

# Policy Optimization with Differentiable MPC: Convergence Analysis under Uncertainty

Riccardo Zuliani<sup>1</sup>, Efe C. Balta<sup>1,2</sup>, and John Lygeros<sup>1</sup>,

**Abstract**— Model-based policy optimization is a well-established framework for designing reliable and high-performance controllers across a wide range of control applications. Recently, this approach has been extended to model predictive control policies, where explicit dynamical models are embedded within the control law. However, the performance of the resulting controllers, and the convergence of the associated optimization algorithms, critically depends on the accuracy of the models. In this paper, we demonstrate that combining gradient-based policy optimization with recursive system identification ensures convergence to an optimal controller design and showcase our finding in several control examples.

**Index Terms**— Policy Optimization, Differentiable Optimization, Model Predictive Control, System Identification.

## I. INTRODUCTION

MODEL predictive control (MPC) is a well-established method that uses a model of the system dynamics to compute control actions in real time. At each time step, the current system state is measured, an optimal control problem is solved over a finite prediction horizon, and the first optimal input is applied to the system. The procedure is then repeated at the next time step, thereby enabling feedback.

Designing the cost function and the constraints in the MPC is a critical problem that has been thoroughly studied in the literature. While the MPC cost can in principle match (or closely approximate) the prescribed higher-level objective (in a so called *economic MPC* scheme), it is often chosen to be a quadratic function of the decision variables to enhance numerical robustness and make the resulting optimization problem easier and faster to solve. The constraints are generally enforced to guarantee system safety both within the MPC horizon and beyond. For systems with linear dynamics and quadratic cost functions, it is conventional to introduce a terminal cost obtained by solving the discrete-time Riccati equation to approximate the infinite horizon cost. This technique was first introduced in [1], and later extended to nonlinear dynamics in [2] by linearizing around the target equilibrium point. While these techniques ensure favorable properties in closed-loop, such as stability and recursive feasibility [3], they generally

This work was supported as a part of NCCR Automation, a National Centre of Competence in Research, funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation (grant number 51NF40.225155). <sup>1</sup>Automatic Control Laboratory (IfA), ETH Zürich, 8092 Zürich, Switzerland {rzuliani,lygeros}@ethz.ch. <sup>2</sup>Control and Automation Group, inspire AG, 8005 Zürich, Switzerland. efe.balta@inspire.ch.

introduce suboptimality in the control action. In recent years, several techniques have been proposed to choose the cost function of the MPC in many different settings, such as tracking periodic references or utilizing artificial setpoints. We refer the reader to [4] for an overview.

An alternative and increasingly popular approach involves formulating the design of the MPC as a closed-loop optimization problem. This corresponds to a *policy optimization problem*, where the policy is the MPC controller. Several works propose Bayesian Optimization (BO) as a way to solve this problem [5]–[7]. Another established strategy is to leverage *differentiable optimization* [8], [9], which enables the computation of gradients of the solution to an optimization problem with respect to its parameters. In this work, we adopt the latter approach. Our work builds on the recently proposed BP-MPC framework [10], [11] that enables optimization of MPC policies with convergence guarantees.

**Related work:** The idea of automatically tuning the hyperparameters of MPC with differentiable optimization dates back to the seminal OptNet paper of Amos & Kolter [8], which showed how a quadratic program can act as a differentiable layer inside a neural network. Shortly after, the same authors generalized the approach to the receding-horizon setting in [9]. A complementary line of work appears in [12], where the authors formalized the concept of implicit differentiation of convex cone programs.

More recent developments include [13], which brings end-to-end gradient information to tube-based robust controllers; [14], where a physics-informed neural state-space model and its MPC policy are trained jointly; [15], using the same approach as [9]; and the very recent [16], which shows how to compute sensitivities of nonlinear optimization problems solved using a sequential quadratic programming algorithm in the software framework Acados.

Most of the papers mentioned above formulate the problem as either supervised learning or reinforcement learning, and they typically lack the recursive feasibility and Lyapunov stability guarantees that are standard in the MPC literature. This limitation is addressed in a parallel line of work by Gros and Zanon, beginning with the data-driven economic MPC framework introduced in [17], where the authors combine policy gradient methods with nonlinear MPC, using the value function of the MPC as an approximator of the optimal cost-to-go in a reinforcement learning problem. Their subsequent works combined this framework with tube-based MPC to ensure safety [18], [19] and practical stability [20]. These

works, however, do not address the question of convergence.

It is worth noting that differentiating the KKT conditions via the Implicit Function Theorem (IFT) is much older than the deep-learning literature, dating back to the 1970s [21]. Within the optimal-control community, systematic treatments of NLP sensitivities can be found in [22], [23], and the open-source interior-point implementation in [16].

Despite this growing body of work, the literature still lacks a rigorous treatment of policy optimization with MPC when the system dynamics are only partially known. To the best of the author's knowledge, no convergence results exist for this setting.

**Contributions:** In this work, we extend the convergence guarantees previously established in [10] to the case where the system dynamics are uncertain and affected by stochastic noise. Our contributions are twofold: i) we prove convergence guarantees for our policy-optimization method under asymptotically exact system identification, and ii) we establish convergence to a suboptimal solution when the model is not learned perfectly. Providing convergence guarantees in this context remains an open problem largely unaddressed in prior literature, with the sole exception of our previous work [10], which considered convex MPC architectures under full model knowledge. Here, we explicitly account for stochastic noise and model uncertainty. Finally, this work does not focus on safety aspects, which were recently presented in [11].

**Notation:** We use  $\mathbb{Z}$  to denote the set of integers, and set  $\mathbb{Z}_{[a,b]} = \mathbb{Z} \cap \{x : a \leq x \leq b\}$ . We denote the sets of real and natural numbers with  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbb{N}$ , respectively. The standard Euclidean norm is denoted with  $\|\cdot\|$ , and given a symmetric positive definite matrix  $A$  we define  $\|x\|_A = \sqrt{x^\top A x}$ . We denote by  $\mathbb{E}_w[\cdot]$  the expectation with respect to the random variable  $w$ . The standard Euclidean distance between a vector  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and a set  $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is denoted with  $\text{dist}(x, \mathcal{X})$ . We denote with  $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  the sequence  $a_0, a_1, \dots$ .

## II. PRELIMINARIES

The concept of path differentiability [24] extends the notion of differentiability to locally Lipschitz functions that are almost everywhere differentiable. Given a locally Lipschitz function  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ , and compact-valued outer semicontinuous multifunction  $\mathcal{J}_f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n$ , we say that  $f$  admits  $\mathcal{J}_f$  as a conservative Jacobian if, for all absolutely continuous curves  $\theta : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  and almost every  $t \in [0, 1]$ , one has

$$\frac{d}{dt} f(\theta(t)) = V\dot{\theta}(t), \quad \forall V \in \mathcal{J}_f(\theta(t)). \quad (1)$$

Moreover, in this case, we say that  $f$  is path differentiable. We denote with  $\mathcal{J}_{f,x}(x, y)$  the projection of the conservative Jacobian  $\mathcal{J}_f(x, y)$  onto the  $x$  variable. Conservative Jacobians are almost everywhere equal to standard Jacobians, and they obey several useful properties, like the chain rule of differentiation and a nonsmooth implicit function theorem. We refer the reader to [24] for an overview.

The class of path differentiable functions is quite wide, as it comprises all functions that are definable in an o-minimal structure [24, Proposition 2], which represent the majority of functions of interest in control and optimization.

An *o-minimal structure* expanding the real field  $\mathbb{R}$  is a collection of sets  $\mathcal{S} = (\mathcal{S}^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , with each  $\mathcal{S}^n \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  satisfying the following

- 1) all algebraic subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  are contained in  $\mathcal{S}^n$ ;
- 2)  $\mathcal{S}^n$  is a Boolean subalgebra of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ;
- 3) if  $A \in \mathcal{S}^m$  and  $B \in \mathcal{S}^n$ , then  $A \times B \in \mathcal{S}^{m+n}$ ;
- 4) the projection onto the first  $n$  coordinates of any  $A \in \mathcal{S}^{n+1}$  belongs to  $\mathcal{S}^n$ ;
- 5) the elements of  $\mathcal{S}^1$  are precisely the finite unions of points and intervals.

The elements of  $\mathcal{S}^n$  are called *definable subsets* of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and a function is called *definable* (in an o-minimal structure) if its graph is a definable set. Definability is preserved by addition, multiplication, power, differentiation, integration, and composition.

## III. PROBLEM FORMULATION

We consider a discrete-time system controlled by an MPC

$$\begin{aligned} x_{t+1} &= f(x_t, u_t, \theta) + w_t, \\ y_t &= \text{MPC}(x_t, y_{t-1}, p), \\ u_t &= \pi(x_t, y_t, p), \\ t &\in \mathbb{Z}[0, T], \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

In (2),  $p \in \mathcal{P}$  is a tunable design parameter chosen from a design set  $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_p}$  while  $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$  and  $u_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$  represent the system state and input, respectively, where  $x_0$  is given. The control law  $\pi : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_y} \times \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$  generates the input based on the current state and MPC output. The term  $w_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$  is a random disturbance (we will impose more assumptions on  $w_t$  in Subsection IV-B). The system dynamics  $f$  depend on an unknown parameter  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\theta}$ , and are modeled as

$$f(x, u, \theta) = \phi(x, u)^\top \theta + \varphi(x, u), \quad (3)$$

where  $\phi, \varphi : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_\theta}$  are known, possibly nonlinear, feature maps. The state and input must fulfill the constraints

$$u_t \in \mathcal{U}, \quad x_t \in \mathcal{X}, \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$  and  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$  are known constraint sets.

Our goal is to identify a parameter  $p$  that minimizes a specified upper-level cost function, while learning the unknown parameter  $\theta$  using online system identification techniques.

The variable  $y_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y}$  denotes the optimal solution of the MPC problem at time  $t$ . Following our previous work [10], we assume that  $\mathcal{U}$  is a polytopic set, and focus on linear MPC architectures formulated as quadratic programs of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MPC}(x_t, y_{t-1}, p) &= \underset{y=(x,u,\epsilon)}{\text{argmin}} \quad P_\epsilon(\epsilon, p) + \sum_{j=0}^N \ell_j(x_j, u_j, p) \\ \text{s.t. } x_{j+1} &= A_j(y_{t-1}, p)x_j + B_j(y_{t-1}, p)u_j + c_j(y_{t-1}, p), \\ H_x(p)x_j &\leq h_x(p) + \epsilon_j, \quad u_j \in \mathcal{U}, \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{Z}[0, N], \\ x_0 &= x_t, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where  $\{\ell_j\}$  is a family of strongly convex quadratic functions of  $x_j$  and  $u_j$  for every  $p \in \mathcal{P}$ . Note that the linear inequality constraints on the state of the MPC are softened via the slack variable  $\epsilon$ , ensuring the feasibility of the optimization problem.

To discourage constraint violations, the cost function includes a penalty term

$$P_\epsilon(\epsilon, p) = c_1(p)\mathbb{1}^\top \epsilon + c_2(p)\epsilon^\top \epsilon, \quad (6)$$

where  $c_1(p), c_2(p) > 0$  may optionally depend on  $p$ . This choice of penalty function is standard in the MPC literature [25]. Furthermore, the state constraints  $H_x(p)x_j \leq h_x(p)$  are allowed to vary with the design parameter  $p$ , providing additional flexibility that can be used to increase performance or to promote safety. If the state constraint set is polytopic, i.e.,  $\mathcal{X} = \{x : H_x x \leq h_x\}$ , then one may fix  $H_x(p) = H_x$  and  $h_x(p) = h_x$ , thereby enforcing the constraints from (4) directly in the MPC formulation. The results in this paper can easily be generalized to nonconvex constraint sets by replacing the constraints of the MPC in (5) with a convex approximation. For simplicity we focus on the case where  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{U}$  are polytopic.

The system dynamics in (5) are enforced through the following affine equality constraint

$$x_{j+1} = A_j(y_{t-1}, p)x_j + B_j(y_{t-1}, p)u_j + c_j(y_{t-1}, p), \quad (7)$$

where  $A_j$ ,  $B_j$ , and  $c_j$  are obtained for all  $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0, N-1]}$  by linearizing  $f$  along the trajectory defined by the previous MPC solution  $y_{t-1}$  for a nominal model parameter  $\vartheta$

$$\begin{aligned} A_j(y_{t-1}, p) &= \nabla_x f(x_{j+1|t-1}, u_{j+1|t-1}, \vartheta), \\ B_j(y_{t-1}, p) &= \nabla_u f(x_{j+1|t-1}, u_{j+1|t-1}, \vartheta), \\ c_j(y_{t-1}, p) &= f(x_{j+1|t-1}, u_{j+1|t-1}, \vartheta) \\ &\quad - A_j(y_{t-1}, p)x_{j+1|t-1} - B_j(y_{t-1}, p)u_{j+1|t-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where  $x_{j|t}$ ,  $u_{j|t}$ , and  $\epsilon_{j|t}$  denote, respectively, the  $j$ -step-ahead predictions of the state, input, and slack variables computed at time  $t$ , and  $y_{t-1} = (x_{\cdot|t-1}, u_{\cdot|t-1}, \epsilon_{\cdot|t-1})$ . Optionally,  $x_{1|t-1}$  in (8) can be replaced with the current state  $x_t$ . We assume, for now, that the design parameter  $p = (\tilde{p}, \vartheta)$  includes both the nominal model  $\vartheta$  and a secondary component  $\tilde{p}$  which may, for instance, affect the cost function of the MPC in (5).

The idea of treating the nominal model as a decision variable is not new in the context of closed-loop design of MPC (see, for example, [17] and subsequent works by the same authors). This approach offers additional flexibility and can enhance the overall performance of the scheme. Nevertheless, in Section VI we focus on an alternative scheme where  $\vartheta$  is set equal to the nominal model  $\theta^k$  at each iteration, aligning the prediction model with the best current estimate of the system dynamics, which offers a practical approach for real-world operation.

While the model in (7) captures a general-purpose linearization along the prior trajectory, it can be simplified to reduce computational complexity. For example, one could linearize the nominal dynamics around a fixed state-input pair or use a time-invariant model linearized at the origin. In this paper, we focus on the general case, and refer the reader to [10, Section VI-A] for a detailed comparison of these alternatives, along with a discussion of their respective trade-offs and performance implications.

We assume that system (2) executes a repeated operation starting at time step  $t = 0$  from a known initial state  $x_0 =$




Fig. 1. Closed-loop optimization algorithm.

$\bar{x}$  with a given  $y_{-1} = \bar{y}$ , evolving until  $t = T$ . After each operation, the state is reset to a possibly different  $\bar{x}$ . We refer to one such operation, spanning  $T$  time steps, as an iteration.

The performance is measured by a cost function  $\mathcal{C}(x, u, p)$ , which is minimized in expectation over the additive noise and the initial condition. This leads to the following stochastic optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} &\underset{p, x, u, y}{\text{minimize}} \quad \mathbb{E}_v[\mathcal{C}(x, u, p)] \\ &\text{subject to} \quad x_{t+1} = f(x_t, u_t, \theta) + w_t, \\ &\quad y_t = \text{MPC}(x_t, y_{t-1}, p), \\ &\quad u_t = \pi(x_t, y_t, p), \\ &\quad u_t \in \mathcal{U}, \quad x_t \in \mathcal{X}, \quad p \in \mathcal{P}, \\ &\quad x_0 = \bar{x}, \quad y_{-1} = \bar{y}, \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0, T-1]}, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

with  $v = (w, \bar{x}, \bar{y})$ ,  $x = (x_0, \dots, x_T)$  and similarly for  $u$  and  $y$ .

Note that (9) cannot be solved directly as both the system parameter  $\theta$  and the distribution of the disturbance  $v$  are unknown. To solve (9), we assume the availability of a nominal model  $\theta^k$  as well as a confidence set  $\Theta^k$  such that  $\theta \in \Theta^k$  (and  $\theta^k \in \Theta^k$ ) with high probability at each iteration  $k$ , and propose an iterative learning-based algorithm, summarized in Figure 1. The method operates in an iteration-wise fashion, where  $p^k$ ,  $\theta^k$ , and  $\Theta^k$  remain fixed throughout each iteration (i.e., for all  $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0, T]}$ ), and are updated only between iterations using the following update rules

$$p^{k+1} = \mathcal{F}(p^k, x^k, y^k, \Theta^k, \theta^k), \quad (10a)$$

$$\Theta^{k+1}, \theta^{k+1} = \mathcal{G}(\theta^k, x^k, u^k), \quad (10b)$$

where  $\mathcal{F}$  is a parameter update algorithm and  $\mathcal{G}$  is an online system identification step that uses the state trajectory  $x^k$  (assumed to be measurable) and the corresponding input sequence  $u^k$  to improve the system model after each iteration. To ensure consistency between the MPC model and the learned confidence set, we impose an additional constraint on the design variable  $p^k = (\tilde{p}^k, \vartheta^k)$ , namely:

$$\mathcal{T}(p) \in \Theta^k, \quad (11)$$

where  $\mathcal{T}$  is a smooth function that, for instance, may enforce  $\vartheta^k \in \Theta^k$ . This leads to the following formal problem statement.

**Problem 1.** Design the update rules in (10), such that the sequence  $\{p^k\}$  converges to a solution of (9) while satisfying the constraint in (11) for all iterations.

In the next section we provide a description of both algorithms in (10).

#### IV. PROBLEM REFORMULATION

To simplify the notation, we define the state, input, and MPC variable trajectories as functions of the design variable  $p^k$  and the disturbance realization  $v^k$

$$x^k = \mathbf{x}(p^k, v^k), \quad u^k = \mathbf{u}(p^k, v^k), \quad y^k = \mathbf{y}(p^k, v^k),$$

where the dependency on  $\theta$  is omitted for brevity. Assuming full knowledge of the true model, Problem 1 can be reformulated as the following stochastic optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{p}{\text{minimize}} \quad \mathbb{C}(p) := \mathbb{E}_v[\bar{\mathcal{C}}(p, v)] \\ & \text{subject to} \quad \mathcal{T}(p) = \theta, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where we define

$$\bar{\mathcal{C}}(p, v) := \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}(p, v), \mathbf{u}(p, v), p) + c_3 \text{dist}(\mathbf{x}(p, v), \mathcal{X}^{T+1}).$$

We assume that  $\pi(x_t, y_t, p) = u_t \in \mathcal{U}$  for all  $x_t$ ,  $y_t$ , and  $p$ , and thus omit the explicit constraint  $u_t \in \mathcal{U}$  in (12). This is a mild requirement since  $u$  is generally obtained directly from the MPC problem (5), which enforces  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  explicitly. The state constraint  $x_t \in \mathcal{X}$  is incorporated via the penalty term  $c_3 \text{dist}(\mathbf{x}(p, v), \mathcal{X}^{T+1})$ , involving the distance to the constraint set  $\mathcal{X}$ . This formulation leads to a design that satisfies state constraints *on average*. Since  $\theta$  is unknown, (12) cannot be solved directly. We therefore consider the problem

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{p}{\text{minimize}} \quad \mathbb{E}_v[\bar{\mathcal{C}}(p, v)], \\ & \text{subject to} \quad p \in \mathcal{Y}_k, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where  $\mathcal{Y}_k := \{p \in \mathcal{P} : \mathcal{T}(p) \in \Theta^k\}$  represents the set of admissible parameters consistent with the confidence region  $\Theta^k$ . To solve (13), we adopt a stochastic projected gradient descent algorithm

$$p^{k+1} = \Pi_{\mathcal{Y}_k}[p^k - \alpha_k J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k], \quad (14)$$

where  $J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k \in \mathcal{J}_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}, p}(p^k, v^k)$  is an element of the conservative Jacobian of the cost function (with respect to  $p$ ),  $\{\alpha_k\} \subset \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  is a sequence positive stepsize, and  $\Pi_{\mathcal{Y}_k}$  is the projector onto the set  $\mathcal{Y}_k$ . In short, rather than computing the full Jacobian  $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{C}}$  of the expected cost  $\mathbb{C}$ , which is computationally intractable due to the expectation over the stochastic disturbance, we instead approximate the gradient using the realized disturbance  $v^k$  at each iteration. This leads to a sample-based gradient step on  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$ , treating the current disturbance as fixed.

##### A. Computing sensitivities using backpropagation

The update of  $p^k$  in (14) additionally requires a model of the dynamics  $f$  to compute the Jacobian  $\mathcal{J}_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k$ . However, the lack of knowledge of the true dynamics makes it impossible, at the end of each iteration, to compute  $\mathcal{J}_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k$  exactly, potentially hindering the convergence of the algorithm. To overcome this challenge, we propose a method to approximate the gradient using the available confidence set  $\Theta^k$  and nominal model  $\theta^k$ .

Given a realization of the disturbance  $v^k$ , the conservative Jacobian  $\mathcal{J}_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k := \mathcal{J}_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}, p}(p^k, v^k)$  of the cost function  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$  can be

obtained by applying the chain rule of differentiation

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{J}_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}(p^k, v^k) \\ &= \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{C}, p}(\mathbf{x}(p^k, v^k), \mathbf{u}(p^k, v^k), p^k) + c_3 \mathcal{J}_{\text{dist}(\cdot, \mathcal{X}^{T+1})}(\mathbf{x}(p^k, v^k)) \\ &= [\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{C}, x}(x^k, u^k, p^k) + \mathcal{J}_{\text{dist}(\cdot, \mathcal{X}^{T+1})}(x^k)] \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{x}, p}(p^k, v^k) \\ & \quad + \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{C}, u}(x^k, u^k, p^k) \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{u}, p}(p^k, v^k) + \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{C}, p}(x^k, u^k, p^k). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

For simplicity, in the rest of the paper we use  $\mathcal{J}_x^k := \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{x}, p}(p^k, v^k)$  and  $\mathcal{J}_u^k = \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{u}, p}(p^k, v^k)$ .

Crucially, although the exact value of  $\theta$  is unknown, the true trajectories  $x^k$  and  $u^k$  are available since the MPC is implemented on the real system. The challenge in computing (15) lies in the unknown Jacobians  $\mathcal{J}_x^k$  and  $\mathcal{J}_u^k$ . To approximate them, we select a nominal model  $\vartheta \in \Theta^k$  (for example the least squares estimate) and define surrogate Jacobians  $\mathcal{J}_x^k(\vartheta)$ ,  $\mathcal{J}_u^k(\vartheta)$ , and  $\mathcal{J}_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k(\vartheta)$  using the recursive relations

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_{x_{t+1}}^k(\vartheta) &= \mathcal{J}_{f, x}(x_t^k, u_t^k, \vartheta) \mathcal{J}_{x_t}^k(\vartheta) + \mathcal{J}_{f, u}(x_t^k, u_t^k, \vartheta) \mathcal{J}_{u_t}^k(\vartheta), \\ \mathcal{J}_{u_t}^k(\vartheta) &= \mathcal{J}_{\pi, x}(x_t^k, y_t^k, p^k) \mathcal{J}_{x_t}^k(\vartheta) + \mathcal{J}_{\pi, u}(x_t^k, y_t^k, p^k) \mathcal{J}_{y_t}^k(\vartheta) \\ \mathcal{J}_{y_t}^k(\vartheta) &= \mathcal{J}_{\text{MPC}, x}(x_t^k, y_{t-1}^k, p^k) \mathcal{J}_{x_t}^k(\vartheta) \\ & \quad + \mathcal{J}_{\text{MPC}, y}(x_t^k, y_{t-1}^k, p^k) \mathcal{J}_{y_{t-1}}^k(\vartheta) \\ & \quad + \mathcal{J}_{\text{MPC}, p}(x_t^k, y_{t-1}^k, p^k) \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

initialized with  $\mathcal{J}_{x, 0}^k(\vartheta) = 0$  since the initial state  $x_0^k$  does not depend on  $p$  (the system identification algorithm  $\mathcal{G}$  is defined in Subsection IV-B).

Applying (16) and (15) (with  $\mathcal{J}_x^k$  and  $\mathcal{J}_u^k$  replaced with  $\mathcal{J}_x^k(\vartheta)$  and  $\mathcal{J}_u^k(\vartheta)$ , respectively), yields an approximate generalized gradient  $\mathcal{J}_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k(\vartheta)$ , which can be used to formulate an update rule

$$p^{k+1} = \Pi_{\mathcal{P}}[p^k - \alpha_k J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k(\theta^k)], \quad (17)$$

where  $J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k(\theta^k) \in \mathcal{J}_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k(\theta^k)$  and  $\theta^k$  is the nominal model at iteration  $k$  obtained via the update law (10b). The complete iterative procedure is outlined in Algorithm 1.

---

##### Algorithm 1 Proposed algorithm.

---

**Require:**  $\Theta^0$ ,  $p^0$ ,  $\{\alpha_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ ,  $\mathcal{G}$ .

**Init:**  $k \leftarrow 0$

- 1: **while** not\_terminated **do**
- 2:     Obtain a sample  $v^k$  of the uncertain elements.
- 3:     Obtain  $x^k = \mathbf{x}^k(p^k, v^k)$  and  $u^k = \mathbf{u}(p^k, v^k)$ .
- 4:     Compute  $J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k(\theta^k) \in \mathcal{J}_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k(\theta^k)$ .
- 5:     Update  $p^{k+1} \leftarrow \Pi_{\mathcal{Y}_k}[p^k - \alpha_k J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k(\theta^k)]$ .
- 6:     Update  $\Theta^{k+1}, \theta^{k+1} = \mathcal{G}(\theta^{k+1}, x^k, u^k)$ .
- 7: **end while**
- 8: **return**  $p^k$ .

---

##### B. Learning the true model

In this section we define the system identification algorithm in (10b), which iteratively estimates  $\theta$  in (3) using data gathered during closed-loop operation.

During each iteration  $k$ , the closed loop systems yields noisy measurements  $x_{t+1}^k$  of  $f(x_t^k, u_t^k)$ . Defining  $\psi_t^k := \phi(x_t^k, u_t^k)$  and  $z_t^k = x_{t+1}^k - \varphi(x_t^k, u_t^k)$ , we have for all  $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0, T-1]}$

$$z_t^k = \psi_t^{k, \top} \theta + w_t^k. \quad (18)$$

Identifying  $\theta$  from measurements of the form (18) is a well-studied problem, and efficient algorithms with theoretical guarantees are available. In this work, we adapt the recursive least squares estimator of [26] to our iterative setting

$$A^{k+1} = A^k + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \psi_t^k \psi_t^{k, \top}, \quad (19a)$$

$$b^{k+1} = b^k + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \psi_t^k z_t^k, \quad (19b)$$

with  $A^0 = \lambda I$  and  $b^0 = \lambda \theta^0$ , where  $\lambda > 0$  and  $\theta^0$  is the best initial guess of  $\theta$ , and  $\theta^k$  is updated via

$$\theta^{k+1} = A^{k, -1} b^k. \quad (19c)$$

Following [26], we impose the following standard assumption on the disturbance.

**Assumption 1.** For each  $t$  and  $k$ , the disturbance  $w_t^k$  is i.i.d., almost surely bounded, and  $R$ -sub-Gaussian for some known  $R \geq 0$ , that is, for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda w_t^k}] \leq \exp\left(\frac{\lambda^2 R^2}{2}\right)$ . Moreover,  $\|\theta\| \leq S$  for some known  $S \geq 0$ .

Under Assumption 1, [26, Theorem 2] guarantees that with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , the following holds for all  $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0, T]}$

$$\|\theta^k - \theta\|_{A^k} \leq R \sqrt{2 \log\left(\frac{\det(A^k)^{1/2}}{\det(\lambda I)^{1/2} \delta}\right)} + \lambda^{1/2} S. \quad (20)$$

This bound can be used to construct ellipsoidal sets that are guaranteed to contain  $\theta$  with high confidence.

We further assume that the state-input sequence is sufficiently rich to ensure that the uncertainty in the parameter estimate diminishes over iterations.

**Assumption 2.** For every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  it holds that  $\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \psi_t^k \psi_t^{k, \top} \geq \gamma I$  for some  $\gamma > 0$ , where  $\psi_t^k = \phi(x_t^k, u_t^k)$ .

Assumption 2 is the *persistency of excitation* (PE) condition, often required in the literature for system identification. However, unlike classical system identification, where excitation conditions are typically required to hold for each time step [27], our PE condition involves the entire iteration  $T$ . Since  $T$  is generally large and stochastic noise  $w_t$  is present, verifying Assumption 2 is not restrictive.

**Theorem 1.** Under Assumptions 1 and 2, for any confidence level  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , the true parameter  $\theta$  belongs to the set  $\Theta^k := \{\theta : \|\theta - \theta^k\|_{A^k} \leq c_k\}$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , where  $A^k$  and  $\theta^k$  are computed through (19), and  $c_k$  is the RHS in (20). Moreover, if  $\|\psi_t^k\| \leq L_\psi$  for each  $t$  and  $k$  then  $\Theta^k \subseteq \{\theta : \|\theta - \theta^k\| \leq \tilde{c}_k\}$  where

$$\tilde{c}_k = R \sqrt{\frac{n_\theta \log(1 + Tk L_\psi^2 / n_\theta \lambda) - 2 \log(\delta)}{k \gamma}} + \frac{\lambda^{1/2} S}{\sqrt{k \gamma}}, \quad (21)$$

and  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{c}_k = 0$ .

*Proof.* Equation (20) can be written equivalently as

$$\|\theta^k - \theta\|_{A^k} \leq R \sqrt{\log\left(\frac{\det A^k}{\lambda^{n_\theta}}\right) - 2 \log \delta + \lambda^{1/2} S}.$$

From [26, Lemma 10] we have  $\det A^k \leq (\lambda + Tk L_\psi^2 / n_\theta)^{n_\theta}$ , meaning that

$$\log\left(\det A^k / \lambda^{n_\theta}\right) \leq n_\theta \log\left(1 + Tk L_\psi^2 / n_\theta \lambda\right).$$

Combining yields

$$\|\theta^k - \theta\|_{A^k} \leq R \sqrt{n_\theta \log(1 + Tk L_\psi^2 / n_\theta \lambda) - 2 \log \delta + \lambda^{1/2} S}.$$

Finally, by Assumption 2 and since  $\|x\|_A \geq \lambda_{\min}(A)^{1/2} \|x\|$ , we have  $\|\theta^k - \theta\| \leq \|\theta^k - \theta\|_{A^k} / \sqrt{k \gamma}$ , which combined with the previous equation completes the proof.  $\square$

In Algorithm 2 we summarize the identification procedure denoted in (10) by  $\Theta^{k+1}, \theta^{k+1} = \mathcal{G}(\theta^k, x^k, u^k)$ .

---

### Algorithm 2 System identification algorithm.

---

**Require:**  $A^k, b^k, x^k, u^k, \delta \in (0, 1)$ .

- 1: Compute  $\psi_t^k = \phi(x_t^k, u_t^k)$  and  $z_t^k = x_{t+1}^k - \varphi(x_t^k, u_t^k)$  for each  $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0, T-1]}$ .
- 2: Compute  $A^k$  and  $b^k$  via (19a, 19b).
- 3: Update  $\theta^{k+1}$  via (19c).
- 4: Define  $\Theta^{k+1} = \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\theta} : \|\theta^k - \theta\|_{A^k} \leq c_k\}$ , where  $c_k$  is the RHS of (20).
- 5: **return**  $\mathcal{G}(\theta^k, x^k, u^k) = \Theta^{k+1}, \theta^{k+1}$ .

---

## V. CONVERGENCE ANALYSIS

In this section we outline sufficient conditions ensuring that the procedure of Algorithm 1 converges to a critical point of (12). First, to ensure existence of the conservative Jacobians  $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_C^k$  of the cost function, we assume the following.

**Assumption 3.** The functions  $\mathcal{C}$ , MPC, and  $\pi$  are locally Lipschitz and definable. The set  $\mathcal{X}$  is definable. Moreover,  $f(\cdot, \cdot, \vartheta)$  is locally Lipschitz and definable for any  $\vartheta \in \Theta^k$  and all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

The family of definable functions encompasses a broad range of functions commonly used in control and optimization, making Assumption 3 a mild requirement. However, establishing the Lipschitz continuity and definability of the MPC requires more careful consideration. Generally, the solution map of an optimization problem may exhibit discontinuities, or even be set-valued. In [10], we presented sufficient conditions under which the Lipschitz continuity and definability assumption of the MPC map are satisfied for problems formulated as quadratic programs. Additionally, we proposed an efficient algorithm to compute the associated conservative Jacobians at each time step by solving a linear system of equations. Appendix B.1 summarizes the sufficient conditions from [10], whereas Appendix B.2 discusses how these conditions may be extended to more general, nonlinear optimization problems.

**Lemma 1.** Under Assumption 3 the function  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$  is locally Lipschitz and definable for all  $k \geq 0$ .

*Proof.* The functions  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{u}$  are obtained as the composition of three mappings,  $f$ , MPC, and  $\pi$ , each of which is locally Lipschitz and definable for all  $k$  by Assumption 3, therefore they are themselves locally Lipschitz and definable by [28, Exercise 1.11]. Consequently, the mapping  $(p, w) \mapsto \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}(p, w), \mathbf{u}(p, w), p)$  is also locally Lipschitz and definable. Furthermore, since  $\mathcal{X}^{T+1}$  is definable (as  $\mathcal{X}$  is definable), the distance function  $\text{dist}(\cdot, \mathcal{X}^{T+1})$  is definable by [28, Exercise 1.15]. Because the distance function is globally Lipschitz [29, Proposition 2.4.1], the composite mapping  $(p, w) \mapsto \text{dist}(\cdot, \mathcal{X}^{T+1})$  is therefore locally Lipschitz and definable.  $\square$

Similar to Assumption 3, to ensure well-posedness of the algorithm, we require the following.

**Assumption 4.** For each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , the function  $\mathcal{T}$  is locally Lipschitz and definable and the set  $\Theta^k$  is definable. The set  $\mathcal{P}$  is also definable.

Norm balls, ellipsoids, and polyhedral sets are all definable, thereby making Assumption 4 a mild condition to verify. The image of a definable set under a definable function is again definable, which gives the following.

**Lemma 2.** Under Assumption 4 the set  $\mathcal{Y}_k := \{p \in \mathcal{P} : \mathcal{T}(p) \in \Theta^k\}$  is definable.

*Proof.* The set  $\{p \in \mathcal{P} : \mathcal{T}(p) = \theta\}$  is definable since  $\mathcal{T}$  is definable by Assumption 4. The set  $\mathcal{Y}_k = \{p \in \mathcal{P} : \mathcal{T}(p) = \Theta^k\}$  can be expressed as  $\mathcal{Y}_k = \bigcup_{\theta \in \Theta^k} \{p \in \mathcal{P} : \mathcal{T}(p) = \theta\}$ , and since  $\Theta^k$  is definable by Assumption 4,  $\mathcal{Y}_k$  is definable by [28, Theorem 1.13].  $\square$

To simplify the analysis, we assume the following.

**Assumption 5.** The set  $\mathcal{P}$  is bounded.

While the boundedness of  $\mathcal{P}$  simplifies the analysis, it can be relaxed in favor of a weaker convergence result that would additionally require  $\sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \|p^k\| < \infty$ . For a discussion on boundedness, we refer the reader to [30, Section 6.1].

We further assume that the stepsizes fulfill the following condition, taken from [30], needed for convergence.

**Assumption 6.** The stepsizes  $\{\alpha_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  satisfy

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \alpha_k = +\infty, \quad \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \alpha_k^2 < +\infty.$$

The condition is relatively mild and it is verified if one chooses, for instance,  $\alpha_k = c/k^\gamma$  where  $c > 0$  and  $\gamma \in (0.5, 1]$ . We require one last technical assumption involving the sequence of sets  $(\mathcal{Y}_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Recall that  $N_{\mathcal{Y}^k}$  denotes the *Normal cone* (see [31, Page 201] for a definition) of the set  $\mathcal{Y}^k$ .

**Assumption 7.** Given any sequence  $p^k \rightarrow \bar{p}$  and  $v^k \in N_{\mathcal{Y}^k}(p^k)$ , with  $v^k \rightarrow \bar{v}$ , we have  $\bar{v} \in N_{\mathcal{Y}}(\bar{p})$ .

Next, we show that Assumption 7 is verified if each  $\Theta^k$  is convex and  $\theta \in \Theta^k$  for all  $k$ , an assumption verified by the least-squares algorithm (19) under Assumption 2.

**Lemma 3.** Assumption 7 is satisfied if  $\mathcal{Y}^k$  is convex and  $\mathcal{Y} := \{p \in \mathcal{P} : \mathcal{T}(p) = \theta\} \subset \mathcal{Y}^k$  for all  $k$ .

*Proof.* Take any  $p^k \rightarrow \bar{p}$  and  $v^k \in N_{\mathcal{Y}^k}(p^k)$  such that  $v^k \rightarrow \bar{v}$ . Then by convexity we have for all  $k$  that  $\langle v^k, p - p^k \rangle \leq 0$  for all  $p \in \mathcal{Y}^k$ . Since by assumption  $\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathcal{Y}_k$ , we immediately have  $\langle v^k, p - p^k \rangle \leq 0$  for all  $p \in \mathcal{Y}$ , meaning that  $v^k \in N_{\mathcal{Y}}(p^k)$ . The result then follows from the outer semicontinuity of the normal cone [31, Proposition 6.6].  $\square$

We now state our main result.

**Theorem 2.** Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, Algorithm 1 converges to a critical point of (9) with arbitrarily high confidence if Algorithm 2 is used to identify the system.

*Proof.* See Appendix A.  $\square$

## VI. CERTAINTY EQUIVALENCE

We now focus on a different variation of the algorithm, where the nominal model  $\theta^k$  is explicitly incorporated in the dynamics of the MPC at iteration  $k$ . This approach, known as certainty equivalence, leverages the most plausible model available at each iteration and it has a rich history in the control systems literature [32]. In contrast to the approach described in Sections III and IV, where the model used in the MPC is part of the tunable parameter  $p$ , certainty equivalence reduces the dimension of  $p$ , thereby improving computational efficiency and tuning effort. While the computational improvement has obvious advantages, especially for real-time applications, it comes at a cost: by constraining the model, we lose degrees of freedom that could potentially enhance performance.

For each iteration, the closed-loop dynamics are given by

$$\begin{aligned} x_{t+1}^k &= f(x_t^k, u_t^k, \theta) + w_t^k, \\ y_t^k &= \text{MPC}(x_t^k, y_{t-1}^k, p^k, \theta^k), \\ u_t^k &= \pi(x_t^k, y_t^k, p^k), \\ t &\in \mathbb{Z}_{[0, T]}, \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

for a fixed  $x_0^k$ . The MPC problem is identical to (5) with  $p^k$  replaced by  $\theta^k$  in the equality constraints associated to the dynamics, that is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MPC}(x_t^k, y_{t-1}^k, p^k, \theta^k) &= \underset{x, u, \epsilon}{\text{argmin}} \quad P(\epsilon, p^k) + \sum_{j=0}^N \ell_j(x_j, u_j, p^k) \\ \text{s.t. } x_{j+1} &= A(y_{t-1}^k, \theta^k)x_j + B(y_{t-1}^k, \theta^k)u_j + c(y_{t-1}^k, \theta^k), \\ H_x(p^k)x_j &\leq h_x(p^k) + \epsilon_j, \quad H_u u_j \leq h_u, \quad \forall j \in [0, N], \\ x_0 &= x_t^k, \end{aligned}$$

where the prediction model in (7) now becomes

$$\begin{aligned} A_j(y_{t-1}, p) &= \nabla_x f(x_{j+1|t-1}, u_{j+1|t-1}, \theta^k), \\ B_j(y_{t-1}, p) &= \nabla_u f(x_{j+1|t-1}, u_{j+1|t-1}, \theta^k), \\ c_j(y_{t-1}, p) &= f(x_{j+1|t-1}, u_{j+1|t-1}, \theta^k) \\ &\quad - A_j(y_{t-1}, p)x_{j+1|t-1} - B_j(y_{t-1}, p)u_{j+1|t-1}, \end{aligned}$$

Since the only information about the system dynamics used in the optimization problem is the nominal model  $\theta^k$ , we abuse the notation and re-define the function  $\mathcal{G}$  as  $\theta^{k+1} =$

$\mathcal{G}(\theta^k, x^k, y^k)$ . We denote the resulting state-input trajectories, assuming a noise realization  $w^k$ , as  $\mathbf{x}(p^k, \theta^k, w^k)$  and  $\mathbf{u}(p^k, \theta^k, w^k)$ , respectively. The certainty equivalence procedure is summarized in Algorithm 3.

---

**Algorithm 3** Certainty equivalence algorithm.

---

**Require:**  $\theta^0, p^0, \{\alpha_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}, \mathcal{G}$ .  
**Init:**  $k \leftarrow 0$   
1: **while** not\_terminated **do**  
2:   Obtain  $x^k = \mathbf{x}^k(p^k, w^k, \theta^k)$  and  $u^k = \mathbf{u}(p^k, w^k, \theta^k)$ .  
3:   Compute  $J_{\mathcal{C}}^k(\theta^k) \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{C}}^k(\theta^k)$ .  
4:   Update  $p^{k+1} \leftarrow \Pi_{\mathcal{P}}[p^k - \alpha_k J_{\mathcal{C}}^k(\theta^k)]$ .  
5:   Update  $\theta^{k+1} = \mathcal{G}(\theta^k, x^k, y^k)$ .  
6: **end while**  
7: **return**  $p^k$ .

---

**Corollary 1.** Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, Algorithm 3 converges to a critical point of (9) with arbitrarily high confidence if Algorithm 2 is used to identify the system.

*Proof.* This corollary follows from the same arguments used to prove Theorem 2. First, we can prove that Lemma 5 continues to hold in the certainty equivalence setting. This can easily be proven by recognizing the local Lipschitz continuity of  $J_{\mathcal{C}}^k(\theta^k)$  in  $\theta^k$ , and leveraging the boundedness of  $\mathcal{P}$ . Then, the result immediately follows from the arguments in the proof of Theorem 2.  $\square$

## VII. CONVERGENCE WITH IMPERFECT MODEL LEARNING

In this section, we address the policy optimization problem in (12) under a more general setting by relaxing the persistency of excitation (PE) assumption in Assumption 2. Without PE, the system identification procedure in (19) is no longer guaranteed to yield an asymptotically exact estimate of the true dynamics, and consequently the radius  $c_k$  of the confidence region  $\Theta^k$  may not shrink to zero. This lack of convergence introduces a challenge for the subsequent analysis, as imperfect model knowledge can lead to a non-vanishing error terms.

In this more challenging scenario, our objective is to design a parameter vector  $\bar{\theta}$  that minimizes the distance between 0 and  $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{C}}(\bar{\theta})$ , while simultaneously providing an upper bound on this (generally unknown) distance. To achieve this, we apply Algorithm 3 (or equivalently, Algorithm 1) without updating the nominal model, that is, by fixing  $\theta^k \equiv \theta^0$  and exploit the fact that  $\theta \in \Theta^0$ , to construct a set of candidate upper bounds

$$S_{\max}^M := \left\{ \max_{J \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{C}}(\theta^i)} \|J\| : \theta^i \in \Theta^0, i \in [0, M] \right\}, \quad (23)$$

where each  $\theta^i$  is sampled randomly from  $\Theta^0$  according to a known probability distribution  $\mathbb{P}_{\theta}$ , and  $M$  denotes the number of samples.

Given a confidence level  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ , the set  $S_{\max}^M$  can be used to compute an upper bound  $J_{\max}^{\epsilon, \beta}$  that satisfies, with probability at least  $1 - \beta$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}[\|\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{C}}(\theta)\| > J_{\max}^{\epsilon, \beta}] \leq \epsilon, \quad (24)$$

for a prescribed violation risk  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ .

**Theorem 3.** Let  $\beta \in (0, 1)$  be a small confidence parameter, and  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$  an acceptable violation risk. If

$$\binom{k + n_p - 1}{k} \sum_{i=0}^{k+n_p-1} \binom{M}{i} \epsilon^i (1 - \epsilon)^{M-i} \leq \beta, \quad (25)$$

then, with probability at least  $1 - \beta$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}[\|\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{C}}(\theta)\| > J_{\max}^{\epsilon, \beta}] \leq \epsilon,$$

where  $J_{\max}^{\epsilon, \beta}$  is the  $k$ -th largest element of  $S_{\max}^M$ .

*Proof.* Consider the following scenario program

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize}_x \\ & \text{subject to } x \in \mathcal{X}_{\theta^i}, \quad i \in [0, M], \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where  $\mathcal{X}_{\theta^i} := \{x : \|\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{C}}(\theta^i)\| \leq x\}$ . Problem (26) is always feasible, satisfying [33, Assumption 2.1]. Moreover, by removing the  $k$  largest elements of  $S_{\max}^M$ , that is, the  $k$  largest values of  $\|\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{C}}(\theta^i)\|$ , the corresponding solution  $x$  that solves (26) almost surely violates the removed constraints, thereby verifying [33, Assumption 2.2]. The result then follows directly from [33, Theorem 2.1].  $\square$

Once an acceptable violation risk  $\epsilon$  has been set, and given a number of data points  $M$ , we can test the condition in (25) for increasing values of  $k$  to understand how many values of  $S_{\max}^M$  can be discarded while fulfilling the required violation probability. This is summarized in Algorithm 4. The tradeoff between violation risk and magnitude of the bound is empirically studied in Subsection VIII-C.

---

**Algorithm 4** Norm upper bound determination.

---

**Require:**  $\Theta, p, \epsilon, \beta \in (0, 1), M > 0$ .

**Init:**  $k \leftarrow 1$

- 1: Sample  $\theta^i \in \Theta$  for  $i = 1, \dots, M$ .
- 2: Form  $S_{\max}^M$  as in (23).
- 3:  $k_{\max} = \text{argmax}_{k \geq 0} \{k : (25) \text{ holds}\}$
- 4: **return**  $J_{\max}^{\epsilon, \beta} = k_{\max}$ -largest element of  $S_{\max}^M$ .

---

## VIII. SIMULATION RESULTS

### A. Random Linear Systems

We start by deploying our Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 3 on a set of randomly generated linear systems. For each simulated system, we start by randomly sampling the poles (uniformly at random from the interval  $[-0.1, 0.1]$ ) of a 4-dimensional continuous-time single input linear system in controllable canonical form, and then we discretize the resulting system (exactly) with a sampling time of 0.15 s. The system dynamics are given by

$$x_{t+1} = Ax_t + B(u_t + w_t),$$

where  $t \in [0, 50]$ ,  $x_0$  is randomly sampled for each iteration from the a ball of radius 1.5, and  $w_t \in \mathbb{R}$  is randomly sampled at each time-step such that  $|w_t| \leq 0.1$ . We then set  $\theta$  to contain all entries of the  $A$  and  $B$  matrices and randomly generate a

**TABLE I.** Suboptimality to the best achievable performance of various controllers on training set ( $\mathcal{S}_{\text{tr}}$ ) and testing set ( $\mathcal{S}_{\text{te}}$ ).

	Alg. 1 (no CE)		Alg. 3 (CE)	
	Mean	Variance	Mean	Variance
Nominal ( $\mathcal{S}_{\text{tr}}$ )	8.15	12.25	8.15	12.25
Tuned ( $\mathcal{S}_{\text{tr}}$ )	0.30	0.00	0.11	0.00
Tuned ( $\mathcal{S}_{\text{te}}$ )	0.30	0.00	0.11	0.00
DARE ( $\mathcal{S}_{\text{te}}$ )	1.93	0.66	1.95	0.69

nominal value  $\theta^0$  of  $\theta$  such that  $\|\theta^0 - \theta\| = 0.3\|\theta\|$ . The MPC problem is set up as in (5) with  $N = 5$  and

$$\ell_t(x_t, u_t, p) = \begin{cases} \|x_t\|_Q^2 + \|u_t\|_R^2, & \text{if } t \neq N, \\ \|x_t\|_P^2, & \text{if } t = N, \end{cases}$$

where  $Q = p_1 p_1^\top + 10^{-8}I$ ,  $R = p_2^2 + 10^{-8}$ , and  $P = p_3 p_3^\top + 10^{-8}I$ , where  $p_1$  and  $p_3$  are lower-triangular matrices, and  $p = \text{col}(p_1, p_2, p_3, \vartheta)$ . We do not consider state constraints and only enforce input constraints  $u_t \in [-1, 1]$ . The upper-level cost is given by


$$\mathcal{C}(x, u) = \sum_{t=0}^T \|x_t\|_Q^2 + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \|u_t\|_R^2,$$

where  $Q = 10I$  and  $R = I$ . We choose  $p^0$  to ensure that the initial values of  $Q$  and  $R$  in the MPC match  $Q$  and  $R$ , respectively,  $P = Q$ , and  $\vartheta = \theta^0$ .


We then run Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 3 for 500 iterations using gradient descent with parameters  $\eta = 10^{-3}$  and  $\rho = 0.8$  ( $\eta = 10^{-3}$  and  $\gamma = 0.8$  for Algorithm 3). To avoid large overshoots, we clip the norm of the gradient to 50. This does not hinder the convergence properties as long as the clipping happens finitely many times during the convergence process.

Our tuning algorithm significantly improves the performance of the MPC on the training and testing sets (containing 500 unseen samples), as can be seen in the two left-most columns of Table I. For a more graphical representation, we took the first 10 experiments in the training set and plotted each as a separate column in Figure 2, where the yellow, blue, and gray segments of each column represent the cost attained by the best, trained, and untrained algorithm (averaged across all 500 samples). In Figure 2 and Table I, the suboptimality is computed against an omniscient controller with foreknowledge of the disturbance sequence  $\{w_t\}$ , whose performance is unattainable with a feedback controller. In addition, as shown in Table I, the tuned MPC significantly outperforms a nominal MPC scheme where the terminal cost  $P$  is chosen as the solution of the Riccati equation (using the true costs  $Q$  and  $R$ , and the nominal model  $A$  and  $B$  obtained after running system identification for all 500 iterations).

In Figure 3 and the two right-most columns of Table I we repeated the same experiments using Algorithm 3. The CE variant consistently outperforms Algorithm 1 across nearly all scenarios (with an average suboptimality of 11% instead of 30%). This improvement stems from the reduced complexity of the CE formulation: since the optimization parameter no longer includes the prediction model, the decision space is significantly smaller. By lowering the number of decision



**Fig. 2.** Relative suboptimality of the MPC trained with Algorithm 1 (blue) against best achievable performance (yellow) and untrained algorithm (gray), on ten randomly generated linear systems.



**Fig. 3.** Relative suboptimality of the MPC trained with Algorithm 3 (blue) against best achievable performance (yellow) and untrained algorithm (gray), on ten randomly generated linear systems.

variables, the CE algorithm tends to locate local minimizers more effectively.

### B. Nonlinear Quadcopter

Next, we deploy the CE variant on a 12-dimensional nonlinear quadcopter taken from [34]. The state of the system is given by the position and velocity in the inertial frame, the Euler angles, and the angular velocity in the body frame. Following [34], we denote with  $p_x, p_y, p_z, v_x, v_y, v_z$  the position and velocity along the three axes, and with  $\phi, \vartheta, \psi, p, q, r$  the Euler angles and the angular rates in the body frame. The control inputs of the system are the rotation speeds  $\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3, \omega_4$ , of each of the four propellers. The thrust  $u_T$  produced by the propellers is aligned with the z-axis of the body frame (i.e., pointing upwards with respect to the orientation of the drone) and given by  $u_T = \text{col}(0, 0, k_t \sum_{i=0}^4 \omega_i^2)$ , where  $k_t$  is the thrust coefficient. The propellers additionally produce a torque on the drone, given by

$$\tau = \begin{bmatrix} \tau_\phi \\ \tau_\vartheta \\ \tau_\psi \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} lk_t(\omega_4^2 - \omega_2^2) \\ lk_t(\omega_3^2 - \omega_1^2) \\ k_b(\omega_2^2 - \omega_1^2 + \omega_3^2 - \omega_4^2) \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $k_b$  is the drag coefficient and  $l$  is the lateral length of the drone. The linear acceleration is

$$\dot{v} = R_z(\phi, \vartheta, \psi) \frac{u_T}{m} - k_d v - g,$$

where  $v = \text{col}(v_x, v_y, v_z)$ ,  $g = \text{col}(0, 9.8)$  is the gravitational acceleration,  $k_d$  is the air resistance coefficient,  $m$  is the mass of the drone, and  $R_z(\phi, \vartheta, \psi)u_T$  denotes the projection of the thrust  $u_T$  (aligned with the  $z$ -axis of the body frame) to the inertial frame, where  $R_z(\phi, \vartheta, \psi)$  is the third column of the rotation matrix from the body frame to the inertial frame

$$R_z(\phi, \vartheta, \psi) = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \psi \sin \vartheta \cos \phi + \sin \psi \sin \phi \\ \sin \psi \sin \vartheta \cos \phi - \cos \psi \sin \phi \\ \cos \vartheta \cos(\phi) \end{bmatrix}.$$

The rotational dynamics are given by

$$\dot{\omega}_B = I^{-1}(-\omega_B \times I\omega_B - J_r \omega_B \omega_r + \tau),$$

where  $\omega_B = \text{col}(p, q, r)$  is the angular velocity in the body frame,  $I = \text{diag}(I_{xx}, I_{yy}, I_{zz})$  is the inertia matrix (under the assumption that the drone is axis symmetrical),  $J_r$  is a constant, and  $\omega_r = \omega_2 - \omega_1 + \omega_4 - \omega_3$ .

To obtain an expression adhering to (2), we can set  $\theta = (\theta_i)_{i=0}^{11}$  and equivalently rewrite the dynamics as

$$\dot{x} = \begin{bmatrix} 0_3 \\ \theta_0 [\sum_{i=0}^4 R_z \omega_i^2 - g] - \text{col}(\theta_1 v_x, \theta_2 v_y, \theta_3 v_z) \\ \omega_\eta(\phi, \vartheta, \psi) \omega_B \\ \theta_4 qr - \theta_5 q \omega_r + \theta_6 (\omega_4^2 - \omega_2^2) \\ \theta_7 pr + \theta_8 p \omega_r + \theta_9 (\omega_3^2 - \omega_1^2) \\ \theta_{10} pq + \theta_{11} (\omega_2^2 - \omega_1^2 + \omega_3^2 - \omega_4^2) \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} v \\ 0_3 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

where  $x = \text{col}(p_x, p_y, p_z, v, \phi, \vartheta, \psi, \omega_B)$  and

$$\omega_\eta(\phi, \vartheta, \psi) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & -\sin \vartheta \\ 0 & \cos \phi & -\sin \phi \cos \vartheta \\ 0 & -\sin \phi & \cos \phi \cos \vartheta \end{bmatrix}$$

relates Euler angle rates to angular velocity in the body frame. We discretize the dynamics using Euler's forward scheme and a sampling time of 0.1 s. We assume that  $\theta$  is unknown and randomly choose  $\theta^0$  such that  $\|\theta^0 - \theta\| = 0.5\|\theta\|$ . The true values of  $\theta$  are taken from [34, Table 1].

We use the MPC of Subsection VIII-A with  $N = 12$  and choose the cost to be

$$\ell_t(x_t, u_t, p) = \begin{cases} \|x_t - x_{\text{ref}}\|_Q^2 + \|u_t - u_{\text{ref}}\|_R^2, & \text{if } t \neq N, \\ \|x_t - x_{\text{ref}}\|_P^2, & \text{if } t = N, \end{cases}$$

where  $x_{\text{ref}} = (-6, -3.5, 0, 0_9)$  and  $u_{\text{ref}}$  is the input required to maintain the drone at a hovering state. We enforce the constraints  $\omega_i \in [0, 630]$ ,  $v_x, v_y, v_z \in [-2, 2]$ ,  $\phi, \vartheta, \psi \in [-\pi/4, \pi/4]$ , and  $p, q, r \in [-\pi/8, \pi/8]$ . The parameter  $p$  is chosen as in Subsection VIII-A (without including the nominal model  $\vartheta$ ). The upper-level horizon is set to  $T = 100$ , and the upper-level cost is

$$\mathcal{C}(x, u) = \sum_{t=0}^T c_3 \text{dist}(x_t, \mathcal{X})^2 + \|x_t - x_{\text{ref}}\|_Q^2 + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \|u_t - u_{\text{ref}}\|_R^2$$

where  $c_3 = 200$  (chosen empirically),  $\mathcal{Q} = 10I$  and  $\mathcal{R} = I$ .

We run Algorithm 3 for 200 iterations with  $\rho = 5 \cdot 10^{-5}$  and  $\eta = 0.6$ . A comparison between the angle and position trajectories of the MPC at iteration 0 and iteration 200 can be seen in Figure 4. Observe how the trajectories have effectively converged to the optimal ones (denoted in red in the top three plots, and in the lines with square markers in the bottom plot). From Figure 5, we can see that the RLS procedure (using  $\lambda = 10^{-8}$ ) successfully learns the model (achieving an estimation error smaller than 1% in about 40 iterations), whereas the closed-loop cost decreases and approaches the best achievable. The convergence behavior is consistent with the one obtained if the model was known at iteration 0 (orange line in the plot above) thus validating our theoretical findings.

To further assess the capabilities of the proposed algorithm, we repeated the experiment by augmenting the upper-level cost with a nonconvex term, namely  $10^{-7} \sum_{t=0}^T \sum_{i=1}^4 \omega_i^3$ , which penalizes the energy consumption associated with propeller usage. Unlike the previous example, the MPC formulation in this case does not account for this additional energy penalty in its cost function. Nevertheless, our algorithm achieves a closed-loop cost of 10594.67, compared to the optimal value of 10589.24, demonstrating that the proposed tuning method can produce effective MPC controllers even if the MPC cost function does not exactly match the upper-level objective. The closed-loop trajectories of the three Euler angles after training are shown in Figure 6.

### C. Lateral Control of an Autonomous Vehicle


In this last simulation example we consider an autonomous car racing on a curvilinear track. We use the bicycle model proposed in [35, Section 4.12], where the effect of the path curvature is treated as an external disturbance. We assume that the longitudinal velocity is controlled separately and set it as a constant through the entire track. We focus only on the control of the lateral dynamics, which are given in linearized form by

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{e}_{\text{cg}} \\ \ddot{e}_{\text{cg}} \\ \dot{\theta}_{\text{e}} \\ \ddot{\theta}_{\text{e}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & a_4 & a_5 & a_6 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} e_{\text{cg}} \\ \dot{e}_{\text{cg}} \\ \theta_{\text{e}} \\ \dot{\theta}_{\text{e}} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ b_1 \\ 0 \\ b_2 \end{bmatrix} \delta + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ a_3 - v_x \\ 0 \\ a_6 \end{bmatrix} r, \quad (27)$$


where  $e_{\text{cg}}$  is the lateral tracking error, that is, the orthogonal distance between the center of gravity of the car and the track, and  $\theta_{\text{e}}$  is the orientation error, that is, the difference between the heading of the car and the tangent direction to the track at the point on the track that is closest to the center of gravity of the car. The input  $\delta$  denotes the steering angle and it is constrained with the interval  $\delta \in [-\frac{\pi}{5}, \frac{\pi}{5}]$ . The effect of the path curvature is represented by  $r(t) = \kappa(t)v_x$ , where  $v_x$  is the (constant) longitudinal velocity, and  $\kappa(t)$  is the instantaneous curvature of the path. We impose the constraints

$e_{\text{cg}} \in [-1, 1]$ ,  $\dot{e}_{\text{cg}} \in [-5, 5]$ ,  $\theta_{\text{e}} \in [-1, 1]$ ,  $\dot{\theta}_{\text{e}} \in [-2.75, 2.75]$ , and consider the following parameters (taken from [35]),  $a_1 = -27.280$ ,  $a_2 = 272.798$ ,  $a_3 = a_4 = a_5 = 0$ ,  $a_6 = -29.388$ ,  $b_1 = 136.399$ ,  $b_2 = 126.129$ , with  $v_x = 10 \text{ m/s}$ .

The continuous-time dynamics in (27) are discretized with a sampling period of 0.01 s using Forward Euler. The initial condition is  $e_{\text{cg}}(0) = 0.75$ ,  $\dot{e}_{\text{cg}}(0) = \theta_{\text{e}}(0) = \dot{\theta}_{\text{e}}(0) = 0$ .



**Fig. 4.** Angle (top) and position (bottom) trajectories for the untrained / trained / best algorithm. In the position plot, the untrained trajectories are the dash-dotted lines, the trained ones are solid lines, and the optimal ones are denoted with square markers.



**Fig. 5.** Cost (top) and estimation error (bottom) across different iterations.

In its current form (27), the system parameters cannot be identified using the RLS technique introduced in Subsection IV-B due to the presence of the unknown disturbance  $r(t)$ , which is neither stochastic nor zero mean. While one could, in principle, apply iterative disturbance estimation techniques combined with system identification to learn both the system parameters and  $r(t)$ , this is beyond the scope of this paper. Instead, our focus is on the setting described in Section VII.

We assume that the parameter  $\theta = (a_1, \dots, a_6, b_1, b_2)$  describing the system dynamics is unknown and that the best estimate available is  $\theta^0 = \alpha_\theta(\mathbb{1} + e_\theta) \odot \theta$ , where  $e_\theta$  is a randomly generated vector with unit norm,  $\alpha_\theta > 0$  is a scalar, and  $\odot$  denotes componentwise product.

The MPC is formulated as in (5), with  $A_j \equiv \bar{A}$ ,  $B_j \equiv \bar{B}$ , and  $c_j \equiv 0$ , where  $\bar{A}$ ,  $\bar{B}$  are obtained from (27) using the nominal parameter  $\theta^0$ . We choose the horizon to be  $N = 5$ ,

and use the same cost parameterization as in Subsection VIII-A, with the addition of a slack penalty  $P_\epsilon$ , chosen as in (6) with  $c_1 = c_2 = 25$ .

For the upper-level problem we choose the cost  $\mathcal{C}(x, u) = \sum_{t=0}^T \|x_t\|^2 + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} 10^{-6} \|u_t\|^2$ , and a penalty  $c_3 = 100$ .

Figure 7 shows the curvilinear track we considered, which was generated by interpolating waypoints using splines and reports trajectories associated to different controllers. Observe how the trajectory of the trained controller (in red) is significantly closer to the best achievable trajectory (in orange) compared to untrained one (in blue). The best achievable trajectory was obtained by solving a trajectory optimization problem using the true cost and the true dynamics, assuming foreknowledge of  $r(t)$ .

**TABLE II.** Closed-loop costs of different controllers.

Controller	Trained	Untrained	Best Cost
Cost	247.323	379.762	209.982

The closed-loop costs of the three controllers are reported in Table II. Training ensures a 34.87% reduction in the closed-loop cost, achieving a suboptimality of 15.10%.

Figure 8 shows the state and input trajectories of the various controllers across time, further remarking the similarity between the tuned controller and the the best trajectory.

Finally, we use the technique described in Section VII to obtain a probabilistic bound on the norm  $\|\mathcal{J}_C(p^*)\|$ , where  $p^*$  denotes the optimal parameter. Figure 9 depicts the predicted upper-bound for a given  $\epsilon$  (and  $\beta$  fixed to  $10^{-10}$ ) across a range of uncertainty radii, that is, for different values of  $\|\theta - \theta^0\|$ . Selecting  $\epsilon$  within the range 0.01-0.02 yields an upper bound that closely matches the true norm (shown in red) without excessive conservatism. Conversely, larger values of  $\epsilon$  lead to an underestimation of the true norm (see inset), highlighting the tradeoff between tightness of the bound and statistical




Fig. 6. Euler angles or tuned MPC with and without energy penalization.




Fig. 7. The curvilinear track considered in Subsection VIII-C (in gray), the trajectory obtained after optimization (solid orange line), the initial trajectory (blue), and the optimal trajectory (dashed red).

confidence.

## IX. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we consider the problem of hyperparameter tuning for model predictive control (MPC). We assume that the true system dynamics are unknown and affected by noise, and introduced a system identification procedure that operates alongside the parameter updates. We then analyzed the convergence properties of the proposed algorithm in two settings: (i) when the MPC prediction model is treated as a design variable, and (ii) when it is fixed to the best available model (certainty equivalence). Furthermore, we developed an efficient method to bound the residual norm of the objective gradient in cases where the model is not exactly learned asymptotically. Finally, we demonstrate the effectiveness of the approach through three simulation examples. In this paper we do not focus on safety aspects. However, once a nominal controller is obtained using the proposed algorithms, the learned dynamical model can be combined with the robust design methodology proposed in [11] to ensure safety and robustness.

Future work will focus on strengthening safety certificates, for example by guaranteeing *anytime feasibility*, that is, ensuring that the state constraints are satisfied for all iterations, and on the implementation of the proposed algorithm on hardware.




Fig. 8. State and input trajectories of different controllers across time.




Fig. 9. Upper bound on gradient norm for different confidence levels and uncertainty radii.

## REFERENCES

[1] M. Sznaier and M. J. Damborg, “Suboptimal control of linear systems with state and control inequality constraints,” in *26th IEEE conference on decision and control*, vol. 26. IEEE, 1987, pp. 761–762.

[2] H. Chen and F. Allgöwer, “A quasi-infinite horizon nonlinear model predictive control scheme with guaranteed stability,” *Automatica*, vol. 34, no. 10, pp. 1205–1217, 1998.

[3] P. O. Scokaert and J. B. Rawlings, “Constrained linear quadratic regulation,” *IEEE Transactions on automatic control*, vol. 43, no. 8, pp. 1163–1169, 1998.

[4] J. Köhler, M. A. Müller, and F. Allgöwer, “Analysis and design of model predictive control frameworks for dynamic operation—An overview,” *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 57, p. 100929, 2024.

[5] W. Edwards, G. Tang, G. Mamakoukas, T. Murphy, and K. Hauser, “Automatic tuning for data-driven model predictive control,” in *2021 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 7379–7385.

[6] F. Sorourifar, G. Makrygirgos, A. Mesbah, and J. A. Paulson, “A data-driven automatic tuning method for MPC under uncertainty using constrained Bayesian optimization,” *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 54, no. 3, pp. 243–250, 2021.

[7] A. G. Puigjaner, M. Prajapat, A. Carron, A. Krause, and M. N. Zeilinger, “Performance-driven Constrained Optimal Auto-Tuner for MPC,” *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 2025.

[8] B. Amos and J. Z. Kolter, “Optnet: Differentiable optimization as a layer in neural networks,” in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2017, pp. 136–145.

[9] B. Amos, I. Jimenez, J. Sacks, B. Boots, and J. Z. Kolter, “Differentiable mpc for end-to-end planning and control,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 31, 2018.

[10] R. Zuliani, E. C. Balta, and J. Lygeros, “BP-MPC: Optimizing the closed-loop performance of MPC using BackPropagation,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2025.

[11] ——, “Closed-loop performance optimization of model predictive control with robustness guarantees,” *European Journal of Control*, p. 101319, 2025.

[12] A. Agrawal, S. Barratt, S. Boyd, and B. Stellato, “Learning convex optimization control policies,” in *Learning for Dynamics and Control*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 361–373.

[13] A. Oshin, H. Almubarak, and E. A. Theodorou, “Differentiable robust model predictive control,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.08426*, 2023.

[14] J. Drgoňa, K. Kiš, A. Tuor, D. Vrabie, and M. Klaučo, “Differentiable predictive control: Deep learning alternative to explicit model predictive control for unknown nonlinear systems,” *Journal of Process Control*, vol. 116, pp. 80–92, 2022.

[15] R. Tao, S. Cheng, X. Wang, S. Wang, and N. Hovakimyan, “Diffitune-mpc: Closed-loop learning for model predictive control,” *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 2024.

[16] J. Frey, K. Baumgärtner, G. Frison, D. Reinhardt, J. Hoffmann, L. Fichtner, S. Gros, and M. Diehl, “Differentiable Nonlinear Model Predictive Control,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.01353*, 2025.

[17] S. Gros and M. Zanon, “Data-driven economic NMPC using reinforcement learning,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 65, no. 2, pp. 636–648, 2019.

[18] S. Gros, M. Zanon, and A. Bemporad, “Safe reinforcement learning via projection on a safe set: How to achieve optimality?” *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 8076–8081, 2020.

[19] S. Gros and M. Zanon, “Learning for MPC with stability & safety guarantees,” *Automatica*, vol. 146, p. 110598, 2022.

[20] M. Zanon, S. Gros, and A. Bemporad, “Practical reinforcement learning of stabilizing economic MPC,” in *2019 18th European Control Conference (ECC)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 2258–2263.

[21] K. Jittortrum, *Sequential algorithms in nonlinear programming*. The Australian National University (Australia), 1978.

[22] H. Pirnay, R. López-Negrete, and L. T. Biegler, “Optimal sensitivity based on IPOPT,” *Mathematical Programming Computation*, vol. 4, pp. 307–331, 2012.

[23] J. A. Andersson and J. B. Rawlings, “Sensitivity analysis for nonlinear programming in CasADi,” *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 51, no. 20, pp. 331–336, 2018.

[24] J. Bolte and E. Pauwels, “Conservative set valued fields, automatic differentiation, stochastic gradient methods and deep learning,” *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 188, pp. 19–51, 2021.

[25] E. C. Kerrigan and J. M. Maciejowski, “Soft constraints and exact penalty functions in model predictive control,” in *Control 2000 Conference, Cambridge*, 2000, pp. 2319–2327.

[26] Y. Abbasi-Yadkori, D. Pál, and C. Szepesvári, “Improved algorithms for linear stochastic bandits,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 24, 2011.

[27] R. M. Johnstone, C. R. Johnson, R. R. Bitmead, and B. D. O. Anderson, “Exponential convergence of recursive least squares with exponential forgetting factor,” vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 77–82. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167691182800145>

[28] M. Coste, *Introduction to o-minimal geometry*. Rennes, France: Institut de recherche mathématique de Rennes (IRMAR), 1999.

[29] F. H. Clarke, *Optimization and nonsmooth analysis*. SIAM, 1990.

[30] D. Davis, D. Drusvyatskiy, S. Kakade, and J. D. Lee, “Stochastic subgradient method converges on tame functions,” *Foundations of computational mathematics*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 119–154, 2020.

[31] R. T. Rockafellar and R. J.-B. Wets, *Variational analysis*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2009, vol. 317.

[32] Y. Bar-Shalom and E. Tse, “Dual effect, certainty equivalence, and separation in stochastic control,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 494–500, 2003.

[33] M. C. Campi and S. Garatti, “A sampling-and-discarding approach to chance-constrained optimization: feasibility and optimality,” *Journal of optimization theory and applications*, vol. 148, no. 2, pp. 257–280, 2011.

[34] A. Abdulkareem, V. Oguntosin, O. M. Popoola, and A. A. Idowu, “Modeling and nonlinear control of a quadcopter for stabilization and trajectory tracking,” *Journal of Engineering*, vol. 2022, no. 1, p. 2449901, 2022.

[35] J. M. Snider *et al.*, “Automatic steering methods for autonomous automobile path tracking,” *Robotics Institute, Pittsburgh, PA, Tech. Rep. CMU-RITR-09-08*, 2009.

[36] P. Speissegger, “The Pfaffian closure of an o-minimal structure,” *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 508, pp. 198–211, 1999.

[37] J. Bolte, T. Le, and E. Pauwels, “Subgradient sampling for nonsmooth nonconvex minimization,” *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 2542–2569, 2023.

[38] J. F. Bonnans and A. Shapiro, *Perturbation analysis of optimization problems*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.

[39] A. Bagirov, N. Karmitsa, and M. M. Mäkelä, *Introduction to Nonsmooth Optimization: theory, practice and software*. Springer, 2014, vol. 12.

## APPENDIX

## A. Proof of Theorem 2

The core of the proof involves showing that Assumption A in [30] is verified, and then leveraging Theorem 1 in [30]. For completeness, we report the assumption here for an algorithm of the form

$$p^{k+1} = p^k + \alpha_k [d_k + \xi_k], \quad d^k \in G_k(p^k),$$

where  $d_k$  represents a subgradient that will be specified later, and  $\xi_k$  denotes an error term. Let  $G : \mathbb{R}^{n_p} \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}^{n_p}$  denote the conservative Jacobian of the cost that is to be minimized.

## Assumption 8 ([30, Assumption A]).

- 1) All limit points of  $\{p^k\}$  lie in  $\mathcal{Y}$ .
- 2) The iterates are bounded, that is,  $\sup_{k \geq 1} \|p^k\| < \infty$  and  $\sup_{k \geq 1} \|d^k\| < \infty$ .
- 3)  $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \alpha_k = \infty$  and  $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \alpha_k^2 < \infty$ .
- 4)  $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \alpha_k \xi_k < \infty$ .
- 5) For any unbounded increasing sequence  $\{k_j\} \subset \mathbb{N}$  such that  $p^{k_j} \rightarrow \bar{p}$ , it holds

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n d^{k_j}, G(\bar{p}) \right) = 0.$$

We start by proving that  $\mathcal{J}_{\bar{C}}^k$  represents a “sample” of the true Jacobian  $\mathcal{J}_{\mathbb{C}}$  of  $\mathbb{C}$ .

**Lemma 4.** Under Assumption 3, the expected cost  $\mathbb{C}(p) := \mathbb{E}_w[\bar{C}(p, w)]$  is locally Lipschitz and definable with conservative Jacobian  $\mathcal{J}_{\mathbb{C}}(p) = \mathbb{E}_w[\mathcal{J}_{\bar{C}}(p, w)]$ .

*Proof.* First, definability and local Lipschitz continuity are preserved by integration [36]. Next, the function  $\mathcal{C}(p, \cdot)$  is integrable for any  $p$  because it is locally Lipschitz continuous. Moreover,  $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{C}}(\cdot, w)$  is a conservative Jacobian for  $\mathcal{C}(\cdot, w)$  by construction. For any given  $w$ , the elements of the conservative Jacobian  $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{C}}(p, w)$  are all bounded for  $p$  in bounded sets, since  $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{C}}(\cdot, w)$  is piecewise smooth. We can then invoke [37, Theorem 3.10], which proves that expectation and path-differentiation can be exchanged, proving the claim.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.** Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3 and 5, there exist some  $L_1 > 0$  such that for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and any  $p \in \mathcal{P}$  and  $w$ , we have

$$\text{dist}(J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k(\theta^k), \mathcal{J}_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}(p^k, w^k)) \leq L_1 \text{diam}(\Theta^k),$$

with confidence at least  $1 - \delta$ , where  $\Theta^k$  is given in (21).

*Proof.* Since  $\text{dist}(J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k(\theta^k), \mathcal{J}_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}(p^k, w^k)) \leq \text{dist}(J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k(\theta^k), J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k)$  for any  $J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k \in \mathcal{J}_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}(p^k, w^k)$ , we focus on showing that  $\|J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k(\theta^k) - J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k\| \leq L_1 \text{diam}(\Theta^k)$  for a specific  $J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k$  that we define later and for some  $L_1 > 0$ .

Given any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0, T-1]}$ , let  $e_{u,t}^k = J_{u,t}^k(\theta^k) - J_{u,t}^k(\theta)$ ,  $e_{x,t}^k = J_{x,t}^k(\theta^k) - J_{x,t}^k(\theta)$ , and  $e_{y,t}^k = J_{y,t}^k(\theta^k) - J_{y,t}^k(\theta)$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|e_{x,t+1}^k\| \\ &= \|J_{x,t+1}^k(\theta^k) - J_{x,t+1}^k(\theta)\| \\ &\leq \|J_{f,x}^k(\theta^k)\| \|e_{x,t}^k\| + \|[J_{f,x}^k(\theta^k) - J_{f,x}^k(\theta)] J_{x,t}^k(\theta)\| \\ &\quad \|J_{f,u}^k(\theta^k)\| \|e_{u,t}^k\| + \|[J_{f,u}^k(\theta^k) - J_{f,u}^k(\theta)] J_{u,t}^k(\theta)\|. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Thanks to the local Lipschitz continuity of  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{u}$  (as an immediate result from Lemma 1), the boundedness of  $\mathcal{P}$  by Assumption 5, and the fact that  $w_t$  is almost surely bounded by Assumption 1, we can find constants  $M_x$  and  $M_u$  satisfying  $\|J_{x,t}^k(\theta)\| \leq M_x$  and  $\|J_{u,t}^k(\theta)\| \leq M_u$  for all  $\theta \in \Theta^k$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0, T-1]}$ , and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . For the same reason, there exist constants  $M_{f,x}$  and  $M_{f,u}$  satisfying  $\|J_{f,x}(x_t^k, u_t^k, \theta)\| \leq M_{f,x}$  and  $\|J_{f,u}(x_t^k, u_t^k, \theta)\| \leq M_{f,u}$  for all  $\theta \in \Theta^k$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0, T-1]}$ , and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\bar{\mathcal{X}}$  be a set such that  $x_t^k \in \bar{\mathcal{X}}$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0, T]}$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . From (28), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_{x,t+1}^k\| &\leq M_{f,x} \|e_{x,t}^k\| + M_{f,u} \|e_{u,t}^k\| \\ &\quad + L_f(M_u + M_x) \|\theta^k - \theta\|, \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where  $f$  is Lipschitz (by Assumption 3) in  $\theta$  uniformly for all  $x \in \bar{\mathcal{X}}$  and  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  with constant  $L_f$ . Similarly, we have

$$\|e_{u,t}\| \leq L_{\pi} [\|e_{x,t}^k\| + \|e_{y,t}^k\|], \quad (30)$$

where  $\pi$  is Lipschitz (by Assumption 3) in  $(x, y)$  uniformly for  $p \in \mathcal{P}$  with constant  $L_{\pi}$ , and

$$\|e_{y,t}\| \leq L_{\text{MPC}} [\|e_{x,t}^k\| + \|e_{y,t-1}^k\|], \quad (31)$$

where MPC is Lipschitz (by Assumption 3) in  $(x, y)$  uniformly in  $p$  for all  $p \in \mathcal{P}$  with constant  $L_{\text{MPC}}$ .

Since  $x_0^k = \bar{x}$  and  $y_{-1}^k = \bar{y}$  are known for all  $k$ , we have  $e_{x,0}^k = e_{y,0}^k = 0$ . Suppose inductively that  $e_{x,t}^k \leq L_{x,t} \|\theta^k - \theta\|$ , and  $e_{y,t-1}^k \leq L_{y,t-1} \|\theta^k - \theta\|$ . Then from (30, 31) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_{y,t}^k\| &\leq L_{\text{MPC}}(L_{x,t} + L_{y,t-1}) \|\theta^k - \theta\|, \\ \|e_{u,t}^k\| &\leq [L_{\pi} L_{x,t} + L_{\pi} L_{\text{MPC}}(L_{x,t} + L_{y,t-1})] \|\theta^k - \theta\|. \end{aligned}$$

Letting  $L_{y,t} = L_{\text{MPC}}(L_{x,t} + L_{y,t-1})$  and  $L_{u,t} = L_{\pi} L_{x,t} + L_{\pi} L_{\text{MPC}}(L_{x,t} + L_{y,t-1})$ , we obtain from (29) that

$$\|e_{x,t-1}^k\| \leq L_{x,t+1} \|\theta^k - \theta\|,$$

where  $L_{x,t+1} = M_{f,x} L_{x,t} + M_{f,u} L_{u,t} + L_f(M_u + M_x)$ . This concludes the induction step, implying that for all  $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0, T-1]}$  we have  $\|e_{u,t}^k\| \leq L_u \|\theta^k - \theta\|$  and for all  $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0, T]}$  we have  $\|e_{x,t}^k\| \leq L_x \|\theta^k - \theta\|$ .

Let  $e_x^k = (e_{x,0}^k, \dots, e_{x,T}^k)$  and  $e_u^k = (e_{u,0}^k, \dots, e_{u,T-1}^k)$ . From Assumption 3, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k(\theta^k) - J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k\| \\ &\leq \|J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k + J_{\text{dist}(\cdot, \mathcal{X}^{T+1})}^k\| \|[TL_x + (T-1)L_u]\| \|\theta^k - \theta\|, \end{aligned}$$

where  $J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k = J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}(x^k, u^k, p^k)$  and  $J_{\text{dist}(\cdot, \mathcal{X}^{T+1})}^k \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{dist}(\cdot, \mathcal{X}^{T+1})}(x^k)$ . Since  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$  and  $\text{dist}(\cdot, \mathcal{X}^{T+1})$  are locally Lipschitz, and  $x^k, u^k$ , and  $p^k$  are almost surely bounded by Assumptions 1 and 5, there exists a constant  $L_C > 0$  such that  $\|J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}(x^k, u^k, p^k) + J_{\text{dist}(\cdot, \mathcal{X}^{T+1})}(x^k)\| \leq L_C$ . Defining  $L_1 = L_C TL_x + L_C(T-1)L_u$  we have  $\|J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k(\theta^k) - J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k\| \leq L_1 \|\theta^k - \theta\| \leq L_1 \text{diam} \Theta^k$  where the last statement holds with probability  $1 - \delta$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.* **Claim 1.** The update in (17) can be written as

$$p^{k+1} = p^k + \alpha_k [d^k + \xi_k], \quad d^k \in G_k(p^k), \quad (32)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} G_k(p) &= -\mathcal{J}_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}(p) - \alpha_k^{-1} \mathbb{E}_w [p - \alpha_k J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}(p, w) - \Pi_{\mathcal{Y}_k} [p - \alpha_k J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}(p, w)]], \\ \alpha_k \xi_k &= \Pi_{\mathcal{Y}_k} [p^k - \alpha_k d^k] - \mathbb{E}_w [\Pi_{\mathcal{Y}_k} [p^k - \alpha_k J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}(p^k, w)]], \end{aligned}$$

where  $J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}(p, w) \in \mathcal{J}_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}(p, w)$ .

*Proof of Claim 1.* By Lemma 4, let  $J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k = \mathbb{E}_w [J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}(p^k, w)] \in \mathcal{J}_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}(p^k)$ . Then substituting

$$d^k = -J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k - \alpha_k^{-1} \mathbb{E}_w [p^k - \alpha_k J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}(p^k, w)] + \alpha_k^{-1} \mathbb{E}_w [\Pi_{\mathcal{Y}_k} [p^k - \alpha_k J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}(p^k, w)]]$$

in (32) yields

$$\begin{aligned} p^{k+1} &= p^k - \alpha_k J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k - p^k + \alpha_k \mathbb{E}_w [J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}(p^k, w)] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_w [\Pi_{\mathcal{Y}_k} [p^k - \alpha_k J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}(p^k, w)]] \\ &\quad + \Pi_{\mathcal{Y}_k} [p^k - \alpha_k d^k] - \mathbb{E}_w [\Pi_{\mathcal{Y}_k} [p^k - \alpha_k J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}(p^k, w)]] \\ &= p^k - \alpha_k J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k - p^k + \alpha_k J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k + \Pi_{\mathcal{Y}_k} [p^k - \alpha_k d^k] \\ &= \Pi_{\mathcal{Y}_k} [p^k - \alpha_k d^k]. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Next, let

$$\alpha_k \eta_k := \Pi_{\mathcal{Y}_k} [p_k - \alpha_k d^k] - \Pi_{\mathcal{Y}_k} [p_k - \alpha_k J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k].$$

**Claim 2.** The limit  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k \eta_k$  exists and it is finite.

*Proof of Claim 2.* We use [38, Proposition 4.32] by showing that all assumptions are verified. Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  be fixed. Let  $\Phi = \mathcal{Y}_k$ ,  $f_k(p) = \|p - p^k + \alpha_k J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k\|^2$  and  $g_k(p) = \|p - p^k + \alpha_k d^k\|^2$ . Observe that

1) Since  $\nabla^2 f_k(p) = 2I$ , for any  $p, p'$

$$f(p') \geq f_k(p) + \nabla f_k(p)^\top (p - p') + \|p - p'\|^2,$$

If  $p \in \arg \min_{x \in \Phi} f_k(x)$ , then  $\nabla f_k(p)^\top d \geq 0$  for all locally feasible directions  $d \neq 0$ , i.e., those  $d \neq 0$  such that there exists some  $\epsilon > 0$  for which  $x + td \in \Phi$  for all  $t \in (0, \epsilon]$  [39, Theorem 4.9]. Therefore, if  $p'$  is sufficiently close to  $p$ , then  $\nabla f_k(p)^\top (p - p') \geq 0$  and therefore  $f$  satisfies the quadratic growth property

$$f_k(p') \geq f_k(p) + \|p - p'\|^2.$$

2) We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla f_k(p) - \nabla g_k(p)\| \\ &= 2\|p - p^k + \alpha_k J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k - p + p^k - \alpha_k d^k\| \\ &\leq 2\alpha_k [\|J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k - d^k\|] \\ &\leq 2\alpha_k L_1 \operatorname{diam} \Theta^k =: \kappa, \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from Lemma 5. This means that  $f_k - g_k$  is  $\kappa$ -Lipschitz.

Let  $S_0$  be the set of minimizers of the problem  $\min_{p \in \Phi} f_k(p)$ , and let  $S_1$  be the set of minimizers of the problem  $\min_{p \in \Phi} g_k(p)$ . Observe that  $\alpha_k \|\eta_k\| \leq \operatorname{dist}(S_0, S_1)$ . From [38, Proposition 4.32] we have that for all  $k$  large enough, say for all  $k \geq \bar{k}$ ,  $\operatorname{dist}(S_0, S_1) \leq \kappa = 2\alpha_k L_1 \operatorname{diam} \Theta^k$ . We conclude that for all  $k \geq \bar{k}$ ,  $\alpha_k \|\eta_k\| \leq 2\alpha_k L_1 \operatorname{diam} \Theta^k$ . By Assumption 6,  $\sum_{k=\bar{k}}^{\infty} 2\alpha_k^2 < \infty$ . By equation (21) in Theorem 1, the local Lipschitz continuity of  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{u}$ , and the boundedness of  $\mathcal{P}$ , there exists some  $C > 0$  for which  $\operatorname{diam} \Theta^k \leq C\sqrt{\log k/k}$ . Therefore,  $\sum_{k=\bar{k}}^{\infty} 2\alpha_k L_1 \operatorname{diam} \Theta^k \leq 2CL_1 \sum_{k=\bar{k}}^{\infty} \alpha_k \sqrt{\log k/k} < \infty$ . We conclude that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k \eta_k < \infty$ .

**Claim 3.** The limit  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k \xi^k$  exists.

*Proof of Claim 3.* We have  $\alpha_k \xi^k = \alpha_k \eta_k + \alpha_k \varphi_k$ , where  $\alpha_k \varphi_k := \Pi_{\mathcal{Y}_k} [p^k - \alpha_k J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k] - \mathbb{E}_w [\Pi_{\mathcal{Y}_k} [p^k - \alpha_k J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k(p^k, w)]]$ . The limit  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k \varphi_k$  exists by Lemma 4 and [30, Lemma A.5], and  $\alpha_k \eta_k$  is summable by Claim 2.

**Claim 4.** Point 5 of Assumption 8 holds true with

$$G(p) = -\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{C}}(p) - N_{\mathcal{Y}}(p).$$

*Proof of Claim 4.* Let  $\{p^k\}$  be defined as  $p^{k+1} = \Pi_{\mathcal{Y}_k} [p^k - \alpha_k J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k]$ , where we denoted  $J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k = J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}(p^k, w)$  for simplicity. From the first-order optimality conditions of the projection we have

$$w_k^{\mathcal{Y}} = p^k - \alpha_k J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k - p^{k+1}, \quad w_k^{\mathcal{Y}} \in N_{\mathcal{Y}_k}(p^{k+1}),$$

where  $N_{\mathcal{Y}_k}$  is the limiting normal cone of  $\mathcal{Y}_k$ . From [30, Lemma A.1] we have that

$$\|w_k^{\mathcal{Y}}\| = \|p^k - \alpha_k J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k - p^{k+1}\| = M < \infty.$$

Using the convexity of the set  $G(p)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{dist} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \left( -w_k^{\mathcal{Y}} - \alpha_k^{-1} \mathbb{E}_w [p^k - \alpha_k J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k - p^{k+1}] \right), G(p) \right) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbb{E}_w \left[ \operatorname{dist} \left( -w_k^{\mathcal{Y}} - \alpha_k^{-1} \mathbb{E}_w [p^k - \alpha_k J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k - p^{k+1}], G(p) \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

where  $-w_k^{\mathcal{Y}} \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{C}}(p^k)$ . Due to the outercontinuity of conservative Jacobians and Assumption 7, we have  $\operatorname{dist}(w_k^{\mathcal{Y}}, \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{C}}(\bar{p})) \rightarrow 0$  and  $\operatorname{dist}(w_k^{\mathcal{Y}}, N_{\mathcal{Y}}(\bar{p})) \rightarrow 0$ , meaning that almost surely

$$\operatorname{dist} \left( -w_k^{\mathcal{Y}} - \alpha_k^{-1} \mathbb{E}_w [p^k - \alpha_k J_{\bar{\mathcal{C}}}^k - p^{k+1}], G(p) \right) \rightarrow 0.$$

The proof then follows by repeating the arguments of Claim 4, Page 150 in [30].  $\square$

Claims 1-4 in Assumption 8 follow from the boundedness of each  $\mathcal{Y}_k$ , from Assumption 6, and Claim 3. Therefore, Assumption A in Assumption 8 holds. Additionally, Assumption B also holds because of the definability assumption Assumption 3. We can therefore invoke [30, Theorem 1] to conclude the proof.

### B. Path-differentiability of optimization problems

1) *Path-differentiability of quadratic programs:* For completeness, in this section we provide sufficient conditions for the path-differentiability of a quadratic program of the form

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{x}{\text{minimize}} \quad \frac{1}{2} x^\top Q(p)x + q(p)^\top x \\ & \text{subject to} \quad F(p)x = f(p), \\ & \quad G(p)x \leq g(p). \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

where  $p$  is a parameter. We require the following constraint qualification.

**Definition 1.** Let  $x$  be an optimizer of (33). We say that the linear independence constraint qualification (LICQ) is satisfied at  $x$  if the rows of  $F(p)$  and the rows of  $G(p)$  associated to active constraints (i.e., those rows  $G_i(p)$  for which  $G_i(p)x = g_i(p)$ ) are all linearly independent. More generally, if the constraints are given by  $h(x) = 0$  and  $g(x) \leq 0$ , then LICQ holds at  $x$  if the rows of  $\nabla_x h(x)$  and the rows of  $\nabla_x g(x)$  associated to active constraints are linearly independent.

**Assumption 9.** Problem (33) satisfies the linear-independence constraint qualification (LICQ) and  $Q(p) \succ 0$  for all  $p$ . Moreover, the functions  $Q$ ,  $q$ ,  $F$ ,  $f$ ,  $G$ , and  $g$  are locally Lipschitz and definable.

The Lagrangian and the dual problem associated to (33) are given, respectively, by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(x, \lambda, \mu, p) &= \frac{1}{2} x^\top Q(p)x + q(p)^\top x + \lambda^\top (F(p)x - f(p)) \\ & \quad + \mu^\top (G(p)x - g(p)), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{z=(\lambda, \mu)}{\text{minimize}} \quad \frac{1}{2} z^\top H(p)z + h(p)^\top z, \\ & \text{subject to} \quad \lambda \geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

respectively, where  $H(p)$  and  $h(p)$  are given by

$$H(p) = \begin{bmatrix} GQ^{-1}G^\top & GQ^{-1}F^\top \\ FQ^{-1}G^\top & FQ^{-1}F^\top \end{bmatrix}, \quad h(p) = \begin{bmatrix} GQ^{-1}q + g \\ FQ^{-1}q + f \end{bmatrix},$$

where we omitted the dependency on  $p$  for simplicity. We define the following map, which retrieves a primal optimizer

$y(p)$  (i.e., a solution to (33)) given a dual optimizer  $z(p)$  (i.e., a solution of (34))

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

**Theorem 4** ([10, Theorem 1]). *Under Assumption 9, the solution map  $y(p)$  of (33) is unique, locally Lipschitz and definable for all  $p$ . Moreover, we have that*

$$W - Q(p)^{-1}[G(p)^\top \ F(p)^\top]Z \in \mathcal{J}_y(p),$$

where  $W \in \mathcal{J}_{G,p}(z, p)$ , with  $z$  solving (34), and  $Z = -U^{-1}V$  with

$$U \in J_{P_C}(I - \gamma H(p)) - I, \quad V \in -\gamma J_{P_C}(Az + B),$$

where  $J_{P_C} = \text{diag}(\text{sign}(\lambda), \mathbb{1}_{n_{eq}})$ , and  $A \in \mathcal{J}_H(p)$ ,  $B \in \mathcal{J}_h(p)$ .

## 2) Path-differentiability of nonlinear optimization problems:

In this section we provide sufficient conditions for the path-differentiability of nonlinear optimization problems, extending the results of Appendix B.1 and allowing the utilization of nonlinear MPC formulations in (9).

We consider a parameterized nonlinear programming problem (NLP) in standard form

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{x}{\text{minimize}} \quad f(x, p) \\ & \text{subject to} \quad h(x, p) = 0, \\ & \quad g(x, p) \leq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

where  $f$ ,  $h$ , and  $g$  are all definable and Lipschitz continuously differentiable,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$  is the optimization variable, and  $p \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p}$  is a parameter.

Assuming the existence of a multiplier vector, the KKT conditions for (35) are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_x \mathcal{L}(x, \lambda, \nu, p) &= 0 \\ g(x, p) &\leq 0, \\ h(x, p) &= 0, \\ \lambda_i g_i(x, p) &= 0, \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}_{[1, n_{in}]}, \\ \lambda_i &\geq 0, \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}_{[1, n_{in}]}, \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

where  $\mathcal{L}$  is the Lagrangian of (35) defined as

$$\mathcal{L}(x, \lambda, \nu, p) = f(x, p) + \sum_{i=1}^{n_{in}} \lambda_i g_i(x, p) + \sum_{j=1}^{n_{eq}} \nu_j h_j(x, p).$$

We denote with  $\mathcal{I}(x) \subset \mathbb{Z}_{[1, n_{in}]}$  the set of inequality constraints satisfied with equality at  $x$ , i.e., those indices  $i$  for which  $g_i(x) = 0$ . Additionally, we define  $\mathcal{I}^{\text{sa}}(x) \subset \mathcal{I}(x)$  the set of strongly active inequality constraints, that is, the subset of  $\mathcal{I}(x)$  for which the associated lagrange multiplier  $\lambda_i$  is strictly positive. We use  $\phi = (x, \lambda, \nu) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\phi}$  to refer to a primal-dual pair.

To ensure the path-differentiability of the solution map of the NLP, we need to introduce the following sufficient condition for optimality.

**Definition 2** (Strong second order sufficient conditions). A primal-dual pair  $\phi = (x, \lambda, \nu)$  satisfies the *strong second order sufficient conditions of optimality* (SSOSC) if it satisfies (36),

and additionally  $y^\top \nabla_x^2 \bar{\mathcal{L}}_\theta(\phi)y > 0$  for all  $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$  satisfying  $\nabla_x h_\theta(x)y = 0$ , and  $\nabla_x g_{\theta,i}(x)y = 0$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{I}^{\text{sa}}(x)$ .

To ensure path-differentiability, we require the following.

**Assumption 10.** The functions  $f, g, h$  in (35) are definable and locally Lipschitz jointly in  $x$  and  $p$ .

**Proposition 1.** *Under Assumption 10, if  $\bar{\phi}$  is a primal-dual pair satisfying the SSOSC and LICQ conditions for a given  $\bar{p}$ , there exist a neighborhood  $N$  of  $\bar{p}$  and a locally Lipschitz definable function  $\phi : N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_\phi}$  such that for all  $p \in N$ ,  $\phi(p)$  solves (35) with parameter  $p$ ; moreover,  $V \in \mathcal{J}_\phi(p)$  where  $V$  is the unique solution of*

$$A(\bar{\phi}, \bar{p})V = b(\bar{\phi}, \bar{p}), \tag{37}$$

with

$$A(\bar{\phi}, \bar{p}) = \begin{bmatrix} \nabla_x^2 \mathcal{L}_p(\bar{\phi}) & \nabla_x g_{\mathcal{I}}(\bar{x}, \bar{p})^\top & \nabla_x h(\bar{x}, \bar{p})^\top \\ \nabla_x g_{\mathcal{I}}(\bar{x}, \bar{p}) & 0 & 0 \\ \nabla_x h(\bar{x}, \bar{p}) & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$b(\bar{\phi}, \bar{p}) = \text{col}(\nabla_x^2 \bar{\mathcal{L}}(\bar{\phi}, \bar{p}), \nabla_p g_{\mathcal{I}}(\bar{x}, \bar{p}), \nabla_p h(\bar{x}, \bar{p})).$$

*Proof.* Under the SSOSC and LICQ, we can invoke [21, Theorem 2.3.3] to prove the existence of a Lipschitz continuous function  $\phi : N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_\phi}$  defined in a neighborhood  $N$  of  $\bar{p}$  for which  $\phi(p)$  solves (35) for all  $p \in N$ . Since the solution map is locally unique, it must be the unique solution of the KKT conditions 36. By Assumption 10, each equality and inequality in 36 is a first-order formula in the sense of [28], and therefore the set  $\{(p, \phi(p)) : \phi(p) \text{ satisfies 36}\}$  is definable by [28, Theorem 1.13] for all  $p \in N$ . Since  $\phi(\cdot)$  is definable and locally Lipschitz, it is path differentiable [24, Proposition 2].

Next, if strict complementarity holds at  $\bar{p}$  (that is, if  $\lambda_i > 0$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{I}(s)$ ), then the result follows from [21, Corollary 2.3.1] by removing the rows of  $\nabla_x g(\cdot, \bar{p})$  associated to inactive constraints and diving both sides by  $\lambda_i$ .

Suppose strict complementarity does not hold. In this case the set of active constraints of (35) may change for local variations of  $p$ . Let  $\mathcal{I}^{\text{wa}}(\bar{x}) := \mathcal{I}(\bar{x}) \cap \{i : \bar{\lambda}_i = 0\}$  denote the set of weakly active constraints at  $\bar{x}$ . By [21, Lemma 2.2.2] all strongly active constraints  $\mathcal{I}(\bar{x}) \setminus \mathcal{I}^{\text{wa}}(\bar{x})$  remain active for all values of  $p \in N$ . Therefore, locally, only constraints that belong to  $\mathcal{I}^{\text{wa}}(\bar{x})$  can change (i.e. either become strongly active, become inactive, or remain weakly active).

Let  $\{N_i\}_{i=1}^m$  be a partition of the full measure subset of  $N$  where  $\phi$  is differentiable, where each  $N_i$  is associated to a different set of strongly active constraints  $\mathcal{R}_{N_i}$  with  $\mathcal{I}(x) \setminus \mathcal{I}^{\text{wa}}(x) \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{N_i} \subseteq \mathcal{I}(x)$ . The Clarke Jacobian of  $\phi$  at  $\bar{p}$  is

$$\mathcal{J}_\phi^c(\bar{p}) = \text{conv}\left\{\bigcup_{i=1, \dots, m, p \in N_i} \lim_{p \rightarrow \bar{p}} \nabla \phi(p)\right\}.$$

Observe that for each  $i$ , the limit  $\lim_{p \rightarrow \bar{p}, p \in N_i} \nabla \phi(p)$  satisfies (37) with  $\nabla_x g_{\mathcal{I}}(\bar{x}, \bar{p})$  replaced with  $\nabla_x g_{\mathcal{R}_{N_i}}(\bar{x}, \bar{p})$ . By [21, Theorem 2.2.2],  $\mathcal{I}^{\text{sa}} = \mathcal{R}_{N_i}$  for some  $i$ , meaning that the derivative obtained by solving  $A(\bar{\phi}, \bar{p})V = b(\bar{\phi}, \bar{p})$  belongs to  $\mathcal{J}_\phi^c(\bar{p})$ . The result follows from  $\mathcal{J}_\phi^c(\bar{p}) \subseteq \mathcal{J}_\phi(\bar{p})$  by [24, Corollary 1].  $\square$