

Model-Free μ -Synthesis: A Nonsmooth Optimization Perspective

Darioush Keivan

Xingang Guo

Peter Seiler

Geir Dullerud

Bin Hu

DK12@ILLINOIS.EDU

XINGANG2@ILLINOIS.EDU

PSEILER@UMICH.EDU

DULLERUD@ILLINOIS.EDU

BINHU7@ILLINOIS.EDU

Abstract

In this paper, we revisit model-free policy search on an important robust control benchmark, namely μ synthesis. In the general output-feedback setting, there do not exist convex formulations for this problem, and hence global optimality guarantees are not expected. [Apkarian \(2011\)](#) presented a nonconvex nonsmooth policy optimization approach for this problem, and achieved state-of-the-art design results via using subgradient-based policy search algorithms which generate update directions in a model-based manner. Despite the lack of convexity and global optimality guarantees, these subgradient-based policy search methods have led to impressive numerical results in practice. Built upon such a policy optimization perspective, our paper extends these subgradient-based search methods to a model-free setting. Specifically, we examine the effectiveness of two model-free policy optimization strategies: the model-free non-derivative sampling method and the zeroth-order policy search with uniform smoothing. We performed an extensive numerical study to demonstrate that both methods consistently replicate the design outcomes achieved by their model-based counterparts. Additionally, we provide some theoretical justifications showing that convergence guarantees to stationary points can be established for our model-free μ -synthesis under some assumptions related to the coerciveness of the cost function. Overall, our results demonstrate that derivative-free policy optimization offers a competitive and viable approach for solving general output-feedback μ -synthesis problems in the model-free setting.

Keywords: Model-free μ -synthesis, direct policy search, nonsmooth optimization, zeroth-order optimization

1. Introduction

In recent years, the empirical success of reinforcement learning (RL) has significantly impacted the controls field, sparking increased interest in direct policy search methods. Various properties of policy optimization (PO) have been established across many standard control benchmark problems ([Hu et al., 2023](#)), including linear quadratic regulators (LQR) ([Fazel et al., 2018](#); [Bu et al., 2019](#); [Malik et al., 2019](#); [Yang et al., 2019](#); [Mohammadi et al., 2021](#); [Furieri et al., 2020](#); [Hambly et al., 2021](#); [Fatkhullin and Polyak, 2021](#); [Duan et al., 2021](#)), stabilization ([Perdomo et al., 2021](#); [Ozaslan et al., 2022](#)), linear robust/risk-sensitive control ([Zhang et al., 2021a, 2020, 2021b](#); [Gravell et al., 2020](#); [Zhao and You, 2021](#); [Guo and Hu, 2022](#); [Guo et al., 2023](#); [Tang and Zheng, 2023](#)), linear quadratic Gaussian (LQG) ([Zheng et al., 2023b,a, 2022](#); [Hu and Zheng, 2022](#)), and Markov jump linear quadratic control ([Jansch-Porto et al., 2020b, 2022, 2020a](#); [Rathod et al., 2021](#)). Many of the above results (implicitly) rely on the fundamental connections between the nonconvex policy optimization formulations and the existing higher-dimensional convex synthesis reformulations ([Scherer et al., 1997](#); [Boyd et al., 1994](#); [Gahinet and Apkarian, 1994](#); [Scherer and Wieland, 2004](#)). However, there are important linear robust control problems that do not have convex reformulations in the first place.

In this paper, we will look at one of such problems, namely the general output-feedback μ -synthesis. The μ -synthesis has long been a cornerstone in robust control, dealing with systems affected by uncertainties (Packard et al., 1993; Honda and Seiler, 2014; Zhou et al., 1996; Dullerud and Paganini, 2013). The goal of μ -synthesis is to design a controller that stabilizes the closed-loop dynamics and minimizes the so-called structured singular value (or equivalently robust performance) at the same time. Traditional methods for addressing μ -synthesis have typically centered around finding upper bounds using DK -iteration techniques (Zhou et al., 1996). Later, Apkarian (2011) innovatively reformulated the general μ -synthesis as a nonconvex, nonsmooth, model-based policy optimization problem such that subgradient-based search techniques can be directly applied to achieve state-of-the-art results and even outperform DK -iteration on many examples. Dealing with the nonconvex nonsmooth optimization in Apkarian (2011) is highly non-trivial, i.e. one needs to enlarge the Clarke subdifferential in some novel way for the purpose of generating good descent directions. The original work in Apkarian (2011) relies on a frequency-domain technique (which is quite similar to the `Hinfstruct` solver (Gahinet and Apkarian, 2011) from the MATLAB robust control toolbox). In principle, one can also use the gradient sampling technique (Burke et al., 2020, 2005; Kiwiel, 2007)¹. In this work, we extend the nonsmooth optimization perspective on μ -synthesis (Apkarian, 2011) to the model-free setting. Notice that the model-free state-feedback μ -synthesis has been previously addressed via combining DK -iteration and a central-path algorithm that adopts robust adversarial reinforcement learning (RARL) as subroutines for finding analytical center in the K step (Keivan et al., 2021). However, such an approach is not directly applicable in the general output-feedback setting. Alternatively, we examine the effectiveness of two model-free policy search strategies that are deeply connected to nonsmooth optimization theory: the model-free non-derivative sampling method and the zeroth-order policy search with uniform smoothing.

Our findings indicate that both methods consistently yield design solutions comparable to those achieved by conventional model-based approaches, such as DK -iteration method. Similar to their model-based counterparts (Apkarian, 2011), our proposed model-free methods even outperform DK -iterations in some cases. Additionally, we provide some theoretical justifications showing that convergence guarantees to stationary points can be established for our model-free μ -synthesis under some assumptions related to the coerciveness of the cost function. Our theoretical developments extend recently-developed convergence/complexity results on \mathcal{H}_∞ policy search (Guo and Hu, 2022; Guo et al., 2023). These outcomes underscore the potential of direct policy search via zeroth-order optimization as a viable and competitive approach for addressing the general output-feedback μ -synthesis in the model-free setting.

2. Problem Formulations and Preliminaries

Setup of μ -synthesis. For the rest of this paper, let G denote the following linear time-invariant (LTI) system:

$$\begin{aligned} x_{t+1} &= Ax_t + B_w w_t + B_d d_t + B_u u_t, \\ v_t &= C_v x_t + D_{vw} w_t + D_{vd} d_t + D_{vu} u_t, \\ e_t &= C_e x_t + D_{ew} w_t + D_{ed} d_t + D_{eu} u_t, \\ y_t &= C_y x_t + D_{yw} w_t + D_{yd} d_t + D_{yu} u_t, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

1. Interestingly, the \mathcal{H}_∞ fixed-order optimization (`HIFOO`) solver (Arzelier et al., 2011; Gumussoy et al., 2009) was developed based on such an alternative choice of algorithms.




Figure 1: Interconnection for Robust Synthesis

where $x_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ is the system state, $u_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ is the control input, $d_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_d}$ is the exogenous disturbance, $e_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_e}$ is the performance signal, $y_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y}$ is the output measurement, $v_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_v}$ is the uncertainty input, and $w_t \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w}$ is the uncertainty output. To start, we consider the standard robust synthesis interconnection as shown in the left-side sub-figure of Figure 1. Let $\mathcal{F}_l(G, K)$ denote the feedback interconnection of G and K . The pair (v, w) satisfies the relation $w = \Delta(v)$, where Δ is a mapping within a *cone* Δ of structured bounded linear time-invariant (LTI) operators. The term Δ denotes the uncertainty set (Zhou et al., 1996; Dullerud and Paganini, 2013). The main objective of robust synthesis is to design a controller that stabilizes the closed-loop dynamics and optimizes the robust performance² at the same time. However, verifying robust performance is inherently intractable, prompting a shift in focus towards establishing an upper bound. This is achieved by introducing a set of positive scaling functions \mathbf{D} , each satisfying $D\Delta = \Delta D$ for all $\Delta \in \Delta$. The block diagram of the scaled system is shown in the middle sub-figure of Figure 1. To optimize this upper bound on robust performance, one eventually needs to minimize the ℓ_2 gain from scaled inputs (\tilde{w}, d) to scaled outputs (\tilde{v}, e) using appropriate D -scales. Therefore, the original robust synthesis task reduces to solving the following optimization problem:

$$\inf_{K \in \mathcal{K}, D \in \mathbf{D}} \|D \mathcal{F}_l(G, K) D^{-1}\|_{\infty}. \quad (2)$$

In classical μ -synthesis, the optimization problem (2) is tackled via the DK -iteration approach, which alternates between optimizing D while fixing K as constant, and then optimizing K with D held constant. During the K -step, K is determined through an \mathcal{H}_{∞} synthesis procedure applied to the scaled plant outlined in (2). During the D -step, a realizable D -scaling is obtained by optimizing D over a discrete frequency grid and subsequently fitting a transfer function $D \in \mathcal{RH}_{\infty}$ with $D^{-1} \in \mathcal{RH}_{\infty}$. While this heuristic technique can locate effective solutions in many practical situations, the coordinate descent nature can potentially lead to unnecessary conservatism.

Policy optimization formulation. In contrast to the DK -iteration approach, Apkarian (2011) proposed an algorithm to solve for D and K simultaneously by constructing a feedback interconnection of an augmented plant and a structured controller, as shown in the right-side sub-figure of Figure 1. This innovative approach transforms the robust synthesis problem (2) into a structured \mathcal{H}_{∞} synthesis problem. In this framework, the augmented controller K_c and the augmented plant G_c are

2. A controller K achieves *Robust Performance of level γ* if for all $\Delta \in \Delta$ satisfying $\|\Delta\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{1}{\gamma}$, the closed-loop system is well-posed, stable, and has the mapping from d to e satisfying $\|T_{d \rightarrow e}(\Delta)\|_{\infty} \leq \gamma$.

formulated as

$$G_c = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & I \\ 0 & 0 \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix} G \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 & -I & 0 \\ 0 & I & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & I \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ I & 0 & -I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, K_c = \begin{bmatrix} K & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{D} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \tilde{D} \end{bmatrix},$$

where \tilde{D} is defined as $\tilde{D} := \begin{bmatrix} D & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} - I$. Specifically, we can reformulate (2) as the following policy optimization problem

$$\min_{K_c \in \mathcal{K}_c} J(K_c), \quad (3)$$

where the decision variable K_c is determined by the structural controller parameterization, the cost function $J(K_c)$ is the closed-loop \mathcal{H}_∞ norm (from $\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{w} \\ d \end{bmatrix}$ to $\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{v} \\ e \end{bmatrix}$) for a given controller, and the feasible set $\mathcal{K}_c := \{K_c : F_l(G_c, K_c) \text{ is internally stable}\}$ just carries the information of the closed-loop stability constraint. The above PO formulation allows very flexible choices in the controller parameterization. For example, in the static output feedback setting and static D scaling, the augmented controller is just parameterized by a static matrix K_c . In the dynamic output feedback setting and LTI D scaling, the augmented controller has the following state-space form:

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{t+1} &= \begin{bmatrix} A_K & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & A_D & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & A_D \end{bmatrix} \xi_t + \begin{bmatrix} B_K & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{B}_D & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \tilde{B}_D \end{bmatrix} y_{ct}, \\ u_{ct} &= \begin{bmatrix} C_K & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{C}_D & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \tilde{C}_D \end{bmatrix} \xi_t + \begin{bmatrix} D_K & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{D}_D & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \tilde{D}_D \end{bmatrix} y_{ct}, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where ξ_t is the internal state for the augmented controller, $\tilde{B}_D = [B_D \ 0]$, $\tilde{C}_D = \begin{bmatrix} C_D \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$, $\tilde{D}_D = \begin{bmatrix} D_D - I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, and the decision variable K_c is just the tuple $(A_K, B_K, C_K, D_K, A_D, B_D, C_D, D_D)$. In general, the formulation (3) provides a unified paradigm for robust control synthesis (2) by allowing flexible choices of the augmented controller parameterization. When the system model is known, subgradient information can be efficiently calculated for solving (3). [Apkarian \(2011\)](#) takes such a nonsmooth optimization approach, leading to state-of-the-art numerical results on many examples.

Problem statement: model-free policy search. In this paper, we focus on solving (3) under the model-free setting, i.e. the plant G is unknown. We do not even assume any prior knowledge on the order of G , i.e. the state dimension n_x can be unknown³. We are particularly interested in model-free direct policy search which updates recursively as follows

$$K_c^{n+1} = K_c^n - \alpha^n F^n, \quad (5)$$

where F^n is a descent direction generated from some simulated data of the closed-loop system $F_l(G_c, K_c^n)$. If the cost J is smooth around K_c^n , then obviously we can set F^n to be some sample-based estimation of the gradient $\nabla J(K_c^n)$. However, the closed-loop \mathcal{H}_∞ norm is typically a nonconvex nonsmooth function of K_c , and can be non-differentiable over important feasible points (e.g., stationary points) in the policy space ([Apkarian and Noll, 2006a,b](#); [Arzelier et al., 2011](#); [Gumussoy et al., 2009](#); [Burke et al., 2020](#); [Curtis et al., 2017](#)). Advanced subgradient-based optimization techniques are typically needed for solving such nonconvex nonsmooth PO problems. We will study how to compute F^n in the model-free setting.

3. It is well-known that the lack of order information can cause difficulty for system identification in some cases.

Review: Subgradient methods in the model-based setting. For readability, let us briefly review several subgradient-based methods that have been used in the model-based setting. It is known that the closed-loop \mathcal{H}_∞ objective function (2) is locally Lipschitz⁴ over the feasible set \mathcal{K}_c (Apkarian and Noll, 2006b). For a locally Lipschitz function, the Clarke subdifferential exists and is defined as

$$\partial J(K_c) := \text{conv}\left\{\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \nabla J(K_{c_i}) : K_{c_i} \rightarrow K_c, K_{c_i} \in \text{dom}(\nabla J) \subset \mathcal{K}_c\right\}, \quad (6)$$

where conv stands for the convex hull. Dealing with the nonconvex nonsmooth optimization in Apkarian (2011) is highly non-trivial, i.e. one needs to enlarge the Clarke subdifferential in some novel way for the purpose of generating good descent directions. The original work in Apkarian (2011) relies on a frequency-domain technique (which is quite similar to the `Hinfstruct` solver (Gahinet and Apkarian, 2011) from the MATLAB robust control toolbox). Alternatively, gradient sampling methods can also generate good descent directions (Burke et al., 2020, 2005; Kiwiel, 2007). Specifically, notice that the Goldstein δ -subdifferential for a point $K_c \in \mathcal{K}_c$ is defined as

$$\partial_\delta J(K_c) := \text{conv}\left\{\cup_{K'_c \in \mathcal{B}_\delta(K_c)} \partial J(K'_c)\right\}, \quad (7)$$

where $\mathcal{B}_\delta(K_c)$ denotes the δ -ball around K_c , and is implicitly required to be in \mathcal{K}_c . Clearly, $\partial_\delta J(K_c)$ is much larger than $\partial J(K_c)$. The minimum norm element of the Goldstein subdifferential provides a good descent direction, i.e. we have $J(K_c - \delta F / \|F\|_2) \leq J(K_c) - \delta \|F\|_2$ for F being the minimum norm element of $\partial_\delta J(K_c)$ (Goldstein, 1977). Computing the minimum norm element from the Goldstein subdifferential can be difficult, and the main idea of gradient sampling method is to estimate a good descent direction from approximating $\partial_\delta J(K_c)$ as the convex hull of randomly sampled gradients over $\mathcal{B}_\delta(K_c)$ (this is reasonable due to the fact that a locally Lipschitz function is differentiable almost everywhere). At every iteration step n , one can randomly sample differential points around K_c^n , and use the convex hull formed by the gradients at those sampled points to approximate the Goldstein subdifferential. Then the minimum norm element from this convex hull of sampled gradients can be efficiently computed via a convex quadratic program and serves as a good descent direction for the policy update.

3. Main Results: Model-Free Algorithms and Theoretical Justifications

In this paper, we aim to minimize the cost function (3) within the policy space directly utilizing two distinct zeroth-order optimization methods: the non-derivative sampling (NS) and the standard zeroth-order policy search with randomized smoothing. In addition, we assume that the state, input, and output matrices specified in (1) are unknown, and the cost function (3) can only be inferred from the input/output data via a “black-box” simulator of the underlying system. In particular, we employ the model-free time-reversal power-iteration-based \mathcal{H}_∞ estimation methods proposed in Wahlberg et al. (2010) for estimating the cost function value (3). Furthermore, we demonstrate theoretically that under some assumptions, the PO problem (3) can be rewritten as another PO problem with coercive cost function. Consequently, leveraging the techniques described in Guo and Hu (2022) and Guo et al. (2023), we can obtain some theoretical justifications for convergence to stationary points.

4. A function $J : \mathcal{K}_c \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be locally Lipschitz if for any bounded set $S \subset \mathcal{K}_c$, there exists a constant L such that $|J(K_c) - J(K'_c)| \leq L \|K_c - K'_c\|_2$ for all $K_c, K'_c \in S$.

Algorithm 1 Non-derivative Sampling (NS)

Require: initial stabilizing policy $K_c^0 \in \mathcal{K}_c$, initial sampling radius δ^0 , optimality tolerances $\delta_{opt}, \epsilon_{opt} > 0$, initial stationarity target $\epsilon^0 \in [0, \infty)$, reduction factors $\mu_\delta, \mu_\epsilon \in (0, 1]$, problem dimension d , line search parameters (β, t, κ) in $(0, 1)$, and a sequence of positive mollifier parameters defined as $\alpha^n = \alpha_0/(n+1)$.

for $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**

Independently sample $\{K_c^{n,i}\}_{i=1}^{d+1}$ uniformly from $\mathcal{B}_{\delta^n}(K_c^n)$

Independently sample $\{z^{n,i}\}_{i=1}^{d+1}$ uniformly from $\mathcal{Z} := \prod_{i=1}^d [-1/2, 1/2]^d$.

Compute $F^n = \arg \min \frac{1}{2} \|F\|_2^2$ s.t. $F \in \text{conv}\{\chi(K_c^{n,1}, \alpha^n, z^{n,1}), \dots, \chi(K_c^{n,m}, \alpha^n, z^{n,m})\}$.

if $\|F^n\| \leq \epsilon_{opt}$ and $\delta^n \leq \delta_{opt}$, terminate.

if $\|F^n\| \leq \epsilon^n$ **then**

set $\epsilon^{n+1} \leftarrow \mu_\epsilon \epsilon^n$, $\delta^{n+1} \leftarrow \mu_\delta \delta^n$, $t^n \leftarrow 0$, $K_c^{n+1} \leftarrow K_c^n$, and move to the next round

else

set $\delta^{n+1} \leftarrow \delta^n$, $\epsilon^{n+1} \leftarrow \epsilon^n$, $\hat{F}^n \leftarrow F^n / \|F^n\|_2$, and $K_c^{n+1} \leftarrow K_c^n - t^n \hat{F}^n$, where t^n is determined using the following line search strategy:

- (i) Choose an initial step size $t = t_{ini}^n = \delta^n \geq t_{min}^n := \min\{t, \kappa \delta^n / 3\}$
- (ii) If $J(K_c^n - t \hat{F}^n) \leq J(K_c^n) - \beta t \|F^n\|$, return $t^n := t$
- (iii) If $\kappa t < t_{min}^n$, return $t^n := 0$
- (iv) Set $t := \kappa t$, and go to (ii).

end if

end for

3.1. Non-derivative Sampling

As mentioned previously, gradient sampling (GS) is a principal optimization algorithm utilized in the HIFOO robust control package (Arzelier et al., 2011; Gumussoy et al., 2009). In this work, given that the system model is unknown and we have access only to estimates of the cost function (2), we adopt the NS algorithm (Kiwiel, 2010), a derivative-free counterpart to the GS algorithm. In contrast to GS, the NS estimates the gradient from function values via Gupal's estimation $\chi(K, \alpha, z)$ (See (Kiwiel, 2010, Section 2) for more details on the computation of χ). The NS method can be implemented as outlined in Algorithm 1.

In the model-free setting, one has to estimate the cost function from data. As discussed in the beginning of this section, we will use well-established \mathcal{H}_∞ -norm estimation methods such as the power iteration method in Wahlberg et al. (2010) to estimate the cost values.

3.2. Derivative-free Optimization with Randomized Smoothing

Our second derivative-free method is based on the utilization of randomized smoothing techniques, which have been widely adopted in both convex and nonconvex optimization challenges (Duchi et al., 2012; Ghadimi and Lan, 2013). We define the uniformly randomized smoothed counterpart of $J(K_c)$ as below.

Definition 1 Given a function J that is L -Lipschitz (which may be nonconvex or nonsmooth) and a uniform distribution \mathbb{P} over the set $\{U : \|U\|_F = 1\}$, the uniformly smoothed form of J , denoted as J_δ , is given by

$$J_\delta(K_c) = \mathbb{E}_{U \sim \mathbb{P}}[J(K_c + \delta U)]. \quad (8)$$

Algorithm 2 Derivative-free optimization method with randomized smoothing

Require: feasible initial point K_c^0 , stepsize $\eta > 0$, problem dimension $d \geq 1$, smoothing parameter δ and iteration number $N \geq 1$.

for $n = 0, 1, \dots, N - 1$ **do**

 Sample $W^n \in \mathbb{R}^{n_d}$ uniformly at random over vectors such that $\|W\|_F = 1$.

 Compute $g^n = \frac{d}{2\delta}(J(K_c^n + \delta W^n) - J(K_c^n - \delta W^n))W^n$.

 Update $K_c^{n+1} = K_c^n - \eta g^n$.

end for

Output: K_c^R where $R \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, N - 1\}$ is uniformly sampled.

This definition requires that both K_c and the perturbed $K_c + \delta U$ remain within the feasible set \mathcal{K}_c , for every U drawn from the distribution \mathbb{P} . Recent insights from [Lin et al. \(2022\)](#) illustrate a key relationship between the Goldstein subdifferential and uniform smoothing, highlighting that $\nabla J_\delta(K_c)$ is an element of $\partial_\delta J(K_c)$. Under the definition of the Goldstein δ -subdifferential (7), a point K_c is a (δ, ϵ) -stationary point if $\text{dist}(0, \partial_\delta J(K_c)) \leq \epsilon$. Therefore, an ϵ -stationary point of $J_\delta(K_c)$ is also (δ, ϵ) -stationary for the original function $J(K_c)$. One nature idea for obtaining a (δ, ϵ) -stationary point of $J(K_c)$ is to perform

$$K_c^{n+1} = K_c^n - \eta \nabla J_\delta(K_c^n) \quad (9)$$

provided that $\nabla J_\delta(K_c)$ is accessible. However, $\nabla J_\delta(K_c)$ is hard to compute in general. In addition, we focus on a model-free setting where we only have the access to the estimated cost values. Building upon the insight in (9), we compute an estimate of the gradient $\nabla J_\delta(K_c)$ using a zeroth-order oracle as outlined in Algorithm 2.

The initialization of both Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 involves establishing a feasible starting point K_c^0 . A typical initialization sets the D scale operator via choosing A_D, B_D, C_D matrices as zero, and making D_D the identity matrix. For the controller K , we adopt initialization strategies such as PO-annealing methods, as suggested in [Ozaslan et al. \(2022\)](#) and [Perdomo et al. \(2021\)](#). Furthermore, to ensure the iterates K_c^n and their perturbations remain within the feasible region \mathcal{K}_c , one can choose small (δ^0, α^0) for Algorithm 1 and small (δ, η) for Algorithm 2.

3.3. Theoretical Justifications

As previously discussed in Section 2, the robust synthesis problem (2) has an equivalent policy optimization formulation (3). In this context, K_c denotes the augmented controllers, integrating both the controller K and the D scale parameters.

If one can prove that the cost function in (3) is coercive, then the existing proof arguments in [Guo and Hu \(2022\)](#) and [Guo et al. \(2023\)](#) can be directly applied to provide theoretical justifications on convergence to stationary points. However, as highlighted in [Bompart et al. \(2007\)](#), the cost function $J(K_c)$ might remain finite at the boundary of \mathcal{K}_c , indicating situations where the system is not internally stable yet exhibits a finite cost $J(K_c)$. The absence of coerciveness in the cost function poses a significant challenge for establishing the convergence behavior of model-free μ -synthesis. To address this, we draw inspiration from [Bompart et al. \(2007\)](#) and consider the closed-loop transfer function:

$$\mathcal{T}_{stab}(K_c, \mathbf{z}) := (\mathbf{z}I - A_{cl}(K_c))^{-1}, \quad (10)$$

where $A_{cl}(K_c)$ represents the closed-loop state matrix for $\mathcal{F}_l(G_c, K_c)$. We assume that we have access to the following zeroth-order oracle that leads to a ‘‘regularized’’ optimization problem:

$$\min_{K_c \in \mathcal{K}_c} J_c(K_c) := \max\{J(K_c), \lambda \|\mathcal{T}_{stab}(K_c, \mathbf{z})\|_\infty\}, \quad (11)$$

where λ is a small positive parameter to be tuned. As commented in [Bompart et al. \(2007\)](#), this adjustment addresses the system’s internal stability concerns, while the modified cost $J_c(K_c)$ is identical to $J(K_c)$ for any K_c satisfying $J(K_c) \geq \lambda \|\mathcal{T}_{stab}(K_c, \mathbf{z})\|_\infty$ (most K_c satisfies this if λ is sufficiently small). Therefore, minimizing (11) with a sufficiently small λ effectively parallels the original policy optimization problem (3), specifically for interior points far away from the boundary of \mathcal{K}_c . Now, we can establish the coerciveness of the $J_c(K_c)$ in the following lemma⁵

Lemma 2 *Suppose $B := [B_w \ B_d \mid B_u]$ and $C := [C_v^\top \ C_e^\top \mid C_y^\top]^\top$ are full rank matrices. Then the objective function $J_c(K_c)$ defined by (11) is coercive over the set \mathcal{K}_c in the sense that for any sequence $\{K_c^l\}_{l=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{K}_c$ we have*

$$J_c(K_c^l) \rightarrow +\infty$$

if either $\|K_c^l\|_F \rightarrow +\infty$, or K_c^l converges to an element in the boundary $\partial\mathcal{K}_c$.

Proof First noticing that it suffices to show that $\|\mathcal{T}_{stab}(K_c, \mathbf{z})\|_\infty$ is coercive over the set \mathcal{K}_c . Suppose that there is a sequence $\{K_c^l\}_{l=1}^\infty$ such that $K_c^l \rightarrow K_c^\dagger \in \partial\mathcal{K}_c$. Clearly we have $\rho(A_{cl}(K_c^\dagger)) = 1$, and there exists some ω_0 such that the matrix $(e^{j\omega_0}I - A_{cl}(K_c^\dagger))$ becomes singular. Therefore, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{T}_{stab}(K_c^l, j\omega)\|_\infty &= \sup_{\omega \in [0, 2\pi]} \sigma_{\max} \left((e^{j\omega}I - A_{cl}(K_c^l))^{-1} \right) \\ &\geq \sigma_{\max} \left((e^{j\omega_0}I - A_{cl}(K_c^l))^{-1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that we have $\rho(A_{cl}(K_c^l)) < 1$ for each l , and hence we have $\sigma_{\min}(e^{j\omega_0}I - A_{cl}(K_c^l)) > 0$, i.e. the smallest singular values of $(e^{j\omega_0}I - A_{cl}(K_c^l))$ are positive for all l . By the continuity of $\sigma_{\min}(\cdot)$, we must have $\sigma_{\min}(e^{j\omega_0}I - A_{cl}(K_c^l)) \rightarrow 0$ as $K_c^l \rightarrow K_c^\dagger \in \partial\mathcal{K}_c$. Hence we have $\sigma_{\max}((e^{j\omega_0}I - A_{cl}(K_c^l))^{-1}) \rightarrow +\infty$ as $l \rightarrow \infty$. Then we have $\|\mathcal{T}_{stab}(K_c^l, \mathbf{z})\|_\infty \rightarrow +\infty$ as $K_c^l \rightarrow K_c^\dagger \in \partial\mathcal{K}_c$. The proof of $J_c(K_c^l) \rightarrow +\infty$ as $\|K_c^l\|_F \rightarrow +\infty$ will be given in the appendix. ■

Once the coerciveness is proved, we can slightly modify the existing proof techniques in ([Guo and Hu, 2022](#); [Guo et al., 2023](#)) to show convergence guarantees to stationary points for model-free μ -synthesis. We provide more discussions on this in the appendix. This part of extensions is actually quite straightforward, and hence omitted here.

5. The coerciveness property does not come for free. The price is that the modification in the cost could potentially lead to new stationary points. For simplicity, this lemma fixes D_D as a constant matrix. We will relax this in the appendix.

4. Numerical Experiments

In this section, we present the numerical study to show the effectiveness of our proposed model-free methods across various examples.

4.1. Doyle's Example

We start with an illustrative example from (Doyle, 1985), showing a scenario where the DK -iteration method has difficulties in converging to the optimal solution. We will show that Algorithm 2 successfully converges to the optimal solution for this example. Consider the following system:

$$G = \begin{bmatrix} R & U \\ V & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{where} \quad R = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad U = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad V = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (12)$$

This system is coupled with a controller $K = Q \in \mathbb{R}$ and an uncertainty set $\mathbf{\Delta} = \{\delta : \delta \in \mathbb{C}\}$. The upper bound of the μ -synthesis is defined as the following problem (given the number of complex scalars being fewer than four, the upper bound is exactly the μ value (Dullerud and Paganini, 2013)):

$$\min_{Q \in \mathbb{R}} \min_{D \in \mathbf{D}} \sigma_{\max} (D \mathcal{F}_l(G, K) D^{-1}) \quad (13)$$

where $\mathcal{F}_l(G, K) = R + UQV$ and $\mathbf{D} = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} d & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} : d > 0 \right\}$. The optimization (13) can be rewritten as

$$\min_{Q \in \mathbb{R}, d > 0} \sigma_{\max} \left(\begin{bmatrix} -1 & d \\ Q/d & 1 \end{bmatrix} \right). \quad (14)$$

The optimal values for Q and d are $Q^* = 0$ and $d^* = 0$, yielding $\mu^* = 1$. Employing the DK -iteration method, with Q fixed, the optimal d is $d = \sqrt{Q}$, and with d fixed, the optimal Q is $Q = d^2$. Thus iteratively, solving for either d or Q will immediately converge to $Q = d^2$. Initializing with $d^0 = 85$ and $Q^0 = 72$, the iterates and contour lines generated by Algorithm 2 are drawn in Figure 2. The results clearly demonstrate the convergence of Algorithm 2 to the global minimum ($Q^* = 0$ and $d^* = 0$), whereas the DK -iteration terminates at the suboptimal point $Q = 8.485$ and $d = 72$.




Figure 2: Algorithm 2 iterates in policy space for Doyle's example.

4.2. Higher Dimension Examples

We now demonstrate the efficiency of our model-free methods on systems of higher dimensions. Specifically, Figure 3 illustrates the relative error trajectories for systems with state dimension $n_x = \{10, 20, 30\}$. The systems under consideration are structured according to Equation (1), with the matrices (A, B_u, C_y) generated via the MATLAB function `drss`. The remaining matrices are realized by sampling from a standard normal distribution. Given that the A matrix is stable, the initial controller matrices $(A_K^0, B_K^0, C_K^0, D_K^0)$ are set to zero. Moreover, the D -scale operator matrices (A_D^0, B_D^0, C_D^0) are initially set to zero, while the D_D^0 matrix is initialized as the identity matrix. For all the experiments, D -scales of a state order of 1 is used. Table 1 presents a detailed results of our model-free methods compared to MATLAB’s model-based `musyn` function. This shows that our model-free methods are not only comparable to, but in certain instances outperform DK -iteration.

Table 1: Comparison of our model-free methods with model-based method

$(n_x, n_w, n_u, n_d, n_v, n_e, n_y)$	Algorithm 1	Algorithm 2	<code>musyn</code>
(10, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)	17.174	17.158	20.536
(20, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2)	17.392	16.255	18.681
(30, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3)	38.417	37.051	32.501




Figure 3: Left: The plot illustrates the normalized deviation of trajectories from Algorithm 1 relative to the MATLAB `musyn` function outputs, denoted as μ_{DK} , across system states $n_x = \{10, 20, 30\}$. Right: The plot illustrates the normalized deviation of trajectories from Algorithm 2 relative to the MATLAB `musyn` function outputs, denoted as μ_{DK} , across system states $n_x = \{10, 20, 30\}$. Solid lines depict the mean values, and the shaded regions represent the 98% confidence intervals.

5. Conclusions

This paper addresses model-free μ -synthesis using nonsmooth optimization and direct policy search. We extend the nonsmooth optimization perspective in Apkarian (2011) to the general model-free output-feedback μ -synthesis setting. Numerical study and theoretical justifications are both provided to demonstrate zeroth-order optimization as an efficient approach for model-free μ -synthesis.

Acknowledgments

The work of Darioush Kevian and Geir Dullerud is supported by NSF under Grant ECCS 1932735. The work of Xingang Guo and Bin Hu is generously supported by the NSF award CAREER-2048168. The work of Peter Seiler is supported by the U.S. Office of Naval Research (ONR) under Grant N00014-18-1-2209.

References

- Pierre Apkarian. Nonsmooth μ -synthesis. *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, 21(13):1493–1508, 2011.
- Pierre Apkarian and Dominikus Noll. Controller design via nonsmooth multidirectional search. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 44(6):1923–1949, 2006a.
- Pierre Apkarian and Dominikus Noll. Nonsmooth \mathcal{H}_∞ synthesis. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 51(1):71–86, 2006b.
- Denis Arzelier, Georgia Deaconu, Suat Gumussoy, and Didier Henrion. H_2 for HIFOO. In *International Conference on Control and Optimization With Industrial Applications*, 2011.
- V. Bompert, D. Noll, and P. Apkarian. Second-order nonsmooth optimization for H_∞ synthesis. *Numerische Mathematik*, 107:433–454, 2007.
- Stephen Boyd, Laurent El Ghaoui, Eric Feron, and Venkataramanan Balakrishnan. *Linear Matrix Inequalities in System and Control Theory*, volume 15. SIAM, 1994.
- Jingjing Bu, Afshin Mesbahi, Maryam Fazel, and Mehran Mesbahi. LQR through the lens of first order methods: Discrete-time case. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.08921*, 2019.
- James V Burke, Adrian S Lewis, and Michael L Overton. A robust gradient sampling algorithm for nonsmooth, nonconvex optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 15(3):751–779, 2005.
- James V Burke, Frank E Curtis, Adrian S Lewis, Michael L Overton, and Lucas EA Simões. Gradient sampling methods for nonsmooth optimization. *Numerical Nonsmooth Optimization*, pages 201–225, 2020.
- Frank E Curtis, Tim Mitchell, and Michael L Overton. A BFGS-SQP method for nonsmooth, nonconvex, constrained optimization and its evaluation using relative minimization profiles. *Optimization Methods and Software*, 32(1):148–181, 2017.
- John C Doyle. Structured uncertainty in control system design. In *1985 24th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 260–265. IEEE, 1985.
- Jingliang Duan, Jie Li, and Lin Zhao. Optimization landscape of gradient descent for discrete-time static output feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.13132*, 2021.
- J.C. Duchi, P.L. Bartlett, and M.J. Wainwright. Randomized smoothing for stochastic optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 22(2):674–701, 2012.

- Geir E Dullerud and Fernando Paganini. *A course in robust control theory: a convex approach*, volume 36. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- Ilyas Fatkhullin and Boris Polyak. Optimizing static linear feedback: Gradient method. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 59(5):3887–3911, 2021.
- M. Fazel, R. Ge, S. Kakade, and M. Mesbahi. Global convergence of policy gradient methods for the linear quadratic regulator. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80, pages 1467–1476, 2018.
- Luca Furieri, Yang Zheng, and Maryam Kamgarpour. Learning the globally optimal distributed LQ regulator. In *Learning for Dynamics and Control*, pages 287–297, 2020.
- P. Gahinet and P. Apkarian. A linear matrix inequality approach to H_∞ control. *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, 4:421–448, 1994.
- Pascal Gahinet and Pierre Apkarian. Structured \mathcal{H}_∞ synthesis in MATLAB. *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, 44(1):1435–1440, 2011.
- S. Ghadimi and G. Lan. Stochastic first-and zeroth-order methods for nonconvex stochastic programming. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 23(4):2341–2368, 2013.
- A.A. Goldstein. Optimization of lipschitz continuous functions. *Mathematical Programming*, 13(1): 14–22, 1977.
- Benjamin Gravell, Peyman Mohajerin Esfahani, and Tyler Summers. Learning optimal controllers for linear systems with multiplicative noise via policy gradient. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 66(11):5283–5298, 2020.
- Suat Gumussoy, Didier Henrion, Marc Millstone, and Michael L Overton. Multiobjective robust control with HIFOO 2.0. *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, 42(6):144–149, 2009.
- Xingang Guo and Bin Hu. Global convergence of direct policy search for state-feedback \mathcal{H}_∞ robust control: A revisit of nonsmooth synthesis with goldstein subdifferential. In *36th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, New Orleans, LA, Nov*, volume 28, 2022.
- Xingang Guo, Darioush Keivan, Geir Dullerud, Peter Seiler, and Bin Hu. Complexity of derivative-free policy optimization for structured \mathcal{H}_∞ control. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.
- Ben Hambly, Renyuan Xu, and Huining Yang. Policy gradient methods for the noisy linear quadratic regulator over a finite horizon. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 59(5):3359–3391, 2021.
- M. Honda and P. Seiler. Uncertainty modeling for hard disk drives. In *American Control Conference*, pages 3341–3347, 2014.
- Bin Hu and Yang Zheng. Connectivity of the feasible and sublevel sets of dynamic output feedback control with robustness constraints. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 7:442–447, 2022.

- Bin Hu, Kaiqing Zhang, Na Li, Mehran Mesbahi, Maryam Fazel, and Tamer Başar. Toward a theoretical foundation of policy optimization for learning control policies. *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, 6:123–158, 2023.
- Joao Paulo Jansch-Porto, Bin Hu, and Geir Dullerud. Policy learning of MDPs with mixed continuous/discrete variables: A case study on model-free control of Markovian jump systems. In *Learning for Dynamics and Control*, pages 947–957, 2020a.
- Joao Paulo Jansch-Porto, Bin Hu, and Geir E Dullerud. Convergence guarantees of policy optimization methods for Markovian jump linear systems. In *American Control Conference*, pages 2882–2887, 2020b.
- Joao Paulo Jansch-Porto, Bin Hu, and Geir E Dullerud. Policy optimization for Markovian jump linear quadratic control: Gradient method and global convergence. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 68(4):2475–2482, 2022.
- Darioush Keivan, Aaron Havens, Peter Seiler, Geir Dullerud, and Bin Hu. Model-free μ synthesis via adversarial reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.15537*, 2021.
- Krzysztof C Kiwiel. Convergence of the gradient sampling algorithm for nonsmooth nonconvex optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 18(2):379–388, 2007.
- Krzysztof C Kiwiel. A nonderivative version of the gradient sampling algorithm for nonsmooth nonconvex optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 20(4):1983–1994, 2010.
- T. Lin, Z. Zheng, and M.I. Jordan. Gradient-free methods for deterministic and stochastic nonsmooth nonconvex optimization. In *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
- Dhruv Malik, Ashwin Pananjady, Kush Bhatia, Koulik Khamaru, Peter Bartlett, and Martin Wainwright. Derivative-free methods for policy optimization: Guarantees for linear quadratic systems. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 2916–2925, 2019.
- Hesameddin Mohammadi, Armin Zare, Mahdi Soltanolkotabi, and Mihailo R Jovanovic. Convergence and sample complexity of gradient methods for the model-free linear quadratic regulator problem. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2021.
- Ibrahim K Ozaslan, Hesameddin Mohammadi, and Mihailo R Jovanović. Computing stabilizing feedback gains via a model-free policy gradient method. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 7:407–412, 2022.
- A. Packard, J. Doyle, and G. Balas. Linear, multivariable robust control with a μ perspective. *ASME Journal Dynamic Systems, Measurement, and Control*, 115(2B):426–438, 1993.
- Juan Perdomo, Jack Umenberger, and Max Simchowitz. Stabilizing dynamical systems via policy gradient methods. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34, 2021.
- Santanu Rathod, Manoj Bhadu, and Abir De. Global convergence using policy gradient methods for model-free Markovian jump linear quadratic control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.15228*, 2021.
- C. Scherer and S. Wieland. Linear matrix inequalities in control. Lecture notes for a course of the dutch institute of systems and control, Delft University of Technology, 2004.

- Carsten Scherer, Pascal Gahinet, and Mahmoud Chilali. Multiobjective output-feedback control via lmi optimization. *IEEE Transactions on automatic control*, 42(7):896–911, 1997.
- Yujie Tang and Yang Zheng. On the global optimality of direct policy search for nonsmooth \mathcal{H}_∞ output-feedback control. In *2023 62nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 6148–6153, 2023.
- B. Wahlberg, M.B. Syberg, and H. Hjalmarsson. Non-parametric methods for l_2 -gain estimation using iterative experiments. *Automatica*, 46(8):1376–1381, 2010.
- Zhuoran Yang, Yongxin Chen, Mingyi Hong, and Zhaoran Wang. Provably global convergence of actor-critic: A case for linear quadratic regulator with ergodic cost. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- Kaiqing Zhang, Bin Hu, and Tamer Başar. On the stability and convergence of robust adversarial reinforcement learning: A case study on linear quadratic systems. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 2020.
- Kaiqing Zhang, Bin Hu, and Tamer Basar. Policy optimization for \mathcal{H}_2 linear control with \mathcal{H}_∞ robustness guarantee: Implicit regularization and global convergence. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 59(6):4081–4109, 2021a.
- Kaiqing Zhang, Xiangyuan Zhang, Bin Hu, and Tamer Başar. Derivative-free policy optimization for linear risk-sensitive and robust control design: Implicit regularization and sample complexity. In *Thirty-Fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021b.
- Feiran Zhao and Keyou You. Primal-dual learning for the model-free risk-constrained linear quadratic regulator. In *Learning for Dynamics and Control*, pages 702–714, 2021.
- Yang Zheng, Yue Sun, Maryam Fazel, and Na Li. Escaping high-order saddles in policy optimization for linear quadratic gaussian (lqg) control. In *2022 IEEE 61st Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 5329–5334. IEEE, 2022.
- Yang Zheng, Chih-fan Pai, and Yujie Tang. Benign nonconvex landscapes in optimal and robust control, part i: Global optimality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.15332*, 2023a.
- Yang Zheng, Yujie Tang, and Na Li. Analysis of the optimization landscape of linear quadratic gaussian (LQG) control. *Mathematical Programming*, 202:399–444, 2023b.
- Kemin Zhou, John Comstock Doyle, and Keith Glover. *Robust and Optimal Control*, volume 40. Prentice Hall New Jersey, 1996.

Appendix

In the main paper, we presented a partial proof of Lemma 2. In the appendix, we will complete the proof for this lemma, and provide some extra discussions on our theoretical justifications.

Completing the proof for Lemma 2: To complete the proof, we need to show that $J_c(K_c^l) \rightarrow +\infty$ as $\|K_c^l\|_F \rightarrow +\infty$. Suppose we have a sequence $\{K_c^l\}$ satisfying $\|K_c^l\|_F \rightarrow +\infty$. It is known that for a given K_c^l , $\|\mathcal{T}_{\text{stab}}(K_c^l, z)\|_\infty^2$ is equivalent to the following supremum expression in the time domain:

$$\sup_{\mathbf{d}^l: \|\mathbf{d}^l\| \leq 1} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \delta_t^\top \delta_t \quad (15)$$

where δ_t is governed by an LTI system as below:

$$\delta_{t+1} = A_{cl}(K_c^l)\delta_t + d_t^l, \quad \delta_0 = 0 \quad (16)$$

Here, $\mathbf{d}^l := \{d_0^l, d_1^l, \dots\}$ represents the disturbance sequence, which can be chosen adversarially. Now, define:

$$\tilde{A} := \begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \tilde{B} := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \hat{B} \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \tilde{C} := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ \hat{C} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (17)$$

where \hat{B} and \hat{C} are defined as

$$\hat{B} := \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} B_w & B_d & B_u \end{bmatrix}}_B \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -I & 0 \\ I & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \hat{C} := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ 0 & 0 \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} C_v \\ C_e \\ C_y \end{bmatrix}}_C.$$

Additionally, using the definition of the augmented controller K_c^l in (4) as below:

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{t+1} &= \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} A_K^l & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & A_D^l & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & A_D^l \end{bmatrix}}_{A_c^l} \xi_t + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} B_K^l & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{B}_D^l & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \tilde{B}_D^l \end{bmatrix}}_{B_c^l} y_{ct}, \\ u_{ct} &= \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} C_K^l & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{C}_D^l & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \tilde{C}_D^l \end{bmatrix}}_{C_c^l} \xi_t + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} D_K^l & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{D}_D^l & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \tilde{D}_D^l \end{bmatrix}}_{D_c^l} y_{ct}, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

and defining $\tilde{K}_c^l := \left[\begin{array}{c|c} A_c^l & B_c^l \\ \hline C_c^l & D_c^l \end{array} \right]$, we can show that $A_{cl}(K_c^l) = \tilde{A} + \tilde{B}\tilde{K}_c^l\tilde{C}$. It can show that $\tilde{B}\tilde{K}_c^l\tilde{C}$ is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B}\tilde{K}_c^l\tilde{C} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & B \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix} \left[\begin{array}{cc} A_c^l & B_c^l \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ 0 & 0 \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -I & 0 \\ I & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} C_c^l & \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -I & 0 \\ I & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} D_c^l \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ 0 & 0 \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix} \end{array} \right] \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ C & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 0 & B \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix}}_{\tilde{B}} \underbrace{\left[\begin{array}{cc} A_c^l & \begin{bmatrix} B_K^l & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ [B_D^l & 0] & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 0 & [-C_D^l] & 0 \\ C_K^l & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & D_K^l \end{bmatrix} \end{array} \right]}_{\tilde{K}_c^l} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ C & 0 \end{bmatrix}}_{\tilde{C}} \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

We can see that \tilde{K}_c^l consists all the elements of K_c^l except D_D and since we assume D_D is a constant fix matrix, so if $\|K_c^l\|_F \rightarrow +\infty$, then $\|\tilde{K}_c^l\|_F \rightarrow +\infty$. Let $\mathbf{d}^l = \{d_0^l, 0, 0, \dots\}$ with $\|d_0^l\| = 1$ such that $\sigma_{\max}(\tilde{B}\tilde{K}_c^l\tilde{C}) = \|\tilde{B}\tilde{K}_c^l\tilde{C}d_0^l\|$. Then, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{T}_{\text{stab}}(K_c^l, j\omega)\|_{\infty}^2 &= \sup_{\mathbf{d}^l: \|\mathbf{d}^l\| \leq 1} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \delta_t^T \delta_t \\ &\geq \sup_{\mathbf{d}^l: \|\mathbf{d}^l\| \leq 1} \delta_1^T \delta_1 + \delta_2^T \delta_2 \\ &=_{(1)} d_0^l{}^T d_0^l + (A_{cl}d_0^l)^T (A_{cl}d_0^l) \\ &\geq d_0^l{}^T A_{cl}^T A_{cl} d_0^l \\ &= d_0^l{}^T (\tilde{A} + \tilde{B}\tilde{K}_c^l\tilde{C})^T (\tilde{A} + \tilde{B}\tilde{K}_c^l\tilde{C}) d_0^l \\ &= d_0^l{}^T (\tilde{A}^T \tilde{A} + \tilde{A}^T \tilde{B}\tilde{K}_c^l\tilde{C} + (\tilde{B}\tilde{K}_c^l\tilde{C})^T \tilde{A} + \tilde{C}^T \tilde{K}_c^l{}^T \tilde{B}^T \tilde{B}\tilde{K}_c^l\tilde{C}) d_0^l \\ &\geq d_0^l{}^T (\tilde{C}^T \tilde{K}_c^l{}^T \tilde{B}^T \tilde{B}\tilde{K}_c^l\tilde{C}) d_0^l \\ &= \|\tilde{B}\tilde{K}_c^l\tilde{C}d_0^l\|^2 \\ &\geq \sigma_{\min}(\tilde{B})\sigma_{\min}(\tilde{C})\sigma_{\max}(\tilde{K}_c^l) \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality (1) holds since we plugged in specific \mathbf{d}^l in (16). Since B and C are full rank matrices, then we have $\sigma_{\min}(\tilde{B}) > 0$ and $\sigma_{\min}(\tilde{C}) > 0$. Since $\|K_c^l\|_F \rightarrow +\infty$ as $l \rightarrow +\infty$, we have $\sigma_{\max}(\tilde{K}_c^l) \rightarrow +\infty$. Therefore, $\|\mathcal{T}_{\text{stab}}(K_c^l, j\omega)\|_{\infty}^2 \rightarrow +\infty$ as $\|K_c^l\|_F \rightarrow +\infty$. This completes the proof. ■

Relaxing assumptions. Also, it is worth mentioning that we can relax the assumptions of Lemma 2 and further remove the restrictions on fixing D_D via using the following regularized cost function:

$$\min_{K_c \in \mathcal{K}_c} J_c(K_c) := \max\{J(K_c), \lambda_1 \|\mathbf{T}_{stab}(K_c, \mathbf{z})\|_\infty, \lambda_2 \|K_c\|_F\} \quad (20)$$

where λ_1 and λ_2 are small positive parameters to be tuned. We have the following corollary.

Lemma 3 *The objective function $J_c(K_c)$ defined by (20) is coercive over the set \mathcal{K}_c .*

Proof As stated in the proof of Lemma 2, as $K_c^l \rightarrow K_c^\dagger \in \partial\mathcal{K}_c$, we observe that $\|\mathbf{T}_{stab}(K_c, \mathbf{z})\|_\infty \rightarrow +\infty$. Consequently, this implies $J_c(K_c) \rightarrow +\infty$. Moreover, when $\|K_c^l\|_F \rightarrow +\infty$, according to the definition in (20), it follows that $J_c(K_c) \rightarrow +\infty$. This completes the proof. ■

For the above new cost function, one can change D_D in a free way, and the resultant cost function is coercive without the extra rank assumptions in the original statement of Lemma 2.

More discussions on convergence to stationary points. As mentioned in the main paper, once the coerciveness is proved, we can slightly modify the proof techniques in (Guo and Hu, 2022; Guo et al., 2023) to show convergence guarantees to stationary points for model-free μ -synthesis.

We provide more explanations here. Consider the constrained optimization problem $\min_{K_c \in \mathcal{K}_c} J_c(K_c)$ with J_c being coercive. Then we can directly apply the arguments in Guo and Hu (2022) to obtain the following facts.

1. For any $\gamma > J_c^*$, the sublevel set defined as $\mathcal{S}_\gamma := \{K_c \in \mathcal{K}_c : J_c(K_c) \leq \gamma\}$ is compact. In addition, there exists a strict separation between \mathcal{S}_γ and the complement set of \mathcal{K}_c , i.e. $\text{dist}(\mathcal{S}_\gamma, \partial\mathcal{K}_c) > 0$.
2. If $K_c^0 \in \mathcal{K}_c$, then Algorithm 1 with $\mu_\delta, \mu_\epsilon < 1$ converges to a stationary point with probability one⁶.

Furthermore, by adapting the arguments outlined in (Guo et al., 2023, Theorem 3.7), we can construct a proof demonstrating the complexity of Algorithm 2 for finding (δ, ϵ) -stationary points.

6. This can be proved via modifying the proofs in (Guo and Hu, 2022, Theorem C.2) and (Kiwiel, 2010, Theorem 3.8).