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Abstract

Model predictive control (MPC) differs from other control methods mainly in implementation of the control actions. In this paper, the tracking error performance index of rolling optimization of predictive control is designed for a class of nonlinear systems by the relative degree, then employed to design controller for robot manipulator. In other words, the robot manipulator’s reference trajectory is based on Taylor expansion, and the actual trajectory is substituted into the performance cost function which is derivated for minimum to obtain the controller. Then the performance analysis for the closed system is made. Simulation results demonstrate the effectiveness of the method based on Taylor expansion.
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1. Introduction

In 1978, Garrett et al. proposed the model prediction-related heuristic control algorithm (MPHC). Since then, predictive control has undergone great development, successively generated the Model Algorithm Control (MAC), Dynamic Matrix Control (DMC), Internal Model Control (IMC), Generalized Predictive Control (GPC) and other dozens of algorithms. Through practical industrial applications, these dozens of algorithms have been proved to have better effects. Initially, these above-mentioned predictive control methods were aimed at linear systems. However, in practice, industrial production processes are often manifested as nonlinear characteristics. Although most of the industrial production processes can be modeled in the vicinity of working points by local linearization methods, some strong nonlinear controlled objects or nonlinear objects with special structures are difficult to obtain satisfactory control effects by using conventional linear control methods. At present, there are not many research results of predictive control methods for nonlinear systems. Being implemented through its rolling optimization, the predictive control itself has a certain degree of robustness. If a system only has weak nonlinear characteristics, it can be regarded as a model mismatch; if a system exhibits strong nonlinear characteristics, using a conventional linear predictive control, due to the model having a comparatively great actual deviation, will not able to reach the effect of optimizing the control, so that the use of a non-linear model will be needed for prediction and optimization, thus producing a nonlinear predictive control method. In view of the present research progress at home and abroad, since the structure identification and parameter estimation of a nonlinear controlled object have great difficulty, the online nonlinear rolling optimization implementation of an algorithm will experience another difficulty even if the dynamic characteristics and predictive model of a process are obtained in some way. For a nonlinear controlled object, because of its own time-varying, coupling and other characteristics, there is not yet a unified predictive control method now to control it. This requires a more effective nonlinear predictive control method.

In order to further reduce the online calculated amount of predictive control, and make it be appropriate for nonlinear controlled object, in recent years, many scholars have conducted a good deal of research into nonlinear predictive control and its improvement methods. This paper [1] draws on the current-output all-order derivatives to construct the future-output Taylor-order prediction model for the smooth affine nonlinear system. Then it derives the controller solution with the predictive output tracking error norm as the minimum indicator, which could improve accuracy of output prediction using the high control orders. In recent years, robot trajectory tracking control has obtained a lot of achievements. However, due to the a robot having strong coupling, high nonlinearity, time-varying and other characteristics, its model parameters vary with the changes in its position, attitude and load, and outside interference, model uncertainty and other factors make the difficulty of controller design increase. In order to achieve the online compensation to uncertainty, various control strategies have been put forward in succession. Among them, self-adaptive control [2,3,4] is mainly used for a case of containing parameter uncertainty and of the unknown parameters of a system being linearized, but has strict real-time requirements, making its realization more complex, and is difficult to ensure the stability of a system and to achieve a certain control performance index especially when there is non-parameter uncertainty; robust control [5] can achieve effective control over a manipulator system, but this method
needs knowing the upper bound of an uncertainty, and in practical application, the upper bound of an uncertainty is difficult to get. Taking into account the defects of the above methods, many scholars combine [6,7,8] an intelligent control method and robust control with adaptive control to make the two coordinate each other, guaranteeing that a control system has good dynamic performance and robust performance. The intelligent control method represented by a neural network [9,10] and fuzzy logic [11] does not need a mathematical model of a system but can accurately approximate a nonlinear system, providing an effective way to deal with an uncertain robot system. However, this algorithm has the large amount of calculation and poor real-time.

This paper combines the Taylor-based mechanical hand trajectory and reference trajectory, and integrates them into the predictive control performance indicators with rolling optimization. Then take the derivative of it to get the controller, which could prove the stability of the controller. Meanwhile, the algorithm is highly real-time.

2. Controlled Object Model

A robot can be regarded as an open-chain, rigid and multi-link mechanism. Its trajectory tracking control problem is that given a joint angle trajectory vector[12] to be tracked and the initial state of the joint angle, it is required to design a controller and provide a joint control torque to make a joint angle of a robot meet a certain track condition. The kinetic equation of a robot having two degrees of freedom can be represented as:

\[
M(\theta)\ddot{\theta} + C(\theta, \dot{\theta})\dot{\theta} + G(\theta) = \tau
\]

(1)

where

\[M(\theta)\]:definite symmetric inertia matrix
\[C(\theta, \dot{\theta})\]:centrifugal force and coriolis force vector
\[G(\theta)\]:gravity vector
\[\tau = [\tau_1, \tau_2]^T\]:joint control torque vector
\[\theta = [\theta_1, \theta_2]^T\]:robot joint angle position
\[\dot{\theta} = [\dot{\theta}_1, \dot{\theta}_2]^T\]:robot joint angle velocity
\[\ddot{\theta} = [\ddot{\theta}_1, \ddot{\theta}_2]^T\]:robot joint angle acceleration.

3. Design of Predictive Controller

For the following MIMO, the nonlinear system is:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x}(t) &= f(x(t)) + g(x(t))u(t) \\
y(t) &= h_i(x(t)) \quad i = 1,2,\cdots,m
\end{align*}
\]

(2)

where

\[x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n\]: state variables
\[u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n\]: system control input
\[y = [y_1, y_2, \cdots, y_m]^T \in \mathbb{R}^n\]: system output.

Consider a class of nonlinear systems like those of formula(2) and make the following assumptions.

Assumption 1. The system’s reference signal and output for time t are continuous.

Assumption 2. The system’s all states can be observed.

Assumption 3. The system’s zero dynamic stability \( \gamma(t) \) has a relative degree \( \rho \), and the system is stable in zero dynamics. For the definition of the relative degree, see Definition 1.

Definition 1. If a nonlinear system like that of formula(2) in area \( D_0 \in D \), then

\[
L_y L_y^j h_i(x) = 0, \quad j = 1,2,\cdots,\rho - 2,
\]

\[
L_y L_y^j h_i(x) \neq 0, \quad \forall x \in D_0
\]

(3)

in the formula, \( L_y^j h_i(x) = L_y[L_y^{j-1} h_i(x)] \), \( L_y^0 h_i(x) = 0 \).

The system has a relative degree \( \rho \), that is, formula(3) is established, equivalent to:

\[
\begin{align*}
L_y h_i(x) &= 0 \\
L_y h_i(x) &= 0 \\
M &= 0 \\
L_y h_i(x) &= 0 \\
L_y h_i(x) &= 0
\end{align*}
\]

(4)

which is established or equivalently has:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial h_i}{\partial x}(x(g), a d_j g(x), a d_j^2 g(x),\cdots, 1), & \ , \\
a d_j^{\rho-1} g(x) &= [0,0,\cdots,\rho(a(x))]
\end{align*}
\]

(5)

in the formula, \( a(x) \neq 0, \forall x \) is an appropriate function.

Definition 2. Suppose the consecutive prediction of the future control amount of the control system \( \hat{u}(t + \tau) \) in \( \tau \in [0, T] \) meets:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{d^k \hat{u}(t + \tau)}{d\tau^k} &= 0, \tau \in [0, T] \\
\frac{d^k \hat{u}(t + \tau)}{d\tau^k} &= 0, \tau \in [0, T], k > r
\end{align*}
\]

(6)

then, \( r \) is the control step of the predictive control system.

At first, define the prediction output and reference trajectory at moment \( t + \tau \) respectively as \( \hat{y}(t + \tau) \) and \( y_i(t + \tau) \), and define the prediction error as:

\[
e(t + \tau) = \hat{y}(t + \tau) - y_i(t + \tau)
\]

(7)

Set the performance indicator of the system in rolling prediction time range \( T \) as:

\[
J = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T e^T(t + \tau) e(t + \tau) d\tau
\]

(8)
Formula (8) shows that the system takes the tracking error as a performance indicator and it can also be considered that the system’s performance indicator is a function of tracking error.

Suppose the control step input by the system is \( r \), and make predictive output \( \hat{y}(t) \) of the system at moment \( t \) derived to \( \rho \) times, then

\[
\begin{align*}
\hat{y}(t) &= L_{\rho} h(x) \\
\vdots \\
\hat{y}^{(\rho-1)}(t) &= L_{\rho-1}^T h(x) \\
\hat{y}^{(\rho)}(t) &= L_{\rho}^T h(x) + L_{\rho}^{\rho-1} h(x) \hat{u}(t) \\
\end{align*}
\tag{9}
\]

in the formula, \( L_{\rho}^T h(x) \) is the \( i \) order derivative of \( \hat{y}(t) \) to \( f(x) \) and \( h(x) = [h_1(x), h_2(x), \ldots h_n(x)]^T \).

Similarly, make reference trajectory \( y_r(t+\tau) \) at moment \( \tau \), using the Taylor series, approximately expressed as:

\[
\hat{y}(t+\tau) = \Gamma(\tau)\tilde{y}(t)
\tag{14}
\]

in the formula, \( \Gamma(\tau) \in R^{m \times m} \) and \( L_{\rho} \) is the unit matrix of \( m \times m \) s.

\[
\tilde{y}(t) = \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{y}^{(0)}(t) \\
\hat{y}^{(1)}(t) \\
\vdots \\
\hat{y}^{(\rho)}(t)
\end{bmatrix} = \\
\begin{bmatrix}
h(x) \\
L_{\rho}^T h(x) \\
\vdots \\
L_{\rho}^{\rho-1} h(x)
\end{bmatrix} + \\
\begin{bmatrix}
0_{n1} \\
0_{n1} \\
\vdots \\
H(\hat{u}(t))
\end{bmatrix}
\tag{15}
\]

\[
H(\hat{u}(t)) = \\
\begin{bmatrix}
L_{\rho}^T h(x)\hat{u}(t) + p_1(\hat{u}(t),x(t)) + L_{\rho}^{\rho-1} h(x)\hat{u}(t) \\
\vdots \\
p_\rho(\hat{u}(t),x(t)) \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Similarly, make reference trajectory \( y_r(t+\tau) \) at moment \( \tau \), using the Taylor series, approximately expressed as:

\[
\hat{y}(t+\tau) = \Gamma(\tau)\tilde{y}(t)
\tag{16}
\]

in the formula, \( \tilde{y}(t) = [y_r(t)^T, \hat{y}(t)^T, L_{\rho}^T y_r(t)^T] \),

\[
\Gamma(\tau) = \int_0^\tau \Gamma(\tau)\tilde{y}(t)dx \in R^{n \times \rho+1}
\tag{17}
\]

make \( \Gamma(\tau) = \int_0^\tau \Gamma(\tau)\tilde{y}(t)dx \in R^{\rho+1} \)

According to formulas (14), (16)and(17), performance index formula (8) can be rewritten as:

\[
J = \int_0^\tau [\tilde{y}(t) - \tilde{y}(t)] d\tau
\tag{18}
\]

In order to make the above-mentioned performance index minimum, make

\[
\frac{\partial J}{\partial \hat{u}(t)} = 0
\tag{19}
\]

The following theorems can be obtained:

Theorem 1. For a class of nonlinear systems composed of formula (2), on satisfying assumptions 1 to 3, use the Taylor formula to make the system output expand to \( \rho + r \) steps. Among them, \( r > 0 \) is the control step. The
following predictive control law can ensure that predictive control performance formula(8) is optimal:
\[ u(t) = -(L_y L^{-1}_y h(x))^T (K M + L^{-1}_y h(x) - y_i) \]
where the non-singular matrix:
\[ L_y L^{-1}_y h(x) = \begin{bmatrix} L_y L^{-1}_y h(x) & \cdots & L_y L^{-1}_y h(x) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ L_y L^{-1}_y h(x) & \cdots & L_y L^{-1}_y h(x) \end{bmatrix} \]

In order to make \( t + t_i \) approximate expanded as follows:
\[ \begin{align*}
\hat{\theta}(t + t_i) &= \sum_{j \in E} t_i^{j-1} \theta^{(j)}(t) + H_i(t_i)y \\
\dot{\hat{\theta}}(t + t_i) &= 0_{2,2} \times \theta + \sum_{j \in E} t_i^{j-1} \theta^{(j)}(t) = H_i(t_i)y
\end{align*} \]

in the formula, \( y = [\theta(t)^T, \theta(t)^T, \theta(t)^T, \theta(t)^T, \theta(t)^T] \)

According to formula(22) and formula(23), performance indicator formula (21) can be approximately expressed as:
\[ J = \frac{1}{2} (y - y) R (y - y) \]

in the formula, \( R = \int_0^T [H_i H_i + \lambda \dot{H}_i H_i] dt_i \) is a 10×10 constant-related symmetric matrix and consistent with the format of formula(8).

For joint angle vector \( \theta(t) \), respectively obtain its 2,3,4-order derivatives, and we will get:
\[ \dot{\theta}(t) = m_1(\theta, \dot{\theta}) + [M(\theta)]^{-1} \tau \]
\[ \theta^{(3)}(t) = m_3(\theta, \dot{\theta}, \ddot{\theta}) + p_3(\theta, \dot{\theta}, \ddot{\theta}) + [M(\theta)]^{-1} \tau \]
\[ \theta^{(4)}(t) = m_4(\theta, \dot{\theta}, \ddot{\theta}, \dddot{\theta}) + p_4(\theta, \dot{\theta}, \ddot{\theta}, \dddot{\theta}) + [M(\theta)]^{-1} \tau \]

Where
\[ m_1(\theta, \dot{\theta}) = -[M(\theta)]^{-1} [C(\theta, \dot{\theta}) \dot{\theta} + G(\theta)] \]
\[ m_3(\theta, \dot{\theta}, \ddot{\theta}) = \frac{\partial m_1(\theta, \dot{\theta})}{\partial \theta} \]
\[ m_4(\theta, \dot{\theta}, \ddot{\theta}, \dddot{\theta}) = \frac{\partial m_3(\theta, \dot{\theta}, \ddot{\theta})}{\partial \theta} \]
\[ p_i(\theta, \dot{\theta}, \ddot{\theta}) = \dot{\theta} \frac{\partial m_i(\theta, \dot{\theta})}{\partial \theta} + \ddot{\theta} \frac{\partial m_i(\theta, \dot{\theta})}{\partial \dot{\theta}} + \frac{\partial [M(\theta)]^{-1}}{\partial \theta} \]

According to the definitions of \( K_1, K_2 \), they can be calculated as:

\[ K_i = \begin{cases} k_i, 0 \\ 0, k_i \end{cases}, \]

\[ K_1 = \left( \begin{array}{cc} k_{11} / K_{12} & k_{13} \\ k_{21} / K_{22} & k_{24} \end{array} \right) \]

\[ K_2 = \left( \begin{array}{cc} k_{11} / K_{12} & k_{13} \\ k_{21} / K_{22} & k_{24} \end{array} \right) \]

\[ k_{11} = 10507 \times (347^{T} + 3744aT^{2} + 16128k^{3}) \]

\[ k_{12} = (33868 \times 1360)(T^{2} + 5460\lambda T^{4} + 25T^{6}) \]

\[ k_{13} = 63000 \times (347^{T} + 3744aT^{2} + 16128k^{3}) \]

\[ k_{14} = (33868 \times 1360)(T^{2} + 5460\lambda T^{4} + 25T^{6}) \]

\[ k_{21} = (33868 \times 1360)(T^{2} + 5460\lambda T^{4} + 25T^{6}) \]

\[ k_{22} = (33868 \times 1360)(T^{2} + 5460\lambda T^{4} + 25T^{6}) \]

\[ k_{23} = (33868 \times 1360)(T^{2} + 5460\lambda T^{4} + 25T^{6}) \]

\[ k_{24} = (33868 \times 1360)(T^{2} + 5460\lambda T^{4} + 25T^{6}) \]

5. Closed-loop system performance analysis

Under a circumstance that the modeling of a robot system is accurate and its interference is zero, a conventional PD controller can also be used to implement the trajectory tracking of its joint angle. Its control law is formula(33):

\[ \tau = M(\theta)(\ddot{\theta} + K_e \dot{\theta} - K_e \theta) + \dot{C}(\theta, \dot{\theta}) \theta + G(\theta) \]

in the formula, \( K_e = aI, a > b > 0 \).

Although this formula(33) and the control law formula (32) obtained from performance index formula (21) rolling optimization in this paper are consistent in form, the two are essentially different. In the PD controller, the selection of coefficients \( K_I \) and \( K_P \) has a great deal of randomness, and the tentative selection of parameters does not ensure that a designed controller is globally optimum. Predictive control using rolling optimization to substitute global one-time optimization, that is, the optimization process is not performed offline at a time but undergoes online repeated optimization calculation and rolling implementation, thus making the uncertainty caused by model mismatch, time varying, interference and the like made up in time, always making new optimization built on an actual foundation, and making control keep actually optimal. For an actual complex industrial process, there inevitably is uncertainty, therefore, a rolling optimization strategy built on a finite time domain will be more effective. Formula (32) \( K_I, K_P \) is exactly the embodiment of this characteristic.

\[ M(\theta) \] is a reversible matrix, so after making robust predictive control law (32) substituted into equation (20) for a controlled object, we can obtain a closed-loop system equation as follows:

\[ \tau = M(\theta)\ddot{\theta} + K_e \dot{\theta} + K_e \theta + \dot{C}(\theta, \dot{\theta}) \]
\[
\ddot{e} + K_e \dot{e} + K_i e = 0
\]

(34)

From the form of \(K_e\) and \(K_i\), we can know it is a positive definite matrix. When a controlled object takes (1) and the control law takes formula (33), equation (34) of a closed-loop system will be globally asymptotically stable.

6. Simulation

Consider that the kinetic model of a two-joint robot system is (1),

where

\[
M(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix}
q_1 + q_2 + 2q_1 \cos(\theta_1) & q_1 + q_2 \cos(\theta_1) \\
q_1 + q_2 \cos(\theta_1) & q_1 & q_2 \\
\end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
C(\theta, \dot{\theta}) = \begin{bmatrix}
-q_1 \dot{\theta}_1 \sin(\theta_1) - q_1 (\dot{\theta}_1 + \dot{\theta}_2) \sin(\theta_1) \\
q_1 \dot{\theta}_1 \sin(\theta_1) & 0 \\
\end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
G(\theta) = \begin{bmatrix}
15q_1 \sin(\theta_1) + 8.75q_2 \cos(\theta_1 + \dot{\theta}_2) \\
8.75q_2 \cos(\theta_1 + \dot{\theta}_2) \\
\end{bmatrix},
\]

simulation parameters are \(v = 13.33, q_1 = 8.98, q_2 = 8.75, g = 9.8\) and the desired tracking signal is \(\tilde{\theta}_1 = 1 + 0.2 \sin(0.5 \pi t), \tilde{\theta}_2 = 1 - 0.2 \cos(0.5 \pi t)\).

In performance indicators (21), select \(\lambda = 2\), predictive time domain, \(\tau = 1 \text{s}\), and the solution will be \(K_c = 2804 Ud, K_i = 7.673 Ud\).

After calculation, the relative step and control step of the robot model used in this section are 2. After using Simulink and S function to carry out control system simulation, the simulation results are shown in Figures 1 (a) to (d).

Figures 1 (a) to 1 (b) show the joint angle output and its reference trajectory, Figure 1 (c) shows the error curve and Figure 1 (d) shows the control torque. From Fig. (a) to Fig. (b), it can be seen that the output curve can quickly track the reference curve. From Figure (c), it can be seen that the tracking error is 0, and the tracking error convergence is relatively rapid. From Figure (d), it can be seen that the control torque and its desired signal are basically the same, with the controller having a good effect.

Fig. 1(a) Joint 1 and its reference trajectory

7. Conclusions

At first, this paper gives a predictive controller design method for a multi-input and multi-output nonlinear system based on Taylor expansion under a nominal condition.

Taking a robot as a controlled object, this paper improves the performance index function in the method we propose, and then uses it for robot control. For the above methods, the design process is simple, without online calculation, thus greatly reducing the heavy computation burden brought by predictive control rolling optimization.
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