Noyau reproduisant LQ et espaces de trajectoires contrôlées en contrôle optimal Linéaire-Quadratique (à contraintes d'état)

Pierre-Cyril Aubin-Frankowski

Biennale SMAI

21 juin 2021

MINES ParisTech

PSL

École des Ponts ParisTech

Where to use Machine Learning in control theory?

Many objects can be learnt depending on the available data

- Trajectory $x : t \in [t_0, T] \mapsto \mathbb{R}^Q$
- Control $u : t \in [t_0, T] \mapsto \mathbb{R}^P$
- Vector field $f : (t, x, u) \mapsto \mathbb{R}^Q$
- Lagrangian $L : (t, x, u) \mapsto \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$
- Value function $V_{T,x_T} : (t_0, x_0) \mapsto \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$

Which one should we try to approximate?

What is the most principled/theoretically grounded application of kernel methods?

Where to use Machine Learning in control theory?

Many objects can be learnt depending on the available data

- Trajectory $x : t \in [t_0, T] \mapsto \mathbb{R}^Q$
- Control $u : t \in [t_0, T] \mapsto \mathbb{R}^P$
- Vector field $f : (t, x, u) \mapsto \mathbb{R}^Q$
- Lagrangian $L : (t, x, u) \mapsto \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$
- Value function $V_{T,x_T} : (t_0, x_0) \mapsto \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$

Which one should we try to approximate?

What is the most principled/theoretically grounded application of kernel methods?

Trajectories of linear systems belong to a reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS)! State constraints are then easy to satisfy!

Time-varying state-constrained LQ optimal control

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}(\cdot),\mathbf{u}(\cdot)} \quad \chi_{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{x}(t_0)) + g(\mathbf{x}(T))$$

$$+\mathbf{x}(t_{ref})^\top \mathbf{J}_{ref}\mathbf{x}(t_{ref}) + \int_{t_0}^{T} \left[\mathbf{x}(t)^\top \mathbf{Q}(t)\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{u}(t)^\top \mathbf{R}(t)\mathbf{u}(t)\right] \mathrm{d}t$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \mathbf{x}'(t) = \mathbf{A}(t)\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}(t)\mathbf{u}(t), \text{ a.e. in } [t_0, T],$$

$$\mathbf{c}_i(t)^\top \mathbf{x}(t) \leq d_i(t), \forall\, t \in \mathcal{T}_c, \forall\, i \in [\mathcal{I}] = [\![1, \mathcal{I}]\!],$$

- state $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^Q$, control $\mathbf{u}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^P$,
- reference time $t_{ref} \in [t_0, T]$, set of constraint times $\mathcal{T}_c \subset [t_0, T]$,
- $\mathbf{A}(\cdot) \in L^1(t_0, T)$, $\mathbf{B}(\cdot) \in L^2(t_0, T)$, $\mathbf{Q}(\cdot) \in L^1(t_0, T)$, $\mathbf{R}(\cdot) \in L^2(t_0, T)$,
- $\mathbf{Q}(t) \succcurlyeq 0$ and $\mathbf{R}(t) \succcurlyeq r\mathrm{Id}_M$ $(r > 0)$, $\mathbf{c}_i(\cdot), d_i(\cdot) \in C^0(t_0, T)$, $\mathbf{J}_{ref} \succ \mathbf{0}$,
- lower-semicontinuous terminal cost $g : \mathbb{R}^Q \to R \cup \{\infty\}$, indicator function $\chi_{\mathbf{x}_0}$,
- $\mathbf{x}(\cdot) : [t_0, T] \to \mathbb{R}^Q$ absolutely continuous, $\mathbf{R}(\cdot)^{1/2}\mathbf{u}(\cdot) \in L^2([t_0, T])$

Time-varying state-constrained LQ optimal control

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}(\cdot),\mathbf{u}(\cdot)} \quad \chi_{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{x}(t_0)) + g(\mathbf{x}(T)) \qquad \rightarrow L(\mathbf{x}(t_j)_{j\in[J]})$$

$$+\mathbf{x}(t_{ref})^\top \mathbf{J}_{ref}\mathbf{x}(t_{ref}) + \int_{t_0}^{T} \left[\mathbf{x}(t)^\top \mathbf{Q}(t)\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{u}(t)^\top \mathbf{R}(t)\mathbf{u}(t)\right] \mathrm{d}t \rightarrow \|\mathbf{x}(\cdot)\|^2_{\mathcal{S}}$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \mathbf{x}'(t) = \mathbf{A}(t)\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}(t)\mathbf{u}(t), \text{ a.e. in } [t_0, T],$$

$$\mathbf{c}_i(t)^\top \mathbf{x}(t) \leq d_i(t), \forall\, t \in \mathcal{T}_c, \forall\, i \in [\mathcal{I}] = [\![1, \mathcal{I}]\!],$$

- state $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^Q$, control $\mathbf{u}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^P$,
- reference time $t_{ref} \in [t_0, T]$, set of constraint times $\mathcal{T}_c \subset [t_0, T]$,
- $\mathbf{A}(\cdot) \in L^1(t_0, T)$, $\mathbf{B}(\cdot) \in L^2(t_0, T)$, $\mathbf{Q}(\cdot) \in L^1(t_0, T)$, $\mathbf{R}(\cdot) \in L^2(t_0, T)$,
- $\mathbf{Q}(t) \succcurlyeq 0$ and $\mathbf{R}(t) \succcurlyeq r\mathrm{Id}_M$ $(r > 0)$, $\mathbf{c}_i(\cdot), d_i(\cdot) \in C^0(t_0, T)$, $\mathbf{J}_{ref} \succ \mathbf{0}$,
- lower-semicontinuous terminal cost $g : \mathbb{R}^Q \to R \cup \{\infty\}$, indicator function $\chi_{\mathbf{x}_0}$, "loss function" $L : (\mathbb{R}^Q)^J \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$,
- $\mathbf{x}(\cdot) : [t_0, T] \to \mathbb{R}^Q$ absolutely continuous, $\mathbf{R}(\cdot)^{1/2}\mathbf{u}(\cdot) \in L^2([t_0, T])$

Reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces (RKHS)

A RKHS $(\mathcal{F}_k, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\mathcal{F}_k})$ is a Hilbert space of real-valued functions over a set $\mathcal{T}$ if one of the following equivalent conditions is satisfied [Aronszajn, 1950]

$\exists\, k : \mathcal{T}\times\mathcal{T}\to\mathbb{R}$ s.t. $k_t(\cdot) = k(\cdot,t)\in\mathcal{F}_k$ and $f(t) = \langle f(\cdot), k_t(\cdot)\rangle_{\mathcal{F}_k}$ for all $t\in\mathcal{T}$ and $f\in\mathcal{F}_k$ (reproducing property)

the topology of $(\mathcal{F}_k, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\mathcal{F}_k})$ is stronger than pointwise convergence i.e. $\delta_t : f\in\mathcal{F}_k \mapsto f(t)$ is continuous for all $t\in\mathcal{T}$.

$$|f(t)-f_n(t)| = |\langle f-f_n, k_t\rangle_{\mathcal{F}_k}| \leq \|f-f_n\|_{\mathcal{F}_k}\|k_t\|_{\mathcal{F}_k} = \|f-f_n\|_{\mathcal{F}_k}\sqrt{k(t,t)}$$

For $\mathcal{T}\subset\mathbb{R}^d$, Sobolev spaces $\mathcal{H}^s(\mathcal{T},\mathbb{R})$ satisfying $s>d/2$ are RKHSs.

$$\begin{cases} H_0^1 = \{f \mid f(0)=0,\ \exists f'\in L^2(0,\infty)\} \\ \langle f,g\rangle_{H_0^1} = \int_0^\infty f'g'\mathrm{d}t \end{cases} \longleftrightarrow k(t,s) = \min(t,s).$$

Other classical kernels

$$k_{\text{Gauss}}(t,s) = \exp\left(-\|t-s\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^2/(2\sigma^2)\right) \quad k_{\text{poly}}(t,s) = (1+\langle t,s\rangle_{\mathbb{R}^d})^2.$$

Two essential tools for computations

Representer Theorem (e.g. [Schölkopf et al., 2001])

Let $L : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$, strictly increasing $\Omega : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$, and

$$\bar{f} \in \arg\min_{f \in \mathcal{F}_k} L\left((f(t_n))_{n\in[N]}\right) + \Omega\left(\|f\|_k\right)$$

Then $\exists\, (a_n)_{n\in[N]} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ s.t. $\bar{f}(\cdot) = \sum_{n\in[N]} a_n k(\cdot, t_n)$

$\hookrightarrow$ Optimal solutions lie in a finite dimensional subspace of $\mathcal{F}_k$.

Finite number of evaluations $\implies$ finite number of coefficients

Kernel trick

$$\langle \sum_{n\in[N]} a_n k(\cdot, t_n), \sum_{m\in[M]} b_m k(\cdot, s_m)\rangle_{\mathcal{F}_k} = \sum_{n\in[N]} \sum_{m\in[M]} a_n b_m k(t_n, s_m)$$

$\hookrightarrow$ On this finite dimensional subspace, no need to know $(\mathcal{F}_k, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\mathcal{F}_k})$.

Vector-valued reproducing kernel Hilbert space (vRKHS)

Definition (vRKHS)

Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a non-empty set. A Hilbert space $(\mathcal{F}_K, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_K)$ of $\mathbb{R}^Q$-vector-valued functions defined on $\mathcal{T}$ is a vRKHS if there exists a matrix-valued kernel $K : \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T} \to \mathbb{R}^{Q\times Q}$ such that the reproducing property holds:

$$K(\cdot,t)\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{F}_K, \quad \mathbf{p}^\top \mathbf{f}(t) = \langle \mathbf{f}, K(\cdot,t)\mathbf{p}\rangle_K, \qquad \text{for } t \in \mathcal{T},\ \mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^Q, \mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}_K$$

There is a one-to-one correspondence between K and $(\mathcal{F}_K, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_K)$ [Micheli and Glaunès, 2014], so changing $\mathcal{T}$ or $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_K$ changes K.

Representer theorem in vRKHSs

Theorem (Representer theorem with constraints, P.-C. Aubin, 2021)

Let $(\mathcal{F}_K, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_K)$ be a vRKHS defined on a set $\mathcal{T}$. For a "loss" $L : \mathbb{R}^{N_0} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$, strictly increasing "regularizer" $\Omega : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$, and constraints $d_i : \mathbb{R}^{N_i} \to \mathbb{R}$, consider the optimization problem

$$\bar{\mathbf{f}} \in \underset{\mathbf{f}\in\mathcal{F}_K}{\arg\min} \quad L\left(\mathbf{c}_{0,1}^\top \mathbf{f}(t_{0,1}), \ldots, \mathbf{c}_{0,N_0}^\top \mathbf{f}(t_{0,N_0})\right) + \Omega\left(\|\mathbf{f}\|_K\right)$$

$$\text{s.t.}$$

$$\lambda_i \|\mathbf{f}\|_K \leq d_i(\mathbf{c}_{i,1}^\top \mathbf{f}(t_{i,1}), \ldots, \mathbf{c}_{i,N_i}^\top \mathbf{f}(t_{i,N_i})), \ \forall\, i \in [\![1, P]\!].$$

Then there exists $\{\mathbf{p}_{i,m}\}_{m\in[\![1,N_i]\!]} \subset \mathbb{R}^Q$ and $\alpha_{i,m} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\bar{\mathbf{f}} = \sum_{i=0}^{P} \sum_{m=1}^{N_i} K(\cdot, t_{i,m})\mathbf{p}_{i,m} \text{ with } \mathbf{p}_{i,m} = \alpha_{i,m}\mathbf{c}_{i,m}.$$

Objective: Turn the state-constrained LQR into “KRR“

We have a vector space $\mathcal{S}$ of controlled trajectories $\mathbf{x}(\cdot) : [t_0, T] \to \mathbb{R}^Q$

$$\mathcal{S}_{[t_0,T]} := \{\mathbf{x}(\cdot) \,|\, \exists\, \mathbf{u}(\cdot) \in L^2(t_0, T) \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{x}'(t) = \mathbf{A}(t)\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}(t)\mathbf{u}(t) \text{ a.e. } \}$$

Given $\mathbf{x}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{S}_{[t_0,T]}$, for the pseudoinverse $\mathbf{B}(t)^{\ominus}$ of $\mathbf{B}(t)$, set

$$\mathbf{u}(t) := \mathbf{B}(t)^{\ominus}[\mathbf{x}'(t) - \mathbf{A}(t)\mathbf{x}(t)] \text{ a.e. in } [t_0, T].$$

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \mathbf{x}_1(\cdot), \mathbf{x}_2(\cdot)\rangle_{\mathcal{S}} :=\ & \mathbf{x}_1(t_{ref})^\top \mathbf{J}_{ref}\mathbf{x}_2(t_{ref}) \\ & + \int_{t_0}^{T} \left[\mathbf{x}_1(t)^\top \mathbf{Q}(t)\mathbf{x}_2(t) + \mathbf{u}_1(t)^\top \mathbf{R}(t)\mathbf{u}_2(t)\right] \mathrm{d}t\end{aligned}$$

LQR for $\mathbf{Q} \equiv \mathbf{0}$, $\mathbf{R} \equiv \mathrm{Id}$

$$\min_{\substack{\mathbf{x}(\cdot)\in\mathcal{S}\\ \mathbf{u}(\cdot)\in L^2}} L(\mathbf{x}(t_j)_{j\in[J]}) + \|\mathbf{u}(\cdot)\|^2_{L^2(t_0,T)}$$

$$\mathbf{c}_i(t)^\top \mathbf{x}(t) \le d_i(t), t \in \mathcal{T}_c, i \in [\mathcal{I}]$$

“KRR“ (Kernel Ridge Regression)

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}(\cdot)\in\mathcal{S}} L(\mathbf{x}(t_j)_{j\in[J]}) + \|\mathbf{x}(\cdot)\|^2_{\mathcal{S}}$$

$$\mathbf{c}_i(t)^\top \mathbf{x}(t) \le d_i(t), t \in \mathcal{T}_c, i \in [\mathcal{I}]$$

Is $(\mathcal{S}, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\mathcal{S}})$ a RKHS?

Objective: Turn the state-constrained LQR into "KRR"

We have a vector space $\mathcal{S}$ of controlled trajectories $\mathbf{x}(\cdot) : [t_0, T] \to \mathbb{R}^Q$

$$\mathcal{S}_{[t_0,T]} := \{\mathbf{x}(\cdot) \,|\, \exists\, \mathbf{u}(\cdot) \in L^2(t_0, T) \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{x}'(t) = \mathbf{A}(t)\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{B}(t)\mathbf{u}(t) \text{ a.e. } \}$$

Given $\mathbf{x}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{S}_{[t_0,T]}$, for the pseudoinverse $\mathbf{B}(t)^{\ominus}$ of $\mathbf{B}(t)$, set

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{u}(t) &:= \mathbf{B}(t)^{\ominus}[\mathbf{x}'(t) - \mathbf{A}(t)\mathbf{x}(t)] \ \text{ a.e. in } [t_0, T]. \\
\langle \mathbf{x}_1(\cdot), \mathbf{x}_2(\cdot)\rangle_{\mathcal{S}} &:= \mathbf{x}_1(t_{ref})^\top \mathbf{J}_{ref}\mathbf{x}_2(t_{ref}) \\
&\quad + \int_{t_0}^{T} \left[\mathbf{x}_1(t)^\top \mathbf{Q}(t)\mathbf{x}_2(t) + \mathbf{u}_1(t)^\top \mathbf{R}(t)\mathbf{u}_2(t)\right] \mathrm{d}t
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma (P.-C. Aubin, 2021)

$(\mathcal{S}_{[t_0,T]}, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\mathcal{S}})$ *is a vRKHS over* $[t_0, T]$ *with uniformly continuous* $K(\cdot,\cdot;[t_0,T])$.

Splitting $\mathcal{S}_{[t_0,T]}$ into subspaces and identifying their kernels

It is hard to identify K, but take $\mathbf{Q} \equiv \mathbf{0}$, $\mathbf{R} \equiv \mathrm{Id}$, $t_{ref} = t_0$, $\mathbf{J}_{ref} = \mathrm{Id}$

$$\langle \mathbf{x}_1(\cdot), \mathbf{x}_2(\cdot) \rangle_{\mathcal{S}} := \mathbf{x}_1(t_0)^\top \mathbf{x}_2(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^{T} \mathbf{u}_1(t)^\top \mathbf{u}_2(t) \mathrm{d}t.$$

$$\mathcal{S}_0 := \{\mathbf{x}(\cdot) \,|\, \mathbf{x}'(t) = \mathbf{A}(t)\mathbf{x}(t), \text{ a.e. in } [t_0, T]\} \qquad \|\mathbf{x}(\cdot)\|_{K_0}^2 = \|\mathbf{x}(t_0)\|^2$$

$$\mathcal{S}_u := \{\mathbf{x}(\cdot) \,|\, \mathbf{x}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{S} \text{ and } \mathbf{x}(t_0) = 0\} \qquad \|\mathbf{x}(\cdot)\|_{K_1}^2 = \|\mathbf{u}(\cdot)\|_{L^2(t_0,T)}^2.$$

As $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_0 \oplus \mathcal{S}_u$, $K = K_0 + K_1$.

Splitting $\mathcal{S}_{[t_0,T]}$ into subspaces and identifying their kernels

It is hard to identify K, but take $\mathbf{Q} \equiv \mathbf{0}$, $\mathbf{R} \equiv \mathrm{Id}$, $t_{ref} = t_0$, $\mathbf{J}_{ref} = \mathrm{Id}$

$$\langle \mathbf{x}_1(\cdot), \mathbf{x}_2(\cdot) \rangle_{\mathcal{S}} := \mathbf{x}_1(t_0)^\top \mathbf{x}_2(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^{T} \mathbf{u}_1(t)^\top \mathbf{u}_2(t) \mathrm{d}t.$$

$$\mathcal{S}_0 := \{\mathbf{x}(\cdot) \,|\, \mathbf{x}'(t) = \mathbf{A}(t)\mathbf{x}(t), \text{ a.e. in } [t_0, T]\} \qquad \|\mathbf{x}(\cdot)\|_{K_0}^2 = \|\mathbf{x}(t_0)\|^2$$

$$\mathcal{S}_u := \{\mathbf{x}(\cdot) \,|\, \mathbf{x}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{S} \text{ and } \mathbf{x}(t_0) = 0\} \qquad \|\mathbf{x}(\cdot)\|_{K_1}^2 = \|\mathbf{u}(\cdot)\|_{L^2(t_0,T)}^2.$$

As $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_0 \oplus \mathcal{S}_u$, $K = K_0 + K_1$. Since $\dim(\mathcal{S}_0) = Q$, for $\mathbf{\Phi}_{\mathbf{A}}(t,s) \in \mathbb{R}^{Q \times Q}$ the state-transition matrix $s \to t$ of $\mathbf{x}'(\tau) = \mathbf{A}(\tau)\mathbf{x}(\tau)$

$$K_0(s,t) = \mathbf{\Phi}_{\mathbf{A}}(s,t_0)\mathbf{\Phi}_{\mathbf{A}}(t,t_0)^\top.$$

Splitting $\mathcal{S}_{[t_0,T]}$ into subspaces and identifying their kernels

It is hard to identify K, but take $\mathbf{Q} \equiv \mathbf{0}$, $\mathbf{R} \equiv \mathrm{Id}$, $t_{ref} = t_0$, $\mathbf{J}_{ref} = \mathrm{Id}$

$$\langle \mathbf{x}_1(\cdot), \mathbf{x}_2(\cdot) \rangle_{\mathcal{S}} := \mathbf{x}_1(t_0)^\top \mathbf{x}_2(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^{T} \mathbf{u}_1(t)^\top \mathbf{u}_2(t) \mathrm{d}t.$$

$$\mathcal{S}_0 := \{\mathbf{x}(\cdot) \,|\, \mathbf{x}'(t) = \mathbf{A}(t)\mathbf{x}(t), \text{ a.e. in } [t_0, T]\} \qquad \|\mathbf{x}(\cdot)\|^2_{K_0} = \|\mathbf{x}(t_0)\|^2$$

$$\mathcal{S}_u := \{\mathbf{x}(\cdot) \,|\, \mathbf{x}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{S} \text{ and } \mathbf{x}(t_0) = 0\} \qquad \|\mathbf{x}(\cdot)\|^2_{K_1} = \|\mathbf{u}(\cdot)\|^2_{L^2(t_0,T)}.$$

As $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_0 \oplus \mathcal{S}_u$, $K = K_0 + K_1$. Since $\dim(\mathcal{S}_0) = Q$, for $\mathbf{\Phi}_{\mathbf{A}}(t,s) \in \mathbb{R}^{Q\times Q}$ the state-transition matrix $s \to t$ of $\mathbf{x}'(\tau) = \mathbf{A}(\tau)\mathbf{x}(\tau)$

$$K_0(s,t) = \mathbf{\Phi}_{\mathbf{A}}(s,t_0)\mathbf{\Phi}_{\mathbf{A}}(t,t_0)^\top.$$

K_1 obtained using only the reproducing property and variation of constants

$$K_1(s,t) = \int_{t_0}^{\min(s,t)} \mathbf{\Phi}_{\mathbf{A}}(s,\tau)\mathbf{B}(\tau)\mathbf{B}(\tau)^\top \mathbf{\Phi}_{\mathbf{A}}(t,\tau)^\top \mathrm{d}\tau.$$

Examples: controllability Gramian/transversality condition

Steer a point from $(0, \mathbf{0})$ to $(T, \mathbf{x}_T)$, with e.g. $g(\mathbf{x}(T)) = \|\mathbf{x}_T - \mathbf{x}(T)\|_Q^2$

Exact planning ($\mathbf{x}(T) = \mathbf{x}_T$)

$$\min_{\substack{\mathbf{x}(\cdot)\in\mathcal{S}\\ \mathbf{x}(0)=\mathbf{0}}} \quad \chi_{\mathbf{x}_T}(\mathbf{x}(T)) + \frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{u}(\cdot)\|^2_{L^2(t_0,T)}$$

Relaxed planning ($g \in \mathcal{C}^1$ convex)

$$\min_{\substack{\mathbf{x}(\cdot)\in\mathcal{S}\\ \mathbf{x}(0)=\mathbf{0}}} \quad g(\mathbf{x}(T)) + \frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{u}(\cdot)\|^2_{L^2(t_0,T)}$$

$\mathbf{x}(0) = \mathbf{0} \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{x}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{S}_u$. Representer theorem: $\exists\, \mathbf{p}_T$, $\bar{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot) = K_1(\cdot, T)\mathbf{p}_T$

Controllability Gramian

$$K_1(T,T) = \int_0^T \mathbf{\Phi}_{\mathbf{A}}(T,\tau)\mathbf{B}(\tau)\mathbf{B}(\tau)^\top \mathbf{\Phi}_{\mathbf{A}}(T,\tau)^\top \mathrm{d}\tau$$

$\bar{\mathbf{x}}(T) = \mathbf{x}_T \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{x}_T \in \operatorname{Im}(K_1(T,T))$

Transversality Condition

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{0} &= \nabla\left(\mathbf{p} \mapsto g(K_1(T,T)\mathbf{p}) + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{p}^\top K_1(T,T)\mathbf{p}\right)(\mathbf{p}_T)\\ &= K_1(T,T)(\nabla g(K_1(T,T)\mathbf{p}_T) + \mathbf{p}_T).\end{aligned}$$

Sufficient to take $\mathbf{p}_T = -\nabla g(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(T))$

Relation with the differential Riccati equation

Take $t_{ref} = T$, $\mathbf{J}_{ref} = \mathbf{J}_T \succ \mathbf{0}$. Let $J(t,T)$ be the solution of

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{-}\partial_1 \mathbf{J}(t,T) &= \mathbf{A}(t)^\top \mathbf{J}(t,T) + \mathbf{J}(t,T)\mathbf{A}(t) \\
&\quad -\mathbf{J}(t,T)\mathbf{B}(t)\mathbf{R}(t)^{-1}\mathbf{B}(t)^\top \mathbf{J}(t,T) + \mathbf{Q}(t), \\
\mathbf{J}(T,T) &= \mathbf{J}_T,
\end{aligned}$$

Theorem (P.-C. Aubin, 2021)

Let $K_{\text{diag}} : t_0 \in]-\infty, T] \mapsto K(t_0, t_0; [t_0, T])$. Then $K_{\text{diag}}(t_0) = \mathbf{J}(t_0, T)^{-1}$. More generally, $K(\cdot, t; [t_0, T])$ is given by a matrix Hamiltonian system for all $t \in [t_0, T]$

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_1 K(s,t) &= \mathbf{A}(s)K(s,t) + \mathbf{B}(s)\mathbf{R}(s)^{-1}\mathbf{B}(s)^\top \begin{cases} \mathbf{\Pi}(s,t) + \mathbf{\Phi}_{\mathbf{A}}(t_0,s)^\top - \mathbf{\Phi}_{\mathbf{A}}(t,s)^\top, s \geq t, \\ \mathbf{\Pi}(s,t) + \mathbf{\Phi}_{\mathbf{A}}(t_0,s)^\top, s < t. \end{cases} \\
\partial_1 \mathbf{\Pi}(s,t) &= -\mathbf{A}(s)^\top \mathbf{\Pi}(s,t) + \mathbf{Q}(s)K(s,t), \\
\mathbf{\Pi}(t_0,t) &= -Id_N, \\
K(t,T) &= -\mathbf{J}_T^{-1}(\mathbf{\Pi}(T,t)^\top + \mathbf{\Phi}_{\mathbf{A}}(t,T) - \mathbf{\Phi}_{\mathbf{A}}(t_0,T)).
\end{aligned}$$

Relation with the differential Riccati equation

$$\bar{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot) := \underset{\mathbf{x}(\cdot)\in\mathcal{S}_{[t_0,T]}}{\arg\min} \quad \underbrace{\mathbf{x}(T)^\top \mathbf{J}_T\, \mathbf{x}(T) + \int_{t_0}^{T} [\mathbf{x}(t)^\top \mathbf{Q}(t)\mathbf{x}(t) + \mathbf{u}(t)^\top \mathbf{R}(t)\mathbf{u}(t)]\mathrm{d}t}_{\|\mathbf{x}(\cdot)\|_{\mathcal{S}}^2}$$

$$\text{s.t.}$$

$$\mathbf{x}(t_0) = \mathbf{x}_0,$$

Pontryagine's Maximum Principle (PMP)

$\mathbf{p}(t) = -\mathbf{J}(t,T)\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t)$ and
$\bar{\mathbf{u}}(t) = \mathbf{R}(t)^{-1}\mathbf{B}(t)^\top \mathbf{p}(t) = -\mathbf{R}(t)^{-1}\mathbf{B}(t)^\top \mathbf{J}(t,T)\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t) =: \mathbf{G}(t)\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t)$
$\hookrightarrow$ **online and differential** approach

Representer theorem from kernel methods

$\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t) = K(t, t_0; [t_0, T])\mathbf{p}_0$, with $\mathbf{p}_0 = K(t_0, t_0; [t_0, T])^{-1}\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^Q$
$\hookrightarrow$ **offline and integral** approach ($\sim$ Green kernel in PDEs)

Numerical example: submarine in a cavern

Original control problem

$$\min_{z(\cdot)\in W^{2,2},u(\cdot)\in L^2} \quad \int_0^1 |u(t)|^2 \mathrm{d}t$$

$$\text{s.t.}$$

$$z(0) = 0, \quad \dot{z}(0) = 0,$$

$$\ddot{z}(t) = -\dot{z}(t) + u(t), \ \forall t \in [0,1],$$

$$z(t) \in [z_{\text{low}}(t), z_{\text{up}}(t)], \ \forall\, t \in [0,1].$$

Numerical example: submarine in a cavern

Original control problem

$$\min_{z(\cdot)\in W^{2,2},u(\cdot)\in L^2} \quad \int_0^1 |u(t)|^2 \mathrm{d}t$$

s.t.

$$z(0) = 0, \quad \dot{z}(0) = 0,$$
$$\ddot{z}(t) = -\dot{z}(t) + u(t), \forall t \in [0,1],$$
$$z(t) \in [z_{\text{low}}(t), z_{\text{up}}(t)], \forall\, t \in [0,1].$$

Rewriting in standard form

$$\min_{\mathbf{z}(\cdot)\in W^{1,2},u(\cdot)\in L^2} \quad \int_0^1 |u(t)|^2 \mathrm{d}t$$

s.t.

$$\mathbf{z}(0) = 0,$$
$$\mathbf{z}'(t) \overset{\text{a.e.}}{=} \mathbf{A}\mathbf{z}(t) + \mathbf{B}u(t),$$
$$z_1(t) \in [z_{\text{low}}(t), z_{\text{up}}(t)], \forall\, t \in [0,1]$$

$$\mathbf{z} = \begin{pmatrix} z \\ \dot{z} \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{B} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Numerical example: submarine in a cavern

RKHS regression

$$\begin{aligned} &\min_{\mathbf{z}(\cdot)\,\in\,\mathcal{S}_u} \quad \|\mathbf{z}(\cdot)\|_{K_1}^2 \\ &\quad\text{s.t.} \\ &z_1(t) \in [z_{\text{low}}(t), z_{\text{up}}(t)],\ \forall\, t \in [0,1] \end{aligned}$$

Rewriting in standard form

$$\begin{aligned} &\min_{\mathbf{z}(\cdot)\in W^{1,2},\, u(\cdot)\in L^2} \quad \int_0^1 |u(t)|^2 \mathrm{d}t \\ &\quad\text{s.t.} \\ &\mathbf{z}(0) = 0, \\ &\mathbf{z}'(t) \overset{\text{a.e.}}{=} \mathbf{A}\mathbf{z}(t) + \mathbf{B}u(t), \\ &z_1(t) \in [z_{\text{low}}(t), z_{\text{up}}(t)],\ \forall\, t \in [0,1] \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathcal{S}_u := \{\mathbf{z}(\cdot) \,|\, \mathbf{z}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{S} \text{ and } \mathbf{z}(0) = 0\} \quad \|\mathbf{z}(\cdot)\|_{K_1}^2 = \|\mathbf{u}(\cdot)\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2.$$

Numerical example: submarine in a cavern

RKHS regression

$$\min_{\mathbf{z}(\cdot)\in\mathcal{S}_u} \quad \|\mathbf{z}(\cdot)\|_{K_1}^2$$

$$\text{s.t.}$$

$$z_1(t) \in [z_{\text{low}}(t), z_{\text{up}}(t)],\ \forall\, t \in [0,1]$$



$$\mathcal{S}_u := \{\mathbf{z}(\cdot) \,|\, \mathbf{z}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{S} \text{ and } \mathbf{z}(0) = 0\} \quad \|\mathbf{z}(\cdot)\|_{K_1}^2 = \|\mathbf{u}(\cdot)\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2.$$

$$K_1(s,t) = \int_0^{\min(s,t)} \mathbf{e}^{(s-\tau)\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{e}^{(t-\tau)\mathbf{A}^\top}\,\mathrm{d}\tau$$

Numerical example: submarine in a cavern

RKHS regression

$$\min_{\mathbf{z}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{S}_u} \quad \|\mathbf{z}(\cdot)\|_{K_1}^2$$

s.t.

$$z_1(t) \in [z_{\text{low},m}, z_{\text{up},m}],$$
$$\forall\, t \in [t_m - \delta_m, t_m + \delta_m],\ \forall m \in [M]$$



$$\mathcal{S}_u := \{\mathbf{z}(\cdot) \,|\, \mathbf{z}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{S} \text{ and } \mathbf{z}(0) = 0\} \quad \|\mathbf{z}(\cdot)\|_{K_1}^2 = \|\mathbf{u}(\cdot)\|_{L^2(0,1)}^2.$$

$$K_1(s,t) = \int_0^{\min(s,t)} \mathbf{e}^{(s-\tau)\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{e}^{(t-\tau)\mathbf{A}^\top} \mathrm{d}\tau$$

Numerical example: submarine in a cavern

RKHS regression

$$\min_{\mathbf{z}(\cdot)\in\mathcal{S}_u} \quad \|\mathbf{z}(\cdot)\|_{K_1}^2$$

s.t.

$$z_1(t_m) \in [z_{\mathrm{low},m}, z_{\mathrm{up},m}],$$

$$\cancel{\forall t \in [t_m-\delta_m, t_m+\delta_m]}, \ \forall m \in [M]$$



$$\bar{\mathbf{z}}(\cdot) = \sum_{m=1}^{M} K_1(\cdot, t_m)\mathbf{p}_m = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \alpha_m K_1(\cdot, t_m) e_m$$

$$K_1(s,t) = \int_0^{\min(s,t)} \mathbf{e}^{(s-\tau)\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{e}^{(t-\tau)\mathbf{A}^\top} \mathrm{d}\tau$$

Numerical example: submarine in a cavern

RKHS regression

$$\min_{\mathbf{z}(\cdot)\in\mathcal{S}_u} \quad \|\mathbf{z}(\cdot)\|_{K_1}^2$$

$$\text{s.t.}$$

$$z_1(t_m) \in [z_{\text{low},m}, z_{\text{up},m}] \pm \eta_m \|\mathbf{z}(\cdot)\|_{K_1},$$

$$\cancel{\forall t \in [t_m - \delta_m, t_m + \delta_m]}, \ \forall m \in [M]$$



$$\bar{\mathbf{z}}(\cdot) = \sum_{m=1}^{M} K_1(\cdot, t_m)\mathbf{p}_m = \sum_{m=1}^{M} \alpha_m K_1(\cdot, t_m) e_m$$

$$K_1(s,t) = \int_0^{\min(s,t)} \mathbf{e}^{(s-\tau)\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{e}^{(t-\tau)\mathbf{A}^\top} \mathrm{d}\tau$$

Take-home messages

"State-constrained LQ Optimal Control is a shape-constrained kernel regression."

"Controlled trajectories have the adequate structure to use kernel methods, most of all for path-planning."

"In general, positive definite kernels are much too linear to tackle nonlinear control problems $\rightarrow$ **Linearize**! "

This talk summarizes

- *Linearly-constrained Linear Quadratic Regulator from the viewpoint of kernel methods*, Aubin, **SIAM J. on Control and Optimization, 2021** (to appear)
- *Interpreting the dual Riccati equation through the LQ reproducing kernel*, Aubin, **Comptes Rendus. Mathématique, 2021**

Acknowledgments

Thank you for your attention!

Deeply grateful to:

Nicolas Petit (Mines ParisTech), my PhD advisor

Jean-Philippe Vert (Mines ParisTech-Google), who got me to love kernels

Zoltán Szabó[1] (Ecole polytechnique), my co-author for quantile regression

[1] ZSz benefited from the support of the Europlace Institute of Finance and that of the Chair Stress Test, RISK Management and Financial Steering, led by the French École Polytechnique and its Foundation and sponsored by BNP Paribas

SOC tightening of state-constrained LQ optimal control

Problem of time-varying linear quadratic optimal control with finite horizon and affine inequality state constraints

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{x}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{S}_{[t_0, T]}} \quad & \chi_{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{x}(t_0)) + g(\mathbf{x}(T)) + \|\mathbf{x}(\cdot)\|_K^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \\ & \mathbf{c}_i(t)^\top \mathbf{x}(t) \le d_i(t), \, \forall\, t \in [t_0, T], \forall\, i \in [\mathcal{I}], \end{aligned}$$

SOC tightening of state-constrained LQ optimal control

Problem of time-varying linear quadratic optimal control with finite horizon and affine inequality state constraints with SOC tightening

$$
\begin{aligned}
\min_{\mathbf{x}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{S}_{[t_0, T]}} \quad & \chi_{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{x}(t_0)) + g(\mathbf{x}(T)) + \|\mathbf{x}(\cdot)\|_K^2 \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \\
& \eta_i(\delta_m, t_m)\|\mathbf{x}(\cdot)\|_K + \mathbf{c}_i(t_{i,m})^\top \mathbf{x}(t_{i,m}) \le d_{i,m}, \ \forall\, m \in [M_i], \forall\, i \in [\mathcal{I}],
\end{aligned}
$$

with $[t_0, T] \subset \bigcup_{m\in[M]}[t_m - \delta_m, t_m + \delta_m]$, and two values defined at each t_m

$$
\begin{aligned}
\eta_i(\delta_m, t_m) &:= \sup_{t \in [t_m-\delta_m, t_m+\delta_m]\cap[0,T]} \|K(\cdot, t_m)\mathbf{c}_i(t_m) - K(\cdot, t)\mathbf{c}_i(t)\|_K, \\
d_{i,m} &:= \inf_{t \in [t_m-\delta_m, t_m+\delta_m]\cap[t_0,T]} d_i(t).
\end{aligned}
$$

Deriving SOC constraints through continuity moduli

Take $\delta \geq 0$ and t s.t. $|t - t_m| \leq \delta$

$$|c(t)^\top x(t) - c(t_m)^\top x(t_m)| = |\langle x(\cdot), K(\cdot, t)c(t) - K(\cdot, t_m)c(t_m)\rangle_K|$$

$$\leq \|x(\cdot)\|_K \underbrace{\sup_{\{t \,|\, |t-t_m|\leq\delta\}} \|K(\cdot, t)c(t) - K(\cdot, t_m)c(t_m)\|_K}_{\eta_m(\delta)}$$

$$\omega_m(x, \delta) := \sup_{\{t \,|\, |t-t_m|\leq\delta\}} |c(t)^\top x(t) - c(t_m)^\top x(t_m)| \leq \eta_m(\delta)\|x(\cdot)\|_K$$

For a covering $[0, T] = \bigcup_{m\in[M]}[t_m - \delta_m, t_m + \delta_m]$

"$c(t)^\top x(t) \leq d, \forall t \in [0, T]$" $\Leftrightarrow$ "$c(t_m)^\top x(t_m) + \omega_m(x, \delta) \leq d, \forall m \in [M]$"

Deriving SOC constraints through continuity moduli

Take $\delta \geq 0$ and t s.t. $|t - t_m| \leq \delta$

$$|c(t)^\top x(t) - c(t_m)^\top x(t_m)| = |\langle x(\cdot), K(\cdot, t)c(t) - K(\cdot, t_m)c(t_m)\rangle_K|$$
$$\leq \|x(\cdot)\|_K \underbrace{\sup_{\{t \,|\, |t-t_m| \leq \delta\}} \|K(\cdot, t)c(t) - K(\cdot, t_m)c(t_m)\|_K}_{\eta_m(\delta)}$$

$$\omega_m(x, \delta) := \sup_{\{t \,|\, |t-t_m| \leq \delta\}} |c(t)^\top x(t) - c(t_m)^\top x(t_m)| \leq \eta_m(\delta)\|x(\cdot)\|_K$$

For a covering $[0, T] = \bigcup_{m \in [M]} [t_m - \delta_m, t_m + \delta_m]$

$$\text{“}c(t)^\top x(t) \leq d \quad, \forall t \in [0, T]\text{“} \Leftarrow \text{“}c(t_m)^\top x(t_m) + \eta_m \|x(\cdot)\| \leq d \quad, \forall m \in [M]\text{“}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\|K(\cdot, t)c(t) - K(\cdot, t_m)c(t_m)\|_K^2 :=& c(t)^\top K(t, t)c(t) + c(t_m)^\top K(t_m, t_m)c(t_m) \\ &- 2c(t_m)^\top K(t_m, t)c(t)\end{aligned}$$

Since the kernel is smooth, for $c(\cdot) \in \mathcal{C}^0$, $\delta \to 0$ gives $\eta_m(\delta) \to 0$.

Deriving SOC constraints through continuity moduli

Take $\delta \geq 0$ and t s.t. $|t - t_m| \leq \delta$

$$
\begin{aligned}
|c(t)^\top x(t) - c(t_m)^\top x(t_m)| &= |\langle x(\cdot), K(\cdot, t)c(t) - K(\cdot, t_m)c(t_m)\rangle_K| \\
&\leq \|x(\cdot)\|_K \underbrace{\sup_{\{t \,|\, |t-t_m|\leq\delta\}} \|K(\cdot, t)c(t) - K(\cdot, t_m)c(t_m)\|_K}_{\eta_m(\delta)}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$\omega_m(x, \delta) := \sup_{\{t \,|\, |t-t_m|\leq\delta\}} |c(t)^\top x(t) - c(t_m)^\top x(t_m)| \leq \eta_m(\delta)\|x(\cdot)\|_K$$

For a covering $[0, T] \subset \bigcup_{m\in[M]} [t_m - \delta_m, t_m + \delta_m]$

$$\text{“}c(t)^\top x(t) \leq d(t), \forall t \in [0, T]\text{“} \Leftarrow \text{“}c(t_m)^\top x(t_m) + \eta_m \|x(\cdot)\| \leq d_m, \forall m \in [M]\text{“}$$

with $d_m := \inf_{t\in[t_m-\delta_m, t_m+\delta_m]} d(t)$.

From affine state constraints to SOC constraints

Take (t_m, δ_m) such that $[0, T] \subset \cup_{m \in [\![1, N_P]\!]} [t_m - \delta_m, t_m + \delta_m]$, define

$$\eta_i(\delta_m, t_m) := \sup_{t \in [t_m - \delta_m, t_m + \delta_m] \cap [0, T]} \|K(\cdot, t_m)\mathbf{c}_i(t_m) - K(\cdot, t)\mathbf{c}_i(t)\|_K,$$

$$d_i(\delta_m, t_m) := \inf_{t \in [t_m - \delta_m, t_m + \delta_m] \cap [0, T]} d_i(t).$$

We have strengthened SOC constraints that enable a representer theorem

$$\eta_i(\delta_m, t_m)\|\mathbf{x}(\cdot)\|_K + \mathbf{c}_i(t_m)^\top \mathbf{x}(t_m) \leq d_i(\delta_m, t_m), \ \forall\, m \in [\![1, N_P]\!], \forall\, i \in [\![1, P]\!]$$

$$\Downarrow$$

$$\mathbf{c}_i(t)^\top \mathbf{x}(t) \leq d_i(t), \ \forall\, t \in [0, T], \forall\, i \in [\![1, P]\!]$$

Lemma (Uniform continuity of tightened constraints)

As $K(\cdot, \cdot)$ is UC, if $\mathbf{c}_i(\cdot)$ and $\mathbf{d}_i(\cdot)$ are $\mathcal{C}^0$-continuous, when $\delta \to 0^+$, $\eta_i(\cdot, t)$ converges to 0 and $d_i(\cdot, t)$ converges to $d_i(t)$, uniformly w.r.t. t.

Main theoretical result in P.-C. Aubin, SICON, 2021

(H-gen) $\mathbf{A}(\cdot), \mathbf{Q}(\cdot) \in L^1$ and $\mathbf{B}(\cdot), \mathbf{R}(\cdot) \in L^2$, $\mathbf{c}_i(\cdot)$ and $d_i(\cdot) \in \mathcal{C}^0$.

(H-sol) $\mathbf{c}_i(t_0)^\top \mathbf{x}_0 < d_i(t_0)$ and there exists a trajectory $\mathbf{x}^\epsilon(\cdot) \in \mathcal{S}$ satisfying strictly the affine constraints, as well as the initial condition.[2]

(H-obj) $g(\cdot)$ is convex and continuous.

Theorem (∃/Approximation by SOC constraints, P.-C. Aubin, 2021)

Both the original problem and its strengthening have unique optimal solutions. For any $\rho > 0$, there exists $\overline{\delta} > 0$ such that for all $(\delta_m)_{m \in [\![1, N_0]\!]}$, with $[t_0, T] \subset \cup_{m \in [\![1,N_0]\!]} [t_m - \delta_m, t_m + \delta_m]$ satisfying $\overline{\delta} \geq \max_{m \in [\![1,N_0]\!]} \delta_m$,

$$\frac{1}{\gamma_K} \sup_{t \in [t_0, T]} \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_\eta(t) - \bar{\mathbf{x}}(t)\| \leq \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_\eta(\cdot) - \bar{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)\|_K \leq \rho$$

with $\gamma_K := \sup_{t \in [0,T], \mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{B}_N} \sqrt{\mathbf{p}^\top K(t,t) \mathbf{p}}$.

[2](H-sol) is implied for instance by an inward-pointing condition at the boundary.

Main practical result in P.-C. Aubin, SICON, 2021

Problem of time-varying linear quadratic optimal control with finite horizon and affine inequality state constraints with SOC tightening

$$\min_{\mathbf{x}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{S}_{[t_0,T]}} \quad \chi_{\mathbf{x}_0}(\mathbf{x}(t_0)) + g(\mathbf{x}(T)) + \|\mathbf{x}(\cdot)\|_K^2$$

$$\text{s.t.}$$

$$\eta_i(\delta_m, t_m)\|\mathbf{x}(\cdot)\|_K + \mathbf{c}_i(t_{i,m})^\top \mathbf{x}(t_{i,m}) \le d_{i,m}, \ \forall\, m \in [M_i], \forall\, i \in [\mathcal{I}].$$

By the representer theorem, the optimal solution has the form

$$\bar{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot) = \sum_{j=0}^{P} \sum_{m=1}^{N_j} K(\cdot, t_{j,m})\bar{\mathbf{p}}_{j,m},$$

where $t_{0,1} = t_0$ and $t_{0,2} = T$, and the coefficients $(\bar{\mathbf{p}}_{j,m})_{j,m}$ solve a finite dimensional second-order cone problem.

Main practical result in P.-C. Aubin, SICON, 2021

More precisely, setting $t_{0,1} = t_0$ and $t_{0,2} = T$, the coefficients of the optimal solution $\bar{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot) = \sum_{j=0}^{P} \sum_{m=1}^{N_j} K(\cdot, t_{j,m})\bar{\mathbf{p}}_{j,m}$ solve

$$\min_{\substack{z \in \mathbb{R}_+, \\ \mathbf{p}_{j,m} \in \mathbb{R}^N, \\ \alpha_{j,m} \in \mathbb{R}}} \quad \chi_{\mathbf{x}_0}\left(\sum_{j=0}^{P}\sum_{m=1}^{N_j} K(t_0, t_{j,m})\bar{\mathbf{p}}_{j,m}\right) + g\left(\sum_{j=0}^{P}\sum_{m=1}^{N_j} K(T, t_{j,m})\bar{\mathbf{p}}_{j,m}\right) + z^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{s.t.} \qquad & z^2 = \sum_{i=0}^{P}\sum_{n=1}^{N_i}\sum_{j=0}^{P}\sum_{m=1}^{N_j} \mathbf{p}_{i,n}^\top K(t_{i,n}, t_{j,m})\mathbf{p}_{j,m}, \\
& \mathbf{p}_{j,m} = \alpha_{j,m}\mathbf{c}_j(t_m), \quad \forall\, m \in [\![1, N_j]\!], \forall\, j \in [\![1, P]\!], \\
& \begin{matrix} \eta_i(\delta_{i,m}, t_{i,m})z + \sum_{j=0}^{P}\sum_{m=1}^{N_j} \mathbf{c}_i(t_{i,m})^\top K(t_{i,m}, t_{j,m})\mathbf{p}_{j,m} \\ \leq d_i(\delta_{i,m}, t_{i,m}), \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \forall\, m \in [\![1, N_i]\!], \\ \forall\, i \in [\![1, P]\!], \end{matrix} .
\end{aligned}$$

which can be written equivalently as a finite dimensional second-order cone problem (SOCP).

What are state constraints?

Optimal control

State constraints

- "avoid the wall"
  $x(t) \in [x_{low}, x_{high}]$
- "abide by the speed limit"
  $x'(t) \in [v_{low}, v_{high}]$
- "do not stress the pilot"
  $x''(t) \in [a_{low}, a_{high}]$

Physical constraints

$\hookrightarrow$ provides feasible trajectories in path-planning

Shape/state constraints are ubiquitous and handled through optimization: in this talk constraints are

affine pointwise inequality constraints over Hilbert spaces

Content of the talk

Optimization in infinite dimensions with infinitely many constraints

- LQ optimal control is usually solved approximately through time discretization, whereas state constraints are theoretically difficult
- kernel methods only provide exact numerical solutions through representer theorems for finitely many constraints

Challenges to tackle

- handle infinitely many constraints in kernel methods with guarantees
- apply kernel methods to state-constrained LQ optimal control

Contributions

- use compact coverings in infinite dimensions to tighten infinitely many constraints by other finitely many constraints
- identify the LQ reproducing kernel corresponding to LQ optimal control

References I

Aronszajn, N. (1950).
Theory of reproducing kernels.
Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, 68:337–404.

Berlinet, A. and Thomas-Agnan, C. (2004).
Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Spaces in Probability and Statistics.
Kluwer.

Heckman, N. (2012).
The theory and application of penalized methods or reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces made easy.
Statistics Surveys, 6(0):113–141.

Micheli, M. and Glaunès, J. A. (2014).
Matrix-valued kernels for shape deformation analysis.
Geometry, Imaging and Computing, 1(1):57–139.

Saitoh, S. and Sawano, Y. (2016).
Theory of Reproducing Kernels and Applications.
Springer Singapore.

References II

Schölkopf, B., Herbrich, R., and Smola, A. J. (2001).
A generalized representer theorem.
In *Computational Learning Theory (CoLT)*, pages 416–426.

Van Loan, C. (1978).
Computing integrals involving the matrix exponential.
IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 23(3):395–404.

Annex: Green kernels and RKHSs

Let D be a differential operator, D^* its formal adjoint. Define the Green function $G_{D^*D,x}(y) : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ s.t. $D^*D\, G_{D^*D,x}(y) = \delta_z(y)$ then, if the integrals over the boundaries in Green's formula are null, for any $f \in \mathcal{F}_k$

$$f(x) = \int_\Omega f(y) D^* D G_{D^*D,x}(y) dy = \int_\Omega Df(y) DG_{D^*D,x}(y) =: \langle f, G_{D^*D,x} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}_k},$$

so $k(x, y) = G_{D^*D,x}(y)$ [Saitoh and Sawano, 2016, p61]. For vector-valued contexts, e.g. $\mathcal{F}_K = W^{s,2}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$ and $D^*D = (1 - \sigma^2\Delta)^s$ component-wise, see [Micheli and Glaunès, 2014, p9].

Alternatively, in 1D, $D\, G_{D,x}(y) = \delta_z(y)$, the kernel associated to the inner product $\int_\Omega Df(y)Dg(y)dy$ for the space of f “null at the border“ writes as

$$k(x, y) = \int_\Omega G_{D,x}(z) G_{D,y}(z) dz$$

see [Berlinet and Thomas-Agnan, 2004, p286] and [Heckman, 2012].

Annex: Why are state constraints difficult to study?

- **Theoretical obstacle**: Pontryagine's Maximum Principle involves not only an adjoint vector $\mathbf{p}(t)$ but also measures/BV functions $\psi(t)$ supported at times where the constraints are saturated. You cannot just backpropagate the Hamiltonian system from the transversality condition.

- **Numerical obstacle**: Time discretization of constraints may fail e.g.



Speed cameras in traffic control

In between two cameras, drivers always break the speed limit.

Annex: IPC gives strictly feasible trajectories

(H-sol) $\mathbf{C}(0)\mathbf{x}_0 < \mathbf{d}(0)$ and there exists a trajectory $\mathbf{x}^\epsilon(\cdot) \in \mathcal{S}$ satisfying strictly the affine constraints, as well as the initial condition.

(H1) $\mathbf{A}(\cdot), \mathbf{B}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{C}^0$, $\mathbf{c}_i(\cdot), d_i(\cdot) \in \mathcal{C}^1$ and $\mathbf{C}(0)\mathbf{x}_0 < \mathbf{d}(0)$.

(H2) There exists $M_u > 0$ s.t. , for all $t \in [t_0, T]$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^Q$ satisfying $\mathbf{C}(t)\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{d}(t)$, and $\|\mathbf{x}\| \leq (1 + \|\mathbf{x}_0\|)e^{T\|\mathbf{A}(\cdot)\|_{L^\infty(t_0,T)} + TM_u\|\mathbf{B}(\cdot)\|_{L^\infty(t_0,T)}}$, there exists $\mathbf{u}_{t,x} \in M_u\mathbb{B}_M$ such that

$$\forall\, i \in \{j \,|\, \mathbf{c}_j(t)^\top \mathbf{x} = d_j(t)\},\ \mathbf{c}_i'(t)^\top \mathbf{x} - d_i'(t) + \mathbf{c}_i(t)^\top (\mathbf{A}(t)\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{B}(t)\mathbf{u}_{t,x}) < 0.$$

This is an inward-pointing condition (IPC) at the boundary.

Lemma (Existence of interior trajectories)

*If (H1) and (H2) hold, then **(H-sol)** holds.*

Annex: control proof main idea, nested property

$$\eta_i(\delta, t) := \sup \|K(\cdot, t)\mathbf{c}_i(t) - K(\cdot, s)\mathbf{c}_i(s)\|_K, \quad \omega_i(\delta, t) := \sup |d_i(t) - d_i(s)|,$$
$$d_i(\delta_m, t_m) := \inf d_i(s), \qquad \text{over } s \in [t_m - \delta_m, t_m + \delta_m] \cap [t_0, T]$$

For $\overrightarrow{\epsilon} \in \mathbb{R}_+^P$, the constraints we shall consider are defined as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{V}_0 &:= \{\mathbf{x}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{S} \,|\, \mathbf{C}(t)\mathbf{x}(t) \le \mathbf{d}(t), \,\forall\, t \in [t_0, T]\},\\
\mathcal{V}_{\delta,\text{fin}} &:= \{\mathbf{x}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{S} \,|\, \overrightarrow{\eta}(\delta_m, t_m)\|\mathbf{x}(\cdot)\|_K + \mathbf{C}(t_m)\mathbf{x}(t_m) \le \mathbf{d}(\delta_m, t_m), \,\forall\, m \in [\![1, M_0]\!]\},\\
\mathcal{V}_{\delta,\text{inf}} &:= \{\mathbf{x}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{S} \,|\, \overrightarrow{\eta}(\delta, t)\|\mathbf{x}(\cdot)\|_K + \overrightarrow{\omega}(\delta, t) + \mathbf{C}(t)\mathbf{x}(t) \le \mathbf{d}(t), \,\forall\, t \in [t_0, T]\},\\
\mathcal{V}_{\overrightarrow{\epsilon}} &:= \{\mathbf{x}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{S} \,|\, \overrightarrow{\epsilon} + \mathbf{C}(t)\mathbf{x}(t) \le \mathbf{d}(t), \,\forall\, t \in [t_0, T]\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proposition (Nested sequence)

Let $\delta_{max} := \max_{m\in[\![1,M_0]\!]} \delta_m$. *For any* $\delta \ge \delta_{max}$, *if, for a given* $y_0 \ge 0$, $\epsilon_i \ge \sup_{t\in[t_0,T]}[\eta_i(\delta, t)y_0 + \omega_i(\delta, t)]$, *then we have a nested sequence*

$$(\mathcal{V}_{\overrightarrow{\epsilon}} \cap y_0\mathbb{B}_K) \subset \mathcal{V}_{\delta,inf} \subset \mathcal{V}_{\delta,fin} \subset \mathcal{V}_0.$$

Only the simpler $\mathcal{V}_{\overrightarrow{\epsilon}}$ constraints matter!

Annex: Van Loan's trick for time-invariant Gramians

Use matrix exponentials as in [Van Loan, 1978]

$$\exp\left(\begin{pmatrix}\mathbf{A} & \mathbf{Q}_c \\ 0 & -\mathbf{A}^\top\end{pmatrix}\Delta\right) = \begin{pmatrix}\mathbf{F}_2(\Delta) & \mathbf{G}_2(\Delta) \\ 0 & \mathbf{F}_3(\Delta)\end{pmatrix}$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{F}}_2(t) = e^{\mathbf{A}t}$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{F}}_3(t) = e^{-\mathbf{A}^\top t}$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{G}}_2(t) = \int_0^t e^{(t-\tau)\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{Q}_c e^{-\tau\mathbf{A}^\top}\mathrm{d}\tau$$

$$K_1(s,t) = \int_0^{\min(s,t)} e^{(s-\tau)\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{B}\mathbf{B}^\top e^{(t-\tau)\mathbf{A}^\top}\mathrm{d}\tau$$

Set $\mathbf{Q}_C = \mathbf{B}\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{B}^\top$.

For $s \leq t,\ K_1(s,t) = \hat{\mathbf{G}}_2(s)\hat{\mathbf{F}}_2(t)^\top$

For $t \leq s,\ K_1(s,t) = \hat{\mathbf{F}}_2(s)\hat{\mathbf{G}}_2(t)^\top$