

# SYSTEM THEORY, CONTROL AND COMPUTING JOURNAL

Vol. 2, No. 2, December 2022

ISSN 2668-2966



**CONTACT** SYSTEM THEORY, CONTROL AND COMPUTING JOURNAL University of Craiova, No. 13, A.I. Cuza Street, Craiova, 200585, Dolj, Romania Phone: 0251 438 198 Email: stcc.journal@ucv.ro Website: http://stccj.ucv.ro/

© 2022 – All rights reserved to Universitaria Publishing House The authors assume all responsibility for the ideas expressed in the materials published.

ISSN 2668-2966 ISSN-L 2668-2966

# **Editorial Team** Editors and Publisher

## Editors

Faculty of Automation, Computers and Electronics of The University of Craiova, Romania Faculty of Automation and Computers of The Politehnica University of Timişoara, Romania Faculty of Control Systems, Computers, Electrical and Electronics Engineering of The "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galați, Romania Faculty of Automatic Control and Computer Engineering of The "Gheorghe Asachi" Technical University of Iași, Romania

# Publisher

Editura Universitaria, Str. A.I. Cuza, 13, 200585 Craiova, Romania <u>https://www.editurauniversitaria.ro/ro</u>

# **Editorial Board**

**Editor-in-Chief** Vladimir RĂSVAN Prof., PhD University of Craiova, Faculty of Automation, Computers and Electronics, Str. A.I. Cuza 13, 200585 Craiova, Romania

### Associate Editors-in-Chief

Radu-Emil PRECUP Corresponding member of The Romanian Academy Prof., PhD Politehnica University of Timisoara, Department of Automation and Applied Informatics, Bd. Vasile Pârvan 2, 300223 Timişoara, Romania Vasile MANTA Prof., PhD "Gheorghe Asachi" Technical University of Iași, Faculty of Automatic Control and Computer Engineering, Bd. Prof. dr. doc. Dimitrie Mangeron 27, 700050 Iasi, Romania Marian BARBU Prof., PhD "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galati, Faculty of Control Systems, Computers, Electrical and Electronics Engineering Str. Științei 2, 800210 Galați, Romania Dan SELIŞTEANU Prof., PhD University of Craiova, Faculty of Automation, Computers and Electronics, Str. A.I. Cuza 13, 200585 Craiova, Romania

### **Field Editors**

Andrzej BARTOSZEWICZ, Technical University of Lodz, Poland Vincent CHARVILLAT, University of Toulouse, IRIT-ENSEEIHT, France Voicu GROZA, University of Ottawa, Canada László T. KÓCZY, Széchenyi István University, Győr, and Budapest University of Technology, Hungary Viorel MINZU, "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galați, Romania Silviu-Iulian NICULESCU, Paris-Saclay University, France Stefan PREITL, Politehnica University of Timișoara, Romania Octavian PĂSTRĂVANU, "Gheorghe Asachi" Technical University of Iași, Romania Imre J. RUDAS, Óbuda University, Budapest, Hungary, Ramon VILANOVA, Universitat Autonoma de Barcelona, Spain Mihail VOICU, "Gheorghe Asachi" Technical University of Iași, Romania

#### **Associate Editors**

Dorel AIORDĂCHIOAIE, "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galați, Romania Costin BĂDICĂ, University of Craiova, Romania Gildas BESANCON, Grenoble Institute of Technology, France Sašo BLAŽIC, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia Eugen BOBASU, University of Craiova, Romania Antoneta Iuliana BRATCU, Grenoble Institute of Technology, France Marius BREZOVAN, University of Craiova, Romania Keith J. BURNHAM, University of Wolverhampton, UK David CAMACHO, Autonomous University of Madrid, Spain Sergiu CARAMAN, "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galați, Romania Oscar CASTILLO, Tijuana Institute of Technology, Mexico Petru CAȘCAVAL, "Gheorghe Asachi" Technical University of Iași, Romania Arben CELA, Paris-Est University, ESIEE Paris, France Daniela CERNEGA, "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galați, Romania Dorian COJOCARU, University of Craiova, Romania Antonio DOURADO, University of Coimbra, Portugal Ioan DUMITRACHE, University Politehnica of Bucharest, Romania Luminita DUMITRIU, "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galați, Romania Stefka FIDANOVA, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Bulgaria Florin-Gheorghe FILIP, Romanian Academy, Romania Adrian FILIPESCU, "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galați, Romania Adina Magda FLOREA, University Politehnica of Bucharest, Romania Giancarlo FORTINO, University of Calabria, Italy Radu GROSU, Vienna University of Technology, Austria Martin GUAY, Queen's University, Canada Kevin GUELTON, Université de Reims Champagne-Ardenne, France Rodolfo HABER GUERRA, Center for Automation and Robotics (CSIC-UPM), Spain Adel HAGHANI, University of Rostock, Germany Jacob HAMMER, University of Florida, USA Zoltán HORVÁTH, Eötvös Loránd University, Hungary Zhongsheng HOU, Qingdao University, China Daniela IACOVIELLO, Sapienza University of Rome, Italy Przemyslaw IGNACIUK, Technical University of Lodz, Poland Mirjana IVANOVIĆ, University of Novi Sad, Serbia Zsolt Csaba JOHANYÁK, John von Neumann University, Hungary Alireza KARIMI, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Lausanne, Switzerland Marius KLOETZER, "Gheorghe Asachi" Technical University of Iași, Romania Petia KOPRINKOVA-HRISTOVA, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Bulgaria Péter KORONDI, Budapest University of Technology and Economics, Hungary Levente KOVÁCS, Óbuda University, Budapest, Hungary Michal KVASNICA, Slovak University of Technology in Bratislava, Slovakia Hak-Keung LAM, King's College London, UK Ioan-Doré LANDAU, Grenoble Institute of Technology, France Corneliu LAZĂR, "Gheorghe Asachi" Technical University of Iași, Romania Mircea LAZÅR, Eindhoven University of Technology, Netherlands Yann LE GORREC, École Nationale Supérieure de Mécanique et des Microtechniques, France Jesús de LEÓN MORALES, Autonomous University of Nuevo León, Mexico Cristian MAHULEA, University of Zaragoza, Spain Mihaela MATCOVSCHI, "Gheorghe Asachi" Technical University of Iași, Romania Patricia MELIN, Tijuana Institute of Technology, Mexico Mihai MICEA, Politehnica University of Timisoara, Romania Liviu MICLEA, Technical University of Cluj-Napoca, Romania Sabine MONDIÉ, CINVESTAV-IPN, Mexico Ion NECOARA, University Politehnica of Bucharest, Romania Sergiu NEDEVSCHI, Technical University of Cluj-Napoca, Romania Sorin OLARU, Paris-Saclay University, France Hitay ÖZBAY, Bilkent University, Turkey Marcin PAPRZYCKI, Systems Research Institute, Polish Academy of Sciences, Poland Nicolae PARASCHIV, Petroleum-Gas University of Ploiești, Romania Lăcră PAVEL, University of Toronto, Canada

Tamara PETROVIĆ, University of Zagreb, Croatia Stefan Wolfgang PICKL, Bundeswehr University Munich, Germany Marios M. POLYCARPOU, University of Cyprus, Cyprus Dan POPESCU, University of Craiova, Romania Dumitru POPESCU, University Politehnica of Bucharest, Romania Elvira POPESCU, University of Craiova, Romania Vicenc PUIG, Polytechnic University of Catalonia, Spain Werner PURGATHOFER, Vienna University of Technology, Austria Xiaobo QU, Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden Antonio E. B. RUANO, University of Algarve, Portugal Sergio Matteo SAVARESI, Polytechnic University of Milan, Italy Olivier SENAME, Grenoble Institute of Technology, France Vasile SIMA, National Institute for Research & Development in Informatics, Romania Xiaona SONG, Henan University of Science and Technology, China James C. SPALL, Johns Hopkins University, USA Liana STĂNESCU, University of Craiova, Romania Dorin SENDRESCU, University of Craiova, Romania Michael ŠEBEK, Czech Technical University in Prague, Czech Republic Igor ŠKRJANC, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia Shigemasa TAKAI, Osaka University, Japan Sihem TEBBANI, Paris-Saclay University, France Gianluca TEMPESTI, University of York, UK Mariana TITICA, University of Nantes, France Alain VANDE WOUWER, University of Mons, Belgium Antonis VARDULAKIS, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece Honoriu VALEAN, Technical University of Cluj-Napoca, Romania Pastora VEGA, University of Salamanca, Spain Ramon VILANOVA, Autonomous University of Barcelona, Spain Alina VODĂ, Grenoble Institute of Technology, France Draguna VRABIE, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, USA Damir VRANČIĆ, Jožef Stefan Institute, Slovenia Shen YIN, Harbin Institute of Technology, China

#### **Executive Associate Editors**

Lucian BÅRBULESCU, PhD University of Craiova, Faculty of Automation, Computers and Electronics, Str. A.I. Cuza 13, 200585, Craiova, Romania

Adrian BURLACU, PhD "Gheorghe Asachi" Technical University of Iasi, Faculty of Automatic Control and Computer Engineering Str. Prof. dr. doc. Dimitrie Mangeron, nr. 27, 700050, Iași, Romania

Marius MARIAN, PhD University of Craiova, Faculty of Automation, Computers and Electronics, Str. A.I. Cuza 13, 200585, Craiova, Romania

Raul-Cristian ROMAN, PhD Politehnica University of Timișoara, Department of Automation and Applied Informatics, Bd. Vasile Pârvan 2, 300223, Timișoara, Romania

Răzvan ȘOLEA, PhD "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galați, Faculty of Control Systems, Computers, Electrical and Electronics Engineering, Str. Științei 2, 800210, Galați, Romania

# Application of Heavy and Underestimated Dynamic Models in Adaptive Receding Horizon Control Without Constraints

Awudu Atinga Doctoral School of Applied Informatics and Applied Mathematics Óbuda University Budapest, Hungary UGN9N8.uni-obuda.hu@stud.uni-obuda.hu József K. Tar

ABC iRob, University Research and Innovation Center Inst. of Appl. Math., John von Neumann Faculty of Informatics Óbuda University Budapest, Hungary

tar.jozsef@nik.uni-obuda.hu

Abstract-In the heuristic "Adaptive Receding Horizon Controller" (ARHC) the available dynamic model of the controlled system usually is placed in the role of a constraint under which various cost functions can be minimized over a horizon. A possible secure design can be making calculations for a "heavy dynamic model" that may produce high dynamical burden that is efficiently penalized by the cost functions and instead of the original nominal trajectory results a "deformed" one that can be realized by the controlled system of "less heavy dynamics". In the lack of accurate system model a fixed point iterationbased adaptive approach is suggested for the precise realization of this deformed trajectory. To reduce the computational burden of the control the usual approach in which the dynamic model is considered as constraint and Lagrange-multipliers are introduced as co-state variables is evaded. The heavy dynamic model is directly built in the cost and the computationally greedy Reduced Gradient Algorithm is replaced by a transition between the simple and fast Newton-Raphson and the slower Gradient Descent algorithms (GDA). In the paper simulation examples are presented for two dynamically coupled van der Pol oscillators as a strongly nonlinear system. The comparative use of simple nondifferentiable and differentiable cost functions is considered, too.

*Index Terms*—Newton-Raphson Algorithm, Gradient Descent Algorithm, Reduced Gradient Algorithm, Receding Horizon Control, Fixed Point Iteration-based Adaptive Control

#### I. INTRODUCTION

This paper is a further developed, extended version of the conference publication [1] in which preliminary calculations were made for two coupled van der Pol oscillators. The originally electrical system (an externally excited triode in [2]) was "transformed" into a mechanical one that allowed working with more convenient physical concepts and units.

The scientific antecedents can be briefly summarized as follows. The idea of optimal controllers can be considered as a generalization of the variational principles of Classical Mechanics in which functionals are minimized. The subject area can be related to the action functional generalized by Bellman as the Hamilton-Jacobi Bellman equation that in the advent of the appearance of powerful computers resulted the idea of "Dynamic Programming" [3], [4]. However, the computational power of the processors even in the beginning of the nineties of the past century was not satisfactory for this purpose in robot control where fast motion was considered. The optimal control framework was completely evaded in the "Computed Torque Control" [5] in which the dynamic model was directly use for the computation of the necessary control forces. In the seventies, to reduce the computational burden of dynamic programming the idea of the "Receding Horizon Controller" was introduced in [6], in which the cost terms are computed in discrete points of a finite horizon length, they are summarized, and the dynamic model's output (certain integer order derivative of the generalized coordinate of the controlled system) are estimated as finite element approximations over this discrete grid. Evidently, the resolution of the grid had to be fine enough to mathematically underpin this approach. The constraint terms were considered as relationships between the neighboring grid points and Lagrange's Reduced Gradient method [7] was applied for the cost minimization.

Certain special cases of this method lead to very popular approaches. In the case of Linear Time-invariant dynamic models and quadratic cost terms the occurring terms can be even "formally treated": based on Riccati's observation in 1724 [8] according to which certain second order differential equation's solution was constructed by solving first order differential equations, and on Schur's lemma that made it possible to tackle quadratic matrix problems with linear ones [9], the idea of "Linear Quadratic Regulator" was developed [10]. These solutions are built into efficient MATLAB codes and the practice of transforming the real problems to such approximate form and solving them by the use of appropriate MATLAB packages was announced by Boyd et al. in 1994 in [11].

Even in the simplified, time grid-based formalism the Lagrange multipliers used for gradient reduction maintain their formal property, i.e., they are counterparts of the canonical

We acknowledge the support of this work by the Doctoral School of Applied Informatics and Applied Mathematics of Óbuda University.

Cite as: A. Atinga and J. K. Tar, "Application of Heavy and Underestimated Dynamic Models in Adaptive Receding Horizon Control Without Constraints", *Syst. Theor. Control Comput. J.*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 1–8, Dec. 2022. DOI: 10.52846/stccj.2022.2.2.36

momentum coordinates in the Hamiltonian equations of motion he introduced in 1834 [12], [13] from which strict analogy with the flow of incompressible fluids can be deduced (e.g., [14]) together with its mathematical consequences.

However, by keeping in mind the fact that in the original problem statement the co-state variables do not appear, attempts were made for the elimination of their computation. At first, instead of solving the usual set of linear equations used for gradient reduction in EXCEL's Solver package [15], [16], the simpler Gram-Schmidt method [17], [18] -earlier also invented by Laplace [19]-was suggested in [20]. As further computational reduction possibility, instead using the separate  $\{g^{(i)}(x) = 0; i = 1, 2, \dots, K\}$  constraint terms with their associated Lagrange multipliers a single term G(x) := $\sum_{\ell} g^{(\ell)^2} = 0$  was applied with which only a single Lagrange multiplier was associated. In [21] the dynamic model was not treated as a constraint term. Instead of that it was directly built in the cost function belonging to the whole horizon. Consequently no gradient reduction was necessary, and the way was opened for using the more efficient Newton-Raphson algorithm [22], [23].

In this paper and in its immediate predecessor [1] the same method is applied for the adaptive RHC control of two coupled van der Pol oscillators. In the computations different nominal trajectories were investigated. Besides the original "fragmented linear" cost functions their differentiable approximation was also investigated. Furthermore, for speeding up the calculations a new stopping condition was built in the system because it was experimentally observed that the original construction sometimes was apt to spend too much time in certain points. Simply the number of the numerical steps was limited.

In the sequel at first the dynamic model of the two coupled oscillators is given (it is identical to that used in [1]).

#### II. THE CONTROLLED SYSTEM

In the simulations three different parameter settings were applied for the same dynamic model, according to Tables I and II.

 TABLE I

 The dynamic model parameters used in the simulations.

Parameter	Unit	Value
$m_1$ , "exact" mass	[kg]	1.0
$\hat{m}_1$ , "heavy" mass	[kg]	$2m_1$
$\check{m}_1$ , "approx." mass	[kg]	$0.8m_1$
$m_2$ , "exact" mass	[kg]	2.0
$\hat{m}_2$ , "heavy mass"	[kg]	$2m_2$
$\check{m}_2$ , "approx." mass	[kg]	$0.9m_2$

Based on [2] the dynamic model is given in (1). Its main format is compatible with the dynamic equations of robots having the structure  $H(q)\ddot{q} + h(q,\dot{q}) = Q$ . The originally electrical system (an externally excited triode) has been transformed into a 2 DoF "mechanical" system with generalized coordinates  $q_1$ ,  $q_2$ , generalized forces  $Q_1 \equiv F_1$ ,  $Q_2 \equiv F_2$ , and parameters given in Table I. Parameters  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  separate the zones of damping and excitation. Evidently, for certain coordinate values the system is excited, and for others it is damped, depending on the signs of the terms  $(a_1^2 - q_1^2)$  and  $(a_1^2 - (q_2 - L_2)^2)$ .

 TABLE II

 The dynamic model parameters used in the simulations.

Parameter	Unit	Value
$k_1$ , "exact" spring stiffness	$[N \cdot m^{-1}]$	100.0
$\hat{k}_1$ , "heavy" spring stiffness	$[N \cdot m^{-1}]$	$1.2k_1$
$\check{k}_1$ , "approx." spring stiffness	$[N \cdot m^{-1}]$	$0.8k_1$
$k_2$ , "exact" spring stiffness	$[N \cdot m^{-1}]$	150.0
$\hat{k}_2$ , "heavy" spring stiffness	$[N \cdot m^{-1}]$	$1.5k_{2}$
$\tilde{k}_2$ , "approx." spring stiffness	$[N \cdot m^{-1}]$	$0.7k_2$
$b_1$ , "exact" excitation coeff.	$[N \cdot m^{-3} \cdot s]$	1.0
$\hat{b}_1$ , "heavy" excitation coeff.	$[N \cdot m^{-3} \cdot s]$	$1.5b_1$
$\tilde{b}_1$ , "approx." excitation coeff.	$[N \cdot m^{-3} \cdot s]$	$0.8b_1$
$b_2$ , "exact" excitation coeff.	$[N \cdot m^{-3} \cdot s]$	1.50
$\hat{b}_2$ , "heavy" excitation coeff.	$[N \cdot m^{-3} \cdot s]$	$1.25b_2$
$\tilde{b}_2$ , "approx." excitation coeff.	$[N \cdot m^{-3} \cdot s]$	$0.7b_2$
$c_1$ , "exact" visc. damping	$[N \cdot m^{-1} \cdot s]$	1.0
$\hat{c}_1$ , "heavy" visc. damping	$[N \cdot m^{-1} \cdot s]$	$1.25c_1$
$\check{c}_1$ , "approx." visc. damping	$[N \cdot m^{-1} \cdot s]$	$0.8c_1$
$c_2$ , "exact" visc. damping	$[N \cdot m^{-1} \cdot s]$	1.50
$\hat{c}_2$ , "heavy" visc. damping	$[N \cdot m^{-1} \cdot s]$	$1.5c_2$
$\check{c}_2$ , "approx." visc. damping	$[N \cdot m^{-1} \cdot s]$	$0.9c_2$
$d_1$ , "exact" turb. damping	$[N \cdot m^{-2} \cdot s^2]$	1.0
$\hat{d}_1$ , "heavy" turb. damping	$[N \cdot m^{-2} \cdot s^2]$	$1.5d_{1}$
$d_1$ , "approx." turb. damping	$[N \cdot m^{-2} \cdot s^2]$	$0.8d_{1}$
$d_2$ , "exact" turb. damping	$[N \cdot m^{-2} \cdot s^2]$	1.50
$\hat{d}_2$ , "heavy" turb. damping	$[N \cdot m^{-2} \cdot s^2]$	$1.25d_{2}$
$d_2$ , "approx." turb. damping	$[N \cdot m^{-2} \cdot s^2]$	$0.7d_{2}$
$a_1$ , "exact" separator	[m]	3.0
$\hat{a}_1$ , "heavy" separator	[m]	$1.5a_1$
$\check{a}_1$ , "approx." separator	m	$0.9a_1$
$a_2$ , "exact" separator	[m]	4.0
a <sub>2</sub> , "heavy" separator	[m]	$1.25a_2$
$u_2$ , approx. separator		$\frac{0.8a_2}{2.0}$
$\hat{L}_2$ , exact shift	[111]	0.01
$L_2$ , neavy smit	[m]	$0.8L_2$
$L_2$ , approx. shift	[m]	$1.2L_2$
$\hat{k}$ , exact coupling suffness	$[N \cdot m^{-\sigma}]$	200.0
k, "heavy" coupling stiffness	$[N \cdot m^{-\sigma}]$	1.5k
<i>k</i> , "approx." coupling stiffness		0.8k
$\hat{L}$ , exact coupling length	[m]	0.5
<i>L</i> , neavy coupling length	[m]	0.9L
L, "approx." coupling length	[ [m]	1.3L
$\sigma$ exact nonlinearity $\hat{\sigma}$ "heavy" poplingerity	[nondimensional]	1.50
	[nondimensional]	$1.2\sigma$ 0.0 $\sigma$
о арргол. понинсанту	[ [nonumensional]	0.90

$$m_{1}\ddot{q}_{1} + k_{1}q_{1} - b_{1}\left(a_{1}^{2} - q_{1}^{2}\right)\dot{q}_{1} + c_{1}\dot{q}_{1} + d_{1}\mathrm{sign}(\dot{q}_{1})\dot{q}_{1}^{2} \\ - k\mathrm{sign}(q_{2} - q_{1} - L)|q_{2} - q_{1} - L|^{\sigma} = F_{1} \\ m_{2}\ddot{q}_{2} + k_{2}(q_{2} - L_{2}) - b_{2}\left(a_{1}^{2} - (q_{2} - L_{2})^{2}\right)\dot{q}_{2} + c_{2}\dot{q}_{2} + d_{2}\mathrm{sign}(\dot{q}_{2})\dot{q}_{2}^{2} + k_{3}\mathrm{sign}(q_{2} - q_{1} - L)|q_{2} - q_{1} - L|^{\sigma} = F_{2}$$

$$(1)$$

Parameters  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  correspond to the usual viscous damping that is typical for low velocities, while  $d_1$  and  $d_2$ 

belong to the drag force that normally is generated during fast motion in turbulent gases or liquids. The oscillators are coupled by a spring of zero force length L, and  $\sigma > 1$  "nonlinearity parameter" according to which the differential stiffness of the coupling spring varies with its compression or dilatation. This system is evidently burdened with strong nonlinearities therefore it can serve as a good paradigm for our investigations.

#### III. RHC WITHOUT GRADIENT REDUCTION

The dynamic model in (1) is considered in a *function format* as

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{q}_1(t_i) &= \mathfrak{f}_1(q_1(t_i), q_2(t_i), \dot{q}_1(t_i), \dot{q}_2(t_i), F_1(t_i), F_2(t_i)), \\ \ddot{q}_2(t_i) &= \mathfrak{f}_2(q_1(t_i), q_2(t_i), \dot{q}_1(t_i), \dot{q}_2(t_i), F_1(t_i), F_2(t_i)) \end{aligned} (2)$$

for each point of the horizon. The *initial conditions*, furthermore  $F_1(t_1)$ , and  $F_2(t_1)$  determine  $\ddot{q}_1(t_1)$  and  $\ddot{q}_2(t_1)$ . Based on the possible interpretation of the forward differences, this determines  $\dot{q}_1(t_2) = \dot{q}_1(t_1) + \Delta t \ddot{q}_1(t_1)$ , and  $\dot{q}_2(t_2) = \dot{q}_2(t_1) + \Delta t \ddot{q}_2(t_1)$ . Again using the forward differences it is obtained that  $q_1(t_3) = q_1(t_2) + \Delta t \dot{q}_1(t_2)$ , and  $q_2(t_3) = q_2(t_2) + \Delta t \dot{q}_2(t_2)$ . Therefore, the initial conditions and the forces in the first grid point determine  $q_1(t_3)$  and  $q_2(t_3)$ . Via continuing this calculation with  $F_1(t_2)$  and  $F_2(t_2)$  the values  $q_1(t_4)$  and  $q_2(t_4)$  can be computed, etc. Therefore, the force components  $\{F_1(t_1), \ldots, F_1(t_{N-2})\}$ , and  $\{F_2(t_1), \ldots, F_2(t_{N-2})\}$  determine the new coordinates  $\{q_1(t_3), \ldots, q_1(t_N)\}$ , and  $\{q_2(t_3), \ldots, q_2(t_N)\}$ . The cost function of optimization may have the form of

$$\Psi\left(F_{1}(t_{1}),\ldots,F_{1}(t_{N-2}),F_{2}(t_{1}),\ldots,F_{2}(t_{N-2})\right) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{N-2} \left(\psi_{q1}\left(q_{1}^{N}(t_{\ell+2}),q_{1}^{o}(t_{\ell+2})\right) + \psi_{q2}\left(q_{2}^{N}(t_{\ell+2}),q_{2}^{o}(t_{\ell+2})\right)\right) + \sum_{\ell=1}^{N-2} \left(\psi_{F1}\left(F_{1}(t_{\ell})\right) + \psi_{F2}\left(F_{2}(t_{\ell})\right)\right) ,$$
(3)

in which the contributions  $\{\psi_{q1} (q_1^N(t_{\ell+2}), q_1^o(t_{\ell+2}))\}$  denote the cost contributions for the tracking error of variable  $q_1$ ,  $\{\psi_{q2} (q_1^N(t_{\ell+2}), q_1^o(t_{\ell+2}))\}$  mean similar terms for tracking the coordinate  $q_2$ ,  $\{\psi_{F1} (F_1(t_\ell))\}$  and  $\{\psi_{F2} (F_2(t_\ell))\}$ are the penalty contributions for the applied control forces. The optimized trajectories  $\{q_1^o(t_\ell)\}, \{q_2^o(t_\ell)\}$ , their timederivatives  $\{\dot{q}_1^o(t_\ell)\}, \{\dot{q}_2^o(t_\ell)\}$ , and second time-derivatives  $\{\ddot{q}_1^o(t_\ell)\}, \{\ddot{q}_2^o(t_\ell)\}$  are built up of the initial conditions and the control forces. The  $\psi_{q1}, \psi_{q2}, \psi_{F1}$ , and  $\psi_{F2}$  functions may have various forms, they can differ from each other even in the different grid points, too. On this reason the heuristic RHC method obtains a high degree of flexibility.

For the minimization of (3) in principle the GDA algorithm can be used via calculating  $\nabla \Psi$ . Its success evidently may depend on the structure of the cost functions.

Instead of the complicated cost functions of [21], the simple ones of common shape were applied for both trajectory tracking, and force limitation. The functions had the "*width* 

*parameter*" ( $w_q > 0$  for trajectory tracking, and  $w_F > 0$  for the force limitation, respectively), and linear increase or "*steepness parameter*" ( $s_q > 0$  for trajectory tracking, and  $s_F > 0$  for force limitation, respectively), as follows:

$$\psi(x) = \begin{cases} \psi = -s(x+w) \text{ if } x \le -w \\ \psi = 0 \text{ if } -w < x \le w \\ \psi = s(x-w) \text{ if } w < x \end{cases}$$
(4)

This function can be so interpreted that small values, i.e., that for which  $|x| \leq w$  are tolerated without causing any cost contribution, but the terms with greater absolute values generate finite, nonzero contribution. The linearity in cost generation is expected to evade the occurrence of numerical overflow problems. In the range of the occurring numerical values *smoothed version* of the above cost function in the form

$$\Psi = \mathfrak{a}|x|^\mathfrak{n} \tag{5}$$

was also used for the sake of comparison. The new parameters were so fitted that at x = 2w the new function value had to be equal to the original resulting

$$\mathfrak{a}(2w)^{\mathfrak{n}} = s(2w - w) \text{ resulting}$$
$$\mathfrak{a} = \frac{sw}{(2w)^{\mathfrak{n}}} \quad . \tag{6}$$



Fig. 1. The original and smoothed cost functions for trajectory tracking, n = 1.5 (LHS:  $s_q = 500m^{-1}$ ,  $w_q = 10^{-4}m$ ) and for force limitation (RHS:  $s_F = 10.0N^{-1}$ , and  $w_F = 1500.0N$ )

The next question is how to speed up the classic "Gradient Descent Algorithm" for finding the local minima. Normally the procedure is stopped when the reduced gradient becomes "zero". However, in a numerical solution, during finite time, only some "approximation of 0" can be achieved, on which the time-need of the method can drastically depend. Here the method suggested in [21] was applied.

In the first step it was assumed, that –as in the case of the Newton-Raphson Algorithm (e.g., [23])– that in a singe step the value of zero as absolute minimum of the error can be achieved. This corresponds to a step  $-\alpha\beta\nabla\psi(x)$  in which  $\beta\|\nabla\psi(x)\|^2 = \psi(x)$  with a starting value of  $\alpha = 1$ . This step-length was maintained while the condition  $\psi(x(n+1)) < \psi(x(n))$  was met. If  $\psi(x(n+1) \ge \psi(x(n)))$  happened, the positive parameter  $\alpha$  was halved. This procedure was repeated until the last value of  $\alpha$  achieved one tenth of its initial value. Then the procedure was stopped and the so found value x was accepted. Since later it was experimentally observed that this solution sometimes can "stick in" in certain point, maximum number of allowed steps was limited to 100. Since the so optimized trajectory  $q^o(t)$  can be quite noisy, according to an idea borrowed from [24], it was smoothed/filtered by a simple low pass filter by tracking it according to the equation

$$\left(\Lambda_f + \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\right)^3 q^{of}(t) = \Lambda_f^3 q^o(t) \tag{7}$$

with the initial conditions  $q^{of}(t_0) = 0$ ,  $\dot{q}^{of}(t_0) = 0$ , and  $\ddot{q}^{of}(t_0) = 0$ . Following that a kinematically designed fixed point iteration-based tracking was planned for the actual trajectory q(t) as

$$\left(\Lambda + \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\right)^3 \int_{t_0}^t \left(q^{of}(\xi) - q(\xi)\right) \mathrm{d}\xi \equiv 0.$$
(8)

The adaptive controller tried to realize (8) according to the principles published in [25]. This approach is based on the idea of the "response function", that in the case of a second order system takes the fact into consideration that in the given physical state of the system  $\{q(t), \dot{q}(t)\}$ , the actual control force F(t), immediately determines the realized 2nd time**derivative** as  $\ddot{q}(t) = \mathfrak{F}(q(t), \dot{q}(t), F(t))$ , in which the force is computed by using the available approximate inverse dynamic model as  $F(t) = \hat{\mathfrak{F}}^{-1}(q(t), \dot{q}(t), \ddot{q}^{Des}(t))$ . Altogether this results a function in the form  $\ddot{q}(t) = \Re \left( \dot{q}(t), \dot{q}(t), \ddot{q}^{Des}(t) \right)$ in which  $\ddot{q}^{Des}(t)$  can be very quickly (even abruptly) varied, while its other arguments, i.e., q(t) and  $\dot{q}(t)$  vary only slowly, therefore approximately it can be stated that  $\ddot{q}(t) \approx$  $\Re(\ddot{q}^{Des}(t))$ , i.e., the slowly varying parts are approximated as parameters. According to this approach, in the case of a digital controller, during one control cycle only one step of modification is possible in the input argument  $q^{Des}(t)$ . The basic idea is the construction of a deformation  $q^{Des}(t) \mapsto q^{Def}(t)$ so that  $\ddot{q}^{Des}(t) = \Re(\ddot{q}^{Def}(t))$ . Evidently, in the case of a strongly nonlinear system, especially in the lack of knowledge on the exact model parameters, this deformation cannot be computed in a single step because even the exact form of the function  $\Re(\ddot{q}(t))$  is unknown, too. However, by observing the appropriate input - output pairs, the behavior of this function can be experimentally observed in similar manner as a car driver observes and learns the behavior of a different car. Let  $\Delta x$  be a small variation in the input argument for which the variation of the output will be

$$\Delta \mathfrak{R} := \mathfrak{R}(x + \Delta x) - \mathfrak{R}(x) \cong \frac{\partial \mathfrak{R}(x)}{\partial x} \Delta x \quad . \tag{9}$$

This function can be called "approximately direction keeping" if  $\Delta \Re^T \Delta x > 0$ , i.e., the angle between the two vectors is *acute*. Since for an arbitrary quadratic real matrix M can be decomposed as a sum of its symmetric and skew-symmetric parts

$$\Delta x^T \frac{1}{2} \left[ \left( M + M^T \right) + \left( M - M^T \right) \right] \Delta x =$$
  
=  $\frac{1}{2} \Delta x^T \left( M + M^T \right) \Delta x$ , (10)

due to symmetry reasons only its symmetric part plays role in the direction keeping property. Let  $x_{\star}$  be so chosen that the

desired goal, i.e., g is the output of this function:  $g = \Re(x_*)$ . Let  $\alpha > 0$  a small positive number, and consider the sequence of points generated as  $\{x_{n+1} = x_n + \alpha(g - x_n)\}$ . For this sequence the following estimation can be done:

$$\Re(x_{n+1}) \cong \Re(x_n) - \alpha \frac{\partial \Re}{\partial x} (\Re(x_n) - g)$$
 (11a)

$$\Re(x_{n+1}) - g \approx \left[I - \alpha \frac{\partial \Re}{\partial x}\right] (\Re(x_n) - g)$$
 . (11b)

Evidently, if the matrix  $M := \frac{\partial \Re}{\partial x}$  in (11b) is approximately direction keeping, for an arbitrary vector w it can be written that

$$||(I - \alpha M)w||^{2} = w^{T}(I - \alpha M^{T})(I - \alpha M)w =$$
(12a)

$$= \|w\|^{2} - \alpha w^{T} \left(M^{T} + M\right) w + \alpha^{2} w^{T} M^{T} M w , \quad (12b)$$

where in (12b) the first term is negative for an approximately direction keeping function, while the last one is always positive. Since the negative term is proportional to the small  $\alpha$ . while the positive one is proportional to  $\alpha^2$ , with a cautiously chosen  $\alpha$  it can be achieved that  $x_n \to x_{\star}$ , and  $\Re(x_n) \to$  $\Re(x_{\star}) = q$ . A mathematically more formal proof can be based on Banach's fixed point theorem [26]. Of course, the input values can be slightly adjusted to approach towards the goal in various manners than using a small parameter  $\alpha > 0$ . In this sequence generation method one cannot easily determine whether an *ad hoc* choice for  $\alpha$  will be good enough, i.e., it will result at least a convergent sequence and that the convergence will be fast enough for the purposes of the controller. To reduce this burden in the design, in [25] a more stable design method was suggested. Each vector under consideration was so augmented by a physically not interpreted new dimension, that they obtained identical Frobenius norms. Consequently it became possible to rotate these vectors into each other with a full angle, or it was possible to move toward each other with an interpolated rotational angle. The interpolation happened by modifying the full angle of rotation. Evidently, the physically interpreted projections of the augmented vectors also moved toward each other. By choosing a large common norm the occurrence of only small angles of rotation can be guaranteed, and the interpolation factor can be easily set. The necessary rotations can be expressed in closed analytical form by the generalization of the Rodrigues formula [27].

#### **IV. THE SIMULATION RESULTS**

In the simulations acceptable discrete step length that is appropriate to the dynamics of the nominal trajectory to be tracked as well as to the additional dynamic burden of the controller's PID-type trajectory corrections must be determined. Instead complicate theoretical considerations simulations can be done for a stable system at time resolution  $\Delta t$  with digital horizon length H that must be compatible with that obtained for a resolution of  $\Delta t/2$ , 2H. As a result of such simulations the control parameters given in Table III were obtained.

Parameter	Unit	Value
$\Delta t$ , time-resolution	[s]	$10^{-3}$
H, horizon length in $\Delta t$ units	[nondimensional integer]	12
$w_q$ , tracking error tolerance	[m]	$10^{-4}$
$s_q$ , tracking error steepness	m <sup>-1</sup>	500.0
$w_F$ , force tolerance	[N],	1500
$s_F$ , force penalty steepness,	[N <sup>-1</sup> ]	$10^{1}$
$\Lambda_f$ , noise filtering parameter	$[s^{-1}]$	100.0
$\Lambda$ , adaptive tracking parameter	[s <sup>-1</sup> ]	30.0
$R_a$ , common augmented $\ \ddot{q}\ $	$\left[ m \cdot s^{-2} \right]$	$10^{6}$
$\lambda_a$ , adaptive interpolation factor	[nondimensional]	0.8

 TABLE III

 THE CONTROL PARAMETERS USED IN THE SIMULATIONS.

The impart of force limitation is examined using simulation results for both the original cost and the smoothed cost function. According to the simulation pair  $w_F = 1500 \text{ N}, s_F =$  $10 \,\mathrm{N}^{-1}$  the Trajectory Tracking of the original cost function in Fig. 2 reveals that the controller follows the optimal trajectory with high amount of error. Therefore, it is well revealed that the force limiting cost contributions can corrupt the trajectory tracking precision for the overestimated heavy dynamic model that needs higher forces than the less heavy realistic one. However, the distorted optimized trajectory is well tracked by the adaptive controller, too. Fig. 6 reveals that the adaptive control forces remained in the reasonable order of magnitude and do not show hectic variation, due to the efficient noise filtering strategy applied for tracking the optimized trajectory. The tracking error that can be observed in the free of force limitation case mainly is generated by this simple low passtype filter. Figs. 7, 8 and 9 clearly testify the efficiency of the adaptation mechanism: due to the considerable extent of the adaptive deformation the realized and the desired 2nd time-derivatives are in each other's close vicinity, due to which the kinematically designed tracking policy is quite precisely realized. Fig. 10 testifies that the drastic force limitation sometimes results in quite small computational time, but this effect is not even therefore its advantages can be realized mainly in offline applications.

The counterparts of Figs. 2, 3 and 4 that belong to the trajectory tracking of the smoothed cost function are described in Figs. 11, 12 and 13. It is clear that quite similar effects caused by the force limitation can observed in the case of a smoothed cost function as in the case of the original cost function one. Fig. 16 reveals that the fluctuation of the optimized control forces is considerably has been reduced due to the smooth nature of the cost function. Fig. 17 shows smoothly varying adaptive control forces and according to Fig 18 it can be stated that mechanism of adaptation worked well. too. In Fig. 19 it can observed that the computational time-need is more even in the case of the smooth cost function, so it does not allow to spare too much time in the offline applications. The computational need of the optimization was estimated for Julia language version 1.8.1 (2022-09-06) running under Linux 5.10.84-1-MANJARO x86\_64 21.2.0 Qonos on a DELL inspiron 15R laptop.



Fig. 2. Trajectory tracking of the original cost functions without (LHS) and with force limitation (RHS) with  $w_F = 1500$  N and  $s_F = 10$  N<sup>-1</sup> (RHS)



Fig. 3. The "nominal-optimal" trajectory tracking error of the original cost functions without (LHS) and with force limitation (RHS) with  $w_F = 1500 \text{ N}$  and  $s_F = 10 \text{ N}^{-1}$  (RHS)



Fig. 4. The "optimal-realized" trajectory tracking error belonging to the original cost functions without (LHS) and with force limitation (RHS) with  $w_F = 1500$  N and  $s_F = 10$  N<sup>-1</sup> (RHS)



Fig. 5. The optimized control forces belonging to the original cost functions without (LHS) and with force limitation (RHS) with  $w_F = 1500$  N and  $s_F = 10$  N<sup>-1</sup> (RHS)



Fig. 6. The adaptive control forces belonging to the original cost functions without (LHS) and with force limitation (RHS) with  $w_F = 1500$  N and  $s_F = 10$  N<sup>-1</sup> (RHS)