International Journal on Recent and Innovation Trends in Computing and Communication ISSN: 2321-8169
Volume: 3 Issue: 4 2330 – 2334

Performance Enhancement of SOPDT System with Numerically Optimized PID Controller

Mr. C. B. Kadu
Associate Professor
Dept. Of Instrumentation and Control,
P.R.E.C, Loni, Maharashtra (India)
chandrakant_kadu@yahoo.com

Mr. S. B. Lukare
PG Student
Dept. Of Instrumentation and Control,
P.R.E.C, Loni, Maharashtra (India)
lukare_santosh@yahoo.co.in

Abstract—This paper presents a simple but effective method for designing robust *PID* controller. The robust *PID* controller design problem is solved by the maximization, on a finite interval of the shortest distance from the Nyquist curve of the open loop transfer function to the critical point $-\mathbf{1}+\boldsymbol{j0}$ i.e. from the knowledge of maximum sensitivity $\boldsymbol{M_s}$. Simple formulae are derived to tune/design *PID* controllers to achieve the improved performance for the given process or system. From control theory we know that all the real time processes have inherent time delays and time constants associated with it. The *PID* tuning method elaborated in this paper is found to be superior as compared with basic *PID* tuning methods based on second-order plus delay-time (*SOPDT*) model of process. Two simulation examples are demonstrated to show the applicability and effectiveness of the given method.

Keywords-*Numerical Optimization; Time-Delay; Sensitivity; PID controller; Process Models*

*****

I. INTRODUCTION

PID controller is a name commonly given to three-term controller. The mnemonic *PID* refers to the First letters of the names of the individual terms that make up the standard three-term controller. These are *P* for the proportional term, *I* for the integral term and *D* for the derivative term in the controller. *PID* controllers are probably the most widely used industrial controller. Even complex industrial control systems may comprise a control network whose main control building block is a *PID* control module. The three-term *PID* controller had a long history of use and has survived the changes of technology from the analogue era into the digital computer control system age. Many thousands of instrumentation and control engineers worldwide are using these controllers in day-to-day work [1]. The *PID* algorithm can be approached in many different directions. It can be viewed as a device that can be operated with a few rules of thumb, but it can also be approached analytically. Applying a *PID* control law consists of applying properly the sum of three types of control actions namely a proportional, an integral and a derivative.

The proportional-integral (*PI*) and proportional-integral-derivative (*PID*) controllers are widely used in many industrial control systems for several decades since Ziegler and Nichols proposed their first *PID* tuning method. This is because the *PID* controller structure is simple and its principle is easier to understand than most other advanced controllers ([1] [14] [16]). On the other hand, the general performance of *PID* controller is satisfactory in many applications. For these reasons, the majority of the controllers used in industry are of *PI/PID* type.

Over the past years, a number of *PID* design and tuning methods for first-order-plus-delay-time have been reported in the literature. An earlier of them is Ziegler- Nichols method [2], Cohen- Coon method [3], Kappa Tau, constant open loop transfer function method [4], synthesis method [5], internal model controller [6], and so on. However, these tuning methods have certain limitations, and often do not provide good tuning parameterizations of the *PID* controllers for high order-plus-delay-time *(HOPDT)* processes. The gain and phase margin *(GPM)* specifications methods have been used in many applications to design the *PI/PD/PID* type controllers for Time Delay and Integral Plus Time Delay processes (e. g. see [7]-[8]-[21]). In this damping factor of the system is related to phase margin of the systems and served as a measure of robustness. In GPM the solutions are normally obtained by numerically or graphically by means of trial-and-error, generally using the Bode plots. This methods are certainly not suitable for systems having infinite phase crossover frequencies (e.g. systems without time delays and having number of zeros less than the number of poles by one i.e. system is not perfect). The main drawback of the *GPM* method is that the transfer function of the controlled systems is restricted to the *FOPDT* or *SOPDT*. An auto tuning of *PID* is also one of the method in which Controller parameters are obtained automatically [25]. The fuzzy logic based *PID* controller design is also possible [26]. The Optimization approach based on FOPDT process model can be used for *PI/PID* tuning [27].

In this paper novel approach of *PID* controller tuning is elaborated. The paper is organized as follows; Section II represents the general process models. Section III includes *PID* controller tuning/design. Section IV represents numerical optimization approach based on *SOPDT* model of process. The simulation results are incorporated in Section V. Finally the paper is summarized in Section VI with conclusion.

II. GENERAL PROCESS MODELS

According to the control theory and literature every control engineer is know that there are wide range of linear self-regulating processes with various dynamics including those with low and high-order, small and large dead time and monotonic or oscillatory responses [11]. All these processes

 ISSN: 2321-8169
2330 – 2334

are expressed in control theory with the help of transfer function or the dynamic model of the process.

As the industrial processes are of different dynamics a very broad class is characterized by aperiodic response. This important class of the process dynamics can be represented by the first-order plus delay-time model as given by (1)

$$G(s) = \frac{k}{1+\tau s} exp^{(-t_0 s)} \quad (1)$$

Note that process model expressed by (1) is only used for the purpose of simplified analysis. The actual process may have multiple lags, non-minimum phase zero, etc. In Equation (1) k, τ and t_0 represents the steady state gain, time constant and time delay of the actual process. Another important class of the industrial process is expressed by non-aperiodic response. This category of processes can be expressed by a second-order plus delay-time model as given by (2)

$$G(s) = \frac{kexp^{(-t_0 s)}}{s^2+a_1 s+a_0} \quad (2)$$

Many identification techniques can be used to obtain the first-order plus delay-time or second-order plus delay- time model for *PID* controller design ([1], [21], [22]). A simple method is based on the analysis of the open-loop step response. The first-order plus dead-time model in (1) is obtained as follows:

$$k = y_\infty$$

$$t_0 = 2.8t_1 - 1.8t_2$$

$$\tau = 5.5(t_2 - t_1) \quad (3)$$

Where $y_\infty$the final value of the step response of the process is, t_1 is the time where the output attains 28% of its final value and t_2 is the time where the output attains 40% of its final value.

The way by which the first-order plus delay-time model of process can be obtained as follows:

$$k = \frac{\Delta y(t)}{\Delta u(t)}$$

$$\tau = \frac{3}{2}(t_{63} - t_{28})$$

$$t_0 = t_{63} - \tau \quad (4)$$

Where t_{63} and t_{28} is the time at which process output reaches 63.2% and 28.3% of its final value.

For second-order plus delay-time model given by (2), the parameters are obtained as

$$k = y_\infty$$

$$t_0 = is\ the\ apparent\ time\ delay$$

$$a_1 = \frac{2|ln(D_1)|}{\pi t_p}, a_0 = \frac{\pi^2+ln(D_1)^2}{\pi^2 t_p^2} \quad (5)$$

Where D_1 is the first overshoot for the unit step response of the process and t_p is the corresponding time. These models can also derive from relay feedback method ([1], [12]).

III. THE GENERAL FEEDBACK CONTROL SYSTEM

In this section, the *PID* controller design theory and considerations are explained. Consider general unity feedback control system as shown in Fig. 1.



Figure 1. A general unity feedback control system with controller

Where $G_p(s)$ is the process model either given by (1) or (2) and $G_c(s)$ the transfer function of the standard *PI/PID* controller is given as (6)

$$G_c(s) = K_p + {K_i}/{s}\ for\ PI$$

$$G_c(s) = K_p + {K_i}/{s} + K_d s\ \ for\ PID \quad (6)$$

For this control system, the sensitivity function $S(s)$ and complementary sensitivity function $T(s)$ which is the transfer function of the closed loop system, are respectively, defined by

$$S(s) = \frac{1}{1+G_c(s)G_p(s)} = \frac{1}{1+L(s)} \quad (7)$$

Where $L(s) = G_c(s)G_p(s)$ is the open loop transfer function and

$$T(s) = 1 - S(s) = \frac{L(s)}{1+L(s)} \quad (8)$$

The quantity $|T(j\omega)|$ represents the input output gain at the frequency ${2\pi}/{\omega}$, for a *PI/PID* controller this gain is equal to one in the low frequency domain that is the steady-state error is equal to zero. The quantity $M_p = max_\omega|T(j\omega)|$ is the peak magnitude of the frequency response of the closed-loop system. It is well known that M_p is related to the overshoot for the step response of the closed-loop system. In order to impose good transient response it is necessary to have

$$M_p \leq M_p^+ \quad (9)$$

Where $M_p^+ > 1$ is the upper bound of the maximum of the complementary sensitivity function. In an equivalent manner the following constraint is required:

$$D_1 \leq D_1^+ \quad (10)$$

Where D_1 is the first overshoot of the step response and D_1^+ is the upper bound value of this overshoot. It is then possible

to introduce a lower bound pseudo-damping factor ξ_m, which is related to the upper bound of the first overshoot by the relation:

$$\xi_m = \frac{|ln(D_1^+)|}{\sqrt{\pi^2 + ln(D_1^+)^2}} \quad (11)$$

The relation between M_p^+ and the lower bound pseudo damping factor ξ_m is given by

$$M_p^+ = \frac{1}{2\xi_m\sqrt{1-(\xi_m)^2}} \quad (12)$$

For good transient response it is required that

$$\xi \geq \xi_m \quad (13)$$

Where ξ is the pseudo-damping factor of the closed-loop system. The quantity $1/|S(j\omega)|$ represents the distance between the Nyquist curve of the open-loop transfer function $L(s)$ and the critical point -1 at the frequency $2\pi/\omega$. The minimum of this distance represents then a good measure of the stability margin. Consider an additive error model of the open loop transfer function $\Delta L(s)$, the influence of this error on the closed-loop transfer function can be deduced from the first order Taylor series expansion as

$$T\big(L(s) + \Delta L(s)\big) = T\big(L(s)\big) + \frac{\partial T(s)}{\partial L(s)}\Delta L(s) \quad (14)$$

This gives the well-known results

$$\frac{\Delta T(s)}{T(s)} = S(s)\frac{\Delta L(s)}{L(s)} \quad (15)$$

The quantity $max_\omega|S(j\omega)|$ represents then a good evaluation of the robustness in the presence of model uncertainties. The sensitivity function $S(s)$ appears also in the transfer function of the input disturbance $D(s)$ to the output $Y(s)$

$$Y(s) = G_p(s)S(s)D(s) \quad (16)$$

The quantity $max_\omega|S(j\omega)|$ represents good evaluation of the performance rejection of the load disturbance. Finally, in order to achieve good transient response, good stability margin, good robustness in the presence of model uncertainties and good rejection of the load disturbance, it is necessary to determine the parameters K_p, K_i and K_d such that

$$\xi \geq \xi_m$$

$$max_{K_pK_iK_d}\left\{\left|\frac{1}{S(j\omega,K_p,K_i,K_d)}\right|\right\} \quad (17)$$

There is not a known analytical solution of this optimization problem. A way to solve this problem is the numerical optimization.

IV. THE NUMERICAL OPTIMIZATION

Numerical Optimization for the PID controller with the second-order plus delay-time (SOPDT) process model: The *PI* controller is sufficient when the process dynamics is essentially first order. For higher-order processes the *PI* controller is not performing well, in this case the PID controller will be used. Therefore let's consider the standard *PID* controller given by (6) and the process model given by (2), then open-loop transfer function becomes

$$L(s) = \frac{k(1+K_pT_is+K_dT_is^2)exp^{-t_0s}}{T_is(s^2+a_1s+a_0)} \quad (18)$$

With $T_i = 1/K_i$ Using the approximation $exp^{-t_0s} \approx 1/(1+t_0s)$, the polynomial characteristic of the closed-loop system is given by

$$p(s) = s^4 + \left(a_1 + \frac{1}{t_0}\right)s^3 + \left(a_0 + \frac{a_1+K_dk}{t_0}\right)s^2 + \left(\frac{a_0+K_pk}{t_0}\right)s + \frac{k}{T_it_0} \quad (19)$$

This can be represented in the form of

$$p(s) = (s+a)^2(s^2 + 2\xi\omega_0 s + \omega_0^2)$$

With

$$a = \frac{1}{2}a_1 + \frac{1}{2t_0} - \xi\omega_0$$

$$K_p = \frac{2(\omega_0+a\xi)a\omega_0t_0-a_0}{k}$$

$$K_i = \frac{a^2\omega_0^2t_0}{k}$$

$$K_d = \frac{(a^2+4a\xi\omega_0+\omega_0^2-a_0)t_0-a_1}{k} \quad (20)$$

The closed-loop stability impose $a > 0$ which is verified if

$$\frac{1}{\xi\omega_0}\left(\frac{1}{2}a_1 + \frac{1}{2t_0}\right) > 1 \quad (21)$$

The above inequality is satisfied for

$$\frac{1}{\xi\omega_0}\left(\frac{1}{2}a_1 + \frac{1}{2t_0}\right) = b$$

With $b > 1$. taking into account the first consideration of (17) we can take $\xi = \xi_m$ for which

$$\omega_0 = \frac{1}{\xi_m b}\left(\frac{1}{2}a_1 + \frac{1}{2t_0}\right)$$

$$a = \frac{1}{2}a_1 + \frac{1}{2t_0} - \xi_m\omega_0 \quad (22)$$

The optimization problem is then written as follows

$$max_{b>1}\{min_\omega|1 + L(j\omega, b)|\}$$

$$L(s) = \frac{k(1+K_pT_is+K_dT_is^2)exp^{-t_0s}}{T_is(s^2+a_1s+a_0)}$$

$$\omega_0 = \frac{1}{\xi_m b}\left(\frac{1}{2}a_1 + \frac{1}{2t_0}\right)$$

 ISSN: 2321-8169
2330 – 2334

$$a = \frac{1}{2}a_1 + \frac{1}{2t_0} - \xi_m\omega_0$$

$$K_p = \frac{2(\omega_0 + a\xi_m)a\omega_0 t_0 - a_0}{k}$$

$$K_i = \frac{a^2\omega_0^2 t_0}{k}$$

$$K_d = \frac{(a^2 + 4a\xi_m\omega_0 + \omega_0^2 - a_0)t_0 - a_1}{k} \quad (23)$$

This is numerically easy to solve.

V. SIMULATION RESULTS

In this Section two simulation examples are simulated to show the applicability and effectiveness of the Numerical Optimization approach based on *SOPDT* process model.

Example 1:

Consider the process having second-order plus delay-time model as given by [23] with parameters in (24)

$$G_p(s) = \frac{0.25 * exp^{(-30*s)}}{s^2 + s + 0.25} \quad (24)$$

For this process model the *PID* controller is design by using the basic *PID* tuning methods such as Ziegler-Nichols (Z-N) method, Cohen-Coon (C-C) method and Kappa-Tau (K-T) method. These basic *PID* controller's parameters are obtained from the knowledge of the process parameters such as $k, a_0 \; and \; a_1$.

As mentioned in Section IV the *PID* controller is design by using the Numerical Optimization approach with the damping and tuning factor ($\xi_m = 0.72 \; and \; b = 20.5$) respectively. The closed-loop step response of the process is obtained with *PID* controller in MATLAB 7.11.0, as shown in Fig. 2 and various performance specifications are found as given in the Table I.



Figure 2. Closed-loop unit step response of Example 1 with various controllers.

Example 2:

Consider the process having second-order plus delay-time model as given by [24] with parameters in (25)

$$G_p(s) = \frac{exp^{(-2.5*s)}}{s^2 + 2s + 1} \quad (25)$$

For this process model the *PID* controller is design by using the basic *PID* tuning methods such as Ziegler-Nichols (Z-N) method, Cohen-Coon (C-C) method and Kappa-Tau (K-T) method. These basic *PID* controllers' parameters are obtained from the knowledge of the process parameters such as $k, a_0 \; and \; a_1$.

TABLE I SIMULATION RESULT FOR EXAMPLE 1

(*OS=Overshoot in %, ST=Settling Time, ISE=Integral Square Error*)

Method	**Controller Parameter**		
	K_p	K_i	K_d
Ziegler-Nichols	0.6800	0.0395	2.9256
Cohen-Coon	0.5145	0.0287	1.4218
Kappa-Tau	0.5062	0.0584	1.1751
NOA-PID	0.6055	0.0355	1.0769
Method	**Specifications**		
	OS	***ST***	***ISE***
Ziegler-Nichols	2.3631	41.8218	345.4549
Cohen-Coon	0.0000	75.2044	315.5184
Kappa-Tau	68.4328	195.6525	495.2275
NOA-PID	0.3792	38.7639	323.0020

As mentioned in Section IV the *PID* controller is design by using the Numerical Optimization approach with the damping and tuning factor ($\xi_m = 0.79 \; and \; b = 4.8$) respectively. The closed-loop step response of the process is obtained with *PID* controller in MATLAB 7.11.0, as shown in Fig. 3 and various performance specifications are found as given in the Table II.



Figure 3. Closed-loop unit step response of Example 2 with various controllers.

TABLE II SIMULATION RESULT FOR EXAMPLE 2

(*OS=Overshoot in %, ST=Settling Time, ISE=Integral Square Error*)

Method	Controller Parameter		
	K_p	K_i	K_d
Ziegler-Nichols	1.0800	0.3074	0.9485
Cohen-Coon	1.1785	0.2848	0.8264
Kappa-Tau	0.7716	0.3409	0.4441
NOA-PID	0.6038	0.2260	0.3816
Method	**Specifications**		
	OS	***ST***	***ISE***
Ziegler-Nichols	2.8217	9.4798	29.9028
Cohen-Coon	11.9042	15.3068	31.3397
Kappa-Tau	18.9807	14.5285	34.4645
NOA-PID	0.0000	9.6531	35.8995

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper the PID controller is designed by various basis methods such as Ziegler-Nichols, Cohen-Coon and Kappa-Tau for second-order plus delay-time process model. For the same processes the PID controller is designed by Numerical Optimization approach based on SOPDT model of process. From simulation results it is found that NOA-PID controller gives the monotonic (smooth) response with less settling time and minimum Overshoot which avoids the excessive oscillation of the final control element as compared with other basic controllers. Therefore the Numerical Optimization approach for tuning of PID controller is found to be more effective and suitable for the processes.

REFERENCES

[1] Astrom K., Hagglund T., "PID controllers: theory, design and tuning", USA: Instrument Society of America; 1995.

[2] Ziegler J. G., Nichols N. B., "Optimum settings for automatic controllers", ASME Transactions, 1942, 64, 759.S.

[3] Cohen G. H., Coon G. A., "Theoretical investigation of retarded control", Transactions of the ASME, 1953, 75, 827.

[4] Haalman A., "Adjusting controllers for dead time processes". Control Engineering, 1965, 12, 71.

[5] Smith C. A., Corripio A. B., "Principles and practice of automatic process control". New York: McGraw Hill, 1985.

[6] Rivera D. E., Morari M., Skogetad, S., "IMC-PID controller design". Industrial Engineering and Chemical Process, Design and Development, 1986, 25, 252.

[7] Fung H., Wang Q., Lee T., "PI tuning in terms of gain and phase margins", Automatica, 1998; 34(9), 1145-1149.

[8] Ho W., Hang C., Cao, L., "Tuning of PID controllers based on gain and phase margin specifications", Automatica, 1995; 31(3), 497-502.

[9] Ho W., Gan O., Tay E., Ang E. L., "Performance and gain and phase margins of well-known PID tuning formulas", IEEE Trans. Control Systems Technology, 1996; 4(11), 473-477.

[10] Wang Q.-G. , Fung H.-W. And Zhang Y.,"PID tuning with exact gain and phase margins", ISA Transactions, 1999; 38, 243-249.

[11] Wang Q.-G. , Lee T.-H. , Fung H.-W. , Qiang B., and Zhang Y., "PID Tuning for Improved Performance", IEEE Transactions on Control System Technology, 1999; 7(4), 457-465.

[12] C.C. Hang, K.J. Astrom, Q.G. Wang, "Relay feedback auto-tuning of process controllers a tutorial review", Journal of Process Control 12 (2002) 143-162, Elsevier.

[13] O. Yaniv, M. Nagurka, "Design of PID controllers satisfying gain margin and sensitivity constraints on a set of plants", Automatica 40 (2004) 111-116, Elsevier.

[14] Lee C.-H., "A Survey of PID controller design based on gain and phase margins (Invited Paper)", International Journal of Computational Cognition, 2004; 2(3), 63-100.

[15] Toscano R., "A simple robust PI/PID controller design via numerical optimization approach", Journal of Process Control, 15, 2005, 81-88.

[16] Jihong Li and Pingkang Li, "Stability Region Analysis of PID Controllers for Time-delay Systems", Proceeding of the 6thWorld Congress on Intelligent Control and automation, June 21-23, 2219-2223, © 2006 IEEE.

[17] Wen Tan, Jizhen Liu, Tongwen Chen, Horacio J. Morquez, "Comparison of some well-known PID tuning formulas", Computers and Chemical Engineering 30 (2006) 1416-1423, Elsevier.

[18] Wang, Q.-G., Zhang, Z., Astrom, K., Chek, L., "Guaranteed dominant pole placement with PID controllers", Journal of Process Control, 2009; 19, 349-352.

[19] Pingkang Li, Peng Wang and Xiuxia Du, "An approach to optimal design of stabilizing PID controllers for Time-delay systems", 2009 Chinese Control and Decision Conference(CCDC 2009) 3465-3470,© 2009 IEEE.

[20] Wuhua Hu, Gaoxi Xiao, Xiumin Li, "An analytical method for PID controller tuning with specified gain and phase margins for integral plus time delay processes", ISA Transactions 50 (2011) 268-276, Elsevier.

[21] C. D. Johnson, "Process Control Instrumentation Technology", Prentice-Hall of India, Seventh Edition, 2003.

[22] B. Wayne Bequette, "Process Control Modeling, Design and Simulation", PHI India (p) Ltd. 2006

[23] Wen-wen Cai , Li-xin Jia , Yan-bin Zhang , Nan Ni "Design and simulation of intelligent PID controllerbased on particle swarm optimization" School of Electrical Engineering Xi'an Jiao Tong University.

[24] Jing-Chung Shen "New tuning method for PID controller" ISA Transactions 41 (2002) 473–484

[25] C. B. Kadu, S. B. Bhusal and S. B. Lukare, "Auto tuning of pid controller for robot arm and Magnet levitation plant" IJRET Volume: 04 Issue: 01 Jan-2015, eISSN: 2319-1163 PP 186-193.

[26] C. B. Kadu, D. V. Sakhare "Improved Inverse Response of Boiler Drum Level using Fuzzy Self Adaptive PID Controller" (IJETT) – Volume 19 Number 3 – Jan 2015, PP 140-144.

[27] C. B. Kadu, S. B. Lukare and S. B. Bhusal, "Design of PI/PID Controller for FOPDT System" IJARCSSE-Volume 5 Issue 2 February 2015 pp. 645-651