LUND UNIVERSITY

Self-Tuning Regulators

Åström, Karl Johan

Published in:
Systems Reliability Issues for Future Aircraft

1975

Document Version:
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Link to publication

Total number of authors:
1

SELF-TUNING REGULATORS

K. J. Åström

Lund Institute of Technology, Sweden

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper gives a brief review of the results of a research project on self-tuning regulators which has been carried out at the Lund Institute of Technology. The project is part of a larger research program on adaptive control which has followed three main lines: A – stochastic control, B – self-tuning regulators, and C – analysis of adaptive regulators proposed in literature.

The approach via stochastic control, which leads to dual-control strategies, has been very useful to provide understanding and insight. So far the results have, however, not been carried out to the stage of implementation. Self-tuning regulators are a particular version of adaptive regulators based on real-time identification. They are a special case of nondual stochastic control algorithms. The work on self-tuning regulators has progressed quite far in the sense that these regulators are reasonably well understood theoretically. They have also been tried extensively in several industrial applications. On the other hand, much work remains to be done in exploring other aspects of these regulators. Project C is needed to stay abreast of the development of other adaptive schemes. It has also resulted in a long list of problems relating to understanding the strange behavior of some algorithms in certain circumstances.

The basic idea underlying the self-tuning regulators is the following. If a description of a system and its environment is known, there are many procedures available to design a control system subject to given specifications. When trying to remove the assumption that the models for the system and its environment are known, we are immediately led to the problem of controlling a system with constant but unknown parameters. This problem can, in principle, be solved by using stochastic control theory at the price of exorbitant calculations. It is then meaningful to ask if there are simple control algorithms that do not require information about the model parameters, such that the controller will converge to the controllers that could be designed if the model parameters were known. It is an empirical fact that such controllers exist in several cases. The investigation of their properties has also led to powerful tools that can be used to analyze many other cases.

The generation of self-tuning algorithms is partly heuristic. It turns out that many algorithms can be obtained by combining a real-time identifier with a control scheme. In our work we have so far mostly considered regulators for the LQG regulator problem. This has been motivated by the particular

applications we have considered. Many of the concepts and ideas can, however, be extended to many other design methods.

2. AN EXAMPLE

The main ideas are first demonstrated by a simple example. Consider the simple discrete time system:

$$y(t + 1) + ay(t) = bu(t) + e(t + 1) + ce(t) \qquad (1)$$

where u is the input, y the output, and $\{e(t)\}$ a sequence of independent, equally distributed, random variables. The number c is assumed to be less than 1. Let the criterion be to minimize the variance of the output, that is,

$$\min V = \min Ey^2 = \min E \frac{1}{t} \sum_{k=1}^{t} y^2(k) \qquad (2)$$

It is easy to show that the control law

$$u(t) = \frac{a - c}{b} y(t) \qquad (3)$$

is a minimum variance strategy, and that the output of system (1) with feedback (3) becomes

$$y(t) = e(t) \qquad (4)$$

(see, e.g., Åström (ref. 1)). Note that the control law (3), which represents a proportional regulator, can be characterized by one parameter only.

A self-tuning regulator for the system (1) can be described as follows:

ALGORITHM (Self-TUning REgulator)

Step 1 (Parameter Estimation)

At each time t, fit the parameter α in the model

$$\hat{y}(k + 1) + \alpha y(k) = u(k) , \quad k = 1, \ldots, t - 1 \qquad (5)$$

by least squares, that is, such that the criterion

$$\sum_{k=1}^{t} \varepsilon^2(k) \qquad (6)$$

where

$$\varepsilon(k) = y(k) - \hat{y}(k) \tag{7}$$

is minimal. The estimate obtained is denoted α_t to indicate that it is a function of time.

Step 2 (Control)

At each time t, choose the control

$$u(t) = \alpha_t y(t) \tag{8}$$

where α_t is the estimate obtained in step 1.

Motivation

There are several ways to arrive at the control strategy given above. The algorithm STURE can, for example, be interpreted as the *certainty equivalence* control for the corresponding stochastic control problem.

Analysis

The properties of a closed-loop system controlled by a self-tuning regulator are now discussed. Since the closed-loop system is nonlinear, time-varying, and stochastic, the analysis is not trivial.

It is fairly obvious that the regulator will perform well if it is applied to a system (1) with $b = 1$ and $c = 0$, because in this case the least-squares estimate α_t will be an unbiased estimate of a. The regulator (8) will thus converge to a minimum variance regulator if the parameter estimate α_t converges. It is surprising, however, that the regulator will also converge to the minimum variance regulator if $c \neq 0$ (as demonstrated below). There may also be some difficulties because the control law is of the certainty equivalence type. Because of the special model structure (5), the feedback gain will, however, be bounded if the estimate α_t is bounded.

The least-squares estimate is given by the normal equation

$$\frac{1}{t} \sum_{k=1}^{t} y(k+1)y(k) + \alpha_{t+1} \frac{1}{t} \sum_{k=1}^{t} y^2(k) = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{k=1}^{t} y(k)u(k)$$

Assuming that the estimate α_t converges toward a value that gives a stable closed-loop system, then it is straightforward to show that

$$\frac{1}{t} \sum_{k=1}^{t} (\alpha_{t+1} - \alpha_k) y^2(k) \rightarrow 0$$

Thus the closed-loop system has the property

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{1}{t} \sum_{k=1}^{t} y(k + 1)y(k) = 0 \qquad (9)$$

Furthermore, assuming that the system to be controlled is governed by equation (1), the output of the closed-loop system obtained in the limit is given by

$$y(t) + [a - \alpha b]y(t - 1) = e(t) + ce(t - 1) \qquad (10)$$

The covariance of $\{y(t)\}$ at lag 1 is then given by

$$Ey(t + 1)y(t) = -f(\alpha) = \frac{(c - a + \alpha b)(1 - ac + \alpha bc)}{1 - (a - \alpha b)^2} \qquad (11)$$

Condition (9) gives

$$f(\alpha) = 0$$

A second-order equation for α which has the solutions:

$$\alpha = \alpha_1 = \frac{a - c}{b}$$

$$\alpha = \alpha_2 = \frac{a - (1/c)}{b}$$

The corresponding poles of the closed-loop system are $\lambda_1 = c$ and $\lambda_2 = 1/c$, respectively. Since c was assumed less than 1, only the value α_1 corresponds to a stable closed-loop system. Note that α_1 corresponds to the gain of the minimum variance regulator (3). Hence, if the parameter estimate α_t converges to a value that gives a stable closed-loop system, then the closed-loop system obtained must be such that equation (9) holds. This means that the algorithm can be thought of as a regulator that attempts to bring the covariance of the output at lag 1, that is, $r_y(1)$, to zero in the same way as an integrating regulator brings the integral of the control error to zero.

If the system to be controlled is actually governed by equation (1), then the self-tuning regulator will converge to a minimum variance regulator if it converges at all.

Figure 1 shows the results of a simulation of the algorithm. It is clear from this simulation that the algorithm converges in the particular case. The least-squares estimate will be a biased estimate of the model parameter $a = -0.5$ because of the correlation between the model errors. As can be expected from the previous analysis, the bias is, however, such that the limiting regulator corresponds to the minimum variance regulator. The lower part of figure 1 shows the asymptotic value of the loss function obtained if the regulator gain is fixed to the current value. It is clear from this figure that the loss function is very close to the minimum loss for the case of known parameter after 50 steps.

3. GENERALIZATIONS

A regulator that generalizes the simple self-tuner of the previous section is shown in figure 2. The regulator can be thought of as being composed of three parts: a parameter estimator (block 1), a controller (block 3), and a third part (block 2), which relates the controller parameters to the estimated parameters. The parameter estimator acts on the process inputs and outputs and produces estimates of certain process parameters. The controller is simply a linear filter characterized by the coefficients of its transfer function. These coefficients are generally a nonlinear function of the estimated parameters. This function is frequently not one to one. This way of describing the regulator is convenient from the point of view of explaining how it works. The subdivision is, however, largely arbitrary, and the regulator can equally well be regarded simply as one nonlinear regulator. The functions of blocks 1, 2, and 3 are also simple, but the interconnection of these blocks represents a system with a rather complex input-output relation. The partitioning of the regulator (fig. 2) is also convenient from the point of view of implementation because the parameter estimator and the controller parameter calculation are often conveniently time shared between several loops.

There are many different ways to estimate the parameters Θ and to calculate the regulator parameters, ϑ. Some possibilities are shown in figure 3. The complexity of the algebraic equation that relates the controller parameters to the estimated parameters can vary significantly, from a simple variable substitution for minimum variance regulators to solution of an algebraic Riccati equation for the general LQG case.

Analysis

A brief statement of some properties of the self-tuning regulators are now given. The results are fairly technical and only a few main points are given here. A review of available results are given in reference 2. The major results were proven in references 3 to 5.

For the analysis, it is assumed that the process to be controlled is governed by

$$A(q^{-1})y(t) = B(q^{-1})u(t - k) + v(t) \tag{12}$$

where $A(q^{-1})$ and $B(q^{-1})$ are polynomials in the backward shift operator q^{-1} and $\{v(t)\}$ is a sequence of random variables with bounded fourth moment. The analysis will basically cover the case $\mu(t) \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$, which corresponds to the case when the parameters are constant.

The following problems can be resolved partially by analysis:

- Overall stability of the closed-loop system
- Convergence of the regulator
- Properties of the possible limiting regulators

The analysis is far from trivial because the closed-loop system is a nonlinear, time-variable stochastic system. Even if the recursive identification schemes used are well known, their convergence properties are largely unknown except for the least-squares case. The input is also generated by a time-varying feedback, which introduces additional difficulties. If the process noise $\{v(t)\}$ is correlated, the least-squares estimates will be biased and the bias will depend on the feedback used.

A global stability result was proven by Ljung and Wittenmark (refs. 5 and 6) (see fig. 4). This result applies to a regulator composed of a least-squares identifier and a minimum variance controller. The result requires that the system (12) is minimum phase and that the time delay k and the parameter β_0 are known.

A key result in the analysis is the observation made by Ljung (ref. 4) that the paths of the estimates are closely related to the trajectories of the differential equation:

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \dfrac{d\Theta}{d\tau} = Sf(\Theta) \\[2em] \dfrac{dS^{-1}}{d\tau} = G(\Theta) - S^{-1} \end{array} \right\} \tag{13}$$

where

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} f(\Theta) = E[\Psi^T(t,\Theta)\varepsilon(t,\Theta)] \\[1em] G(\Theta) = E[\Psi^T(t,\Theta)\Psi(t,\Theta)] \end{array} \right\} \tag{14}$$

In the particular case of the regulator LS+MV, the control law is chosen in such a way that $\hat{y}(t,\Theta) = 0$ and the stationary points are then given by

$$\Theta = f(\Theta) = E[y(t + 1)\phi(t)] = 0$$

56

The regulator LS+MV thus attempts to zero the autocovariance of the output and the crosscovariance of the input and the output for certain lags. This result, which generalizes the simple example discussed in section 2, was shown in reference 7. It was also shown here that

$$f(\Theta) = 0 \tag{15}$$

has only one stationary solution for the regulator of LS+MV if the orders of the system and the model are compatible.

The differential equations (13) and (14) can be used in several different ways. Ljung has exploited them to construct both convergence proofs and examples which show that the parameter estimates do not converge. The differential equations have also been very useful in simulations (see, e.g., refs. 8 and 9).

The simulations shown in figures 5, 6, and 7 illustrate the behavior of different versions of the self-tuner.

4. SERVOPROBLEM

So far, the self-tuning regulator has been discussed only in the framework of the regulator problem. It is straightforward to apply self-tuning to the servoproblem, too. Clarke and Gawthrop (ref. 10) propose to do so by posing a linear quadratic problem for a servoproblem.

Another approach is simply to introduce the reference values by the standard procedure using feedforward and an inverse model. For known parameters, the problem is handled as follows. Assume that the process is described by equation (12) and introduce the reference values $u^r(t)$ and $y^r(t)$ which satisfy the same dynamics as the process

$$A(q^{-1})y^r(t) = B(q^{-1})u^r(t - k) \tag{16}$$

Hence

$$A(q^{-1})[y(t) - y^r(t)] = B(q^{-1})[u(t - k) - u^r(t - k)] + v(t)$$

A design procedure for the regulator then gives the feedback

$$u(t) - u^r(t) = \frac{G(q^{-1})}{F(q^{-1})} [y(t) - y^r(t)]$$

If the command signal $y^r(t)$ is specified,

$$u(t) = \frac{A(q^{-1})}{B(q^{-1})} y^r(t + k) + \frac{G(q^{-1})}{F(q^{-1})} [y(t) - y^r(t)] \tag{17}$$

57

This system cannot be realized unless the change in reference value is known or can be predicted k steps ahead. If this is not the case, a time delay in the response of k units must be accepted.

Observe that the control law (17) can be written:

$$B(q^{-1})F(q^{-1})u(t) = B(q^{-1})G(q^{-1})y(t) + [A(q^{-1})F(q^{-1}) - q^{-k}G(q^{-1})]y^r(t + k) \quad (18)$$

The servoproblem can be incorporated into the self-tuning regulator simply by changing the model in the parameter estimation step to

$$M: \hat{y}(t) = - A(q^{-1})y(t - 1) + B(q^{-1})u(t - k) + C(q^{-1})\varepsilon(t - 1)$$

$$+ D(q^{-1})y^r(t - 1)$$

and making the modification (18) in the control step.

5. APPLICATIONS

The self-tuning regulators are conveniently implemented using a digital computer. The simple regulator LS+MV requires no more than 30 lines of FORTRAN code, while the regulator RML+LQ requires an order-of-magnitude more code because of the necessity of solving the algebraic Riccati equation in each iteration. The regulators have been applied to a number of industrial processes. Among the applications currently known to me are

- paper machine (refs. 11 and 12)
- digester (ref. 13)
- ore crusher (ref. 14)
- enthalpy exchanger (ref. 15)
- supertanker (ref. 16)

Several of these applications have been in operation for a long time. A self-tuning regulator has, for example, been running as an adaptive autopilot for a supertanker for more than a year.

Even if the regulators discussed automatically tune their parameters, it is necessary to determine some parameters in advance; for instance,

- Number of parameters in the prediction model (p, r, and s)
- Initial values of the parameter estimates
- Value of any fixed parameters in the model
- Rate of exponential forgetting of past data in the estimation algorithm
- Sampling rate

Experience has shown that it is fairly easy to make the proper choice in practice. These parameters are also much easier to choose than to directly

determine the coefficients of a complex control law. It is our experience that system engineers without previous exposure to this type of algorithm have been able to learn how to use it after only a short training period. There have also been several misapplications. The most common mistake is to attempt a self-tuner for a control design that will not work even if the parameters are known.

REFERENCES

1. Åström, K. J.: Introduction to Stochastic Control Theory, Academic Press, New York, 1970.

2. Åström, K. J.; Borisson, U.; Ljung, L.; and Wittenmark, B.: Theory and Applications of Adaptive Regulators Based on Recursive Parameter Estimation, Preprint IFAC 6th World Congress, Boston, 1975.

3. Åström, K. J.; and Wittenmark, B.: On Self-Tuning Regulators, Automatica, vol. 9, no. 2, March 1973, pp. 185-199.

4. Ljung, L.: Stochastic Convergence of Algorithms for Identification and Adaptive Control, Thesis Rept. 7406, Dept. Automatic Control, Lund Institute of Technology, Lund, Sweden, March 1974.

5. Ljung, L.; and Wittenmark, B.: Asymptotic Properties of Self-Tuning Regulators, Rept. 7404, Dept. Automatic Control, Lund Institute of Technology, Feb. 1974.

6. Ljung, L.; and Wittenmark, B.: Analysis of a Class of Adaptive Regulators, Preprint IFAC Symposium on Stochastic Control, Budapest, 1974.

7. Åström, K. J.; and Wittenmark, B.: On the Control of Constant But Unknown Systems, Proceedings of the Int. Fed. Autom. Control 5th World Congress, Paris, June 12-17, 1972.

8. Wittenmark, B.: A Self-Tuning Regulator, Rept. 7311, Dept. Automatic Control, Lund Institute of Technology, Lund, Sweden, April 1973.

9. Wittenmark, B.: Self-Tuning Regulators, Rept. 7312 (thesis), Dept. Automatic Control, Lund Institute of Technology, Lund, Sweden, April 1973.

10. Clarke, D. W.; and Gawthrop, P. J.: A Generalization of the Self-Tuning Regulator, Rept., Dept. Eng. Sci., Oxford Univ., England, 1974. Electron Lett, vol. 11, no. 2, Jan. 23, 1975, pp. 40-41.

11. Cegrell, Torsten; and Hedqvist, Torbjörn: Successful Adaptive Control of Paper Machines, Preprints 3rd IFAC Symposium on Identification and System Parameter Estimation, Hague, 1973, vol. 11, no. 1, Jan. 1975, pp. 53-59.

12. Borisson, U.; and Wittenmark, B.: An Industrial Application of a Self-Tuning Regulator, Preprints IFAC Symposium on Digital Computer Applications to Process Control, Zürich, 1974.

13. Cegrell, T.; and Hedqvist, T.: A New Approach to Continuous Digester Control, Preprints 4th IFAC/IFIP International Conference on Digital Computer Applications to Process Control, Zürich, 1974.

14. Borisson, Ulf; and Syding, Rolf: Self-Tuning Control of an Ore Crusher, Preprint IFAC Symposium on Stochastic Control, Budapest, 1974. Automatica, vol. 12, no. 1, Jan. 1976, pp. 1-7.

15. Jensen, L.; and Hänsel, R.: Computer Control of an Enthalpy Exchanger, Rept. 7417, Dept. Automatic Control, Lund Institute of Technology, Lund, Sweden, Oct. 1974.

16. Källström, C.: The Sea Scout Experiments, Rept. 7407(C), Dept. Automatic Control, Lund Institute of Technology, Lund, Sweden, April 1974.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alsholm, O.; Borisson, U.; Stavnes, O.; and Wittenmark, B: A Feasibility Study of Self-Tuning Regulators, Rept. 7338, Dept. Automatic Control, Lund Institute of Technology, Lund, Sweden, Oct. 1973.

Andersson, L.; Borisson, U.; Braun, R.; and Syding, R.: A DDC Loop Between Lund and Kiruna for Control of an Ore Crusher, Rept. 7318(C), Dept. Automatic Control, Lund Institute of Technology, Lund, Sweden, June 1973.

Åstrom, K. J.: A Self-Tuning Parameter Estimator. Publication 74/55 (Research Report), Dept. of Computing and Control, Imperial College of Science and Technology, London SW7 2BT. Also available as Rept. 7419(C), Dept. Automatic Control, Lund Institute of Technology, Lund, Sweden, Aug. 1974.

Åström, K. J.: A Self-Tuning Regulator for Non-Minimum Phase Systems, Rept. 7411(C), Dept. Automatic Control, Lund Institute of Technology, Lund, Sweden, June 1974.

Åström, K. J.: Theory and Applications of Self-Tuning Regulators. Proc. Théorie du Controle Méthodes Numériques et Modélisation des Systèms Informatiques, Institut de Rechercher d'Informatique et d'Automatique, Rocquencourt, France, June 1974, Springer 1975. Also available as Rept. 7417(C), Dept. Automatic Control, Lund Institute of Technology, Lund, Sweden, Aug. 1974.

Åström, K. J.; and Eykhoff, P.: System Identification — A Survey. Automatica, vol. 7, no. 2, March 1971, pp. 123-162. Originally given as an invited survey paper Int. Fed. Autom. Control Symposium on System Identification and Parameter Estimation, Prague, June 1970.

Åström, K. J.; and Wittenmark, B.: Problems of Identification and Control. JMAA, vol. 34, no. 1, April 1971, pp. 90-113.

Åström, K. J.; and Wittenmark, B.: Analysis of a Self-Tuning Regulator for Non-Minimum Phase Systems. Preprints IFAC Symposium on Stochastic Control, Budapest, 1974. Also available as Rept. 7418(C), Dept. Automatic Control, Lund Institute of Technology, Lund, Sweden, Aug. 1974.

Athans, M., ed.: Special Issue on Linear-Quadratic-Gaussian Problem. IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control, vol. AC-16, Dec. 1971.

Bar-Shalom, Y.; Tse, Edison; and Larson, R. E.: Some Recent Advances in the Development of Closed-Loop Stochastic Control and Resource Allocation Algorithms. IFAC Symposium on Stochastic Control Theory, Budapest, 1974.

Bohlin, T.: Information Pattern for Linear Discrete-Time Model With Stochastic Coefficients. IEEE Trans. Automat. Control, vol. AC-15, no. 1, Feb. 1970, pp. 104-106.

Borisson, U.; and Wittenmark, B.: Moisture Content Control on a Papermachine — An Application of a Self-Tuning Regulator. Rept. 7337, Dept. Automatic Control, Lund Institute of Technology, Lund, Sweden, Nov. 1973.

Borisson, U.; and Syding, R. Control of an Ore Crusher — A Feasibility Study of Self-Tuning Control and Remote Processing. Rept. 7318, Dept. Automatic Control, Lund Institute of Technology, Lund, Sweden, June 1973.

Borisson, U.: Self-Tuning Regulators — Industrial Applications and Multivariable Theory. Rept. 7513 (thesis), Dept. Automatic Control, Lund Institute of Technology, Lund, Sweden, Oct. 1975.

Clarke, D. W.; and Gawthrop, B. A.: A Self-Tuning Controller. Technical Report, Dept. Eng. Sci., Oxford Univ., England, 1975. (Submitted to IEE).

Farison, J. B.: Parameter Identification for a Class of Linear Discrete Systems. IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control, vol. AC-12, no. 1, Feb. 1967, p. 109.

Florentin, J. J.: Optimal Probing, Adaptive Control of a Simple Bayesian System. Int. J. Electronics and Control, vol. 13, no. 2, Aug. 1962, pp. 165-177.

Gallier, P. W.; and Otto, R. E.: Self-Tuning Computer Adapts DDC Algorithms in Progress in Direct Digital Control. T. J. Williams and F. M. Ryan, eds., ISA.

Gawthrop, P. J.; and Clarke, D. W.: Simulation of a Generalized Self-Tuning Regulator. Report, Dept. Eng. Sci., Oxford Univ., England, 1974. Electron Lett, vol. 11, no. 2, Jan 23, 1975, pp. 41-42.

Gustavsson, I.; Ljung, L.; and Söderström, T.: Identification of Linear, Multivariable Process Dynamics Using Closed Loop Estimation. Rept. 7401, Dept. Automatic Control, Lund Institute of Technology, Lund, Sweden, Jan. 1974.

Hetthéssy, J.; and Keviczky, L.: Some Innovations to the Minimum Variance Control. Preprints IFAC Symposium on Stochastic Control, Budapest, Sept. 1974.

Holst, J.: Användande av Självinställande Prediktorer för Prognos av Belastning i Kraftsystem (Using Self-Tuning Predictors for Load Prediction) (in Swedish). Rept. 7433(C), Dept. Automatic Control, Lund Institute of Technology, Lund, Sweden, Dec. 1974.

Hughes, D. J.; and Jacobs, O. L. R.: Turn-off, Escape and Probing in Non-Linear Stochastic Control. Preprints IFAC Symposium on Stochastic Control Theory, Budapest, Sept. 1974.

Hughes, D. J.; and Jacobs, O. L. R.: Simultaneous Identification and Control Using a Neutral Control Law. Report, Dept. Eng. Sci., Oxford Univ., England, 1974.

Jacobs, O. L. R.: Structure of Stochastic Control Laws. IMA Conference on Stochastic Programming, Oxford Univ., England, July 1974.

Jacobs, O. L. R.; and Langdon, S. M.: An Optimal Extremal Control System. Automatica, vol. 6, 1970, pp. 297-301.

Jacobs, O. L. R.; and Hughes, D. J.: Simultaneous Identification and Control Using a Neutral Control Law. Preprints IFAC Congress, Boston, Aug. 1975.

Kalman, R. E.: Design of a Self-Optimizing Control System. Trans. of the ASME, vol. 80, no. 2, Feb. 1958, pp. 468-478.

Ljung, L.: Convergence of Recursive Stochastic Algorithms. IFAC Symposium on Stochastic Control, Budapest, 1973. Also Rept. 7403, Dept. Automatic Control, Lund Institute of Technology, Lund, Sweden, Feb. 1974.

Nahorski, Z.: Simultaneous Identification and Control of Linear Discrete-Time System Using Dual Control Concept. IFAC Symposium on Stochastic Control, Budapest, Sept. 1974.

Nahorski, Zbigniew; and Vidal, Rene V. V.: Stabilization of Linear Discrete-Time Systems Using Simultaneous Identification and Control. Int. J. Control, vol. 19, no. 2, Feb. 1974, pp. 353-364.

Panuska, V.: A Stochastic Approximation Method for Identification of Linear Systems Using Adaptive Filtering, 9th Joint Automatic Control Conf., 1968, pp. 1014-1021.

Peterka, V.: Adaptive Digital Regulation of a Noisy System. Paper no. 6.2, Preprints 2nd IFAC Symposium on Identification and Process Parameter Estimation, Prague, 1970.

Peterka, V.; and Åström, K. J.: Control of Multivariable Systems with Unknown but Constant Parameters. Preprint 3rd IFAC Symposium on Identification and System Parameter Estimation, The Hague, June 1973.

Söderström, T.; Ljung, L.; and Gustavsson, I.: A Comparative Study of Recursive Identification Methods. Rept. 7427, Dept. Automatic Control, Lund Institute of Technology, Lund, Sweden, Dec. 1974.

Tse, E.; and Bar-Shalom, Y.: An Actively Adaptive Control for Linear Systems With Random Parameters via the Dual Control Approach. IEEE Trans., vol. AC-18, April 1973, pp. 109-117.

Tse, E.; Bar-Shalom, Y.; and Meier III, L.: Wide-sense Adaptive Dual Control for Nonlinear Stochastic Systems. IEEE Trans., vol. AC-18, April 1973, pp. 98-108.

Vanecek, A.: Coupled Air/Fuel Dynamic Optimization and Temperature Regulation: A Case Study in Stochastic Control. Preprints IFAC Symposium on Stochastic Control, Budapest, Sept. 1974.

Wellstead, P. E.; and Edmunds, J. M.: Least Squares Identification of Closed Loop Systems. Report, University of Manchester, 1975. Int. J. Control, vol. 21, no. 4, April 1975, pp. 689-699.

Wellstead, P. E.; and Edmunds, J. M.: On-Line Process Identification and Regulation, Report, University of Manchester, 1975.

Wieslander, J.; and Wittenmark, B.: An Approach to Adaptive Control Using Real Time Identification. Automatica, vol. 7, March 1971, pp. 211-217.

Wittenmark, B.: Adaptive Control of a Paper-machine. Preprint Computer, Electronics and Control Conference, Calgary, May 1974.

Wittenmark, Björn: A Self-Tuning Predictor. IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control, vol. AC-19, no. 6, Dec. 1974, pp. 848-851.

Wouters, W. R. E.: Parameter Adaptive Regulatory Control for Stochastic SISO Systems. Theory and Applications. Preprints IFAC Symposium on Adaptive Control, Budapest, Sept. 1974.

Figure 1.- Example of self-tuning regulator.

Figure 2.- Block diagram of a general self-tuning regulator.

PARAMETER ESTIMATION

Model: $\hat{y}(t) = -A(q^{-1})y(t-1) + B(q^{-1})u(t-1) + C(q^{-1})\varepsilon(t-1)$

$\qquad\qquad = \vartheta(t)\Theta$

$\qquad \varepsilon(t,\Theta) = y(t) - \vartheta(t)\Theta$

$\qquad \Theta(t+1) = \Theta(t) + \mu(t)S(t+1)\psi^{T}(t)\varepsilon(t,\Theta)$

$\quad S^{-1}(t+1) = S^{-1}(t) + \mu(t+1)[\psi^{T}(t+1)\psi(t+1) - S^{-1}(t)]$

For: Least squares, $C \equiv 0$

Extended least squares, $\phi(t) = \psi(t)$

Recursive maximum likelihood, $-\text{grad}_{\Theta}\varepsilon(t,\Theta)$

CONTROL STRATEGIES

$$\mu(t) = \frac{G(q^{-1})}{F(q^{-1})}\, y(t)$$

Regulator parameters: $\vartheta = \text{col}[q_1 q_2 \cdots q_m ; \quad f_1, f_2 \cdots f_2]$

Criteria: Minimum variance

Linear quadratic

Figure 3.- Some approaches to parameter estimation and control.

Let the system be

$$A(q^{-1})y(t) = B(q^{-1})u(t - k) + V(t)$$

where the parameters are estimated by least squares
and control gives a minimum variance response
if the time delay, k, and the lead coefficient of
the polynomial $B(q^{-1})$, β_0, are known
if the system order is not underestimated and
if

$$\lim \text{SUP} \quad \frac{1}{N} \sum V^2(t) \leq \infty$$

then

$$\lim \text{SUP} \quad \frac{1}{N} \sum y(t) < \infty$$

and if the system be minimum phase then also

$$\lim \text{SUP} \quad \frac{1}{N} \sum u^2(t) < \infty$$

Figure 4.- An example global stability result.

Figure 5.- Example regulator design using least squares and minimum variance estimation and control.


Figure 6.- Example regulator design using least squares and linear-quadratic estimation and control.


Figure 7.- Regulator design using extended least squares and linear-quadratic estimation and control.

67