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Abstract

This paper presents a method for optimum tuning of Fractional PID controllers using PSO algorithm which have fractional or integer order transfer functions. Particle swarm optimization (PSO) is a robust stochastic optimization technique based on the movement and intelligence of swarm, applies the concept of social interaction to problem solving. The best parameters of Fractional-Order PID controller consist of proportional gain $k_p$, integral gain $k_i$, fractional-order of integrator $\lambda$, derivative gain $k_d$ and fractional-order of differentiator $\mu$ can be determinate by using this technique. The proposed approach with defined cost function has a very easy implementation and ability of fast tuning of optimum fractional-order PID controllers parameters. From the comparison this technique with the other methods, its influence and efficiency are illustrated.
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1. Introduction

In the last decade, fractional-order dynamic systems and controllers has been studying widely in many areas of engineering and science [1-5]. The concept of the fractional-order PID controllers was proposed by Podlubny in 1997 [6]. He also demonstrated the better response of this type of controllers, in comparison with the classical PID controllers, when used for the control of fractional-order systems. He was demonstrated the major role of fractional-order calculus in a smart mechatronic system [7]. Hardware and digital realizations of fractional-order systems can be followed in [8, 9, 10]. A frequency domain approach based on given phase margin and crossover frequency is studied in [11]. In [12] an optimization method is presented such that predefined design specifications are satisfied. A method is presented based on the pole distribution of the characteristic equation in the complex plane [13]. A state-space design approach is presented based on feedback pole placement in [14]. A method is presented based on differential evolution (DE) technique in [15]. Also, a method is presented based on idea of the Ziegler–Nichols and the Astrom–Hagglund methods in [16]. A method is presented based on the asymptotic behavior of fractional algebraic equations and applies a delicate property of the root loci of the system in [16]. A fractional order $(PI)^\lambda$ controller is designed to improve the flight control performance of a small fixed-wing unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) in [17]. In [18] a fractional order controller for AVR system is presented based on a new criterion function with eight terms by use of particle swarm
optimization in [19] by applying Mean of Root of Squared Error (MRSE), Mean of Absolute Magnitude of the Error (MAE) and Mean Minimum Fuel and Absolute Error (MMFAE) as fitness function, Fractional PID Controllers Using PSO Algorithm for Robot Trajectory Control is tuned.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 discusses a brief review to fractional calculus especially fractional order PID controller. In Section 3, introduction to particle swarm optimization algorithm is given. Also, the purposed fitness function is illustrated in this section and its application in $PI^dD^\mu$PSO-controller is discussed. In Section 4, the results are indicated using two examples.

2. Review on Fractional Calculus

2.1. Fractional-order PID controllers (FOPID)

The fractional PID controller is a generalization of the PID controller. The transfer function of this controller is given by the following function:

$$C(s) = k_p + \frac{k_i}{s^\lambda} + k_d s^\mu$$

where $k_p$ is the proportional constant, $k_i$ is the integration constant, $k_d$ is the differentiation constant and $\lambda$ and $\mu$ are positive real numbers. The most popular definitions of Fractional Derivatives or integrals in Fractional calculus are Grünwald-Letnikov (GL), Riemann-Liouville (RL) and Caputo statements. The Grünwald-Letnikov expressed the Fractional-Order derivative by the following equation [20]:

$$aD_t^\gamma f(t) = \lim_{h\to 0} h^{-\gamma} \sum_{j=0}^{[t/a/h]} (-1)^j \binom{\gamma}{j} f(t - jh)$$

where $\binom{\gamma}{j}$ are [21],

$$c_0^{(r)} = 1 , c_j^{(r)} = \left( 1 - \frac{1+r}{t} \right) c_{j-1}^{(r)} , j = 0,1,2,... (3)$$

and used for recursive computation, these are weights.

Reimann-liouville (RL) expression for fractional-order derivative is given by:

$$aD_t^\gamma f(t) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(n-\gamma)} \frac{d^n}{dt^n} \int_a^t \frac{f(\tau)}{(t-\tau)^{n+1}} d\tau$$

where $\Gamma(\cdot)$ is Euler’s Gamma function that generalizes the factorial, and allows operator, to take non-integer values. An another definition is the Caputo definition given by:

$$aD_t^\gamma f(t) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\gamma-n)} \int_a^t \frac{f^{(n)}(\tau)}{(t-\tau)^{n+1}} d\tau$$
2.2. Oustaloup approximation algorithm

Oustaloup’s approximation method uses a band-pass filter to approximate the fractional order operator $s^\lambda$ based on frequency – domain response [22]. The approximate transfer function of a continuous fractional order operator $s^\lambda$ with Oustaloup Algorithm is as follows:

$$G_f(s) = K \prod_{k=-N}^{N} \frac{s + \omega'_k}{s + \omega_k}$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

where the zeros, poles and the gain can be evaluated, respectively, as:

$$\omega'_k = \omega_p \left( \frac{\omega_h}{\omega_b} \right)^{\frac{k+N+\frac{1}{2}((1-\gamma))}{2N+1}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

$$\omega_k = \omega_p \left( \frac{\omega_h}{\omega_b} \right)^{\frac{k+N+\frac{1}{2}((1+\gamma))}{2N+1}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

$$K = \left( \frac{\omega_h}{\omega_b} \right)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \prod_{k=-N}^{N} \frac{\omega_k}{\omega'_k}$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

In simulation, for approximation of $s^\lambda$, frequency range is closed as: $\omega \in [\omega_b, \omega_h]$ and $\omega_b=0.001$, $\omega_h=1000$, $N=2$.

More detail is available in [23].

3. Design of $PI^\lambda D^\mu$ pso-controller

3.1. Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO)

PSO was developed in 1995 by James Kennedy (social- psychologist) and Russell Eberhart (electrical engineer)[24]. PSO is the only algorithm that does not implement the survival of the fittest. It uses a number of agents (particles) that constitute a swarm moving around in the search space looking for the best solution. $Jth$ particle($k_j$) is treated as a point in a N-dimensional space($k_j = k_{j,1}, k_{j,2}, ..., k_{j,N}$) which adjusts its “flying” according to its own flying experience as well as the flying experience of other particles. Each particle keeps track of its coordinates in the solution space which are associated with the best solution (fitness) that has achieved so far by that particle. This value is called personal best, $Pbest$: $pbest_j = (pbest_{j,1}, pbest_{j,2}, ..., pbest_{j,N})$ is previous position of the $jth$ particle in a N-dimension space. Another best value that is tracked by the PSO is the best value obtained so far by any particle in the neighborhood of that particle. This value is called $gbest$. The basic concept of PSO lies in accelerating each particle toward its $pbest$ and the $gbest$ locations, with a random weighted acceleration at each time step. The searching method of the implemented PSO-FOPID controller is given in its flowchart in Figure 1. The modification of the particle’s position can be mathematically modeled according the following equations:

$$v_{j,N}^{(t+1)} = \omega \cdot v_{j,N}^{(t)} + c_1 \cdot rand_1(...) \left(pbest_{j,N} - K_{j,N}^{(t)} \right) + c_2 \cdot rand_2(...) \left(gbest - K_{j,N}^{(t)} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)
the following constraints for velocity in each iteration is applied as:

\[
v_{j,N}^{(t+1)} = \begin{cases} 
V_{N}^{\text{max}}, & v_{j,N}^{(t+1)} > V_{N}^{\text{max}} \\
-V_{N}^{\text{max}}, & v_{j,N}^{(t+1)} < -V_{N}^{\text{max}} 
\end{cases}
\]  

(12)

where \( V_{N}^{\text{max}} \) is the maximum possible magnitude of velocity of any particle in the Nth dimension, \( j=1,2,\ldots,n, N=1,2,\ldots,m \), and

\( n \) number of particles in the population(population size);
\( m \) dimension of problem(number of members in a particle) that there is five;
\( t \) pointer of iterations(generations);
\( v_{j,N}^{(t)} \) Velocity of particle \( j \) at iteration \( t \);
\( \omega \) weighting function;
\( c_1,c_2 \) acceleration factors;
\( rand_1(...) \), \( rand_4(...) \) uniformly distributed random numbers between 0 and 1;
\( K_{j,N}^{(t)} \) Current position of particle \( j \) at iteration \( t \);
\( \text{pbest}_{j,N} \) position of particle \( j \);
\( \text{gbest} \) position of swarm.

Changing velocity by this way enables the Jth particle, to search around its local best position, pbest, and global best position, gbest. In many experiences with PSO, \( V_{N}^{\text{max}} \) is often set to the maximum dynamic range of the variables on each dimension.

Suitable selection of weighting function \( \omega \) in (10) provides a balance between global and local explorations, thus requiring less iteration on average to find a sufficiently optimal solution. \( \omega \) often decreases linearly from \( \omega_{\text{max}} \) about 0.9 to \( \omega_{\text{min}} \) about 0.4 during a run.

Weighting function \( \omega \) is set by:

\[
\omega = \omega_{\text{max}} - \frac{\omega_{\text{max}} - \omega_{\text{min}}}{\text{iter}_{\text{max}}} \times \text{iter} 
\]  

(13)

where \( \text{iter}_{\text{max}} \) is the maximum number of iterations and \( \text{iter} \) is the current number of iterations.
3.2. Purposed fitness function

The most difficult step in applying PSO is to choose the best fitness function which is used to evaluate fitness of each particle. Unity feedback closed loop system is shown in Figure 2.

In this paper transfer function of the plant can be fractional or integer order. Controller of the system is stated in equation (1). In [25] is calculated the following equations:

\begin{align*}
  f_1(\lambda, \mu) &= k_p + k_i \omega_{cp}^{\lambda} \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2} \lambda\right) + k_d \omega_{cp}^{\mu} \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2} \mu\right) - k_c \cos \phi_{pm} = 0 \quad (14) \\
  f_2(\lambda, \mu) &= -k_i \omega_{cp}^{\lambda} \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2} \lambda\right) + k_d \omega_{cp}^{\mu} \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2} \mu\right) - k_c \sin \phi_{pm} = 0 \quad (15)
\end{align*}
where $\phi_{pm}$ is the required phase margin and $\omega_{cp}$ is frequency of the critical point on the Nyquist curve of $G(s)$ as:

$$\arg\left(G(j\omega_{cp})\right) = -180^0 \quad (16)$$

And $k_c$ is gain margin as:

$$\frac{1}{|G(j\omega_{cp})|} = k_c \quad (17)$$

The fitness functions defined as:

$$|f_1| + |f_2| + ITAE \quad (18)$$

where $f_1$, $f_2$ are equations (14), (15), $|.|$ is absolute operator, ITAE is integral of the absolute magnitude of error criterion given by:

$$ITAE = \int_0^{t_{sim}} te(t) \, dt \quad (19)$$

where $t_{sim}$ is total simulation time and $e(t)=r(t)-y(t)$ is the tracking error. The ITAE performance indice has excellences of smaller overshoot and oscillation than the IAE(integral of the absolute error) or the ISE(integral square error) performance indices and it is the most sensitive then ITAE has the best selectivity the purposed fitness function have a suitable structure of time and frequency domain criterion that provide good control performance. The goal is obtaining the best step response, by minimization of $f(k_p, k_i, \lambda, k_d, \mu)$ using PSO algorithm and obtain optimum parameters of $PI^\lambda D^\mu$-pso-controller. The following limits are fixed for every parameter by using the practical assumption of the FOPID controller design in [26]:

$$1 \leq k_p \leq 1000, 1 \leq k_i, \lambda \geq 0, k_d \leq 500, \mu \leq 2 ; \quad (20)$$

With this suitable fitness function and assumption, the optimized parameters of the fractional order controller are calculated with least run of PSO algorithm.

4. Results

A. Example 1

Consider the following fraction order plant for Figure 2 given in [27, 16, 28]:

$$G(s) = \frac{1}{0.8s^{2.2} + 0.5s^{0.9} + 1} \quad (21)$$

The unit step response of open loop system is shown in Figure 3. Phase crossover frequency and gain margin of the system can be calculated as:

$$\omega_{cp} = 1.63 \text{ rad/s}$$

$$k_c = 1.39 \text{ dB}$$
And specified phase margin is $\phi_m$ as:

$$\phi_m = \frac{\pi}{3}\text{rad}$$

In this paper PSO parameters is selected as:

$$c_1 = c_2 = 2, \omega_{\text{max}} = 0.9, \omega_{\text{min}} = 0.4, \text{ maxIter} = 100, \text{ population size} = 100.$$  

Optimal $PI^\lambda D^\mu, PD^\mu$ controller using this method is designed as:

$$c_{\text{pso-}}PI^\lambda D^\mu(s) = \frac{40.888}{s^{1.5733}} + 27.1914s^{1.8797}$$  \hspace{0.5cm} (22)  

$$c_{\text{pso-}}PD^\mu(s) = 109.7672 + 40.1513s^{1.8663}$$  \hspace{0.5cm} (23)

The $PD^\mu$ controllers were designed in [27, 16] as:

$$c_1(s) = 20.5 + 3.7343s^{1.15}$$  \hspace{0.5cm} (24)  

$$c_2(s) = 20.5 + 20.5s^{1.2}$$  \hspace{0.5cm} (25)

The $PI^\lambda D^\mu$ controller was designed in [28] as:

$$c_3(s) = 233.4234 + \frac{22.3972}{s^{0.1}} + 18.5274s^{1.15}$$  \hspace{0.5cm} (26)

The close loop step response of the system with $c_{\text{pso-}}PI^\lambda D^\mu(s), c_3(s)$ controllers is shown in Figure 4. The close loop step response of the system with $c_1(s), c_2(s), c_{\text{pso-}}PD^\mu(s)$ controllers is shown in Figure 5 where obviously illustrate that the proposed method has better response than the others. Step response specifications $c_3(s), c_{\text{pso-}}PI^\lambda D^\mu(s), c_2(s), c_{\text{pso-}}PD^\mu(s)$ are shown in Table 1. The convergence characteristic of the PSO-fractional PID controller is shown in Figure 8. The response of the system to a square wave with period of four seconds and sample time 0.01 seconds is shown in Figure 6.

![Figure 3. The unit step response of open loop fractional order system](image-url)
Figure 4. Comparison Close Loop step response of the system with $c_{ps0−PD^\mu}(s), c_3(s)$ controllers

Figure 5. The unit step response of close loop fractional order system with $c_1(s), c_2(s), c_{ps0−PD^\mu}(s)$ controllers

Table 1. Step Response Specifications $c_3(s), c_{ps0−PD^\mu}(s), c_2(s), c_{ps0−PD^\mu}(s)$ Controllers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step response specifications</th>
<th>fractional PID for a class of fractional order plants</th>
<th>Proposed $PT^\Delta D^\mu$ controller with PSO algorithm</th>
<th>$PD^\mu$ controller $c_2(s)$</th>
<th>Proposed $PD^\mu$ controller with PSO algorithm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>max. overshoot, %</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peak time, s</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rise time, s</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>settling time (%5)</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>settling time (%2)</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 6. The Response of the System to a Square Wave

B. Example 2

Consider the following plant for Fig. 2 given in [25]:

\[ G(s) = \frac{1}{s(s+3)(s+4)} \quad (27) \]

Phase crossover frequency and gain margin of the system can be calculated as:

\[ \omega_{cp} = 3.46 \text{ rad/s} \]

\[ k_c = 38.5 \text{ dB} \]

And specified phase margin is \( \phi_m \) as:

\[ \phi_m = \frac{\pi}{6} \text{ rad} \]

Optimal \( PI^\lambda D^\mu \) controller using this method with proposed fitness function is designed as:

\[ c_{psd}(s) = 39 + \frac{39}{s^{0.0934}} + 39s^{1.1388} \quad (28) \]

Using the Ziegler–Nichols and Astrom–Hagglund methods, the \( PI^\lambda D^\mu \) controller were designed in [25] as:

\[ c_1(s) = 50.4 + \frac{55.6}{s^{0.7569}} + 22s^{0.8564} \quad (29) \]

Using Simulink by considering least square method for optimization, the \( PI^\lambda D^\mu \) controller were designed in [25] as:

\[ c_{2opt}(s) = 42.4580 + \frac{87.2733}{s^{0.5030}} + 53.1352s^{0.9623} \quad (30) \]
The close loop step response of the system with $c_1(s), c_{2opt}(s), c_{pso}(s)$ controllers is shown in Figure 7. Step response specifications $c_1(s), c_{2opt}(s), c_{pso}(s)$ are shown in Table 2. Obviously the proposed method influence and efficiency are illustrated. The convergence characteristic of the PSO-fractional PID controller is shown in Figure 9. The response of the system to a square wave with period of four seconds and sample time 0.01 seconds is shown in Figure 10.

![Figure 7. Comparison close loop step response with $c_1(s), c_{2opt}(s), c_{pso}(s)$ Controllers](image)

![Figure 8. The Convergence Characteristic of the PSO-fractional PID Controller](image)
Figure 9. The Convergence Characteristic of the PSO-fractional PID Controller

Table 2. Step Response Specifications $c_1(s), c_{2opt}(s), c_{psO}(s)$ Controllers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step response specifications</th>
<th>fractional PID</th>
<th>fractional PID with optimized values</th>
<th>Proposed $PI^dD^s$ controller with PSO algorithm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>max. overshoot, %</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peak time, s</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rise time, s</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>settling time (%5)</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>settling time (%2)</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10. The response of the system to a square wave
5. Conclusions

In this paper, a method of tuning the optimal parameters of fractional order PID using PSO algorithm is proposed for the fractional or integer order systems. Using purposed fitness function, optimum parameters can be found in less number of iterations. The simulation results illustrate that this method has better control performance than the other methods. The proposed technique may apply as an efficient method for the optimal design of fractional-order controllers. The proposed method of fractional PID controller design can apply for practical systems.
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