}^s is the sub-optimal cost associated with $\hat{s}_{k+1|k}, \hat{u}_{k+1}^*$ (cf. Theorem 1), and in view of (24), one has the monotonic property:

$$\begin{aligned} V_{k+1}^* - V_k^* &\leq -\|\hat{x}_k\|_Q^2 - \|\hat{u}_k\|_R^2 + \\ &\quad \|\hat{s}_{k+N}\|_{F^T P F - P + \bar{Q} + K^T R K}^2 \\ &= -\|\hat{x}_k\|_Q^2 - \|\hat{u}_k\|_R^2. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Then, from (27), $V_{k+1}^* - V_k^* \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. Consider also $V_k^* - V_{k+1}^* \geq \|\hat{x}_k\|_Q^2 + \|\hat{u}_k\|_R^2$, hence $\hat{u}_k \rightarrow 0, \hat{x}_k \rightarrow 0$, as $k \rightarrow +\infty$,

in view of the positive-definiteness of R and Q . Also, $\hat{s}_k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$ due to $\Psi(0) = 0$ in view of [Assumption 3](#). Moreover, recall that $x \in \hat{x} \oplus \mathcal{Z}_x$, $u \in \hat{u} \oplus K\mathcal{Z}_s$, and $s \in \hat{s} \oplus \mathcal{Z}_s$, it holds that, $x_k \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_x$ and $u_k \rightarrow K\mathcal{Z}_s$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$; and $s_k \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_s$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. $\square$

Remark 7. Note that, in the MPC problem (22) with (23), penalizing the lifted state, i.e., $\|\hat{s}\|_Q^2$ can be used instead, where $\tilde{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\psi \times n_\psi}$ is a positive-definite tuning matrix. Herewith the observability of (A, C) is not necessarily required in (24) since a solution surely exists for any $\tilde{Q}$ being positive-definite. In this case, in the proof argument of [Theorem 2](#), $\|\hat{x}\|_Q^2$ in (27) is replaced by $\|\hat{s}\|_{\tilde{Q}}^2$, which leads directly to the asymptotic stability of $\hat{s}$ and $\hat{x}$ since $\hat{x} = C\hat{s}$.

Moreover, under the result in [Theorem 2](#), point-wise asymptotic convergence of r-KMPC can be verified, under $w_o = 0$.

Theorem 3 (Point-wise Convergence). Under [Assumptions 1–5](#), if $w_o = 0$ and

$$E = (L_s I + L_u K^\top K) \left\| \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} F^k \right\| \text{ is Schur stable,} \quad (28)$$

then the closed-loop systems (10) with (20) and (1) with (20) converge to the origin asymptotically, i.e.,

$$x_k \rightarrow 0, \quad u_k \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{and} \quad s_k \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad k \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Proof. In view of [Theorem 2.\(a\)](#), assume that $\hat{u}$, $\hat{x}$, and $\hat{s}$ have converged asymptotically to the origin, i.e., $\hat{u} = 0$, $\hat{x} = 0$, and $\hat{s} = 0$. Also, u , x , and s have converged asymptotically to robust tubes, i.e., $x \in \mathcal{Z}_x$, $u \in K\mathcal{Z}_s$, and $s \in \mathcal{Z}_s$. From (21), one can write

$$\begin{cases} s_{k+1} = Fs_k + w_k \\ x_k = Cs_k + v_k, \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

where, in view of (13), the uncertainty w satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} \|w\| &= \|w(s, u, 0, 0)\| \\ &\leq L_s \|s\| + L_u \|u\| \\ &= L_s \|s\| + L_u \|\hat{u} + K(s - \hat{s})\| \\ &\leq \|s\|_{L_s I + L_u K^\top K} \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

and the last inequality is due to (20) and $\hat{u}, \hat{s} = 0$. Inline with [Farina, Zhang, and Scattolini \(2018\)](#), we write the evolution $s_{k+1} = Fs_k + w_k$ from (29) with two redundant interconnected systems, i.e.,

$$\begin{cases} s_1^+ = Fs_1 + w_2 \\ s_2^+ = Fs_2 + w_1, \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

where the initial condition $s_{1,0} = s_{2,0} = s_0$ and $w_{1,0} = w_{2,0} = w_0$. In view of the small gain theorem in [Farina et al. \(2018\)](#), the interconnected system converges to the origin asymptotically (31) if (28) holds (see also [Zhang, Pan, Scattolini, Yu, & Xu, 2021](#)). Hence, the state s converges to the origin asymptotically. Moreover, $x_k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$ since $x_k = Cs_k + v(s_k)$, $s_k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$, and $v(0) = 0$. Also, in view of (20), $u_k \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. $\square$

4. Simulation results

4.1. Regulation of a Van der Pol oscillator

Consider a Van der Pol oscillator ([Korda & Mezić, 2018a](#)), whose continuous-time model is

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{x}_1 \\ \dot{x}_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ -2x_2 + 10x_1^2 x_2 + 0.8x_1 + u \end{bmatrix} + w_o, \quad (32)$$




Fig. 1. The state and control tubes of the controlled Van der Pol oscillator under sinusoidal noise. In the left (right) panel, the real trajectory, marked with blue + (*), lies in the gray tube, i.e., $\mathcal{Z}_x (K\mathcal{Z}_s)$, centered at the nominal one, marked with black + (*).

Table 1

Cumulative cost comparison: “S” and “SW” stand for “sinusoidal” and “Step-wise” respectively.

Algorithm		r-KMPC KMPC (Korda & Mezić, 2018a)			
		$n_\psi = 4$	$n_\psi = 4$	$n_\psi = 12$	$n_\psi = 22$
Thinplate kernel	Nominal	258	431	401	360
	S-noise	270	449	418	374
	UDR-noise	248	413	403	371
	SW-noise	262	379	387	359
Cost J	Nominal	247	427	402	–
	S-noise	257	446	419	–
	UDR-noise	241	416	403	–
	SW-noise	253	416	410	–

where $x = (x_1, x_2)$ and u are the state and control respectively, $\|w_o\|_\infty \leq 0.4$. Peculiarly, a sinusoidal noise $w_o = 0.4 \sin(10\pi t)$ is initially adopted. The consideration on other types of disturbances are deferred in [Table 1](#). The state and control are limited as $-(2.5 \text{ m}, 2.5 \text{ m/s}) \leq x \leq (2.5 \text{ m}, 2.5 \text{ m/s})$, $-10 \text{ m}^2/\text{s} \leq u \leq 10 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$.

In order to implement r-KMPC, we first discretized model (32) to obtain model (1) with a suitable sampling period $T = 0.01$ s. We obtained the data-driven model using Koopman operators. The datasets of $(u, \hat{w}_o, x, x^+)$ in (6) with $M = 8 \cdot 10^5$ were collected with a uniformly distributed random (UDR) control policy. A thinplate BF was selected to construct the lifted observable function, i.e., $\Psi(x) = (x, \psi_1(x), \psi_2(x)) - (0, \psi_1(0), \psi_2(0))$, where $\psi_i(x) = \|x - c_i\|^2 \log(\|x - c_i\|)$, $i = 1, 2$, $n_\psi = 4$, $c_1 = (0.381, -0.341)$, $c_2 = (0.267, -0.889)$ were the kernel centers generated with UDR numbers. The parameters of the linear predictor were computed with (6) and (7).

The penalty matrices $\tilde{Q}$ and R were selected as $\tilde{Q} = \text{diag}\{1, 1, 0.1, 0.1\}$, $R = 0.1$. Matrix P was calculated with (24). The sets $\tilde{\mathcal{W}}, \mathcal{V}$ were obtained according to Algorithm 2, see [Appendix](#). The gain matrix K was computed via solving a linear quadratic problem. The robust invariant set was obtained with (21) and the terminal constraint $\mathcal{S}_f$ was computed according to [Rawlings and Mayne \(2009\)](#). The prediction horizon was chosen as $N = 10$.

The proposed r-KMPC algorithm was implemented with an initial condition $x_0 = (1.5, -1.5) \in \mathcal{X}$. The simulation tests were performed within Yalmip toolbox ([Löfberg, 2004](#)) installed in Matlab 2019a environment. The simulation results are reported in [Fig. 1](#), which show that the nominal lifted state $\hat{s}$ and control $\hat{u}$ converge to the origin; moreover, the real state trajectory x and the real control u remain in tubes centered at $\hat{x}$ and $\hat{u}$ respectively, i.e., $x \in \hat{x} \oplus \mathcal{Z}_s$ and $u \in \hat{u} \oplus K\mathcal{Z}_s$, which verifies the robustness of the closed-loop control system. Also, under no




Fig. 2. The state and control tubes of the controlled inverted pendulum under sinusoidal noise. In the left (right) panel, the real trajectory, marked with blue + (*), lies in the gray tube, i.e., $\mathcal{Z}_x(K\mathcal{Z}_s)$, centered at the nominal one, marked with black + (*).

external perturbation, the state and control of r-KMPC converge asymptotically to the origin, see Figure 3 in Zhang et al. (2021).

The KMPC algorithm in Korda and Mezić (2018a) is adopted for comparison. First, we have chosen the lifted function in KMPC as $\Psi(x)$ without the resetting procedure, i.e., $\Psi(0) \neq 0$. The resulting one-step prediction collective square error with 50000 different initial state conditions is 56.4, comparable with 55.9 obtained by using the resetting procedure. The resulting controller using KMPC does not yet converge with 400 steps, while the state and control of our approach converge to the origin (see Figure 3 in Zhang et al. (2021)). For a numerical comparison, the cumulative costs of both approaches, computed as $J = \sum_{k=1}^{400} \|x_k\|_Q^2 + \|u_k\|_R^2$, are collected in Table 1, which show that the proposed r-KMPC results in a lower cost consumption, compared with KMPC (Korda & Mezić, 2018a) even using a greater number of observable functions.

4.2. Angle regulation of an inverted pendulum

The continuous-time model of an inverted pendulum is

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{x}_1 \\ \dot{x}_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ 4g \sin(x_1) - 3u \cos(x_1) \end{bmatrix} + w_o, \quad (33)$$

where $x = (x_1, x_2)$ are the state variables that represent the angle and its rate respectively, while u is the control, $w_o = 2 \sin(10\pi t)$. The constraints to be enforced are $-(1 \text{ rad}, 2 \text{ rad/s}) \leq x \leq (1 \text{ rad}, 2 \text{ rad/s})$, $-20 \text{ m}^2/\text{s} \leq u \leq 20 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$.

Inline with Section 4.1, model (33) was discretized with $T = 0.005\text{s}$. The data samples were obtained with $M = 5 \cdot 10^4$ under a UDR control policy. A Gaussian kernel was selected to construct $\Psi(x)$, i.e., $\Psi(x) = (x, \psi_1(x), \psi_2(x), \psi_3(x)) - (\mathbf{0}, \psi_1(0), \psi_2(0), \psi_3(0))$, where $\psi_i(x) = e^{-\|x - c_i\|^2}$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, $n_\psi = 5$, $c_1 = (-0.644, -1.09)$, $c_2 = (-0.99, 0.76)$, and $c_3 = (-0.26, -1.48)$ were the kernel centers generated with UDR numbers. The penalty matrices $\bar{Q}$ and R were selected as $\bar{Q} = I_5$, $R = 0.1$. The prediction horizon was chosen as $N = 10$. The proposed r-KMPC was implemented with $x_0 = (0.2, 1)$. The obtained results by applying r-KMPC to (33) (see Fig. 2 and Figures 4–6 in Zhang et al. (2021)) verify the robustness of the closed-loop control system and the point-wise convergence of the nominal system. Under no external perturbation, the state and control of r-KMPC can converge asymptotically to the origin. Compared with KMPC (Korda & Mezić, 2018a), r-KMPC results in a lower cost consumption even using a smaller number of observable functions (see Table 2). For more details of simulation results and implementation aspects see Zhang et al. (2021).

We also verified the proposed approach for regulation of a nonlinear non-affine system (Ge, Hang, & Zhang, 1999). The

Table 2

Cumulative cost comparison: “S” and “SW” stand for “sinusoidal” and “Step-wise” respectively; “InvQuad” stands for “Inverse quadratic”.

Algorithm		r-KMPC KMPC (Korda & Mezić, 2018a)			
		$n_\psi = 5$	$n_\psi = 5$	$n_\psi = 15$	$n_\psi = 25$
Cost J	Nominal	175	434	228	203
	Gaussian kernel S-noise	333	695	407	367
	UDR-noise	191	570	235	189
	SW-noise	201	763	255	214
Cost J	Nominal	173	512	252	–
	InvQuad kernel S-noise	319	871	432	–
	UDR-noise	236	546	276	–
	SW-noise	248	484	261	–

continuous-time model of the adopted non-affine system is

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{x}_1 \\ \dot{x}_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_1^2 + 0.15u^3 + 0.1(1 + x_2^2)u + \sin(0.1u) \end{bmatrix} + w_o, \quad (34)$$

where $x = (x_1, x_2)$ are the state variables, u is the control, $w_o = \sin(10\pi t)$. The constraints to be enforced are $-(2.5, 2.5) \leq x \leq (2.5, 2.5)$, $-25 \leq u \leq 25$.

The obtained results by applying r-KMPC to (34) (see Figures 7–9 in Zhang et al. (2021)) illustrate that the robustness of the closed-loop control system and the point-wise convergence of the nominal system are verified. Under no external perturbation, the state and control of r-KMPC can converge asymptotically to the origin. For more details of simulation results and implementation aspects see Zhang et al. (2021).

5. Conclusions

In this paper, we proposed a robust tube-based model predictive control scheme, i.e., r-KMPC, for nonlinear systems with additive disturbances as well as state and control constraints. The proposed r-KMPC relies upon a lifted global linear model built using Koopman operators. The closed-loop robust controller is composed of a nonlinear control action computed by an online linear MPC using the nominal Koopman model and a nonlinear static state-feedback policy. The robustness of the closed-loop system was verified under internal modeling errors and exogenous disturbances. Moreover, the asymptotic stability of the controlled system under no exogenous disturbance was proven under mild assumptions. Simulation results verified the effectiveness of the proposed approach.

Appendix. Statistical validations of sets $\bar{\mathcal{W}}$ and $\mathcal{V}$

The derivation of $\bar{\mathcal{W}}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ relies upon a relaxed risk evaluation condition according to the law of large numbers (see also Hertneck et al., 2018) :

$$P\left(|\hat{G}(f_i) - G(f_i)| \geq \epsilon\right) \leq \delta_r \quad (A.1)$$

where $\delta_r := 2 \exp(-2L\epsilon^2)$, $\hat{G}(f_i)$ and $G(f_i)$ are the empirical and true risk respectively, f_i is the learned function, and L is the number of samples. For fixed f_i , $\delta_r \rightarrow 0$ as $L \rightarrow +\infty$.

Loss function for validation: Let L tuples $(u_i, \hat{w}_{o,i}, x_i, x_i^+)$ be generated under Assumption 1. Let $\bar{w}_i = \Psi(x_i^+) - \hat{s}_i^+$ where $\hat{s}_i^+$ is computed by (8) with $\hat{s} = \Psi(x_i)$ and $\hat{u} = u_i$ and let $v_i = x_i - C\Psi(x_i)$. We define the loss function as

$$\ell_\star(u_i, x_i, x_i^+) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } g_\star = 1 \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (A.2)$$

where $\star = \bar{w}, v$ in turns, $g_{\bar{w}_i} = 1$ stands for $\bar{w}_i \in \bar{\mathcal{W}}$ and $g_{v_i} = 1$ stands for $v_i \in \mathcal{V}$.

With (A.2), for any $\star = \bar{w}, v$, the empirical risk of the learned linear predictor is $\hat{G}_\star = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^L \ell_\star(u_i, x_i, x_i^+)$. In view of (A.1), $P_\star(\ell = 0) = G_\star \leq \hat{G}_\star + \epsilon_\star$. For the validation of uncertainty sets, we choose $\bar{G}_\star \geq G_\star$ and $\delta_r > 0$, then we check if for the L samples that Hertneck et al. (2018)

$$\bar{G}_\star \geq \hat{G}_\star + \epsilon_\star \quad (\text{A.3})$$

with a confidence level of $1 - \delta_r$, $\epsilon_\star = \sqrt{-\log(0.5\delta_r)/2L}$.

Algorithm 2 Computation of $\bar{\mathcal{W}}$ and $\mathcal{V}$

- 1) Set initial sets $\bar{\mathcal{W}}_l$ and $\mathcal{V}_l$;
 - 2) Set $\bar{G}_\star \geq G_\star$ and δ_r , we calculate $\hat{G}_\star$ with (A.2) and $\epsilon_\star = \sqrt{-\log(0.5\delta_r)/2L}$, for $\star = \bar{w}, v$;
 - if Condition (A.3) is satisfied for $\star = \bar{w}$ (or $\star = v$) then
 - 3) Return $\bar{\mathcal{W}}_l$ (or $\mathcal{V}_l$);
 - else
 - 4) Increase L or enlarge the size of $\bar{\mathcal{W}}_l$ (or $\mathcal{V}_l$);
 - 5) Go back to step 2);
 - end if
 - 6) Set $\bar{\mathcal{W}} = \gamma_w \bar{\mathcal{W}}_l$ and $\mathcal{V} = \gamma_v \mathcal{V}_l$ where $\gamma_w, \gamma_v > 1$.
-

The computation steps of $\bar{\mathcal{W}}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ are given in Algorithm 2. For a detailed description of the rationale behind the uncertainty scaling in step 6) of Algorithm 2 please see Zhang et al. (2021).

References

- Albertini, Francesca, & D'Alessandro, Domenico (1996). Remarks on the observability of nonlinear discrete time systems. In *System modelling and optimization* (pp. 155–162). Springer.
- Arbabi, Hassan, Korda, Milan, & Mezić, Igor (2018). A data-driven Koopman model predictive control framework for nonlinear flows. arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.05291.
- Bacciotti, Andrea (1988). The local stabilizability problem for nonlinear systems. *IMA Journal of Mathematical Control and Information*, 5(1), 27–39.
- Bemporad, Alberto, Borrelli, Francesco, & Morari, Manfred (2003). Min-max control of constrained uncertain discrete-time linear systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 48(9), 1600–1606.
- Boyd, Stephen, & Vandenberghe, Lieven (2004). *Convex optimization*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bujarbaruah, Monimoy, Zhang, Xiaojing, Tanaskovic, Marko, & Borrelli, Francesco (2019). Adaptive MPC under time varying uncertainty: Robust and stochastic. arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.13473.
- Carron, Andrea, Arcari, Elena, Wermelinger, Martin, Hewing, Lukas, Hutter, Marco, & Zeilinger, Melanie N. (2019). Data-driven model predictive control for trajectory tracking with a robotic arm. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 4(4), 3758–3765.
- Clarke, Frank H. (1975). Generalized gradients and applications. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 205, 247–262.
- Clarke, Francis (1976). On the inverse function theorem. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 64(1), 97–102.
- Fagiano, Lorenzo, Schildbach, Georg, Tanaskovic, Marko, & Morari, Manfred (2015). Scenario and adaptive model predictive control of uncertain systems. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 48(23), 352–359.
- Farina, Marcello, Zhang, Xinglong, & Scattolini, Riccardo (2018). A hierarchical multi-rate MPC scheme for interconnected systems. *Automatica*, 90, 38–46.
- Folkstad, Carl, Pastor, Daniel, Mezić, Igor, Mohr, Ryan, Fonoberova, Maria, & Burdick, Joel (2020). Extended dynamic mode decomposition with learned Koopman eigenfunctions for prediction and control. In *2020 American control conference* (pp. 3906–3913). IEEE.
- Ge, Shuzhi Sam, Hang, Chang Chieh, & Zhang, Tao (1999). Adaptive neural network control of nonlinear systems by state and output feedback. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics, Part B (Cybernetics)*, 29(6), 818–828.
- Han, Yiqiang, Hao, Wenjian, & Vaidya, Umesh (2020). Deep learning of Koopman representation for control. In *2020 59th IEEE conference on decision and control* (pp. 1890–1895). IEEE.
- Hertneck, Michael, Köhler, Johannes, Trimpe, Sebastian, & Allgöwer, Frank (2018). Learning an approximate model predictive controller with guarantees. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 2(3), 543–548.
- Klus, Stefan, Nüske, Feliks, & Hamzi, Boumediene (2020). Kernel-based approximation of the Koopman generator and Schrödinger operator. *Entropy*, 22(7), 722.
- Klus, Stefan, Nüske, Feliks, Peitz, Sebastian, Niemann, Jan-Hendrik, Clementi, Cecilia, & Schütte, Christof (2020). Data-driven approximation of the Koopman generator: Model reduction, system identification, and control. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 406, Article 132416.
- Köhler, Johannes, Andina, Elisa, Soloperto, Raffaele, Müller, Matthias A., & Allgöwer, Frank (2019). Linear robust adaptive model predictive control: Computational complexity and conservatism. In *2019 IEEE 58th conference on decision and control* (pp. 1383–1388). IEEE.
- Korda, Milan, & Mezić, Igor (2018a). Linear predictors for nonlinear dynamical systems: Koopman operator meets model predictive control. *Automatica*, 93, 149–160.
- Korda, Milan, & Mezić, Igor (2018b). On convergence of extended dynamic mode decomposition to the Koopman operator. *Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 28(2), 687–710.
- Lian, Yingzhao, Wang, Renzi, & Jones, Colin N. (2021). Koopman based data-driven predictive control. arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.05122.
- Limon, D., Calliess, J., & Maciejowski, Jan Marian (2017). Learning-based nonlinear model predictive control. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 50(1), 7769–7776.
- Löfberg, J. (2004). YALMIP: A toolbox for modeling and optimization in MATLAB. In *Proceedings of the CACSD conference*.
- Lorenzen, Matthias, Allgöwer, Frank, & Cannon, Mark (2017). Adaptive model predictive control with robust constraint satisfaction. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 50(1), 3313–3318.
- Mayne, David Q., Kerrigan, Erric C., Van Wyk, E. J., & Falugi, Paola (2011). Tube-based robust nonlinear model predictive control. *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, 21(11), 1341–1353.
- Mayne, David Q., Rawlings, James B., Rao, Christopher V., & Sckaert, Pierre O. M. (2000). Constrained model predictive control: Stability and optimality. *Automatica*, 36(6), 789–814.
- Mayne, David Q., Seron, María M., & Raković, S. V. (2005). Robust model predictive control of constrained linear systems with bounded disturbances. *Automatica*, 41(2), 219–224.
- Narasimhan, Abhinav, & Kwon, Joseph Sang-Il (2020). Data-driven feedback stabilization of nonlinear systems: Koopman-based model predictive control. arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.09741.
- Otto, Samuel E., & Rowley, Clarence W. (2021). Koopman operators for estimation and control of dynamical systems. *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, 4, 59–87.
- Peitz, Sebastian, & Klus, Stefan (2019). Koopman operator-based model reduction for switched-system control of PDEs. *Automatica*, 106, 184–191.
- Peitz, Sebastian, Otto, Samuel E., & Rowley, Clarence W. (2020). Data-driven model predictive control using interpolated Koopman generators. *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems*, 19(3), 2162–2193.
- Piga, Dario, Formentin, Simone, & Bemporad, Alberto (2017). Direct data-driven control of constrained systems. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, 26(4), 1422–1429.
- Proctor, Joshua L., Brunton, Steven L., & Kutz, J. Nathan (2018). Generalizing Koopman theory to allow for inputs and control. *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems*, 17(1), 909–930.
- Qin, S. Joe, & Badgwell, Thomas A. (2003). A survey of industrial model predictive control technology. *Control Engineering Practice*, 11(7), 733–764.
- Rawlings, James Blake, & Mayne, David Q. (2009). *Model predictive control: theory and design*. Nob Hill Pub.
- Rosolia, Ugo, & Borrelli, Francesco (2017). Learning model predictive control for iterative tasks: a data-driven control framework. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 63(7), 1883–1896.
- Son, Sang Hwan, Narasingam, Abhinav, & Kwon, Joseph Sang-Il (2020). Handling plant-model mismatch in Koopman Lyapunov-based model predictive control via offset-free control framework. arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.07239.
- Surana, Amit, & Banaszuk, Andrzej (2016). Linear observer synthesis for nonlinear systems using Koopman operator framework. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 49(18), 716–723.
- Terzi, Enrico, Fagiano, Lorenzo, Farina, Marcello, & Scattolini, Riccardo (2019). Learning-based predictive control for linear systems: A unitary approach. *Automatica*, 108, Article 108473.
- Williams, Matthew O., Hemati, Maziar S., Dawson, Scott T. M., Kevrekidis, Ioannis G., & Rowley, Clarence W. (2016). Extending data-driven Koopman analysis to actuated systems. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 49(18), 704–709.
- Williams, Matthew O., Kevrekidis, Ioannis G., & Rowley, Clarence W. (2015). A data-driven approximation of the Koopman operator: Extending dynamic mode decomposition. *Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 25(6), 1307–1346.
- Zhang, Xinglong, Pan, Wei, Scattolini, Riccardo, Yu, Shuyou, & Xu, Xin (2021). Robust tube-based model predictive control with Koopman operators—extended version. arXiv:2108.13011.



Xinglong Zhang was born in Anhui, China, in 1990. He received the Ph.D. degree in System and Control from the Politecnico di Milano, Italy, 2018.

He is presently an Associate Professor at the College of Intelligence Science and Technology, National University of Defense Technology, Changsha, China.

He is a member of IEEE CIS Technical Committee on Adaptive Dynamic Programming and Reinforcement Learning.

His research interests include learning-based model predictive control, adaptive dynamic programming, and their applications in automotive systems.



Wei Pan received the Ph.D. degree in Bioengineering from Imperial College London in 2017. He is currently an Assistant Professor at Department of Cognitive Robotics, Delft University of Technology, the Netherlands.

Until May 2018, he was a Project Leader at DJI, Shenzhen, China, responsible for machine learning research for DJI drones and AI accelerator.

He is the recipient of Dorothy Hodgkin's Postgraduate Awards, Microsoft Research Ph.D. Scholarship and Chinese Government Award for Outstanding Students Abroad, Shenzhen Peacock Plan Award.

He is an Area Chair of CoRL, Associate Editor of IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters, ICRA and IROS. His research interests include control, machine learning and robotics.



Riccardo Scattolini was born in Milano, Italy, in 1956. He received the Laurea degree in electronic engineering from the Politecnico di Milano, Italy, in 1979. He is Professor of automatic control with the Politecnico di Milano.

From 1984 to 1985, he was a Visiting Researcher at the Department of Engineering Science, Oxford University, U.K.

He also spent one year working in industry on the simulation and control of chemical plants.

His current research interests include modeling, identification, simulation and control of industrial plants and distribution networks, with emphasis on hierarchical, distributed, and stochastic model predictive control of large-scale systems.

Prof. Scattolini received the Heaviside Premium from the Institution of Electrical Engineers, U.K., in 1991.

He is currently Associate Editor of Automatica.



Shuyou Yu received his B.S. and M.S. degrees in Control Science & Engineering at Jilin University, Changchun, China, in 1997 and 2005, respectively, and the Ph.D. degree in Engineering Cybernetics at the University of Stuttgart, Stuttgart, Germany, in 2011.

From 2010 to 2011, he was a Research and Teaching Assistant at the Institute for Systems Theory and Automatic Control at the University of Stuttgart.

In 2012, he joined the Faculty of the Department of Control Science & Engineering at Jilin University, Changchun, China, where he is currently a full professor. His current research interests include model predictive control, robust control, and applications in mechatronic systems.



Xin Xu received the Ph.D. degree in control science and engineering from the College of Mechatronics and Automation, National University of Defense Technology (NUDT), in 2002.

He has been a Visiting Professor at Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong; the University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada; the University of Guelph, Guelph, ON, Canada; and the University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, U.K.

He is currently a Professor with the College of Intelligence Science and Technology, NUDT. His current research interests include intelligent control, reinforcement learning, approximate dynamic programming, machine learning, robotics, and autonomous vehicles.

Dr. Xu was a recipient of the National Science Fund for Outstanding Youth in China and the Second-Class National Natural Science Award of China.

He has served as an Associate Editor or a Guest Editor for Information Sciences, International Journal of Robotics and Automation, IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems, Intelligent Automation and Soft Computing, International Journal of Adaptive Control and Signal Processing, and Acta Automatica Sinica.

He is a member of the IEEE CIS Technical Committee on Approximate Dynamic Programming and Reinforcement Learning and the IEEE RAS Technical Committee on Robot Learning.