

Felipe Souza Lima

***Metacontrol*: a Python based software for
self-optimizing control structure selection using
metamodels**

Campina Grande, Paraíba, Brasil

Março, 2020

Felipe Souza Lima

***Metacontrol: a Python based software for self-optimizing
control structure selection using metamodels***

Dissertação apresentada ao Programa de Pós-Graduação em Engenharia Química da Universidade Federal de Campina Grande, como requisito parcial para obtenção do grau de Mestre. Área de concentração: Engenharia Química.

Universidade Federal de Campina Grande

Unidade Acadêmica de Engenharia Química

Programa de Pós-Graduação em Engenharia Química

Supervisor: Dr. Antônio Carlos Brandão de Araújo

Campina Grande, Paraíba, Brasil

Março, 2020

Felipe Souza Lima

Metacontrol: a Python based software for self-optimizing control structure selection using metamodels/ Felipe Souza Lima. – Campina Grande, Paraíba, Brasil, Março, 2020-

65p. : il. (algumas color.) ; 30 cm.

Supervisor: Dr. Antônio Carlos Brandão de Araújo

Dissertação Mestrado – Universidade Federal de Campina Grande

Unidade Acadêmica de Engenharia Química

Programa de Pós-Graduação em Engenharia Química, Março, 2020.

1. Software. 2. Metamodel. 3. Plantwide. 4. Self-optimizing Control. 5. Python. I. Orientador. II. Universidade xxx. III. Faculdade de xxx. IV. Título

Errata sheet

Elemento opcional da **NBR14724:2011**. Exemplo:

FERRIGNO, C. R. A. **Tratamento de neoplasias ósseas apendiculares com reimplantação de enxerto ósseo autólogo autoclavado associado ao plasma rico em plaquetas**: estudo crítico na cirurgia de preservação de membro em cães. 2011. 128 f. Tese (Livre-Docência) - Faculdade de Medicina Veterinária e Zootecnia, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2011.

Folha	Linha	Onde se lê	Leia-se
1	10	auto-conclavo	autoconclavo

Felipe Souza Lima

Metacontrol: a Python based software for self-optimizing control structure selection using metamodels

Dissertação apresentada ao Programa de Pós-Graduação em Engenharia Química da Universidade Federal de Campina Grande, como requisito parcial para obtenção do grau de Mestre. Área de concentração: Engenharia Química.

Trabalho aprovado. Campina Grande, Paraíba, Brasil, XX de março de 2020:

Dr. Antônio Carlos Brandão de Araújo
Orientador

Professor
Dr. Heleno Bispo da Silva Júnior

Professor
Convidado 2

Campina Grande, Paraíba, Brasil
Março, 2020

For those who doubt themselves. Just embrace it.

Acknowledgements

Os agradecimentos principais são direcionados à Gerald Weber, Miguel Frasson, Leslie H. Watter, Bruno Parente Lima, Flávio de Vasconcellos Corrêa, Otavio Real Salvador, Renato Machnievscz¹ e todos aqueles que contribuíram para que a produção de trabalhos acadêmicos conforme as normas ABNT com L^AT_EX fosse possível.

Agradecimentos especiais são direcionados ao Centro de Pesquisa em Arquitetura da Informação² da Universidade de Brasília (CPAI), ao grupo de usuários *latex-br*³ e aos novos voluntários do grupo *abnT_EX2*⁴ que contribuíram e que ainda contribuirão para a evolução do abnT_EX2.

¹ Os nomes dos integrantes do primeiro projeto abnT_EX foram extraídos de <http://codigolivre.org.br/projects/abntex/>

² <http://www.cpai.unb.br/>

³ <http://groups.google.com/group/latex-br>

⁴ <http://groups.google.com/group/abntex2> e <http://www.abntex.net.br/>

*“To love the journey is to accept no such end.
I have found, through painful experience, that the most important step a person can take is
always the next one.
(Dalinar Kholin, Oathbringer.)*

Resumo

Segundo a **NBR6028:2003**, o resumo deve ressaltar o objetivo, o método, os resultados e as conclusões do documento. A ordem e a extensão destes itens dependem do tipo de resumo (informativo ou indicativo) e do tratamento que cada item recebe no documento original. O resumo deve ser precedido da referência do documento, com exceção do resumo inserido no próprio documento. (...) As palavras-chave devem figurar logo abaixo do resumo, antecedidas da expressão Palavras-chave:, separadas entre si por ponto e finalizadas também por ponto.

Palavras-chave: latex. abntex. editoração de texto.

Abstract

This is the english abstract.

Keywords: latex. abntex. text editoration.

List of Figures

Figure 1	– Initial plot of our complex model. The solid blue line represents the function behavior. The dashed line is the <i>Kriging</i> metamodel of the three sampled points (red circles) available.	44
Figure 2	– The <i>Kriging</i> model after one update.	45
Figure 3	– The <i>Kriging</i> model after four updates. Notice how the <i>Kriging</i> model adjusts to the true function.	46
Figure 4	– Flowchart of Caballero and Grossmann (2008) algorithm, translated to Python by the authors of this work and implemented within <i>Metacontrol</i>	47

List of frames

List of Tables

List of abbreviations and acronyms

CV Controlled Variable

NLP Non Linear Problem

RTO Real Time Optimization

SOC Self-Optimizing Control

List of symbols

Chapter 2

c	Controlled variable
d	Process disturbances
F	Optimal measurement sensitivity matrix with respect to the disturbances
G^y	Gain matrix with respect to the measurements
G_d^y	Gain matrix with respect to the disturbances
H	Linear combination matrix
J	Process objective function
J_{opt}	Optimal value of J
J_{ud}	Hessian of cost function with respect to the disturbance variables $\left(\frac{\partial^2 J}{\partial u \partial d}\right)$
J_{uu}	Hessian of cost function with respect to the manipulated variables $\left(\frac{\partial^2 J}{\partial^2 u}\right)$
L	Loss
n	Implementation error
$n^{y'}$	Implementation error with respect to the measurements
u	Manipulated variable
u_0	Process degrees of freedom
W_d	Diagonal magnitude matrix of disturbances
W_n	Diagonal magnitude matrix of measurement errors
x	Process states
y	Measurements
z	Loss variable

Chapter 3

\hat{y}	Metamodel (approximation) of y
$\mathcal{F}, f(x)$	Polynomial regression function
σ_l^2	Process variance

θ	<i>Kriging</i> hyperparameter of variable activity
ε	Residuals or random noise
p	<i>Kriging</i> hyperparameter of correlation smoothness
x	Input of a process, or sample
y	Function that calculates the output of a process
z	Stochastic departure function

Contents

1	INTRODUCTION	29
2	THE SELF-OPTIMIZING CONTROL OVERVIEW	31
3	<i>KRIGING</i> REASONING	39
4	NON LINEAR OPTIMIZATION AND INFILL CRITERIA	43
	References	49
	APPENDIX	53
	APPENDIX A – QUISQUE LIBERO JUSTO	55
	APPENDIX B – NULLAM ELEMENTUM URNA VEL IMPERDIET SODALES ELIT IPSUM PHARETRA LIGULA AC PRETIUM ANTE JUSTO A NULLA CURABITUR TRISTIQUE ARCU EU METUS	57
	ANNEX	59
	ANNEX A – MORBI ULTRICES RUTRUM LOREM.	61
	ANNEX B – CRAS NON URNA SED FEUGIAT CUM SOCIIS NA- TOQUE PENATIBUS ET MAGNIS DIS PARTURI- ENT MONTES NASCETUR RIDICULUS MUS	63
	ANNEX C – FUSCE FACILISIS LACINIA DUI	65

1 Introduction

This dissertation is about an assembly of several methodologies into a software tool, called *Metacontrol*, which enables a fast implementation of the Self-Optimizing Control (SOC) technique. This assembly consist of three major methodologies: *Kriging* metamodels, optimization through infill criteria and SOC. The dissertation is organized as follows:

Chapter 2 gives a brief summary of the key concepts involving SOC methodology and the main the reason why this research and software tool development was needed.

Chapter 3 presents a discussion of *Kriging* metamodels and its reasoning.

Chapter 4 introduces the process of constrained nonlinear optimization using *Kriging* metamodels. This process is also known as infill criteria.

Chapter 5 demonstrates how the assembly of the methodologies shown in chapters 2, 3 and 4 are combined to form the core concept behind *Metacontrol*.

Chapter 6 is dedicated to case-studies using *Metacontrol*. In addition, there is a brief discussion on good practices involving the use of the software tool.

The *Metacontrol* software is publicly available at <https://github.com/feslima/metacontrol>. There, the reader can find instructions on how to install the open-source tool. Also, for each technique discussed in chapters 2, 3 and 4, there is an open-source Python package as result. Their links are found in their respective chapters.

2 The Self-Optimizing Control overview

Every industrial process is under limitations ranging from design/safety (e.g. temperature or pressure which an equipment can operate, etc.), environmental (e.g. pollutant emissions), to quality specifications (e.g. product purity), and economic viability. More often than not, these constraints are applied all at once and can be conflicting. Therefore, it is mandatory to operate such processes optimally (or, at least, close to its optimal point) in order to attain maximum profits or keep expenses at minimum while still obeying these specifications.

One way to achieve this is through the application of plantwide control methodologies. In particular, Self-Optimizing Control ([MORARI; STEPHANOPOULOS, 1980](#); [SKOGESTAD, 2000](#); [ALSTAD; SKOGESTAD; HORI, 2009](#)) is a practical way to design a control structure of a process following a criterion (for instance: economic, environmental, performance) considering a constant set-point policy ([ALVES et al., 2018](#)). The SOC methodology is advantageous in this scenario because there is no need to reoptimize the process every time that a disturbance occurs.

However, the review presented here contains merely the paramount elements needed to understand the main concepts and expressions that translate the ideas behind the method. The author recommends them if the reader needs a more detailed explanation ([SKOGESTAD, 2000](#); [HALVORSEN et al., 2003](#); [HORI; SKOGESTAD; ALSTAD, 2005](#); [HORI; SKOGESTAD, 2007](#); [ALSTAD; SKOGESTAD; HORI, 2009](#); [ALVES et al., 2018](#); [KARIWALA; CAO; JANARDHANAN, 2008](#); [KARIWALA; CAO, 2009](#); [UMAR et al., 2012](#)).

The main concept of Self-optimizing control consists in the pursue of a control structure that is based on a constant setpoint policy, leading to near-optimal operation. From [Skogestad \(2004\)](#):

“Self-optimizing control is when one can achieve an acceptable loss with constant setpoint values for the controlled variables without the need to reoptimize when disturbances occur.”

It is assumed the process objective function, assumed scalar, is influenced by its steady-state operation. Therefore, the optimization problem described in [Equation 2.1](#) is formed, with u_0 being the degrees of freedom available, x and d representing the states

and the disturbances of the system, respectively.

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \underset{u_0}{\text{minimize}} && J_0(x, u_0, d) \\
 & \text{subject to} && g_1(x, u_0, d) = 0 \\
 & && g_2(x, u_0, d) \leq 0
 \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

Regarding the disturbances, these can be: change in feed conditions, prices of the products and raw materials, specifications (constraints) and/or changes in the model. Using NLP solvers, the objective function can be optimized considering the expected disturbances and implementation errors.

Since the whole technology considers near-optimal operation, as a result of keeping constant setpoints (differently from RTO, for instance), there will always exist a (positive) loss, given by [Equation 2.2](#)

$$L = J_0(d, n) - J_{opt}(d) \tag{2.2}$$

Metacontrol focus on the first four steps of the Self-Optimizing Control technology, named by [Skogestad \(2000\)](#) as “top-down” analysis. In these steps, the variable selection seeking the usage of the steady-state degrees of freedom is the main problem to be addressed with the systematic procedure proposed. It is possible to search for a Self-Optimizing Control structure basically using two methods:

1. Manually testing each CV candidate, reoptimizing the process for different disturbances’ scenarios, and choosing the structure that yields the lowest (worst-case or average-case) loss;
2. Using local methods based on second-order Taylor series expansion of the objective function, that are capable of easily and quickly “pre-screening” the most promising CV candidates.

The manual nature of method [1](#) and the possibility of creating an automated framework using method [2](#) motivated the creation of *Metacontrol* itself. Applying, comprehensively, the second method in a software was also a key motivation for this work. Therefore, it is logical that the usage of the linear methods will be discussed in this section, since they are the ones implemented within *Metacontrol*.

A linear model with respect to the plant measurements can be represented as [Equation 2.3](#)

$$\Delta y = G^y \Delta u + G_d^y \Delta d \quad (2.3)$$

With

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta y &= y - y^* \\ \Delta u &= u - u^* \\ \Delta d &= d - d^* \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

G^y and G_d^y are the gain matrices with respect to the measurements and disturbances, respectively. Regarding the CVs, linearization will give [Equation 2.5](#)

$$\Delta c = H \Delta y = G \Delta u + G_d \Delta d \quad (2.5)$$

With

$$\begin{aligned} G &= H G^y \\ G_d &= H G_d^y \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

Linearizing the loss function results in [Equation 2.7](#):

$$\begin{aligned} L &= J(u, d) - J_{opt}(d) = \frac{1}{2} \|z\|_2^2 \\ z &= J_{uu}^{\frac{1}{2}} (u - u_{opt}) = J_{uu}^{\frac{1}{2}} G^{-1} (c - c_{opt}) \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

Later, [Halvorsen et al. \(2003\)](#) developing the exact local method, showed that the loss function can be rewritten as in [Equation 2.8](#)

$$z = J_{uu}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[(J_{uu}^{-1} J_{ud} - G^{-1} G_d) \Delta d + G^{-1} n \right] \quad (2.8)$$

With J_{ud} and J_{uu} corresponding to the hessian with respect to the disturbances and manipulated variables $\left(\frac{\partial^2 J}{\partial u \partial d} \right)$ and with respect to the manipulated variables $\left(\frac{\partial^2 J}{\partial^2 u} \right)$, respectively. If one assumes that W_d is a (diagonal) magnitude matrix that considers the disturbances and W_n^y the magnitude matrix that takes into account the measurement error, and considering that both are 2-norm-bounded ([Halvorsen et al. \(2003\)](#) and [Alstad,](#)

Skogestad, and Hori (2009) contains a discussion and justification for using 2-norm), Equations 2.9 to 2.11 can be defined to scale the system:

$$d - d^* = W_d d' \quad (2.9)$$

$$n = HW_n^y n^{y'} = W_n n^{y'} \quad (2.10)$$

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} d' \\ n^{y'} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_2 \leq 1 \quad (2.11)$$

The loss function from Equation 2.7 can be also written in a more appropriate way considering the definition of (ALSTAD; SKOGESTAD; HORI, 2009) of the uncertainty variables regarding the contribution of the disturbances and measurement error on the incurred loss, Equation 2.12 and considering the scaled system from Equations 2.9 to 2.11

$$M \triangleq [M_d \quad M_n^y] \quad (2.12)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} M_d &= -J_{uu}^{1/2} (HG^y)^{-1} HFW_d \\ M_n^y &= -J_{uu}^{1/2} (HG^y)^{-1} HW_n^y \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

with F corresponding to the optimal measurement sensitivity matrix with respect to the disturbances.

Finally, if one uses all the definitions described so far, the worst-case loss for the effect of the disturbances and measurement error is given by Equation 2.14

$$L_{\text{worst-case}} = \max_{\left\| \begin{pmatrix} d' \\ n^{y'} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_2 \leq 1} = \frac{\bar{\sigma}(M)^2}{2} \quad (2.14)$$

Equation 2.14 shows that in order to minimize the worst-case loss, it is necessary to minimize $\bar{\sigma}(M)$, Equation 2.15:

$$H = \arg \min_H \bar{\sigma}(M) \quad (2.15)$$

This optimization problem was initially solved using a numerical search, as proposed by Halvorsen et al. (2003). Fortunately, Alstad, Skogestad, and Hori (2009) derived an explicit solution that gives the optimal linear combination of measurements coefficient matrix (H) that minimize the worst-case loss that exists due to the effect of the disturbances and measurement errors, in Equation 2.16

$$H^T = \left(\tilde{F} \tilde{F}^T \right)^{-1} G^y \left(G^{yT} \left(\tilde{F} \tilde{F}^T \right)^{-1} G^y \right)^{-1} J_{uu}^{1/2} \quad (2.16)$$

where

$$\tilde{F} = [F W_d W_n^y] \quad (2.17)$$

Assuming that $\tilde{F} \tilde{F}^T$ is full rank.

Equation 2.16 has three interesting properties proved by Alstad, Skogestad, and Hori (2009):

1. It applies to any number of measurements (n_y).
2. The solution for H was proved to minimize not only the worst-case, but also the average-case loss. Therefore, if one uses Equation 2.16 seeking the determination of a control structure that minimizes the loss at the worst-case scenario, he is also minimizing the loss for the average-case scenario. This was called as a “super-optimality” by Alstad, Skogestad, and Hori (2009).
3. The solution proposed minimizes the *combined* effect of the disturbances and the measurement errors, simultaneously.

Therefore, the usage of the explicit solution will give both the minimized worst and average case losses using a single evaluation, and will also consider the combined effect of the disturbances and measurement errors of the problem. Therefore, this solution it is the default one used in *Metacontrol*.

Another way of solving the optimization problem from Equation 2.15 is to use the Extended nullspace method (ALSTAD; SKOGESTAD; HORI, 2009). Differently from Equation 2.16, this solution does not consider the combined effect of the disturbances and measurement errors simultaneously. Instead, the problem is solved in two steps. The first regards “disturbance rejection”: The loss is minimized with respect to disturbances. If there are remaining degrees of freedom, then the effect of the measurement errors can be minimized. The extended nullspace, differently from the exact local method, is not an optimal solution, instead being considered sub-optimal. (ALSTAD; SKOGESTAD, 2007; ALSTAD; SKOGESTAD; HORI, 2009). However, the authors of Alves et al. (2018) also

translated the mathematical formulations of the extended nullspace method into Python, and it is intended to be implemented within *Metacontrol* GUI in future releases merely as a secondary feature, giving its sub-optimality. The solution using the extended nullspace method is depicted in Equation 2.18:

$$H = M_n^{-1} \tilde{J} \left(W_{n^y}^{-1} \tilde{G}^y \right)^\dagger W_{n^y}^{-1} \quad (2.18)$$

Since Equation 2.16 also minimizes the worst-case loss, its evaluation was also considered inside *Metacontrol*: the user can inspect the expected average-case loss for each control structure that can exist in the combinatorial problem. The expression for the average-case loss is a result of the work of Kariwala, Cao, and Janardhanan (2008) and is described in Equation 2.19:

$$L_{\text{average}} = \frac{1}{6(n_y + n_d)} \left\| J_{uu}^{\frac{1}{2}} (H G^y)^{-1} H \tilde{F} \right\|_F^2 \quad (2.19)$$

Lastly, it was necessary to implement within *Metacontrol* a branch-and-bound algorithm capable of quickly searching the best control structures for each possible subset of a given process, using the incurred loss as metric. This was considered by the authors of Alves et al. (2018) as an obligatory feature, since when *Metacontrol* is being used, it was understood that the main idea was to, in a comprehensive software, the user operating it should be capable of inspecting the most promising control structures, and discarding the unnecessary evaluation of the unpromising structures (i.e.: With a high incurred loss - both average of worst-case scenario) to save time and effort. It is important to remember that there is an evident combinatorial problem that grows in an explosive fashion, as the number of the unconstrained degrees of freedom of the reduced space problem and the number of available measurements both increases. Without a search method that is capable of quickly discarding undesired solutions, the usability of *Metacontrol* would be seriously compromised. Luckily, there are several implementations of branch-and-bound algorithms tailored for Self-Optimizing Control studies purposes, such as in Cao and Saha (2005), Cao and Kariwala (2008) and Kariwala and Cao (2009).

From the aforementioned works, Kariwala and Cao (2009) it is of particular interest: the monotonic criterion implemented consists of the exact local method from Halvorsen et al. (2003) and derived explicitly by Alstad, Skogestad, and Hori (2009), which is used as the default methodology to pre-screen the most promising self-optimizing CV candidates in *Metacontrol*. Therefore, the usage of the proposed branch-and-bound algorithm by Kariwala and Cao (2009) it is not only convenient, making the software more effective, but also keeps the “calculation engine” from *Metacontrol* using the same criterion. It would not make any sense, for instance, using a branch-and-bound algorithm that outputs the index of the most promising CVs using the maximum singular value rule from Skogestad

and Postlethwaite (2007) and use the CV index sequence from this algorithm to evaluate the worst-case loss. Fundamentally speaking, the orders of “best” control structures would not be the same, simply because the search method would be using an different criterion from the linear method implemented to evaluate the H matrix.

The Branch-and-Bound algorithm developed by Kariwala and Cao (2009) that was originally implemented in MATLAB® by them was translated to Python by the main author of Alves et al. (2018). The same is true for equations of Exact Local and Extended Nullspace methods described by Alstad, Skogestad, and Hori (2009). Those Python routines were packaged under the name of *pySOC* (Python-based Self-Optimizing Control), and can be found in <https://github.com/feslima/pySOC>, with the code being freely available for inspection, revision and suggestions.

3 *Kriging* reasoning

Metamodels are a way to represent the world in simpler terms. Think of them as a photograph, they do not capture the moment as whole but can represent it good enough. In this analogy, the moment is a complex process that it is too cumbersome to explain it completely in mathematical terms, and metamodels, as photographs, may serve the purpose of capturing the core trends of this process without being too unwieldy and not losing too much information.

There is a family of metamodeling methodologies, ranging from a simple linear regression to complex neural networks. However, this chapter will be dedicated to discuss *Kriging* surrogates.

The simplest form to represent a real world process (y) through a metamodel (\hat{y}) and its error (ε) is done through [Equation 3.1](#).

$$y(x) = \hat{y}(x) + \varepsilon \quad (3.1)$$

The error ε is associated with the unmodeled effects of the inputs x and random noise (i.e. it cannot be explained in detail but cannot be ignored as well.). When using the *Kriging* methodology as metamodel, this error is assumed to be a probabilistic function of x , or in other words, this error is assumed to be *not* independent and identically distributed. The specific probabilistic function is represented by a Gaussian distribution with mean zero and variance σ^2 .

$$\varepsilon = \varepsilon(x) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2) \quad (3.2)$$

As from [Søren Nymand Lophaven, Hans Bruun Nielsen, and Jacob Søndergaard \(2002\)](#), a *Kriging* metamodel is comprised of two parts: a polynomial regression \mathcal{F} and departure function z of stochastic nature, as can be seen in [Equation 3.3](#).

$$\hat{y}_l(x) = \mathcal{F}(\beta_{:,l}, x) + z_l(x), \quad l = 1, \dots, q \quad (3.3)$$

The regression model, considered as a linear combination of t functions ($f_j : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$), as defined in [Equation 3.4](#).

$$\mathcal{F}(\beta_{:,l}, x) \equiv f(x)^T \beta_{:,l} \quad (3.4)$$

The most common choices for $f(x)$ are polynomials with orders ranging from zero (constant) to two (quadratic). It is assumed that z has mean zero, and the covariance between two given points, arbitrarily named w and x for instance, is defined by Equation 3.5:

$$\text{Cov}[z_l(w), z_l(x)] = \sigma_l^2 \mathcal{R}(\theta_l, w, x), \quad l = 1, \dots, q \quad (3.5)$$

With σ_l^2 being the process variance for the l th response component, and $\mathcal{R}(\theta, w, x)$ defined as the correlation model. In *Metacontrol*, the correlation model used is described in Equation 3.6.

$$\mathcal{R}(\theta_l, w, x) = \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^m \theta_l (w - x_i)^p\right), \quad (\theta_l \geq 0, p_l \in [0, 2]) \quad (3.6)$$

Two important concepts must be addressed at this point: The first regards the meaning of the hyperparameter θ , being interpreted as the “activity” of variable x , meaning that, a low value of θ indicates that the points are highly correlated (ALVES et al., 2018). In addition, the value of θ also indicates how fast the correlation goes to zero as the process moves in the l th direction, as discussed by Caballero and Grossmann (2008). The second concept regards the parameter p in Equation 3.6, that represents the “smoothness” of the correlation. As its value reduces, the rate of the initial correlation drops as the distance between w and x_i increases. When $p \approx 0$, there is a discontinuity between $Y(w)$ and $Y(x_i)$ (FORRESTER; SOBESTER; KEANE, 2008) and there is no immediate correlation between the given points.

The hyperparameters θ are degrees of freedom available for optimization purposes, seeking the improvement of the metamodel fitness. In Søren Nyman Lophaven, Hans Bruun Nielsen, and Jacob Søndergaard (2002), the optimal set of hyperparameters θ^* corresponds to the maximum likelihood estimation. Assuming a Gaussian process (LOPHAVEN, S.; NIELSEN, H.; SØNDERGAARD, Jacob, 2002), the optimal values of the hyperparameters solves Equation 3.9:

$$\min_{\theta} \left\{ \psi(\theta) \equiv |R|^{\frac{1}{m}} \sigma^2 \right\} \quad (3.7)$$

Where $|R|$ is the determinant of the correlation matrix. The internal optimizer used in *DACE* corresponds to a modified version of the *Hooke & Jeeves* method, as showed by S. N. Lophaven, H. B. Nielsen, and J. Søndergaard (2002).

As stated before, high-order data obtainment it is an obligatory step in the proposed methodology implemented in *Metacontrol*. Fortunately, Søren Nyman Lophaven, Hans Bruun Nielsen, and Jacob Søndergaard (2002) also derived expressions for Jacobian

evaluation of a *Kriging* prediction (for full demonstration, consult Søren Nymand Lophaven, Hans Bruun Nielsen, and Jacob Søndergaard (2002)), given in Equation 3.8:

$$\hat{y}'(x) = J_f(x)^T \beta^* + J_r(x)^T \gamma^* \quad (3.8)$$

The expression for Hessian evaluation was derived by Alves et al. (2018) (full demonstration in appendix A of their work), and it is depicted in Equation 3.9:

$$\hat{y}''(x) = H_f(x) \beta^* + H_r(x) \gamma^* \quad (3.9)$$

Equations 3.8 and 3.9, differently from numeric/automatic differentiation, are not approximations and, instead, are analytical expressions derived by Søren Nymand Lophaven, Hans Bruun Nielsen, and Jacob Søndergaard (2002) and Alves et al. (2018). Therefore, it is expected a reduced error when one is using these expressions, if compared to techniques based in numerical approximation, considering that the *Kriging* metamodel used is precise enough.

For the design of experiments part, it was decided to implement the Latin Hypercube Sampling (LHS) because it allows to better sample the optimization domain without introducing ill-conditioning in the spatial correlation matrix calculated by the *Kriging* builder.

Lastly, both the LHS function and *Kriging* model builder/predictor were implemented as a separated package in Python under the name of *pydace* (from *Python toolbox for Design and Analysis of Experiments*). This package is a partial code translation from the MATLAB® toolbox implemented by Søren Nymand Lophaven, Hans Bruun Nielsen, and Jacob Søndergaard (2002) named *DACE* to the Python programming language. The link to the open-source code is <https://github.com/feslima/pydace>. There the reader can find a brief documentation on how to install and example of usage.

4 Non linear optimization and infill criteria

When dealing with a non linear problem, such as in [Equation 2.1](#), typically it is resorted to classical solvers (e.g. SQP, trust-region-dogleg, genetic algorithms, simulated annealing, etc.) to obtain its solution, depending on the nature of the NLP (e.g. presence of discontinuities, whether or not the function is differentiable, etc.).

There is a entire field of study dedicated to find these NLP solutions with *Kriging* surrogates. In the works of [Jones \(2001\)](#), [Sasena \(2002\)](#), [Forrester, Sobester, and Keane \(2008\)](#) and [Alexandrov et al. \(2000\)](#), there are entire discussions and frameworks on how to solve non linear problems and comparisons of several metrics involved in the optimization process with metamodels.

The premise of performing a optimization using surrogates is that the model to be optimized is too time consuming or computationally expensive to be solved with classical solvers. To circumvent this, the following steps are proposed:


1. Build an approximation model with *Kriging* surrogates using a limited number of initial samples. This approximation is a “generalistic” enough representation of the real model;
2. Perform a optimization of the approximation model using classical NLP solvers and an infill criteria. The surrogate model reduces the “search area” needed by the solver;
3. Compare the surrogate optimum found in step 2 with the result from original model. In other words: feed the results from the *Kriging* metamodel optimum into the original model and see if they are close enough;
4. If the optimum from the metamodel is close enough (based on a chosen metric) to the original model, then this may be the true optimum. Otherwise, update the *Kriging* model by introducing the value found and return to step 2;

This process is basically “filling holes” (hence the name *infill*) in our *Kriging* metamodel until original model optimum is found. To illustrate this in the simplest way, suppose a complex process that we need to optimize that is represented by the following function:

$$f(x) = -\cos(x) - e^{\frac{x}{20}} + 5$$

Assuming that we only have three initial points sampled from this model function, we build our *Kriging* model. As can be seen in Figure 1.

Figure 1 – Initial plot of our complex model. The solid blue line represents the function behavior. The dashed line is the *Kriging* metamodel of the three sampled points (red circles) available.




Source: Author.

When applying an optimization solver on the *Kriging* model, we get a new optimal value for x near 7.8 (3.47 for $f(x)$ when we consult the original model). Now, we include these values of $(x, f(x))$ in the sample and rebuild the *Kriging* metamodel. The result is shown Figure 2. We keep repeating this procedure until we get the result in Figure 3.

This example is a trivial one because the problem involves a single input variable and infill criteria is the own *Kriging* prediction of the model. As discussed in Jones (2001), this criteria has its pitfalls if used without other precautions.

Caballero and Grossmann (2008) presented an algorithm, based on the “method 2” in the work of Jones (2001), referred as a gradient matching technique where the gradient of the surrogate is forced to match with the true function gradient, this is done through trust-region approach to ensure local convergence which was proven in the work of Alexandrov et al. (2000). The basic idea of this approach is: minimize the NLP problem


Figure 2 – The *Kriging* model after one update.

Source: Author.

metamodel, consult the original function at the minimum found in the metamodel, update the sample matrix used to build the surrogate. Repeat this until a convergence criteria is met. The flowchart depicting the whole procedure is defined in Figure 4. For detailed explanation of each step of the proposed algorithm, one must refer to Caballero and Grossmann (2008) and Alves et al. (2018).


This approach was implemented as a procedure of the Python package *surropt* (from *Surrogate Optimization*). It uses as internal NLP solver a Python wrapper authored by Kummerer and Moore (2019) of the well-established *IpOpt* package (WÄCHTER; BIEGLER, 2006). The *surropt* package is found on <https://github.com/feslima/surropt>.

Figure 3 – The *Kriging* model after four updates. Notice how the *Kriging* model adjusts to the true function.



Source: Author.

Figure 4 – Flowchart of Caballero and Grossmann (2008) algorithm, translated to Python by the authors of this work and implemented within *Metacontrol*.



Source: Alves et al. (2018)

References

- ALEXANDROV, N. et al. Optimization with variable-fidelity models applied to wing design. In: 38TH aerospace sciences meeting and exhibit. [S.l.: s.n.], 2000. P. 841.
- ALSTAD, Vidar; SKOGESTAD, Sigurd. Null space method for selecting optimal measurement combinations as controlled variables. **Industrial & engineering chemistry research**, v. 46, n. 3, p. 846–853, 2007. DOI: [10.1021/ie060285+](https://doi.org/10.1021/ie060285+).
- ALSTAD, Vidar; SKOGESTAD, Sigurd; HORI, Eduardo S. Optimal measurement combinations as controlled variables. **Journal of Process Control**, Elsevier BV, v. 19, n. 1, p. 138–148, Jan. 2009. DOI: [10.1016/j.jprocont.2008.01.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jprocont.2008.01.002).
- ALVES, Victor M. C. et al. Metamodel-Based Numerical Techniques for Self-Optimizing Control. **Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research**, American Chemical Society (ACS), v. 57, n. 49, p. 16817–16840, Nov. 2018. DOI: [10.1021/acs.iecr.8b04337](https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.iecr.8b04337).
- CABALLERO, José A.; GROSSMANN, Ignacio E. An algorithm for the use of surrogate models in modular flowsheet optimization. **AIChE Journal**, Wiley, v. 54, n. 10, p. 2633–2650, Oct. 2008. DOI: [10.1002/aic.11579](https://doi.org/10.1002/aic.11579).
- CAO, Yi; KARIWALA, Vinay. Bidirectional branch and bound for controlled variable selection. **Computers & Chemical Engineering**, Elsevier BV, v. 32, n. 10, p. 2306–2319, Oct. 2008. DOI: [10.1016/j.compchemeng.2007.11.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compchemeng.2007.11.011).
- CAO, Yi; SAHA, Prabirkumar. Improved branch and bound method for control structure screening. **Chemical Engineering Science**, Elsevier BV, v. 60, n. 6, p. 1555–1564, Mar. 2005. DOI: [10.1016/j.ces.2004.10.025](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ces.2004.10.025).
- FORRESTER, Alexander; SOBESTER, Andras; KEANE, Andy. **Engineering design via surrogate modelling: a practical guide**. [S.l.]: John Wiley & Sons, 2008.
- HALVORSEN, Ivar J. et al. Optimal Selection of Controlled Variables†. **Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research**, American Chemical Society (ACS), v. 42, n. 14, p. 3273–3284, July 2003. DOI: [10.1021/ie020833t](https://doi.org/10.1021/ie020833t).
- HORI, Eduardo S.; SKOGESTAD, Sigurd. Selection of Control Structure and Temperature Location for Two-Product Distillation Columns. **Chemical Engineering Research and Design**, Elsevier BV, v. 85, n. 3, p. 293–306, Jan. 2007. DOI: [10.1205/cherd06115](https://doi.org/10.1205/cherd06115).
- HORI, Eduardo S.; SKOGESTAD, Sigurd; ALSTAD, Vidar. Perfect Steady-State Indirect Control. **Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research**, American Chemical Society (ACS), v. 44, n. 4, p. 863–867, Feb. 2005. DOI: [10.1021/ie049736l](https://doi.org/10.1021/ie049736l).

- JONES, Donald R. A taxonomy of global optimization methods based on response surfaces. **Journal of global optimization**, Springer, v. 21, n. 4, p. 345–383, 2001.
- KARIWALA, Vinay; CAO, Yi. Bidirectional branch and bound for controlled variable selection. Part II: Exact local method for self-optimizing control. **Computers & Chemical Engineering**, Elsevier BV, v. 33, n. 8, p. 1402–1412, Aug. 2009. DOI: [10.1016/j.compchemeng.2009.01.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compchemeng.2009.01.014).
- KARIWALA, Vinay; CAO, Yi; JANARDHANAN, Sivaramakrishnan. Local self-optimizing control with average loss minimization. **Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research**, v. 47, n. 4, p. 1150–1158, 2008. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1021/ie070897+>.
- KUMMERER, Matthias; MOORE, Jason K. **Cython interface for the interior point optimizer IPOPT**. [S.l.: s.n.], Dec. 2019. Available from: [<https://github.com/matthias-k/cyipopt>](https://github.com/matthias-k/cyipopt).
- LOPHAVEN, S. N.; NIELSEN, H. B.; SØNDERGAARD, J. **Aspects of the Matlab toolbox DACE**. Richard Petersens Plads, Building 321, DK-2800 Kgs. Lyngby, 2002. (IMM-TR-2002-13).
- LOPHAVEN, Søren Nymand; NIELSEN, Hans Bruun; SØNDERGAARD, Jacob. **DACE - A Matlab Kriging Toolbox, Version 2.0**. [S.l.: s.n.], 2002.
- MORARI, Manfred; STEPHANOPOULOS, George. Studies in the synthesis of control structures for chemical processes: Part II: Structural aspects and the synthesis of alternative feasible control schemes. **AIChE Journal**, Wiley, v. 26, n. 2, p. 232–246, Mar. 1980. DOI: [10.1002/aic.690260206](https://doi.org/10.1002/aic.690260206).
- SASENA, Michael James. **Flexibility and efficiency enhancements for constrained global design optimization with kriging approximations**. 2002. PhD thesis – University of Michigan Ann Arbor, MI.
- SKOGESTAD, Sigurd. Control structure design for complete chemical plants. **Computers & Chemical Engineering**, Elsevier BV, v. 28, n. 1-2, p. 219–234, Jan. 2004. DOI: [10.1016/j.compchemeng.2003.08.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compchemeng.2003.08.002).
- SKOGESTAD, Sigurd. Plantwide control: the search for the self-optimizing control structure. **Journal of Process Control**, Elsevier BV, v. 10, n. 5, p. 487–507, Oct. 2000. DOI: [10.1016/s0959-1524\(00\)00023-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0959-1524(00)00023-8).
- SKOGESTAD, Sigurd; POSTLETHWAITE, Ian. **Multivariable feedback control: analysis and design**. [S.l.]: Wiley New York, 2007. v. 2.
- UMAR, Lia Maisarah et al. Selection of Controlled Variables using Self-optimizing Control Method. In: **PLANTWIDE Control**. [S.l.]: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Mar. 2012. P. 43–71. DOI: [10.1002/9781119968962.ch4](https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119968962.ch4).

WÄCHTER, Andreas; BIEGLER, Lorenz T. On the implementation of an interior-point filter line-search algorithm for large-scale nonlinear programming. **Mathematical Programming**, v. 106, n. 1, p. 25–57, Mar. 2006. ISSN 1436-4646. DOI: [10.1007/s10107-004-0559-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-004-0559-y). Available from: [<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-004-0559-y>](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-004-0559-y).

Appendix

APPENDIX A – Quisque libero justo

Quisque facilisis auctor sapien. Pellentesque gravida hendrerit lectus. Mauris rutrum sodales sapien. Fusce hendrerit sem vel lorem. Integer pellentesque massa vel augue. Integer elit tortor, feugiat quis, sagittis et, ornare non, lacus. Vestibulum posuere pellentesque eros. Quisque venenatis ipsum dictum nulla. Aliquam quis quam non metus eleifend interdum. Nam eget sapien ac mauris malesuada adipiscing. Etiam eleifend neque sed quam. Nulla facilisi. Proin a ligula. Sed id dui eu nibh egestas tincidunt. Suspendisse arcu.

APPENDIX B – Nullam elementum urna vel imperdiet sodales elit ipsum pharetra ligula ac pretium ante justo a nulla curabitur tristique arcu eu metus

Nunc velit. Nullam elit sapien, eleifend eu, commodo nec, semper sit amet, elit. Nulla lectus risus, condimentum ut, laoreet eget, viverra nec, odio. Proin lobortis. Curabitur dictum arcu vel wisi. Cras id nulla venenatis tortor congue ultrices. Pellentesque eget pede. Sed eleifend sagittis elit. Nam sed tellus sit amet lectus ullamcorper tristique. Mauris enim sem, tristique eu, accumsan at, scelerisque vulputate, neque. Quisque lacus. Donec et ipsum sit amet elit nonummy aliquet. Sed viverra nisl at sem. Nam diam. Mauris ut dolor. Curabitur ornare tortor cursus velit.

Morbi tincidunt posuere arcu. Cras venenatis est vitae dolor. Vivamus scelerisque semper mi. Donec ipsum arcu, consequat scelerisque, viverra id, dictum at, metus. Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Ut pede sem, tempus ut, porttitor bibendum, molestie eu, elit. Suspendisse potenti. Sed id lectus sit amet purus faucibus vehicula. Praesent sed sem non dui pharetra interdum. Nam viverra ultrices magna.

Aenean laoreet aliquam orci. Nunc interdum elementum urna. Quisque erat. Nullam tempor neque. Maecenas velit nibh, scelerisque a, consequat ut, viverra in, enim. Duis magna. Donec odio neque, tristique et, tincidunt eu, rhoncus ac, nunc. Mauris malesuada malesuada elit. Etiam lacus mauris, pretium vel, blandit in, ultricies id, libero. Phasellus bibendum erat ut diam. In congue imperdiet lectus.

Annex

ANNEX A – Morbi ultrices rutrum lorem.

Sed mattis, erat sit amet gravida malesuada, elit augue egestas diam, tempus scelerisque nunc nisl vitae libero. Sed consequat feugiat massa. Nunc porta, eros in eleifend varius, erat leo rutrum dui, non convallis lectus orci ut nibh. Sed lorem massa, nonummy quis, egestas id, condimentum at, nisl. Maecenas at nibh. Aliquam et augue at nunc pellentesque ullamcorper. Duis nisl nibh, laoreet suscipit, convallis ut, rutrum id, enim. Phasellus odio. Nulla nulla elit, molestie non, scelerisque at, vestibulum eu, nulla. Ut odio nisl, facilisis id, mollis et, scelerisque nec, enim. Aenean sem leo, pellentesque sit amet, scelerisque sit amet, vehicula pellentesque, sapien.

ANNEX B – Cras non urna sed feugiat cum sociis natoque penatibus et magnis dis parturient montes nascetur ridiculus mus

Sed consequat tellus et tortor. Ut tempor laoreet quam. Nullam id wisi a libero tristique semper. Nullam nisl massa, rutrum ut, egestas semper, mollis id, leo. Nulla ac massa eu risus blandit mattis. Mauris ut nunc. In hac habitasse platea dictumst. Aliquam eget tortor. Quisque dapibus pede in erat. Nunc enim. In dui nulla, commodo at, consectetur nec, malesuada nec, elit. Aliquam ornare tellus eu urna. Sed nec metus. Cum sociis natoque penatibus et magnis dis parturient montes, nascetur ridiculus mus. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas.

ANNEX C – Fusce facilisis lacinia dui

Phasellus id magna. Duis malesuada interdum arcu. Integer metus. Morbi pulvinar pellentesque mi. Suspendisse sed est eu magna molestie egestas. Quisque mi lorem, pulvinar eget, egestas quis, luctus at, ante. Proin auctor vehicula purus. Fusce ac nisl aliquam ante hendrerit pellentesque. Class aptent taciti sociosqu ad litora torquent per conubia nostra, per inceptos hymenaeos. Morbi wisi. Etiam arcu mauris, facilisis sed, eleifend non, nonummy ut, pede. Cras ut lacus tempor metus mollis placerat. Vivamus eu tortor vel metus interdum malesuada.