Numerical adaptive learning control scheme for discrete-time non-linear systems
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Abstract: In this study, a novel numerical adaptive learning control scheme based on adaptive dynamic programming (ADP) algorithm is developed to solve numerical optimal control problems for infinite horizon discrete-time non-linear systems. Using the numerical controller, the domain of definition is constrained to a discrete set that makes the approximation errors always exist between the numerical controls and the accurate ones. Convergence analysis of the numerical iterative ADP algorithm is developed to show that the numerical iterative controls can make the iterative performance index functions converge to the greatest lower bound of all performance indices within a finite error bound under some mild assumptions. The stability properties of the system under the numerical iterative controls are proved, which allow the present iterative ADP algorithm to be implemented both on-line and off-line. Finally, two simulation examples are given to illustrate the performance of the present method.

1 Introduction

Optimal control of non-linear systems has always been the key focus of the control field in the latest several decades [1–4]. For the traditional optimal control schemes, in order to find the solution of optimal control problems, it often requires the control domain of definition to be a continuous space, such as the whole domain of real space [5]. This allows one to obtain optimal control solutions with arbitrary precision. As the development of digital computers, numerical control (NC) attracts more and more attention to researchers [6–8]. The NC concept employs a digital processing and output device, such as a digital computer, in control systems. Many functions of the conventional controller are replaced in an NC system by a computer program denoted as the NC program. In this situation, the accurate optimal control can hardly be obtained and there always exists an approximation error between the NC and the accurate one. This makes invalid the traditional optimal control schemes implemented by numerical controllers. To overcome this difficulty, a new optimal control method for NC systems must be considered.

Adaptive dynamic programming, proposed by Werbos [9, 10], is an effective adaptive learning control approach to solve optimal control problems for non-linear systems forward-in-time. Iterative adaptive dynamic programming (ADP) is a very important component of ADP to obtain the solution of Hamilton–Jacobi–Bellman (HJB) equation indirectly and have received lots of attention [11–17]. There are two main iterative ADP algorithms that are based on policy and value iterations, respectively [18]. Policy iteration algorithms for optimal control of continuous-time systems with continuous state and action spaces were given in [16]. In 2011, Wang et al. [19] studied finite-horizon optimal control problems of discrete-time non-linear systems with unspecified terminal time. Value iteration algorithms for optimal control of discrete-time non-linear systems were given in [20]. In [21], a value iteration algorithm, which is referred to as greedy iterative HDP algorithm, is proposed for finding the optimal control law and the convergence of the algorithm is also proved. While for value iteration algorithms, the stability of system under the iterative control cannot be guaranteed. In [22], an iterative θ-ADP algorithm is proposed, which permits the ADP algorithm to be implemented without the initial admissible control sequence, where the stability and convergence properties are both guaranteed. Although iterative ADP algorithms attract more and more attentions [23–31], for nearly all of the iterative ADP algorithms, the iterative control in each iteration is required to be accurately obtained. These iterative ADP algorithms can be called ‘accurate iterative ADP algorithms’.

For the NC problem, however, the definition domain of the control (control set for brief) is always discrete, which means the accurate control cannot generally be obtained. In this situation, the convergence properties in the accurate iterative ADP algorithms may be invalid. Although in [32, 33], an iterative ADP algorithm with finite approximation error is proposed based on the iterative θ-ADP algorithm, while the domain of control is still required to be continuous. This means that the target control can always be defined. While for the NC problem, the target control may not belong to the discrete control set, which means that the target control may not be defined. Furthermore, for the algorithms in [32, 33]
and many other iterative ADP algorithms, such as value iteration algorithms [20, 21, 27, 28], only the convergence of the iterative performance index function is discussed. In this situation, the stability of the iterative control cannot be guaranteed. This makes the iterative ADP algorithm in [20, 21, 27, 28, 32, 33] only implementable off-line. Till now, to the best of our knowledge, there are no discussions on the convergence and the stability properties of the iterative ADP algorithms implemented by a numerical controller. This presents a great challenge for on-line applications of iterative ADP algorithms, which motivates our research.

In this paper, it is the first time that the iterative ADP algorithm is studied with a numerical controller. Inspired by [22, 32, 33], a new numerical iterative $\theta$-ADP algorithm is developed to obtain the numerical optimal control scheme by introducing a digital computer into the ADP structure. Convergence and optimality proofs are given to guarantee that the iterative performance index function converges to a finite neighbourhood of the optimal performance index function. We emphasise that the stability properties of iterative controls are also analysed, which make the non-linear system stable during the iteration of the numerical $\theta$-iterative ADP algorithm. In summary, the main contributions of the present algorithm include:

1. A new numerical iterative ADP algorithm is developed to obtain the numerical optimal control law and optimal performance index function iteratively.
2. Convergence and optimality properties are proved to make the iterative performance index function converge to a finite neighbourhood of the optimal performance index function.
3. Any of the iterative controls obtained by the present numerical iterative ADP algorithm can stabilise the non-linear system. This makes the present algorithm implementable both on-line and off-line.
4. The least upper bound of the approximation error (admissible approximation error for brief) can also be obtained in order to justify quantitatively the convergence and stability properties.

2 Problem statement

In this paper, we study deterministic discrete-time non-linear systems

$$\begin{equation}
x_{k+1} = F(x_{k}, u_{k}), \hspace{1em} k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots
\end{equation}$$

where $x_{k} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ is the $n$-dimensional state vector and $u_{k} \in \mathbb{R}^{m}$ is the $m$-dimensional control vector. Let $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n}$ be the set of NCs where we assume 0 $\in \mathfrak{A}$. Let $x_{0}$ be the initial state. Let $u_{0} = (u_{01}, u_{02}, \ldots)$ be an arbitrary control sequence from $\mathfrak{A}$ to $\infty$. The performance index function for state $x_{0}$ under the control sequence $u_{0} = (u_{01}, u_{02}, \ldots)$ is defined as

$$\begin{equation}
J(x_{0}, u_{0}) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} U(x_{k}, u_{k})
\end{equation}$$

where $U(x_{k}, u_{k}) > 0$ for $\forall x_{k}, u_{k} \neq 0$, is the utility function. In this paper, the results are based on the following assumptions.

Assumption 1: System (1) is controllable and the function $F(x_{k}, u_{k})$ is Lipschitz continuous for $\forall x_{k}, u_{k}$.

Assumption 2: The system state $x_{0} = 0$ is an equilibrium state of system (1) under the control $u_{k} = 0$, i.e. $F(0, 0) = 0$.

Assumption 3: The feedback control $u_{k} = u(x_{k})$ is a Lipschitz continuous function for $\forall x_{k}$ and satisfies $u_{k} = u(x_{k}) = 0$ for $x_{0} = 0$.

Assumption 4: The utility function $U(x_{k}, u_{k})$ is a continuous positive-definite function for $\forall x_{k}, u_{k}$.

Define the set of control sequences as $\mathcal{U} = u_{0} : u_{0} = (u_{01}, u_{02}, \ldots), \forall u_{k} \in \mathbb{R}^{m}, i = 0, 1, \ldots$. Then, for an arbitrary control sequence $u_{k} \in \mathcal{U}$, the optimal performance index function can be defined as

$$\begin{equation}
J^{*}(x_{0}) = \min \{J(x_{0}, u_{k}) : u_{k} \in \mathcal{U}\}
\end{equation}$$

According to Bellman’s principle of optimality, $J^{*}(x_{k})$ satisfies the discrete-time HJB equation

$$\begin{equation}
J^{*}(x_{k}) = \min_{u_{k} \in \mathbb{R}^{m}} \left\{ U(x_{k}, u_{k}) + J^{*}(F(x_{k}, u_{k})) \right\}
\end{equation}$$

Then, the law of optimal single control vector can be expressed as

$$\begin{equation}
u_{k}(x_{k}) = \arg \min_{u_{k} \in \mathbb{R}^{m}} \{ U(x_{k}, u_{k}) + J^{*}(F(x_{k}, u_{k})) \}
\end{equation}$$

Generally, $J^{*}(x_{k})$ is impossible to obtain by solving the HJB equation (4) directly. In [22], an iterative $\theta$-ADP algorithm is proposed to solve the performance index function and control law by iterations. The iterative $\theta$-ADP algorithm can be expressed as the following equations, with the iteration index $i$ increasing from 0 to infinity.

$$\begin{cases}
v_{i}(x_{k}) = \arg \min_{u_{k} \in \mathbb{R}^{m}} \{ U(x_{k}, u_{k}) + V_{i}(x_{k+1}) \} \\
V_{i+1}(x_{k}) = \min_{u_{k} \in \mathbb{R}^{m}} \{ U(x_{k}, u_{k}) + V_{i}(x_{k+1}) \}
\end{cases}$$

where $V_{i}(x_{k}) = \theta \Psi_{i}(x_{k})$, $\Psi_{i}(x_{k}) \in \Psi_{i k}$, is the initial performance index function and $\theta > 0$ is a large finite positive constant. The set of positive-definite functions $\Psi_{i k}$ is defined as follows [22, 32].

Definition 1: The set of initial positive-definite functions is defined as

$$\begin{equation}
\Psi_{i k} = \{ \Psi(x_{k}) : \Psi(x_{k}) > 0 \text{ is positive definite and} \exists v(x_{k}) \in \mathbb{R}^{m}, \Psi(F(x_{k}, v(x_{k}))) < \Psi(x_{k}) \}.
\end{equation}$$

In [22], it is proved that the iterative performance index function $V_{i}(x_{k})$ converges to $J^{*}(x_{k})$, as $i \to \infty$ (Theorem 3.5 in [22] for details). It also shows that for $i = 0, 1, \ldots$, the iterative control law $v_{i}(x_{k})$ stabilises the non-linear system (1) when the accurate iterative control laws and accurate iterative performance index functions are obtained.

In real-world implementations, especially for the NC systems, however, for $\forall i = 0, 1, \ldots$, the accurate iterative control law $v_{i}(x_{k})$ and the iterative performance index function $V_{i}(x_{k})$ are generally impossible to obtain. For the situation that the control $u_{k} \notin \mathfrak{A}$, the iterative $\theta$-ADP algorithm in [22] may be invalid. First, for NC systems, the set of NCs $\mathfrak{A}$ is discrete. This means that there are always finite elements in the set of NCs $\mathfrak{A}$, which makes the iterative control law and iterative performance index function obtainable.
3 Properties of the numerical iterative \( \theta \)-ADP algorithm

In this section, a new numerical iterative \( \theta \)-ADP algorithm is developed to obtain the numerical optimal controller for non-linear systems \((1)\). Convergence and stability proofs will also be given in this section.

3.1 Derivation of the numerical iterative \( \theta \)-ADP algorithm

In the present numerical iterative \( \theta \)-ADP algorithm, the performance index functions and control laws are updated by iterations, with the iteration index \( i \) increasing from 0 to infinity. Then, for \( \forall x_i \in \mathbb{R}^n \), let the initial performance index function be \( V_0(x_i) = \theta \Psi(x_i) \), where \( \theta > 0 \) is a large finite positive constant. The numerical iterative control law \( \hat{v}_0(x_i) \) can be computed as follows

\[
\hat{v}_0(x_i) = \arg \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \{U(x_i, u_i) + \hat{V}_0(x_{i+1})\}
\]  

(8)

where \( \hat{V}_0(x_{i+1}) = \theta \Psi(x_{i+1}) \). The performance index function can be updated by

\[
\hat{V}_i(x_i) = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \{U(x_i, u_i) + \hat{V}_0(x_{i+1})\} = U(x_i, \hat{v}_0(x_i)) + \hat{V}_0(F(x_i, \hat{v}_0(x_i)))
\]  

(9)

For \( i = 1, 2, \ldots \), the numerical iterative \( \theta \)-ADP algorithm will iterate between the iterative control law

\[
\hat{v}_i(x_i) = \arg \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \{U(x_i, u_i) + \hat{V}_i(x_{i+1})\}
\]  

(10)

and the iterative performance index function

\[
\hat{V}_{i+1}(x_i) = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \{U(x_i, u_i) + \hat{V}_i(x_{i+1})\} = U(x_i, \hat{v}_i(x_i)) + \hat{V}_i(F(x_i, \hat{v}_i(x_i)))
\]  

(11)

Remark 1: As the set of NCs \( \mathcal{U} \) is discrete, we can say that for \( \forall i \geq 0 \), \( \hat{v}_i(x_i) \neq \hat{v}_{i+1}(x_i) \) in general. Then, we have for \( \forall i \geq 1 \), the iterative performance index function \( \hat{V}_i(x_i) \neq V_i(x_i) \), which means that there exists an error between \( \hat{V}_i(x_i) \) and \( V_i(x_i) \). It should be pointed out that the iterative approximation error is not a constant. The fact is that as the iteration index \( i \to \infty \), the boundary of iterative approximation errors will also increase to infinity. The following lemma will show this property.

**Lemma 1:** Let \( x_i \in \mathbb{R}^n \) be an arbitrary controllable state and Assumptions 1–4 hold. For \( i = 1, 2, \ldots \), define a new iterative performance index function as

\[
\Gamma_i(x_i) = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \{U(x_i, u_i) + \hat{V}_{i-1}(x_{i+1})\}
\]  

(12)

where \( \hat{V}_{i}(x_i) \) is defined in \((11)\). If the initial iterative performance index function \( \Gamma_0(x_i) = \theta \Psi(x_i) \) and for \( i = 1, 2, \ldots \), there exists a finite constant \( \epsilon \) that makes

\[
\hat{V}_i(x_i) - \Gamma_i(x_i) \leq \epsilon
\]  

(13)

hold uniformly, then we have

\[
\hat{V}_i(x_i) - V_i(x_i) \leq i\epsilon
\]  

(14)

where \( \epsilon \) is called uniform approximation error.

**Proof:** The theorem can be proved by mathematical induction. First, let \( i = 1 \). We have

\[
\Gamma_1(x_i) = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \{U(x_i, u_i) + \hat{V}_0(x_{i+1})\} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \{U(x_i, u_i) + V_0(F(x_i, u_i))\} = V_i(x_i)
\]  

(15)

Then, according to \((13)\), we can obtain

\[
\hat{V}_i(x_i) - V_i(x_i) \leq \epsilon
\]  

(16)

Assume that \((14)\) holds for \( i - 1 \). Then, for \( i \), we have

\[
\Gamma_i(x_i) = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \{U(x_i, u_i) + \hat{V}_{i-1}(x_{i+1})\} \leq \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \{U(x_i, u_i) + V_{i-1}(x_{i+1}) + (i-1)\epsilon\} = V_i(x_i) + (i-1)\epsilon
\]  

(17)

Then, according to \((13)\), we can obtain \((14)\). \( \square \)

Lemma 1 shows that although the approximation error for each single step is finite and may be small, as the iteration index \( i \to \infty \) increases, the bounds of approximation errors between \( \hat{V}_i(x_i) \) and \( V_i(x_i) \) may also increase to infinity. To overcome these difficulties, we must discuss the convergence and stability properties of the iterative ADP algorithm with finite approximation errors. For convenience of analysis, we transform the expressions of the approximation error. According to the definitions of \( \hat{V}_i(x_i) \) and \( \Gamma_i(x_i) \) in \((11)\) and \((12)\), we have \( \Gamma_i(x_i) \leq \hat{V}_i(x_i) \). Then, for \( \forall i = 0, 1, \ldots \), there exists a \( \sigma \geq 1 \) that makes

\[
\Gamma_i(x_i) \leq \hat{V}_i(x_i) \leq \sigma \Gamma_i(x_i)
\]  

(18)

hold uniformly. Hence, we can give the following theorem.

**Theorem 1:** Let \( x_i \in \mathbb{R}^n \) be an arbitrary controllable state and Assumptions 1–4 hold. For \( \forall i = 0, 1, \ldots \), let \( \Gamma_i(x_i) \) be
expressed as (12) and \( \hat{J}_i(x_i) \) be expressed as (11). Let \( \gamma < \infty \) and \( 1 \leq \delta < \infty \) be constants that make
\[
J^*(F(x_i, u_i)) \leq \gamma U(x_i, u_i)
\] (19)
and
\[
J^*(x_i) \leq V_0(x_i) \leq \delta J^*(x_i)
\] (20)
hold uniformly. If there exists a \( \sigma \), that is, \( 1 \leq \sigma < \infty \), that satisfies
\[
\sigma \leq 1 + \frac{\delta - 1}{\gamma \delta}
\] (21)
then the iterative performance index function \( \hat{J}_i(x_i) \) converges to a bounded neighbourhood of \( J^*(x_i) \), as \( i \to \infty \).

**Proof:** According to (18)–(20), using the mathematical induction, for \( i = 0, 1, \ldots \), the iterative performance index functions \( \hat{J}_i(x_i) \) satisfies
\[
\hat{J}_i(x_i) \leq \sigma \left( 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{i} \frac{\gamma' \sigma^{j-1} (\sigma - 1)}{(\gamma + 1)^j} + \frac{\gamma' \sigma' (\delta - 1)}{(\gamma + 1)^j} \right) J^*(x_i)
\] (22)
From (22), we can see that for \( j = 1, 2, \ldots \), the sequence is a geometrical series. If (21) holds, then the right side of (22) is convergent for \( i \to \infty \), which proves the conclusion.

**Theorem 2:** Let \( x_i \in \mathbb{R}^n \) be an arbitrary controllable state. If for \( \forall x_i \), Theorem 1 holds and \( \sigma \) satisfies (21), then for \( i = 0, 1, \ldots \), the numerical iterative control law \( \hat{v}_i(x_i) \) is an asymptotically stable control law for system (1).

**Proof:** As \( \hat{V}_0(x_i) = V_0(x_i) = \theta \Psi(x_i) \), we have that \( \hat{V}_0(x_i) \) is a positive-definite function for \( i = 0 \). Using the mathematical induction, assume that the iterative performance index function \( \hat{V}_i(x_i) \), \( i = 0, 1, \ldots \), is positive definite. Then, for \( i + 1 \), according to Assumptions 1–4, we can obtain
\[
\hat{V}_{i+1}(0) = U(0, \hat{v}_0(0)) + \hat{V}(F(0, \hat{v}_0(0))) = 0
\] (23)
for \( x_i = 0 \). When \( x_i \to \infty \), as the utility function \( U(x_i, u_i) \) is a positive function for \( x_i \), we have \( \hat{V}_{i+1}(x_i) \to \infty \). Hence, \( \hat{V}_{i+1}(x_i) \) is a positive-definite function and the mathematical induction is completed. Next, let \( x_i \) be defined as
\[
x_i = \sigma \left( 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{i} \frac{\gamma' \sigma^{j-1} (\sigma - 1)}{(\gamma + 1)^j} + \frac{\gamma' \sigma' (\delta - 1)}{(\gamma + 1)^j} \right) J^*(x_i)
\] and \( \hat{V}_i(x_i) = \chi_i J^*(x_i) \). As \( \sigma \geq 1 + (\delta - 1)/\gamma \delta \), we have \( \chi_i = \chi_i \leq \chi \), which means \( \hat{V}_{i+1}(x_i) \leq \hat{V}(x_i) \). Then, we can obtain
\[
\hat{V}_i(x_i) \geq \hat{V}_{i+1}(x_i) = U(x_i, \hat{v}_i(x_i)) + \hat{V}(x_{i+1})
\] (24)
where \( \hat{v}_i(x_i) = \arg \min_{u \in U} [U(x_i, u_i) + \hat{V}(x_{i+1})] \). So, we have \( \hat{V}(x_{i+1}) - \hat{V}_i(x_i) \leq -U(x_i, \hat{v}_i(x_i)) < 0 \). Hence, \( \hat{V}_i(x_i) \) is a Lyapunov function and \( \hat{v}_i(x_i) \) is an asymptotically stable control law for \( \forall i = 0, 1, \ldots \).

As \( \hat{v}_i(x_i) \) is an asymptotically stable control law, we have \( x_{i+N} \to 0 \) as \( N \to \infty \), that is \( \hat{V}_i(x_{i+N}) \to 0 \). Since \( 0 < \hat{V}_i(x_i) \leq \hat{V}(x_i) \) holds for \( \forall x_i \), then we can obtain \( 0 < \hat{V}_i(x_{i+N}) \leq \hat{V}(x_{i+N}) \) as \( N \to \infty \). So we have \( \hat{V}_i(x_{i+N}) \to 0 \) as \( N \to \infty \). As \( \hat{V}_i(x_i) \) is a positive-definite function, we can conclude \( x_{i+N} \to 0 \) as \( N \to \infty \) under the control law \( \hat{v}_i(x_i) \).

### 3.2 Properties of the numerical iterative \( \theta \)-ADP algorithm

Although Theorem 1 gives the convergence criterion, while we can see that the parameters \( \sigma \), \( \gamma \) and \( \delta \) are very difficult to achieve, which make the convergence criterion (21) quite difficult to verify. To overcome this difficulty, a new convergence conditions must be developed to guarantee the convergence of the numerical iterative \( \theta \)-ADP algorithm. For the convenience of analysis, we define a new performance index function as
\[
\hat{V}_{i+1}(x_i, \hat{v}_i(x_i)) = U(x_i, \hat{v}_i(x_i)) + \hat{V}(F(x_i, \hat{v}_i(x_i)))
\] (25)
where we can see that \( \hat{V}_{i+1}(x_i) = \hat{V}_{i+1}(x_i, \hat{v}_i(x_i)) \) and \( \hat{V}_0(x_i) = \hat{v}_i(x_i, 0) \). Then, we have the following definition.

**Definition 2:** The iterative performance index function \( \hat{V}_{i+1}(x_i, \hat{v}_i(x_i)) \) is a Lipschitz continuous function for \( \forall \hat{v}_i(x_i) \), if there exists an \( L \in \mathbb{R} \) that makes
\[
\| \hat{V}_{i+1}(x_i, \hat{v}_i(x_i)) - \hat{V}_{i+1}(x_i, \hat{v}'_i(x_i)) \| \leq L\| \hat{v}_i(x_i) - \hat{v}'_i(x_i) \|
\] (26)
hold, where \( \hat{v}_i(x_i) \in \mathbb{R} \) and \( \hat{v}_i(x_i) \neq \hat{v}_i(x_i) \).

For the NC system, the set of NCs \( \mathbb{A} \) is discrete. Then, according to the grid principle, let \( P_i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m \), be the discrete grids for the \( j \)th dimension in \( \mathbb{A} \). Let \( Z \) be the set of positive integers. As \( \mathbb{A} \subset \mathbb{R}^m \), then using the grid principle, we can define \( \mathbb{A} \) as
\[
\mathbb{A} = \{ u(p_1, \ldots, p_m) : p_1, \ldots , p_m \in Z, 1 \leq p_1 \leq P_1, \ldots , 1 \leq p_m \leq P_m \}
\] (27)
to denote all the control elements in \( \mathbb{A} \), where \( P_1, \ldots , P_m \) are all positive integers. Thus, for \( \forall x_i \in \mathbb{R}^n \) and \( \forall i = 0, 1, \ldots \), there exists a sequence of positive numbers \( p_1^i, \ldots , p_m^i \) that makes
\[
u(p_1^i, \ldots , p_m^i) = \hat{v}_i(x_i)
\] (28)
hold, where \( 1 \leq p_1^i \leq P_1, \ldots , 1 \leq p_m^i \leq P_m \). Then, according to (25), we can rewrite \( \hat{V}_i(x_i, \hat{v}_i(x_i)) \) as
\[
\hat{V}_{i+1}(x_i, \hat{v}_i(x_i)) = \min_{u \in \mathbb{U}} [U(x_i, u_i) + \hat{V}(x_{i+1})]
\] (29)
Next, for \( \forall u(p_1^i, \ldots , p_m^i) \in \mathbb{A} \), \( 1 \leq p_1^i \leq P_1, j = 1, \ldots , m \), we can define a neighbourhood set of \( u(p_1^i, \ldots , p_m^i) \) as
\[
\hat{A}(p_1^i, \ldots , p_m^i) = \{ u(\bar{p}_1^i, \ldots , \bar{p}_m^i) : j = 1, 2, \ldots , m, u(\bar{p}_1^i, \ldots , \bar{p}_m^i) \in \mathbb{A}, | p_j^i - \bar{p}_j^i | \leq \varepsilon \}
\] (30)
where \( \varepsilon \in \mathbb{Z} \) is defined as the radius of \( \hat{A}(p_1^i, \ldots , p_m^i) \).
Remark 2: From (30), we can see that for an $m$-dimensional control vector $u(p_1', \ldots, p_m')$ inside the set of NCs $\mathfrak{A}$ and for $\forall \theta \geq 1$, there are $(2p + 1)^m$ elements in the set $\mathfrak{A}(p_1', \ldots, p_m')$, where $\mathfrak{A}(p_1', \ldots, p_m')$ is also included in $\mathfrak{A}(p_1, \ldots, p_m)$. If $u(p_1', \ldots, p_m')$ is located at the boundary of $\mathfrak{A}$, the elements in $\mathfrak{A}(p_1', \ldots, p_m')$ is reduced correspondingly. For the control vectors in the same neighbourhood set, for convenience of analysis, we assume that there exists the same Lipschitz constant. If the Lipschitz constants are different, the largest one will be adopted to guarantee the effectiveness of the algorithm and the details will be discussed later in the paper.

Define a new performance index function $\Psi_{i+1}(x_i, \tilde{v}_i(x_i))$ as

$$
\Psi_{i+1}(x_i, \tilde{v}_i(x_i)) = \min_{u_k \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{ U(x_i, u_k) + \tilde{V}_i(x_{i+1}) \}
$$

$$
= U(x_i, \tilde{v}_i(x_i)) + \tilde{V}_i(F(x_i, \tilde{v}_i(x_i)))
$$

(31)

We can see that $\Gamma_{i+1}(x_i) = \Psi_{i+1}(x_i, \tilde{v}_i(x_i))$. As $\tilde{v}_i(x_i)$ cannot be obtained, it is very difficult to analyse its properties. While for $\forall u(p_1', \ldots, p_m')$, we can obtain $\mathfrak{A}(p_1', \ldots, p_m')$ by (30) immediately. So, if $\tilde{v}_i(x_i)$ is inside $\mathfrak{A}(p_1', \ldots, p_m')$ with the radius $\hat{\rho} \geq 1$, then the properties of $\tilde{v}_i(x_i)$ can be obtained. In the following, the relationship between $\tilde{v}_i(x_i)$ and $\mathfrak{A}(p_1', \ldots, p_m')$ will be analysed. Before that, some lemmas are necessary.

Lemma 2: Let $O = (p_1', \ldots, p_m')$ denote the origin of the $m$-dimensional coordinate system and let $\overline{OL}$ be an arbitrary vector in the $m$-dimensional space. If we let $\ell_j, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, be the intersection angle between $\overline{OL}$ and the $j$th coordinate axis, then we have $\sum_{j=1}^{m} \cos^2 \ell_j = 1$.

Proof: Let $L = (\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_m)$ be an arbitrary point in the $m$-dimensional coordinate system. Then we have $\overline{OL} = (\ell_1' - p_1', \ldots, \ell_m' - p_m')$. According to the definition of $\ell_j$, we have $\cos \ell_j = |\ell_j' - p_j'|/|\overline{OL}|$, where

$$
|\overline{OL}| = \sqrt{(\ell_1' - p_1')^2 + \cdots + (\ell_m' - p_m')^2}
$$

Then we have

$$
\sum_{j=1}^{m} \cos^2 \ell_j = \frac{(\ell_1' - p_1')^2 + \cdots + (\ell_m' - p_m')^2}{(\ell_1' - p_1')^2 + \cdots + (\ell_m' - p_m')^2} = 1
$$

Lemma 3: Let $O = (p_1', \ldots, p_m')$ denote the origin of the $m$-dimensional coordinate system and let $\overline{OL}$ be an arbitrary vector in the $m$-dimensional space. Let $A_i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, be points on the $j$th coordinate axis of $m$-dimensional space and $\forall j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, $\overline{OA}_j = \overline{OL}$. If we let $\theta_j = \min\{\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_m\}$, then we have

$$
\overline{AJ} \leq m - 1 / m \cos \left( \frac{1}{2} \arcsin \left( \frac{m - 1}{m} \right) \right)
$$

(32)

Proof: Let $\theta_j = \cdots = \theta_m = \arccos(1/\sqrt{m})$, then we can see that $\theta_j$ reaches the maximum. Let $\alpha_j = \angle OA_jL$. We can obtain $\alpha_j = \frac{1}{2} (\pi - \theta_j)$. According to sine rule [34], we have

$$
\overline{AJ} \leq \frac{\sin \theta_j}{\sin \alpha_j}
$$

(33)

As $\sin \theta_j = (1/m)$, we have $\sin \theta_j = \sqrt{(m - 1)/m}$, and sin $\alpha_j = \cos(1/2 \arcsin(\sqrt{(m - 1)/m}))$. Taking sin $\theta_j$ and sin $\alpha_j$ into (33), we can obtain the conclusion. \hfill \Box

Lemma 4: Let $O = (p_1', \ldots, p_m')$ denote the origin of the $m$-dimensional coordinate system and let $A_i = (p_1', \ldots, p_m')$ be an arbitrary point in $\mathfrak{A}(p_1', \ldots, p_m')$, where $1 \leq \ell \leq (2p + 1)^m$. Let $L = (p_1', \ldots, p_m')$ be an arbitrary point that satisfies $\overline{OL} \leq \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq (2p + 1)^m} \{ \angle OA_i \}$. If the radius $\varrho$ of $\mathfrak{A}(p_1', \ldots, p_m')$ satisfies the following inequality

$$
\varrho \geq \frac{3(m - 1) + \sqrt{3(m - 1)}}{3m}
$$

(34)

then there exists an $\ell$ that satisfies

$$
\overline{AJ} \leq \overline{OL}
$$

(35)

Proof: Without loss of generality, let $L = (\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_m)$ be located in the first quadrant. According to Lemmas 2 and 3, we can see that if intersection angles satisfy $\theta_1 = \cdots = \varrho_\ell = \arccos(1/\sqrt{m})$, the value on the left-hand side of (32) reaches its maximum for each coordinate axis. In this situation, we can let $L = (p_1' + \varrho, \ldots, p_m' + \varrho)$. Let $A_i = (0, 0, \ldots, 0, p_1', \ldots, p_m')$ and $A_i' = (p_1' + \varrho, \ldots, p_m' + \varrho)$. Then, we can see that the points $A_i, A_i'$, and $L$ are on the same line. Let $\overline{A_i} \parallel \overline{BO}_iL$. Then, we have

$$
\cos \ell_j = \frac{(\overline{OA}_i')^2 + (\overline{OL})^2 - (\overline{OA}_i)^2}{2\overline{OA}_i\overline{OL}}
$$

(36)

Taking the coordinates of $A_i$ and $L$ into (36), we can obtain

$$
\cos \ell_j = \frac{(\varrho - 1)m + 1}{\sqrt{m\varrho(\varrho - 1)^2m - (\varrho - 1)^2 + \varrho^2}}
$$

(37)

Next, extend the line $\overline{OA}_i$ to $B_i$, so that it satisfies $\overline{OB}_i = \overline{OL}$. Then $\angle OB_iL$ is an isosceles triangle. It is obvious that when $\ell_j \leq \pi/3$, that is $\cos \ell_j \geq 1/2$, we can obtain $\overline{OB}_i \leq \overline{OL}$. According to (37), we can obtain (34). On the other hand, according to sine rule [31], we can obtain (34). On the other hand, according to sine rule [31], we can obtain $\sin \ell_j / \sin \overline{OB}_i = (\sin \angle OA_i' \angle (\overline{OA}_i' \angle \overline{OL}))$. If $\angle OB_iL \leq \angle OA_iL \leq \pi/2$, we can easily obtain $\overline{AJ} \leq \overline{BL} \leq \overline{OL}$. If $\pi/2 \leq \angle OA_iL \leq \pi$, then $\angle OA_iL$ is the maximum angle in $\angle OA_iL$, which obtain $\overline{AJ} \leq \overline{AC} = \overline{OL}$ directly. The proof is completed. \hfill \Box

Given the above preparation, we derive the following theorem.

Theorem 3: Let $\tilde{v}(x_i) = u(p_1', p_2', \ldots, p_m') \in \mathfrak{A}$ and let $u(p_1', p_2', \ldots, p_m') \in \mathfrak{A}(p_1', p_2', \ldots, p_m')$, $1 \leq \ell \leq (2p + 1)^m$, be an arbitrary control vector. If the radius $\varrho$ of $\mathfrak{A}(p_1', p_2', \ldots, p_m')$ satisfies (34), then there exists a positive number $L \in \mathbb{R}$ that satisfies

$$
\| \tilde{v}_{i+1}(x_i, u(p_1', \ldots, p_m')) - \Psi_{i+1}(x_i, \tilde{v}_i(x_i)) \|
$$

$$
\leq L \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq (2p + 1)^m} \| u(p_1', \ldots, p_m') - \tilde{V}_i(x_i) \|
$$

(38)
Proof: According to the definitions of the iterative performance index functions \( \bar{V}_{i+1}(x_i, u(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im})) \) and \( \bar{\Upsilon}_{i+1}(x_i, \bar{v}(x_i)) \) in (29) and (31), respectively, we can see that if we put the control \( \bar{v}(x_i) \) into the set of NCs \( \mathfrak{A} \), then we have \( \bar{V}_{i+1}(x_i, \bar{v}(x_i)) = \bar{\Upsilon}_{i+1}(x_i, \bar{v}(x_i)) \). For the control \( u(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im}) \), according to Definition 2, there exists an \( L \) that makes

\[
\|\hat{V}_{i+1}(x_i, u(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im})) - \bar{\Upsilon}_{i+1}(x_i, \bar{v}(x_i))\| \\
\leq L\|u(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im}) - \bar{v}(x_i)\| \tag{39}
\]

hold. As \( \bar{v}(x_i) \) cannot be obtained accurately, the distance between \( \bar{v}(x_i) \) and \( u(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im}) \) is unknown. Hence, \( \bar{v}(x_i) \) must be replaced by other known vector. Next, we will show that

\[
\|u(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im}) - \bar{v}(x_i)\| \\
\leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq (2m+1)^m} \|u(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im}) - u(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im})\| \tag{40}
\]

As \( \bar{v}(x_i) \) is put into \( \mathfrak{A} \), then \( \bar{v}(x_i) \) becomes the neighbouring point of \( u(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im}) \) and we can put \( \bar{v}(x_i) \) into \( \bar{A}(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im}) \) which makes \( \bar{v}(x_i) \in \bar{A}(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im}) \). Next, we will prove the conclusion by contradiction. Assume that the inequality (40) does not hold. Then, we have

\[
\|u(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im}) - \bar{v}(x_i)\| \\
> \max_{1 \leq i \leq (2m+1)^m} \|u(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im}) - u(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im})\| \tag{41}
\]

as \( \bar{v}(x_i) \) belongs to the set \( \bar{A}(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im}) \). As there are \( m \) dimensions in \( \bar{A}(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im}) \), we can divide it into \( 2^m \) quadrants.

Without loss of generality, let \( \bar{v}(x_i) \) be located in the first quadrant where \( L = (p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im}) \) is the corresponding coordinate. If we let \( O = (p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im}) \) be the origin, then we have \( \overline{OL} = \|u(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im}) - \bar{v}(x_i)\| \). As \( \bar{V}_{i+1} \) is Lipschitzian according to Theorem 4, if \( \overline{OL} \) is the max vector in \( \bar{A}(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im}) \), then there exists an vector \( \bar{O} \bar{A}_i \in \bar{A}(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im}) \) with the coordinate \( \bar{A}_i = (p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im}) \), that makes (35) hold. Let \( L \) be the Lipschitz constant. Then we can obtain

\[
\|\hat{V}_{i+1}(x_i, u(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im})) - \bar{\Upsilon}_{i+1}(x_i, \bar{v}(x_i))\| \\
= L_i \|u(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im}) - \bar{v}(x_i)\| \\
\geq L_i \|u(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im}) - \bar{v}(x_i)\| \\
= \|\hat{V}_{i+1}(x_i, u(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im})) - \bar{\Upsilon}_{i+1}(x_i, \bar{v}(x_i))\| \tag{42}
\]

According to the definition of \( \bar{\Upsilon}_{i+1}(x_i, \bar{v}(x_i)) \) in (31), we know that \( \hat{V}_{i+1}(x_i, u(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im})) \geq \bar{\Upsilon}_{i+1}(x_i, \bar{v}(x_i)) \) and \( \hat{V}_{i+1}(x_i, u(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im})) \geq \bar{\Upsilon}_{i+1}(x_i, \bar{v}(x_i)) \) hold, for \( i = 1, \ldots, \). Thus, according to (42), we can obtain

\[
\hat{V}_{i+1}(x_i, u(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im})) > \hat{V}_{i+1}(x_i, \bar{v}(x_i)) \tag{43}
\]

This contradicts with the definition of \( \hat{V}_{i+1}(x_i, u(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im})) \) in (29). Therefore the assumption is false and the inequality (40) holds. The proof is completed.

Remark 3: From Theorem 3 we can see that to obtain (38), the inequality (34) should be satisfied. While according to (30), for \( \forall \varrho = 1, 2, \ldots \), the elements in the set \( \bar{A}(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im}) \) is exponentially increasing. This may cause serious computational burden. Fortunately, this situation will never happen. From (34), we can see that if the dimension \( 1 \leq m \leq 4 \), we have \( \varrho \leq 1 \), which means only the points in \( \mathfrak{A}(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im}) \) with radius \( \varrho = 1 \) will be calculated. For \( 4 < m \leq \infty \), we can see that \( 1 < (3(m-1) + \sqrt{3(m-1)/3m}) < 2 \). This means for \( m \geq 5 \), the radius \( \varrho = 2 \) is enough. Therefore the number of the points that needs to compute in \( \mathfrak{A}(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im}) \) is never more than \( 5^m \), which releases the computation burden very much.

According to the definitions of the iterative performance index functions \( \hat{V}_{i+1}(x_i, u(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im})) \) and \( \bar{\Upsilon}_{i+1}(x_i, \bar{v}(x_i)) \) in (29) and (31), respectively, for \( i = 0, 1, \ldots \), we can define

\[
\hat{V}_{i+1}(x_i, u(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im})) - \bar{\Upsilon}_{i+1}(x_i, \bar{v}(x_i)) = \epsilon_{i+1}(x_i) \tag{44}
\]

where \( \epsilon_{i+1}(x_i) = 0 \). Then, for any \( \epsilon_{i+1}(x_i) \) expressed in (44), there exists a \( \epsilon_{i+1}(x_i) \) that satisfies

\[
\bar{\Upsilon}_{i+1}(x_i, \bar{v}(x_i)) = \hat{V}_{i+1}(x_i, u(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im})) - \epsilon_{i+1}(x_i) \\
\bar{v}(x_i) \tag{45}
\]

Theorem 4: Let the iterative performance index function \( \hat{V}_{i+1}(x_i, u(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im})) \) and the numerical iterative control \( u(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im}) \) be obtained by (28)--(29), respectively. If for \( x_i \in \mathbb{R}^n \), we define the admissible approximation error as

\[
\bar{\epsilon}_{i+1}(x_i) = L_i(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im}) \max_{1 \leq i \leq (2m+1)^m} \|u(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im}) - u(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im})\| \tag{46}
\]

where \( L_i(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im}) \) is Lipschitz constant and \( \bar{\epsilon}_{i+1}(x_i) = 0 \), for \( \forall i = 0, 1, \ldots \), we have

\[
\epsilon_{i+1}(x_i) \leq \bar{\epsilon}_{i+1}(x_i) \tag{47}
\]

Proof: As \( \hat{V}_{i+1}(x_i, u(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im})) \) is Lipschitz continuous, according to (27), we have

\[
\|\hat{V}_{i+1}(x_i, u(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im})) - \bar{\Upsilon}_{i+1}(x_i, \bar{v}(x_i))\| \\
\leq L_i(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im}) \|u(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im}) - \bar{v}(x_i)\| \tag{48}
\]

where \( L_i(p_{i1}, \ldots, p_{im}) \) is the Lipschitz constant. According to (40), we can draw the conclusion. □
arbitrary control vector. Then, we can obtain
\[
\begin{align*}
&\|\tilde{V}_{i+1}(x_2, u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m)) - \tilde{V}_{i+1}(x_2, u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m))\| \\
&= \tilde{L}_i(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m)\|u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m) - u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m)\| \\
&= \tilde{L}_i(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m)\|u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m) - u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m)\|
\end{align*}
\]
(49)
where
\[
\tilde{L}_i(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m) > 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, (2Q + 1)^m, \quad i = 0, 1, \ldots
\]
Let
\[
\tilde{L}_i(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq (2Q + 1)^m} \|\tilde{L}_i(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m)\|
\]
(50)
be the local Lipschitz constant. Then (49) can be written as
\[
\begin{align*}
\|\tilde{V}_{i+1}(x_2, u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m)) - \tilde{V}_{i+1}(x_2, u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m))\| \\
\leq \tilde{L}_i(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m)\|u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m) - u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m)\|
\end{align*}
\]
(51)
For \(u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m) \in \mathfrak{A}\), we can define the global Lipschitz constant \(\tilde{L}_i\) as
\[
\tilde{L}_i = \max[\tilde{L}_i(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m) : 1 \leq i \leq P_j, \quad j = 1, 2, m] \\
\]
(52)
Thus, from (50) and (52), we can easily obtain
\[
L_i(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m) \leq \tilde{L}_i \\
\]
(53)
Remark 4: From (49)–(52), we can see that if we want to obtain the global Lipschitz constant \(\tilde{L}_i\), then all the controls \(u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m)\) in the set of NCs \(\mathfrak{A}\) should be searched. This means for \(i = 0, 1, \ldots\), we should run \(P_1 \cdot P_2 \cdot \ldots \cdot P_m \cdot (2Q+1)^m\) times of computation to obtain \(\tilde{L}_i\) by (52). So, the computational burden is very heavy. In this paper, to simplify the algorithm, the local Lipschitz constant \(L_i(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m)\) is used instead of the global one. We use the control vector \(u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m)\) which satisfies (28). Obtaining \(\tilde{A}(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m)\) according to (30), we can obtain \(L_i(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m)\) by (50). Then, the approximation error \(\bar{e}_{i+1}(x_2)\) can easily be obtained by (46).

In the above, we give an effective method to obtain the approximation error \(\bar{e}_{i+1}(x_2)\) of the numerical iterative \(\theta\)-ADP algorithm. In the following, we will show how to obtain the admissible approximation error to guarantee the convergence criterion of the present numerical iterative ADP algorithm. According to (19), we can define \(\gamma = \max(J^*(F(x_2, u_2))/U(x_2, u_2)) : x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n, u_2 \in \mathfrak{A}\). If we let
\[
\tilde{V}_{i+1} = \left\{ \tilde{V}_i(F(x_2, u_2))/U(x_2, u_2) : x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n, u_2 \in \mathfrak{A} \right\}
\]
(54)
then we can obtain \(\tilde{V}_{i+1} \geq \gamma\). Before the next theorem, we make some denotations. Let
\[
\tilde{\sigma}_{i+1}(x_2) = \frac{\tilde{V}_{i+1}(x_2, u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m))}{\tilde{V}_{i+1}(x_2, u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m))} - \bar{e}_{i+1}(x_2) \\
\]
(55)
and
\[
\delta_{i+1}(x_2) = \frac{\tilde{V}_0(x_2, 0)}{\tilde{V}_{i+1}(x_2, u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m))} \\
\]
(56)
Theorem 5: Let the iterative performance index function \(\tilde{V}_{i+1}(x_2, u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m))\) be defined in (25) and the numerical iterative control \(u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m)\) be defined in (28). For \(V_0(x_2, u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m))\), we should run
\[
\bar{e}_{i+1}(x_2) \leq \frac{V_{i+1}(x_2, u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m))}{V_0(x_2, 0)} - \frac{V_i(x_2, u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m))}{V_{i+1}(x_2, u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m))} \\
\]
(57)
then we have the numerical iterative control law \(u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m)\) stabilises the non-linear system (1) and simultaneously makes the iterative performance index function \(\tilde{V}_{i+1}(x_2, u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m))\) converge to a finite neighbourhood of \(J^*(x_2)\), as \(i \to \infty\).

Proof: From (20), we can define \(\delta = \max\{|V_0(x_2, 0)/J^*(x_2)| : x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n\}\). From (54)–(56), for \(x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n\), we can obtain
\[
\bar{e}_{i+1}(x_2) \leq \frac{V_{i+1}(x_2, u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m))}{V_0(x_2, 0)} - \frac{V_i(x_2, u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m))}{V_{i+1}(x_2, u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m))} \\
\]
(57)
then we have the numerical iterative control law \(u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m)\) stabilises the non-linear system (1) and simultaneously makes the iterative performance index function \(\tilde{V}_{i+1}(x_2, u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m))\) converge to a finite neighbourhood of \(J^*(x_2)\), as \(i \to \infty\).

Remark 4: From (49)–(52), we can see that if we want to obtain the global Lipschitz constant \(\tilde{L}_i\), then all the controls \(u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m)\) in the set of NCs \(\mathfrak{A}\) should be searched. This means for \(i = 0, 1, \ldots\), we should run \(P_1 \cdot P_2 \cdot \ldots \cdot P_m \cdot (2Q+1)^m\) times of computation to obtain \(\tilde{L}_i\) by (52). So, the computational burden is very heavy. In this paper, to simplify the algorithm, the local Lipschitz constant \(L_i(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m)\) is used instead of the global one.

According to Theorems 1 and 2, we can draw the conclusion. □

Theorem 6: Let the iterative performance function \(\tilde{V}_{i+1}(x_2, u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m))\) be defined in (25) and the numerical iterative control \(u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m)\) be defined in (28). For \(\forall x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n\), we have
\[
U(x_2, u_2) \geq U(x_2, 0) \\
\]
(61)
and for \(i = 0, 1, \ldots\), the approximation error satisfies (see (62))
\[
\bar{e}_{i+1}(x_2) \leq \frac{V_{i+1}(x_2, u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m))}{V_0(x_2, 0)} - \frac{V_i(x_2, u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m))}{V_{i+1}(x_2, u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m))} \\
\]
(62)
then we have that the numerical iterative control law \(u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m)\) stabilises the non-linear system (1) and simultaneously makes the iterative performance index functions \(\tilde{V}_{i+1}(x_2, u(p'_1, \ldots, p'_m))\) converge to a finite neighbourhood of \(J^*(x_2)\), as \(i \to \infty\).
Proof: If we let
\[ y_{i+1} = \max \left\{ \frac{V_i(x_k, u(p_1, \ldots, p_m))}{\hat{U}(x_k, 0)} - 1 : x_k \in \mathbb{R}^n, u_k \in \mathcal{U} \right\} \] (63)
then we can obtain \( y_{i+1} \geq (J^*(x_i))/(U(x_k, u^*(x_i))) - 1 \geq \gamma \). So, if \( \bar{y}_{i+1}(x_k) \leq 1 + \delta(\bar{y}_{i+1}(x_k) - 1), \) then we have (21) holds, which means that iterative performance index functions \( \hat{V}_{i+1}(x_k, u(p_1, \ldots, p_m)) \) converge to a finite neighbourhood of \( J^*(x_i) \) according to Theorem 1. According to (55), (56) and (63), we can obtain (62). \( \square \)

Remark 5: We can see that if the utility function \( U(x_k, u_k) \) satisfies (61), then the convergence criterion in (62) becomes much simpler than the one in (57). We should say that many real utility functions satisfy the criterion in (62). For example, all the quadratic form utility functions (or state-dependent ones) with the expressions \( x^T Q x_k + u_r^T R u_k \) for \( Q, R > 0 \) in [13, 15, 18–22, 24, 26, 32] satisfy this property. Moreover, all the utility functions with the expressions \( R(x_k) + W(u_k) \) for \( Q(x_k), W(u_k) > 0 \) in [14, 16] also satisfy this property. Therefore the criterion in (62) is not strong and can easily be satisfied for strong optimal control systems. In this paper, to release the computation quantity, we adopt the utility that satisfies (61).

From Theorems 5 and 6 we can see that the information of the parameter \( y_{i+1} \) should be used while the value of \( y_{i+1} \) is usually difficult to obtain. So in the following part, we give a more simplified convergence justification theorem of the iterative ADP algorithm.

Theorem 7: Let the iterative performance index function \( \hat{V}_i(x_k, u(p_1, \ldots, p_m)) \) and the numerical iterative control \( u(p_1, \ldots, p_m) \) be obtained by (28) and (29), respectively. Let \( \bar{y}_{i+1} \) be expressed as in (46). For \( i = 0, 1, \ldots, \) if the utility function \( U(x_k, u_k) \) satisfies (61) and the iterative approximation error satisfies
\[ \bar{y}_{i+1}(x_k) \leq \hat{V}_i(x_k, u(p_1, \ldots, p_m)) - \frac{\hat{V}_0(x_k, 0)}{\gamma} \times \left( \hat{V}_i(x_k, u(p_1, \ldots, p_m)) - U(x_k, 0) \right) \] (64)
then we have the numerical iterative control law \( u(p_1, \ldots, p_m) \) stabilises the non-linear system (1) and simultaneously makes the iterative performance index function \( \hat{V}_{i+1}(x_k, u(p_1, \ldots, p_m)) \) converge to a finite neighbourhood of \( J^*(x_i) \), as \( i \to \infty \).

Proof: First, we look at (19) and (20). Without loss of generality, we let \( \bar{V}_i(x_k) = (J^*(x_i) - U(x_k, u^*(x_i)))/(U(x_k, u^*(x_i)) \) and \( \bar{d}(x_k) = (J^*(x_i) - U(x_k, u^*(x_i)) \). Then, we can obtain \( \bar{V}_i(x_k) \) and \( \delta(x_k) = (V_0(x_k)) - \bar{d}(x_k) \). According to (56), we can obtain \( (\bar{V}_i(x_k) - \bar{d}(x_k)) \) and \( |\delta(x_k)| \). Next, we note that if \( \bar{y}_{i+1}(x_k) \) satisfies
\[ \bar{y}_{i+1}(x_k) \leq 1 + \frac{(\bar{d}(x_k) - 1)}{\gamma} \times \frac{U(x_k, 0)}{\gamma} \] (65)
then we have
\[ \bar{y}_{i+1}(x_k) \geq (J^*(x_i)/(U(x_k, u^*(x_i)) - 1 \geq \gamma \). So, if \( \bar{y}_{i+1}(x_k) \leq 1 + \delta(\bar{y}_{i+1}(x_k) - 1), \) then we have (21) holds, which means that iterative performance index functions \( \hat{V}_{i+1}(x_k, u(p_1, \ldots, p_m)) \) converge to a finite neighbourhood of \( J^*(x_i) \) according to Theorem 1. According to (55), (56) and (63), we can obtain (62). \( \square \)

Remark 6: From Theorem 7, we can see that the parameter \( \gamma_{i+1} \) is omitted in (64) and this makes the convergence criterion much simpler. This is the significant merit of this method, which is an important property we must point out. From (65) we can see that for \( i = 0, 1, \ldots, \) the right-hand side of the inequality is not necessarily larger than 1. This means the approximation error \( \bar{y}_{i+1} \) may be smaller than zero, which makes the convergence criterion (64) invalid, which is a shortcoming of this justification method. In Section 5, we will give a simulation example to show this property. To summarise, we recommend to verify the convergence property by (62) to guarantee the effectiveness of the convergence criterion.

3.3 Summary of the numerical iterative \( \theta \)-ADP algorithm

Now, we summarise the numerical iterative \( \theta \)-ADP algorithm.

Step 1. Choose an array of initial states \( x_0 \) and choose the approximation precision \( \xi \). Give the set of NCs \( \mathcal{X} \) by the expression (27). Give the max iteration index \( \nu_{max} \).

Step 2. Choose a large enough \( \theta \). Let \( i = 0 \) and \( \bar{V}_0(x_k) = \theta \Psi(x_k), \) where \( \Psi(x_k) \in \mathcal{X} \).

Step 3. According to \( \mathcal{X} \), implement the numerical iterative \( \theta \)-ADP algorithm (8)–(9) to obtain \( \bar{V}_i(x_k) \) and \( \bar{V}_{i+1}(x_k) \).

Step 4. Obtain \( u(p_1^0, \ldots, p_m^0) = \bar{V}_0(x_k) \) by (28) and obtain \( \bar{X}(p_1^0, p_2^0, \ldots, p_m^0) \) by (30). Obtain \( \bar{V}_i(x_k, u(p_1^0, \ldots, p_m^0)) \) by (29).

Step 5. Solve the Lipschitz constant \( L_0(p_1^0, p_2^0, \ldots, p_m^0) \) according to (50). Compute \( \bar{y}_i(x_k) \) by (46).

Step 6. If \( \bar{y}_i(x_k) \) satisfies (62), then let \( i = i + 1 \) and go to next step; otherwise, go to Step 11.

Step 7. For \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, \) implement the numerical iterative \( \theta \)-ADP algorithm (10)–(11) to obtain \( \bar{V}_i(x_k) \) and \( \bar{V}_{i+1}(x_k) \). Obtain \( u(p_1^i, \ldots, p_m^i) = \bar{V}_i(x_k) \) by (28) and obtain \( \bar{X}(p_1^i, \ldots, p_m^i) \) by (30). Obtain \( \bar{V}_i(x_k, u(p_1^i, \ldots, p_m^i)) \) by (29).

Step 8. Obtain the Lipschitz constant \( L_i(p_1^i, \ldots, p_m^i) \) according to (50). Compute \( \bar{y}_i(x_k) \) by (46).

Step 9. If \( \bar{y}_i(x_k) \) satisfies (62), then go to next step. Otherwise, go to Step 11.

Step 10. If \( \bar{V}_i(x_k) = \bar{V}_i(x_k) \leq \xi, \) then the iterative performance index function is converged and go to Step 11; else if \( i > \nu_{max} \) then go to Step 11; else, let \( i = i + 1 \) and go to Step 7.

Step 11. Stop.
4 Simulation studies

To evaluate the performance of our numerical iterative $\theta$-ADP algorithm, we choose two examples with quadratic utility function for numerical experiments.

Example 1: Our first example is chosen as the example in [22, 32, 35, 36]. We consider the following system

$$
\begin{align*}
    x_1(k + 1) &= [x_1^2(k) + x_2^2(k) + u(k)] \cos(x_2(k)) \\
    x_2(k + 1) &= [x_1^2(k) + x_2^2(k) + u(k)] \sin(x_2(k))
\end{align*}
$$

(67)

Let $x_0 = [x_1(k), x_2(k)]^T$ denote the system state vector and $u_k = u(k)$ denote the control. Let $\mathcal{X} = [-2, -2 + \zeta, -2 + 2\zeta, \ldots, 2]$, where $\zeta$ is the grid step. The performance index function is defined as (4) with the utility function $U(x_k, u_k) = x_1^2 Q x_1 + u_1^2 R u_1$, where $Q = R = I$ and $I$ is the identity matrix with suitable dimensions. The initial state is $x_0 = [1, -1]^T$.

The iterative ADP algorithm runs for 30 iteration steps to guarantee the convergence of the iterative performance index function. The curves of the admissible approximation error obtained by (62) and (64) are displayed in Figs. 1 and 2, respectively. From Fig. 2, we can see that the for some states $x_k$, the admissible approximation error is smaller than zero, which makes the convergence criterion (64) invalid. While from Fig. 1, we can see that the admissible approximation error curve is above zero which makes the convergence criterion (62) effective for all $x_k$.

To show the effectiveness of the numerical iterative ADP algorithm, we choose four different grid steps. Let $\zeta = 10^{-8}$, $10^{-4}$, $10^{-2}$, $10^{-1}$, respectively. The trajectories of the iterative performance index function are shown in Figs. 3a–d, respectively. For $\zeta = 10^{-8}$ and $\zeta = 10^{-4}$, implement the approximate optimal control for system (67), respectively. Let the implementation time be $T_I = 40$. The trajectories of the states and controls are displayed in Figs. 4a–d, respectively. When $\zeta = 10^{-2}$, we can see that the iterative performance index function is not completely converged within 30 iteration steps. The trajectories of the state are displayed in Fig. 5a and the corresponding control trajectory is displayed in Fig. 5b. When $\zeta = 10^{-1}$, we can see that the iterative performance index functions is not convergent. The control system is not stable.

In this paper, it is shown that if the inequality (57) holds, then for $\forall i = 0, 1, \ldots$, the numerical iterative control $\hat{v}_i(x_k)$ stabilise the system (67), which makes the numerical iterative $\theta$-ADP algorithm implementable both on-line and off-line. In Figs. 6a–d, we give the system state and control trajectories of the system (67) under the iterative control law $\hat{v}_6(x_k)$ with $\tilde{\zeta} = 10^{-8}$ and $\zeta = 10^{-4}$, respectively. In Figs. 7a–d, we give the system state and control trajectories of the system (67) under the iterative control law $\hat{v}_6(x_k)$ with $\tilde{\zeta} = 10^{-2}$ and $\zeta = 10^{-1}$, respectively.

Remark 7: In [32, 33], only the convergence of the iterative performance index function is considered, while the convergence of the iterative performance index function cannot guarantee the stability of the system. From Fig. 3c, for $\zeta = 10^{-2}$, we can see that the iterative performance index function is convergent. From Figs. 7a and b we can see that the system is not stable under the iterative control $\hat{v}_6(x_k)$. This makes the iterative ADP algorithm in [32, 33] is only implementable off-line. While from the simulation results such as Figs. 6a–d, we can see that if the approximation error satisfies (62) the stability of the system under the numerical controller can be satisfied, which makes the numerical iterative $\theta$-ADP algorithm implementable both on-line and off-line. This is an obvious advantage of the present algorithm in this paper.

Example 2: We now examine the performance of the present algorithm in a practical torsional pendulum system [37]. The dynamics of the pendulum is given as follows

$$
\begin{align*}
    \frac{d\omega}{dt} &= \omega \\
    J \frac{d\omega}{dt} &= u - Mgl \sin \theta - f_d \frac{d\theta}{dt}
\end{align*}
$$

(68)

where $M = 1/3$ kg and $l = 2/3$ m are the mass and length of the pendulum bar, respectively. Let $J = 4/3Ml^2$ and $f_d = 0.2$ be the rotary inertia and frictional factor, respectively. Let $g = 9.8$ be the gravity acceleration. Discretising the system function and the performance index function using Euler method [38] with the sampling interval $\Delta t = 0.1s$ leads to

$$
\begin{align*}
    \begin{bmatrix}
    x_1(k+1) \\
    x_2(k+1)
    \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix}
    0.1x_{2k} + x_{1k} \\
    -0.49 \sin(x_{1k}) - 0.1f_d x_{2k} + x_{3k}
    \end{bmatrix} \\
    + \begin{bmatrix}
    0 \\
    0.1
    \end{bmatrix} u_k
\end{align*}
$$

(69)
Fig. 3  Trajectories of the iterative performance index functions

\( a \varsigma = 10^{-8} \)
\( b \varsigma = 10^{-4} \)
\( c \varsigma = 10^{-3} \)
\( d \varsigma = 10^{-1} \)

Fig. 4  Control and state trajectories

\( a \) State trajectories for \( \varsigma = 10^{-8} \)
\( b \) Control trajectory for \( \varsigma = 10^{-8} \)
\( c \) State trajectories for \( \varsigma = 10^{-3} \)
\( d \) Control trajectory for \( \varsigma = 10^{-4} \)
Fig. 5  Control and state trajectories

a State trajectories for $\zeta = 10^{-2}$
b Control trajectory for $\zeta = 10^{-2}$

Fig. 6  Control and state trajectories under $\hat{v}_0(x_k)$

a State trajectories for $\zeta = 10^{-8}$
b Control trajectory for $\zeta = 10^{-8}$
c State trajectories for $\zeta = 10^{-4}$
d Control trajectory for $\zeta = 10^{-4}$
where $x_{1k} = \theta_k$ and $x_{2k} = \omega_k$. Assume that the sampling interval satisfies the Shannon’s sampling theorem [39]. Let the initial state be $x_0 = [1, -1]^{T}$. The utility function is chosen the same as the one in Example 1.

The numerical iterative $\theta$-ADP algorithm runs for 16 iteration steps to guarantee the convergence of the iterative performance index function. The curve of the admissible approximation error obtained by (62) is displayed in Fig. 8.

Let the grid step of the control be $\zeta = 10^{-6}$ to guarantee the convergence condition (62). The convergence trajectory of the iterative performance index function is shown in Fig. 9a. To illustrate the performance of the present numerical iterative $\theta$-ADP algorithm, our results will be compared with traditional value iteration algorithm, which is widely used in [20, 21, 27, 28]. Let the initial performance index function be $V_0(x_k) \equiv 0$. We implement the value iteration algorithm for 30 iterations. The convergence trajectory obtained value iteration algorithm is shown in Fig. 9b.

**Remark 8:** From Figs. 9a and b we can see that the two iterative performance index functions obtained by the numerical
Fig. 10  Optimal control and state trajectories

a Optimal state trajectories obtained by numerical iterative \( \theta \)-ADP algorithm
b Optimal control trajectory obtained by numerical iterative \( \theta \)-ADP algorithm
c Optimal state trajectories obtained by value iteration algorithm
d Optimal control trajectory obtained by value iteration algorithm

Fig. 11  Iterative state and control trajectories under the first iteration control law

a State trajectories under \( \hat{v}_0(x_k) \) obtained by numerical iterative \( \theta \)-ADP algorithm
b First iteration control trajectory \( \hat{v}_0(x_k) \) by numerical iterative \( \theta \)-ADP algorithm
c State trajectories under \( \bar{v}_0(x_k) \) obtained by value iteration algorithm
d First iteration control trajectory \( \bar{v}_0(x_k) \) by value iteration algorithm
iterative \(\theta\)-ADP algorithm and the value iteration algorithm are both convergent, while the convergence properties of the two iterative performance index functions are different. For the numerical iterative \(\theta\)-ADP algorithm, the iterative performance index function is monotonically non-increasing and convergent. However, for the value iteration algorithm, the iterative performance index function is monotonically non-decreasing and convergent. This is an obvious difference between the two algorithms because of the different choice of the initial performance index function.

The optimal state and control trajectories by the numerical iterative \(\theta\)-ADP algorithm are shown in Figs. 10a and b, respectively. The optimal state and control trajectories by the traditional value iteration algorithm are shown in Figs. 10c and d, respectively.

From the simulation results, we can see that the numerical iterative \(\theta\)-ADP algorithm effectively obtains the optimal control law of the torsional pendulum system. On the other hand, we point out that for value iteration, it cannot make the system stable under the iterative control law, while for the numerical iterative \(\theta\)-ADP algorithm, the stability of the system can be guaranteed. In Fig. 11a, we give the system state trajectories of the system (69) under the iterative control law \(\hat{v}_b(x_k)\) by numerical iterative \(\theta\)-ADP algorithm. The corresponding control trajectory is shown in Fig. 11b. Let \(\hat{v}_b(x_k)\) be the control law of the first iteration obtained by value iteration algorithm. Then the system state trajectories of the system (69) under the iterative control law \(\hat{v}_b(x_k)\) by value iteration algorithm are shown in Fig. 11c. The corresponding control trajectory is shown in Fig. 11d.

Remark 9: From the simulation results, we see that the stability of the system under the iterative control law obtained by the value iteration algorithm cannot be guaranteed. This makes the value iteration algorithms can only implemented off-line to obtain the optimal control law. For our present numerical iterative \(\theta\)-ADP algorithm, it is successfully obtain the optimal control law for the torsional pendulum system. If the approximation error is satisfied, then the iterative performance index function is convergent to the finite neighbourhood of the optimal performance index functions. We emphasise that the stability of the system is also guaranteed. This is an great advantage of the present algorithm in this paper comparing the iteration algorithms.

5 Conclusions

In this paper, we have developed an effective numerical iterative \(\theta\)-ADP algorithm to find the infinite horizon optimal control for discrete-time non-linear systems. In the numerical iterative \(\theta\)-ADP algorithm, any of the iterative control is stable for the non-linear system which means the present algorithm can be used both on-line and off-line. Convergence analysis of the performance index function for the iterative ADP algorithm is proved and the stability proofs are also given. Finally, two simulation examples are given to illustrate the performance of the present algorithm.
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