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Abstract: Most papers on predictive control use either state-space models with an observer or transfer function models with output realignment for prediction purposes. Here it is shown that the this approach can have weaknesses, especially with regard to noise rejection and the independent model approach should often be preferred.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Model predictive control (MPC), e.g. (Garcia et al., 1989) is a popular control strategy, however there is a significant discrepancy between the early variants such as Dynamic matrix control (DMC), (Cutler et al., 1980), IDCOM ((Richalet et al., 1978)) and IMC (Garcia et al., 1982) and the algorithms common in the academic literature, for instance Generalized predictive control (GPC), (Clarke et al., 1987). Historically the main difference is in the type of model used for computation of the system predictions; DMC and IDCOM use FIR models, IMC uses an internal model (often a FIR) whereas academia has favoured transfer function and state space models. More recently industrial vendor ADERSA in its product PFC (Predictive functional control) have favoured the use of independent models a concept that bears a strong resemblance to the internal model principle in IMC (Garcia et al., 1982) but specifically is not restricted to FIR models. They argue that the use of transfer function models (or state space models with an estimator) in MPC realigns the model state on noisy data, hence giving poor predictions (Rossiter et al., 2001). FIR models avoid this shortcoming by basing the predictions almost entirely on past input information with only an output correction to avoid offset, however they introduce bias errors due to truncation.

The independent (internal) model can overcome the shortcomings of the FIR models (truncation, large number of parameters) by being transfer function or state-space based while retaining the advantages of low prediction sensitivity to noise (by being based on inputs not outputs). It has been shown in an earlier paper (Rossiter et al., 2001) that the structure of the prediction equations is such that one would expect the use of an independent model to give more reliable predictions than realigned models, that is less sensitive to noise. However, that paper did not consider the impact of such prediction errors on
the resulting closed-loop control law. Hence the purpose of this paper is twofold.

- To show how predictive control laws are derived with realigned models and independent models and thus to derive the sensitivity functions of the closed-loop in each case.
- To demonstrate by way of example how sensitivity varies significantly depending on whether one uses the realigned model or the independent model.

The paper finishes with a discussion.

2. BACKGROUND AND CONTROL LAW STRUCTURE

In this section we give only a quick overview of how to compute the control laws; the reader is referred to the literature (e.g. Clarke et al., 1987) for more details. As our aim is to derive the sensitivity functions, we will not dwell on the most efficient realisation of these laws, but rather a convenient form that can be expressed using Z-transforms. The notation adopted is GPC for GPC with no T-filter (Yoon et al., 1995), GPCT for GPC with a T-filter and GPCI for GPC with an independent model. Note GPC is equivalent to GPCT with \( T(z) = 1 \).

2.1 Conventional GPC with a T-filter

In GPC (Clarke et al., 1987) the aim is, at each sample, to minimise a cost function of the form

\[
J = \|W_y (R - Y) \|^2 + \|W_u \Delta U \|^2 \tag{1}
\]

where \( W_y \), \( W_u \) are weighting matrices, \( Y \) is a vector of output predictions, \( R \) is a vector of future set points\(^1\) and \( \Delta U \) is a vector of future control increments. Assuming a model of the form

\[
A(z)y_k = B(z)u_k + T(z) \frac{\zeta}{\Delta} \tag{2}
\]

where \( y, u, \zeta \) are outputs, inputs and an unknown zero mean random disturbance respectively. Define filtered values \( \hat{y} = y/T, \hat{u} = u/T \), then it is easy e.g. (Rossiter, 1993) to form predictions

\[
Y = H \Delta U + P \Delta \hat{U}_{past} + Q \hat{Y}_{past} \tag{3}
\]

where \( \Delta \hat{U}_{past}, \hat{Y}_{past} \) are vectors of past filtered input/output values respectively and \( Y, \Delta U \) are vectors of unfiltered future output/input predictions respectively. Substitution of (3) into (1), minimisation w.r.t. \( \Delta U \) and selection of only the first block element of the optimal \( \Delta U \) gives rise to a control law of the form

\[
\Delta u_k = -\hat{D}_k \Delta \hat{U}_{past} - \hat{N}_k \hat{y}_{past} \tag{4}
\]

This is easily rearranged into a more conventional form in terms of \( z \)-transforms:

\[
D_k(z)\Delta u = -N_k(z)\hat{y} \tag{5}
\]

\[
D_k(z) = \frac{I}{z^{-1}I} + \frac{\hat{D}_k}{z^{-1}I}; N_k(z) = \frac{\hat{N}_k}{z^{-1}I} \tag{5}
\]

The argument \( z \) is dropped hereafter to improve clarity. Note that the corresponding \( D_k, N_k \) for GPC and GPCT will be different as \( T \) affects the definition of \( P, Q \) (Clarke et al., 1987).

2.2 GPC with an independent model

In this case the predictions are slightly different from that adopted in (3). Simulate an independent model \( \hat{A} \hat{y} = \hat{B} \hat{u} \) in parallel with the plant\(^2\) and use the measured offset \( y_k - \hat{y}_k \) to correct predictions based on this model. The predictions are

\[
Y = H \Delta U + \hat{P} \hat{U}_{past} + \hat{Q} \hat{Y}_{past} + L(y_k - \hat{y}_k) \tag{6}
\]

where \( \hat{Y}_{past} \) is based on past outputs of the model (not process), \( \hat{U}_{past} \) is past absolute inputs (not increments) and for example in the SISO case, \( L \) is a vector of ones. Substitution into (1) and minimisation w.r.t. \( \Delta U \) gives a control law of the form

\[
\Delta u_k = -\hat{D}_k \hat{U}_{past} - \hat{N}_k \hat{y}_{past} - \hat{M}_k y_k \tag{7}
\]

\[
\hat{D}_k = [I, 0, 0, ..., |H^TH + W_u|^{-1}H^TW_y \hat{P}] \hat{N}_k = [I, 0, 0, ..., |H^TH + W_u|^{-1}H^TW_y \hat{Q}] \tag{7}
\]

\[
\hat{M}_k = [I, 0, 0, ..., |H^TH + W_u|^{-1}H^TW_y L] \tag{7}
\]

(7) Again, as in (5), this is easily rearranged into a neat form based on \( z \)-transforms:

\[
D_k(z)u = -N_k(z)\hat{y} - M_k(z)\hat{y}; \quad \hat{A} \hat{y} = \hat{B} \hat{u} \tag{8}
\]

where \( D_k(z), N_k(z), M_k(z) \) depend upon the parameters in \( \hat{D}_k, \hat{N}_k, \hat{M}_k \). Then (8) can be simplified to

\[
D_t u = -M_k \hat{y}; \quad D_t = [D_k + N_k \hat{A}^{-1} \hat{B}] \tag{9}
\]

2.3 Summary of control laws

The \( z \)-transform representation of the control laws for GPC, GPCT and GPCI are summarised in table 1. Again, it is emphasised that \( D_k, N_k \) for GPC and GPCT will be different in general.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Control laws</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPCI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Hereafter as it is not relevant, a zero setpoint is assumed.

\(^2\) Clearly one chooses \( \hat{A} = A, \hat{B} = B \) if possible
3. COMPUTATION OF SENSITIVITY

The following assumptions are made (different assumptions will give rise to different sensitivity functions): (i) the sensitivity to the two signals noise and disturbance captures a good range of possibilities and (ii) the plant model is given as

\[ A(x)y_k = B(x)u_k + d_k; \quad w_k = y_k + v_k \]  

(10)

where \( d_k \) is a disturbance signal, \( v_k \) is output measurement noise and \( w_k \) is the measured output. The controller acts on \( w_k \) not on \( y_k \).

The sensitivity functions, that is the transferences from \( d_k \), \( v_k \) to \( y \), \( u \) can be computed in a straightforward manner by solving for \( y_k \), \( u_k \) in terms of \( d_k \), \( v_k \) using eqn.(10) and the control laws of table 1. The notation adopted is that sensitivity of \( x \) wrt. \( f \) is denoted \( S_{xf} \). The sensitivities for no parameter uncertainty are presented in tables 2-5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Output sensitivity to noise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPC  [ S_{vy} = \frac{A + B(D_k\Delta^{-1}N_k)^{-1}A}{D_k\Delta N_k} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPCT [ S_{vy} = \frac{A + B(D_k\Delta^{-1}N_k)^{-1}A}{D_k\Delta N_k} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPCI [ S_{vy} = \frac{A + B[D_k^{-1}M_k]^{-1}A}{[D_k^{-1}M_k]^{-1}} ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Output sensitivity to disturbances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPC  [ S_{dy} = \frac{A + B(D_k\Delta^{-1}N_k)^{-1}A}{D_k\Delta N_k} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPCT [ S_{dy} = \frac{A + B(D_k\Delta^{-1}N_k)^{-1}A}{D_k\Delta N_k} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPCI [ S_{dy} = \frac{A + B[D_k^{-1}M_k]^{-1}A}{[D_k^{-1}M_k]^{-1}} ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Input sensitivity to noise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPC  [ S_{nu} = \frac{D_k\Delta + N_kA^{-1}B}{D_k\Delta + N_kA^{-1}B} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPCT [ S_{nu} = \frac{D_k\Delta + N_kA^{-1}B}{D_k\Delta + N_kA^{-1}B} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPCI [ S_{nu} = \frac{D_k\Delta + M_kA^{-1}B}{D_k\Delta + M_kA^{-1}B} ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5: Input sensitivity to disturbances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPC  [ S_{du} = \frac{D_k\Delta + N_kA^{-1}B}{D_k\Delta + N_kA^{-1}B} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPCT [ S_{du} = \frac{D_k\Delta + N_kA^{-1}B}{D_k\Delta + N_kA^{-1}B} ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPCI [ S_{du} = \frac{D_k\Delta + M_kA^{-1}B}{D_k\Delta + M_kA^{-1}B} ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Nominal control laws

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controller</th>
<th>Law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPC</td>
<td>[ K = D_k\Delta^{-1}N_k ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPCT</td>
<td>[ K = D_k\Delta^{-1}N_k ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPCI</td>
<td>[ K = D_k^{-1}M_k ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sensitivity to multiplicative model uncertainty for the nominal case is

\[ S_y = [I + KG]^{-1}KG; \quad G = A^{-1}B \]  

(11)

The different controllers to be substituted into this expression are summarised in table 6.

Fig. 1. Closed-loop sensitivities to noise and disturbances, example 1

\[ S_{dy}, S_{vy}, S_{du}, S_{nu}, S_y \] with notation as in table 7. The frequency range is 0 to \( \pi \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7: Notation of plots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPC solid line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPCT dashed line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPCI dotted line</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For disturbances, it might be argued that the focus should be on output sensitivity only for low frequencies as one would not normally expect high frequency disturbances. However, the integral action will deal with this which shifts the focus back to the transients in disturbances, that is high frequencies. Also one would expect noise to be mostly high frequency and hence one should focus mainly on the high frequency range of these bode plots.

4. EXAMPLES

This is a SISO example. The controller is designed with \( n_y = 30, n_u = 3, W_u = 1 \). The corresponding sensitivity functions are displayed in figures 1,2.

\[ A(x) = 1 - 1.8z^{-1} + 0.81z^{-2} \]
\[ B(x) = 0.01z^{-1} + 0.003z^{-2} \]
\[ T(x) = 1 - 0.8z^{-1} \]  

Clearly using an independent model has much reduced the input sensitivity to noise and disturbances (as well as multiplicative uncertainty) in the high frequency range. This could be construed as a good thing as one does not want the inputs chasing noise as can happen with realigned models (e.g. (Rossiter et al., 2001)). The output variance is also smaller for high frequencies. The price is a larger variance of output at intermediate frequencies where one might consider noise/disturbances are less likely to occur. Clearly GPCT is better than GPC and more interestingly (as discussed in
(Yoon et al., 1995), if $T(z) = A(z)$ the sensitivity plots of GPCT exactly replicate those of GPCI. The choice $T = A$ however may not always be a wise choice of filter. GPCI also has better robustness to model uncertainty (figure 2).

4.2 Example 2

This is a 2 by 2 plant with reasonably large interactions in the step response characteristics. However, the step responses are smooth with non-minimum phase characteristics.

$$A(z) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} -1.3 & 0 \\ 0 & -0.7 \end{bmatrix} z^{-1} + \begin{bmatrix} 0.4 & 0 \\ 0 & -0.18 \end{bmatrix} z^{-2} \tag{13}$$

$$B(z) = \begin{bmatrix} 0.5 & 0.2 \\ -0.6 & 1 \end{bmatrix} z^{-1} + \begin{bmatrix} -0.5 & 0.3 \\ 0.3 & 1 \end{bmatrix} z^{-2} + \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0.5 \\ 0.6 & 0.5 \end{bmatrix} z^{-3} \tag{14}$$

With $T(z) = 1 - 0.8 z^{-1}, n_x = 5, n_y = 30, W_u = 1.$ The corresponding closed-loop sensitivity functions are plotted in figures 3-7 where the subplot position corresponds to the matrix position, that is row 'i', col 'j' of the figure corresponds to $S_{i,j}$. Here we see a similar trend to example 1. The independent model algorithm has the lowest input and output sensitivity for high frequencies, but poorer at intermediate frequencies. For robustness to multiplicative uncertainty the case is less clear cut though GPCI is clearly better than GPC.

4.3 Example 3

This is a 3 by 3 plant with large interaction.

$$A(z) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} -0.88 & -0.16 & 0 \\ 0.32 & -0.96 & -0.8 \\ 0 & 0 & -0.72 \end{bmatrix} z^{-1} + \begin{bmatrix} 0.064 & 0.018 & 0 \\ -0.08 & 0.072 & 0.24 \\ 0.16 & 0 & 0.0192 \end{bmatrix} z^{-2} + \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & 1 \\ -0.8 & 0.6 & 0.5 \\ 1 & 0.3 & 0.5 \end{bmatrix} z^{-3} \tag{15}$$

$$B(z) = \begin{bmatrix} 0.5 & 0.2 & -0.5 \\ 2 & 0 & 0.3 \\ 0 & 0.9 & -0.4 \end{bmatrix} z^{-1} + \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & 1 \\ -0.8 & 0.6 & 0.5 \\ 1 & 0.3 & 0.5 \end{bmatrix} z^{-2} \tag{16}$$

With $T(z) = 1 - 0.8 z^{-1}, n_x = 15, n_y = 30, W_u = 1.$ The corresponding closed-loop sensitivity functions are plotted in figures 8-12. Here we see that the results are less conclusive but one can still see a preference for the independent model at high frequencies.

4.4 Discussion

The purpose here was to compare ‘simple’ approaches to minimising sensitivity, without the
use of involved robust control theory. For the examples shown GPCI has outperformed GPC and also on average outperformed GPCT. One might argue that with a SISO case, one can always choose $T = A$ (making GPCT equivalent to GPCI) however this may not be desirable in general. Moreover, for multivariable systems the guidelines for choosing $T$ are much less clear cut and then one can see that GPCI is likely to be the best. Conversely, with GPCI, there is one less control parameter to design (that is no $T$) and without loss of performance. Hence at the very least it is worth considering the use of an IM at the outset of a control design. To compare
Fig. 12. Sensitivity to multiplicative uncertainty, example 3

the sensitivities arising from the use of different models is relatively trivial in simulation and there may be much to be gained. An offline case by case comparison is essential in general, because one cannot generalise. The conclusions will change for different models and moreover if the disturbance model differs from that in (10).

One might argue that, at least in the unconstrained case, that the Youla parameterisation can be used to adapt all controllers (for realigned and IM models) with the same nominal performance to have similar robustness and to give a convenient decoupling of performance objectives from robustness objectives (e.g. see (Kouvaritakis et al., 1992), (Garcia et al., 1982 for details). Hence does the model choice really matter? To counter this, it should be emphasised that one strength of predictive control is the ability to do online constraint handling. Systematic extension of sensitivity functions to the case is non trivial and scenario dependent. However, to date no simple and systematic means of augmenting robustness, for instance via the Youla parameterisation, has been developed for the constraint handling case. Some ideas are presented in (Rossiter et al., 1998) but need further work. In the meantime, one can argue that if the prediction structure gives low sensitivity in the nominal case, this is likely to carry over to the constrained case in general.

5. CONCLUSION

It has been shown that the typical academic practice of using realigned models in predictive control can lead to poor sensitivity with respect to noise. This is often corrected by the design of a T-filter, however such a process is not systematic beyond the guideline of using a low-pass filter with poles near those of the plant. Here some examples have shown that the alternative proposal of using an independent model (internal model) gives low sensitivity without the need for an extra design parameter. It is expected that such benefits will transfer to the constrained case where robust design approaches are not easily applicable.
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