

Chapter 1

Introduction to Adaptive Control

1.1 Adaptive Control—Why?

Adaptive Control covers a set of techniques which provide a systematic approach for automatic adjustment of controllers in *real time*, in order to achieve or to maintain a desired level of control system performance when the parameters of the plant dynamic model are unknown and/or change in time.

Consider first the case when the parameters of the dynamic model of the plant to be controlled are unknown but constant (at least in a certain region of operation). In such cases, although the structure of the controller will not depend in general upon the particular values of the plant model parameters, the correct tuning of the controller parameters cannot be done without knowledge of their values. Adaptive control techniques can provide an automatic tuning procedure in closed loop for the controller parameters. In such cases, the effect of the adaptation vanishes as time increases. Changes in the operation conditions may require a restart of the adaptation procedure.

Now consider the case when the parameters of the dynamic model of the plant change unpredictably in time. These situations occur either because the environmental conditions change (ex: the dynamical characteristics of a robot arm or of a mechanical transmission depend upon the load; in a DC-DC converter the dynamic characteristics depend upon the load) or because we have considered simplified linear models for nonlinear systems (a change in operation condition will lead to a different linearized model). These situations may also occur simply because the parameters of the system are slowly time-varying (in a wiring machine the inertia of the spool is time-varying). In order to achieve and to maintain an acceptable level of control system performance when large and unknown changes in model parameters occur, an *adaptive control* approach has to be considered. In such cases, the adaptation will operate most of the time and the term *non-vanishing adaptation* fully characterizes this type of operation (also called *continuous adaptation*).

Further insight into the operation of an adaptive control system can be gained if one considers the design and tuning procedure of the “good” controller illustrated in Fig. 1.1. In order to design and tune a good controller, one needs to:

Fig. 1.1 Principles of controller design





Fig. 1.2 An adaptive control system



- (1) Specify the desired control loop performances.
- (2) Know the dynamic model of the plant to be controlled.
- (3) Possess a suitable controller design method making it possible to achieve the desired performance for the corresponding plant model.

The dynamic model of the plant can be identified from input/output plant measurements obtained under an experimental protocol in open or in closed loop. One can say that the design and tuning of the controller is done from data collected on the system. An adaptive control system can be viewed as an implementation of the above design and tuning procedure in real time. The tuning of the controller will be done in real time from data collected in real time on the system. The corresponding adaptive control scheme is shown in Fig. 1.2.

The way in which information is processed in real time in order to tune the controller for achieving the desired performances will characterize the various adaptation techniques. From Fig. 1.2, one clearly sees that an adaptive control system is nonlinear since the parameters of the controller will depend upon measurements of system variables through the adaptation loop.

The above problem can be reformulated as nonlinear stochastic control with incomplete information. The unknown parameters are considered as auxiliary states (therefore the linear models become nonlinear: $\dot{x} = ax \implies \dot{x}_1 = x_1 x_2, \dot{x}_2 = v$ where v is a stochastic process driving the parameter variations). Unfortunately, the resulting solutions (*dual control*) are extremely complicated and cannot be implemented in practice (except for very simple cases). Adaptive control techniques can be viewed as approximation for certain classes of nonlinear stochastic control problems associated with the control of processes with unknown and time-varying parameters.

1.2 Adaptive Control Versus Conventional Feedback Control

The unknown and unmeasurable variations of the process parameters degrade the performances of the control systems. Similarly to the disturbances acting upon the controlled variables, one can consider that the variations of the process parameters are caused by disturbances acting upon the parameters (called parameter disturbances). These parameter disturbances will affect the performance of the control systems. Therefore the disturbances acting upon a control system can be classified as follows:

- (a) disturbances acting upon the controlled variables;
- (b) (parameter) disturbances acting upon the performance of the control system.

Feedback is basically used in conventional control systems to reject the effect of disturbances upon the controlled variables and to bring them back to their desired values according to a certain performance index. To achieve this, one first measures the controlled variables, then the measurements are compared with the desired values and the difference is fed into the controller which will generate the appropriate control.

A similar conceptual approach can be considered for the problem of achieving and maintaining the desired performance of a control system in the presence of parameter disturbances. We will have to define first a *performance index* (IP) for the control system which is a measure of the performance of the system (ex: the damping factor for a closed-loop system characterized by a second-order transfer function is an IP which allows to quantify a desired performance expressed in terms of “damping”). Then we will have to measure this IP. The *measured* IP will be compared to the *desired* IP and their difference (if the measured IP is not acceptable) will be fed into an *adaptation mechanism*. The output of the *adaptation mechanism* will act upon the parameters of the controller and/or upon the control signal in order to modify the system performance accordingly. A block diagram illustrating a basic configuration of an adaptive control system is given in Fig. 1.3.

Associated with Fig. 1.3, one can consider the following definition for an adaptive control system.

Definition 1.1 *An adaptive control system* measures a certain performance index (IP) of the control system using the inputs, the states, the outputs and the known disturbances. From the comparison of the measured performance index and a set of given ones, the adaptation mechanism modifies the parameters of the adjustable controller and/or generates an auxiliary control in order to maintain the performance index of the control system close to the set of given ones (i.e., within the set of acceptable ones).

Note that the control system under consideration is an *adjustable dynamic system* in the sense that its performance can be adjusted by modifying the parameters of the controller or the control signal. The above definition can be extended straightforwardly for “adaptive systems” in general (Landau 1979).

A conventional feedback control system will monitor the controlled variables under the effect of disturbances acting on them, but its performance will vary (it




Fig. 1.3 Basic configuration for an adaptive control system

is not monitored) under the effect of parameter disturbances (the design is done assuming known and constant process parameters).

An adaptive control system, which contains in addition to a feedback control with adjustable parameters a supplementary loop acting upon the adjustable parameters of the controller, will monitor the performance of the system in the presence of parameter disturbances.

Consider as an example the case of a conventional feedback control loop designed to have a given damping. When a disturbance acts upon the controlled variable, the return of the controlled variable towards its nominal value will be characterized by the desired damping if the plant parameters have their known nominal values. If the plant parameters change upon the effect of the parameter disturbances, the damping of the system response will vary. When an adaptation loop is added, the damping of the system response will be maintained when changes in parameters occur.

Comparing the block diagram of Fig. 1.3 with a conventional feedback control system, one can establish the correspondences which are summarized in Table 1.1.

While the design of a conventional feedback control system is oriented firstly toward the elimination of the effect of disturbances upon the controlled variables, the design of adaptive control systems is oriented firstly toward the elimination of the effect of parameter disturbances upon the performance of the control system. An adaptive control system can be interpreted as a feedback system where the controlled variable is the *performance index* (IP).

One can view an adaptive control system as a hierarchical system:

- Level 1: conventional feedback control;
- Level 2: adaptation loop.

In practice often an additional “monitoring” level is present (Level 3) which decides whether or not the conditions are fulfilled for a correct operation of the adaptation loop.

Table 1.1 Adaptive control versus conventional feedback control

Conventional feedback control system	Adaptive control system
Objective: monitoring of the “controlled” variables according to a certain IP for the case of known parameters	Objective: monitoring of the performance (IP) of the control system for unknown and varying parameters
Controlled variable	Performance index (IP)
Transducer	IP measurement
Reference input	Desired IP
Comparison block	Comparison decision block
Controller	Adaptation mechanism




Fig. 1.4 Comparison of an adaptive controller with a conventional controller (fixed parameters), (a) fixed parameters controller, (b) adaptive controller

Figure 1.4 illustrates the operation of an adaptive controller. In Fig. 1.4a, a change of the plant model parameters occurs at $t = 150$ and the controller used has constant parameters. One can see that poor performance results from this parameter change. In Fig. 1.4b, an adaptive controller is used. As one can see, after an adaptation transient the nominal performance is recovered.

1.2.1 Fundamental Hypothesis in Adaptive Control

The operation of the adaptation loop and its design relies upon the following fundamental hypothesis: *For any possible values of plant model parameters there is a controller with a fixed structure and complexity such that the specified performances can be achieved with appropriate values of the controller parameters.*

In the context of this book, the plant models are assumed to be linear and the controllers which are considered are also linear.

Therefore, *the task of the adaptation loop is solely to search for the “good” values of the controller parameters.*

This emphasizes the importance of the control design for the known parameter case (the *underlying control design problem*), as well as the necessity of a priori information about the structure of the plant model and its characteristics which can be obtained by *identification* of a model for a given set of operational conditions.

In other words, an adaptive controller is not a “black box” which can solve a control problem in real time without an initial knowledge about the plant to be controlled. This a priori knowledge is needed for specifying achievable performances, the structure and complexity of the controller and the choice of an appropriate design method.

1.2.2 Adaptive Control Versus Robust Control

In the presence of model parameter variations or more generally in the presence of variations of the dynamic characteristics of a plant to be controlled, *robust control design* of the conventional feedback control system is a powerful tool for achieving a satisfactory level of performance for a family of plant models. This family is often defined by means of a *nominal model* and a size of the uncertainty specified in the parameter domain or in the frequency domain.

The range of uncertainty domain for which satisfactory performances can be achieved depends upon the problem. Sometimes, a large domain of uncertainty can be tolerated, while in other cases, the uncertainty tolerance range may be very small. If the desired performances cannot be achieved for the full range of possible parameter variations, adaptive control has to be considered in addition to a robust control design. Furthermore, the tuning of a robust design for the true nominal model using an adaptive control technique will improve the achieved performance of the robust controller design. Therefore, robust control design will benefit from the use of adaptive control in terms of performance improvements and extension of the range of operation. On the other hand, using an underlying robust controller design for building an adaptive control system may drastically improve the performance of the adaptive controller. This is illustrated in Figs. 1.5, 1.6 and 1.7, where a comparison between conventional feedback control designed for the nominal model, robust control design and adaptive control is presented. To make a fair comparison the presence of unmodeled dynamics has been considered in addition to the parameter variations.




Fig. 1.5 Frequency characteristics of the true plant model for $\omega_0 = 1$ and $\omega_0 = 0.6$ and of the identified model for $\omega_0 = 1$

For each experiment, a nominal plant model is used in the first part of the record and a model with different parameters is used in the second part.

The plant considered for this example is characterized by a third order model formed by a second-order system with a damping factor of 0.2 and a natural frequency varying from $\omega_0 = 1$ rad/sec to $\omega_0 = 0.6$ rad/sec and a first order system. The first order system corresponds to a high-frequency dynamics with respect to the second order. The change of the damping factor occurs at $t = 150$.

The nominal system (with $\omega_0 = 1$) has been identified using a second-order model (lower order modeling). The frequency characteristics of the true model for $\omega_0 = 1$, $\omega_0 = 0.6$ and of the identified model for $\omega_0 = 1$ are shown in Fig. 1.5.

Based on the second-order model identified for $\omega_0 = 1$ a conventional fixed controller is designed (using pole placement—see Chap. 7 for details). The performance of this controller is illustrated in Fig. 1.6a. One can see that the performance of the closed-loop system is seriously affected by the change of the natural frequency. Figure 1.6b shows the performance of a robust controller designed on the basis of the same identified model obtained for $\omega_0 = 1$ (for this design pole placement is combined with the shaping of the sensitivity functions—see Chap. 8 for details). One can observe that the nominal performance is slightly lower (slower step response) than for the previous controller but the performance remains acceptable when the characteristics of the plant change.




Fig. 1.6 Comparison of conventional feedback control and robust control, (a) conventional design for the nominal model, (b) robust control design

Figure 1.7a shows the response of the control system when the parameters of the conventional controller used in Fig. 1.6a are adapted, based on the estimation in real time of a second-order model for the plant. A standard parameter adaptation algorithm is used to update the model parameters. One observes that after a transient, the nominal performances are recovered except that a residual high-frequency oscillation is observed. This is caused by the fact that one estimates a lower order model than the true one (but this is often the situation in practice). To obtain a satisfactory operation in such a situation, one has to “robustify” the adaptation algorithm (in this example, the “filtering” technique has been used—see Chap. 10 for details) and the results are shown in Fig. 1.7b. One can see that the residual oscillation has disappeared but the adaptation is slightly slower.

Figure 1.7c shows the response of the control system when the parameters of the robust controller used in Fig. 1.6b are adapted using exactly the same algorithm as for the case of Fig. 1.7a. In this case, even with a standard adaptation algorithm, residual oscillations do not occur and the transient peak at the beginning of the adaptation is lower than in Fig. 1.7a. However, the final performance will not be better than that of the robust controller for the nominal model.

After examining the time responses, one can come to the following conclusions:

1. Before using adaptive control, it is important to do a robust control design.
2. Robust control design improves in general the adaptation transients.




Fig. 1.7 Comparison of adaptive controller, (a) adaptation added to the conventional controller (Fig. 1.6a), (b) robust adaptation added to the conventional controller (Fig. 1.6a), (c) adaptation added to the robust controller (Fig. 1.6b)

3. A robust controller is a “fixed parameter” controller which instantaneously provides its designed characteristics.
4. The improvement of performance via adaptive control requires the introduction of additional algorithms in the loop and an “adaptation transient” is present (the time necessary to reach the desired performance from a degraded situation).
5. A trade-off should be considered in the design between robust control and robust adaptation.

1.3 Basic Adaptive Control Schemes

In the context of various adaptive control schemes, the implementation of the three fundamental blocks of Fig. 1.3 (performance measurement, comparison-decision, adaptation mechanism) may be very intricate. Indeed, it may not be easy to decompose the adaptive control scheme in accordance with the basic diagram of Fig. 1.3. Despite this, the basic characteristic which allows to decide whether or not a system is truly “adaptive” is the presence or the absence of the closed-loop control of a certain performance index. More specifically, an *adaptive control* system will use information collected in real time to improve the tuning of the controller in order




Fig. 1.8 Open-loop adaptive control

to achieve or to maintain a level of desired performance. There are many control systems which are designed to achieve acceptable performance in the presence of parameter variations, but they do not assure a closed-loop control of the performance and, as such, they are not “adaptive”. The typical example is the *robust control design* which, in many cases, can achieve acceptable performances in the presence of parameter variations using a fixed controller.

We will now go on to present some basic schemes used in adaptive control.

1.3.1 Open-Loop Adaptive Control

We shall consider next as an example the “gain-scheduling” scheme which is an *open-loop adaptive control system*. A block diagram of such a system is shown in Fig. 1.8. The adaptation mechanism in this case is a simple look-up table stored in the computer which gives the controller parameters for a given set of environment measurements. This technique assumes the existence of a rigid relationship between some measurable variables characterizing the environment (the operating conditions) and the parameters of the plant model. Using this relationship, it is then possible to reduce (or to eliminate) the effect of parameter variations upon the performance of the system by changing the parameters of the controller accordingly.

This is an *open-loop adaptive control system* because the modifications of the system performance resulting from the change in controller parameters are not measured and feedback to a comparison-decision block in order to check the efficiency of the parameter adaptation. This system can fail if for some reason or another the rigid relationship between the environment measurements and plant model parameters changes.

Although such *gain-scheduling systems* are not fully adaptive in the sense of Definition 1.1, they are widely used in a variety of situations with satisfactory results. Typical applications of such principles are:

1. adjustments of autopilots for commercial jet aircrafts using speed and altitude measurements,

2. adjustment of the controller in hot dip galvanizing using the speed of the steel strip and position of the actuator (Fenot et al. 1993),

and many others.

Gain-scheduling schemes are also used in connection with adaptive control schemes where the gain-scheduling takes care of rough changes of parameters when the conditions of operation change and the adaptive control takes care of the fine tuning of the controller.

Note however that in certain cases, the use of this simple principle can be very costly because:

1. It may require additional expensive transducers.
2. It may take a long time and numerous experiments in order to establish the desired relationship between environment measurements and controller parameters.

In such situations, an adaptive control scheme can be cheaper to implement since it will not use additional measurements and requires only additional computer power.

1.3.2 Direct Adaptive Control

Consider the basic philosophy for designing a controller discussed in Sect. 1.1 and which was illustrated in Fig. 1.1.

One of the key points is the specification of the desired control loop performance. In many cases, the desired performance of the feedback control system can be specified in terms of the characteristics of a dynamic system which is a *realization* of the desired behavior of the closed-loop system. For example, a tracking objective specified in terms of rise time, and overshoot, for a step change command can be alternatively expressed as the input-output behavior of a transfer function (for example a second-order with a certain resonance frequency and a certain damping). A regulation objective in a deterministic environment can be specified in terms of the evolution of the output starting from an initial disturbed value by specifying the desired location of the closed-loop poles. In these cases, the controller is designed such that for a given plant model, the closed-loop system has the characteristics of the *desired* dynamic system.

The design problem can in fact be equivalently reformulated as in Fig. 1.9. The *reference model* in Fig. 1.9 is a realization of the system with *desired* performances. The design of the controller is done now in order that:

- (1) the error between the output of the plant and the output of the reference model is identically zero for identical initial conditions;
- (2) an initial error will vanish with a certain dynamic.

When the plant parameters are unknown or change in time, in order to achieve and to maintain the desired performance, an adaptive control approach has to be considered and such a scheme known as *Model Reference Adaptive Control (MRAC)* is shown in Fig. 1.10.

Fig. 1.9 Design of a linear controller in deterministic environment using an explicit reference model for performance specifications





Fig. 1.10 Model Reference Adaptive Control scheme




This scheme is based on the observation that the difference between the output of the plant and the output of the reference model (called subsequently plant-model error) is a measure of the difference between the real and the desired performance. This information (together with other information) is used by the *adaptation mechanism* (subsequently called *parameter adaptation algorithm*) to directly adjust the parameters of the controller in real time in order to force asymptotically the plant-model error to zero. This scheme corresponds to the use of a more general concept called *Model Reference Adaptive Systems (MRAS)* for the purpose of control. See Landau (1979). Note that in some cases, the reference model may receive measurements from the plant in order to predict future desired values of the plant output.

The model reference adaptive control scheme was originally proposed by Whitaker et al. (1958) and constitutes the basic prototype for direct adaptive control.

The concept of model reference control, and subsequently the concept of direct adaptive control, can be extended for the case of operation in a stochastic environment. In this case, the disturbance affecting the plant output can be modeled as an ARMA process, and no matter what kind of linear controller with fixed parameter will be used, the output of the plant operating in closed loop will be an ARMA model. Therefore the control objective can be specified in terms of a desired ARMA model for the plant output with desired properties. This will lead to the concept of *stochastic reference model* which is in fact a *prediction reference model*. See Landau (1981). The prediction reference model will specify the desired behavior of the predicted output. The plant-model error in this case is the *prediction error* which

Fig. 1.11 Indirect adaptive control (principle)



is used to directly adapt the parameters of the controller in order to force asymptotically the plant-model stochastic error to become an *innovation* process. The *self tuning minimum variance controller* (Åström and Wittenmark 1973) is the basic example of direct adaptive control in a stochastic environment. More details can be found in Chaps. 7 and 11.

Despite its elegance, the use of *direct adaptive control* schemes is limited by the hypotheses related to the underlying linear design in the case of known parameters. While the performance can in many cases be specified in terms of a reference model, the conditions for the existence of a feasible controller allowing for the closed loop to match the reference model are restrictive. One of the basic limitations is that one has to assume that the plant model has in all the situations stable zeros, which in the discrete-time case is quite restrictive.¹ The problem becomes even more difficult in the multi-input multi-output case. While different solutions have been proposed to overcome some of the limitations of this approach (see for example M'Saad et al. 1985; Landau 1993a), direct adaptive control cannot always be used.


1.3.3 Indirect Adaptive Control

Figure 1.11 shows an indirect adaptive control scheme which can be viewed as a real-time extension of the controller design procedure represented in Fig. 1.1. The basic idea is that a suitable controller can be designed on line if a model of the plant is estimated on line from the available input-output measurements. The scheme is termed *indirect* because the adaptation of the controller parameters is done in two stages:

- (1) on-line estimation of the plant parameters;
- (2) on-line computation of the controller parameters based on the current estimated plant model.

¹Fractional delay larger than half sampling periods leads to unstable zeros. See Landau (1990a). High-frequency sampling of continuous-time systems with difference of degree between denominator and numerator larger or equal to two leads to unstable zeros. See Åström et al. (1984).

Fig. 1.12 Basic scheme for on-line parameter estimation



This scheme uses current plant model parameter estimates as if they are equal to the true ones in order to compute the controller parameters. This is called the *ad-hoc certainty equivalence* principle.²

The indirect adaptive control scheme offers a large variety of combinations of control laws and parameter estimation techniques. To better understand how these indirect adaptive control schemes work, it is useful to consider in more detail the on-line estimation of the plant model.

The basic scheme for the on-line estimation of plant model parameters is shown in Fig. 1.12. The basic idea is to build an *adjustable predictor* for the plant output which may or may not use previous plant output measurements and to compare the predicted output with the measured output. The error between the plant output and the predicted output (subsequently called *prediction error* or *plant-model error*) is used by a *parameter adaptation algorithm* which at each sampling instant will adjust the parameters of the adjustable predictor in order to minimize the prediction error in the sense of a certain criterion. This type of scheme is primarily an *adaptive predictor* which will allow an estimated model to be obtained asymptotically giving thereby a correct input-output description of the plant for the given sequence of inputs.

This technique is successfully used for the plant model identification in open-loop (see Chap. 5). However, in this case special input sequences with a rich frequency content will be used in order to obtain a model giving a correct input-output description for a large variety of possible inputs.

The situation in indirect adaptive control is that in the absence of external rich excitations one cannot guarantee that the excitation will have a sufficiently rich spectrum and one has to analyze when the computation of the controller parameters based on the parameters of an adaptive predictor will allow acceptable performance to be obtained asymptotically.

Note that on-line estimation of plant model parameters is itself an adaptive system which can be interpreted as a *Model Reference Adaptive System* (MRAS). The plant to be identified represents the reference model. The parameters of the adjustable predictor (the adjustable system) will be driven by the PAA (parameter

²For some designs a more appropriate term will be *ad-hoc separation theorem*.

Table 1.2 Duality of model reference adaptive control and adaptive prediction

Model reference adaptive control	Adaptive predictor
Reference model	Plant
Adjustable system (plant + controller)	Adjustable predictor




Fig. 1.13 Indirect adaptive control (detailed scheme)

adaptation algorithm) in order to minimize a criterion in terms of the adaptation error (prediction error).

The scheme of Fig. 1.12 is the *dual* of Model Reference Adaptive Control because they have a similar structure but they achieve different objectives. Note that one can pass from one configuration to the other by making the following substitutions (Landau 1979) (see Table 1.2).

Introducing the block diagram for the plant model parameter estimation given in Fig. 1.12 into the scheme of Fig. 1.11, one obtains the general configuration of an *indirect adaptive control* shown in Fig. 1.13. Using the indirect adaptive control schemes shown in Fig. 1.13, one can further elaborate on the ad-hoc use of the “certainty equivalence” or “separation theorem” which hold for the linear case with known parameters.

In terms of *separation* it is assumed that the adaptive predictor gives a good prediction (or estimation) of the plant output (or states) when the plant parameters are unknown, and that the prediction error is independent of the input to the plant (this is false however during adaptation transients). The adjustable predictor is a system for which full information is available (parameters and states). An appropriate control for the predictor is computed and this control is also applied to the plant. In terms of *certainty equivalence*, one considers the unknown parameters of the plant model as additional states. The control applied to the plant is the same as the one applied when all the “states” (i.e., parameters and states) are known exactly, except that the “states” are replaced by their estimates. The indirect adaptive control was originally introduced by Kalman (1958).

However, as mentioned earlier, the parameters of the controller are calculated using plant parameter estimates and there is no evidence, therefore, that such schemes will work (they are not the exact ones, neither during adaptation, nor in general, even asymptotically). A careful analysis of the behavior of these schemes should be done. In some cases, external excitation signals may be necessary to ensure the convergence of the scheme toward desired performances. As a counterpart adaptation has to be stopped if the input of the plant whose model has to be estimated is not *rich* enough (meaning a sufficiently large frequency spectrum).

Contributions by Gevers (1993), Van den Hof and Schrama (1995) have led to the observation that in indirect adaptive control the objective of the plant parameter estimation is to provide the best prediction for the behavior of the closed loop system, for given values of the controller parameters (in other words this allows to assess the performances of the controlled system). This can be achieved by either using appropriate data filters on plant input-output data or by using adaptive predictors for the closed-loop system parameterized in terms of the controller parameters and plant parameters. See Landau and Karimi (1997b), Chaps. 9 and 16.

1.3.4 Direct and Indirect Adaptive Control: Some Connections

Comparing the direct adaptive control scheme shown in Fig. 1.10 with the indirect adaptive control scheme shown in Fig. 1.13, one observes an important difference. In the scheme of Fig. 1.10, the parameters of the controller are directly estimated (adapted) by the adaptation mechanism. In the scheme of Fig. 1.13, the adaptation mechanism 1 tunes the parameters of an adjustable predictor and these parameters are then used to compute the controller parameters.

However, in a number of cases, related to the desired control objectives and structure of the plant model, by an appropriate parameterization of the adjustable predictor (reparameterization), the parameter adaptation algorithm of Fig. 1.13 will directly estimate the parameter of the controller yielding to a direct adaptive control scheme. In such cases the adaptation mechanism 2 (the design block) disappears and one gets a *direct adaptive control* scheme. In these schemes, the output of the adjustable predictor (whose parameters are known at each sampling) will behave as the output of a reference model. For this reason, such schemes are also called “implicit model reference adaptive control” (Landau 1981; Landau and Lozano 1981; Egardt 1979). This is illustrated in Fig. 1.14.

To illustrate the idea of “reparameterization” of the plant model, consider the following example. Let the discrete-time plant model be:

$$y(t + 1) = -a_1 y(t) + u(t) \quad (1.1)$$

where y is the plant output, u is the plant input and a is an unknown parameter. Assume that the desired objective is to find $u(t)$ such that:

$$y(t + 1) = -c_1 y(t) \quad (1.2)$$




Fig. 1.14 Implicit model reference adaptive control

(The desired closed-loop pole is defined by c_1). The appropriate control law when a_1 is known has the form:

$$u(t) = -r_0 y(t); \quad r_0 = c_1 - a_1 \tag{1.3}$$

However, (1.1) can be rewritten as:

$$y(t + 1) = -c_1 y(t) + r_0 y(t) + u(t) \tag{1.4}$$

and the estimation of the unknown parameter r_0 will directly give the parameter of the controller. Using an adjustable predictor of the form:

$$\hat{y}(t + 1) = -c_1 y(t) + \hat{r}_0(t) y(t) + u(t) \tag{1.5}$$

and a control law derived from (1.3) in which r_0 is replaced by its estimates:

$$u(t) = -\hat{r}_0(t) y(t) \tag{1.6}$$

one gets:

$$\hat{y}(t + 1) = -c_1 y(t) \tag{1.7}$$

which is effectively the desired output at $(t + 1)$ (i.e., the output of the implicit reference model made from the combination of the predictor and the controller).

A number of well known adaptive control schemes (minimum variance self-tuning control—Åström and Wittenmark 1973, generalized minimum variance self-tuning control—Clarke and Gawthrop 1975) have been presented as indirect adaptive control schemes, however in these schemes one directly estimates the controller parameters and therefore they fall in the class of direct adaptive control schemes.

1.3.5 *Iterative Identification in Closed Loop and Controller Redesign*

In indirect adaptive control, the parameters of the controller are generally updated at each sampling instant based on the current estimates of the plant model parameters.

However, nothing forbids us to update the estimates of the plant model parameters at each sampling instant, and to update the controller parameters only every N sampling instants. Arguments for choosing this procedure are related to:

- the possibility of getting better parameter estimates for control design;
- the eventual reinitialization of the plant parameters estimation algorithm after each controller updating;
- the possibility of using a more sophisticated control design procedure (in particular robust control design) requiring a large amount of computation.

If the plant to be controlled has constant parameters over a large time horizon, one can consider a large horizon N for plant parameters estimation, followed by the redesign of the controller based on the results of the identification in closed loop. Of course, this procedure can be repeated. The important feature of this approach is that identification in closed loop is done in the presence of a linear fixed controller (which is not the case in indirect adaptive control where plant parameter estimates and controller parameters are updated at each sampling instant).

This approach to indirect adaptive control is called *iterative identification in closed loop and controller redesign*. See Gevers (1993), Bitmead (1993), Van den Hof and Schrama (1995).

This technique can be used for:


- retuning and redesign of an existing controller without opening the loop;
- retuning of a controller from time to time in order to take into account possible change in the model parameters.

It has been noticed in practice that this technique often allows to improve the performances of a controller designed on the basis of a model identified in open loop. See Bitmead (1993), Van den Hof and Schrama (1995), Langer and Landau (1996) and Chap. 9.

The explanation is that identification in closed loop is made with an effective plant input which corresponds to the external excitation filtered by a sensitivity function. This sensitivity function will enhance the signal energy in the frequency range around the band pass of the closed loop and therefore will allow a more accurate model to be obtained in this region, which is critical for the design.

This technique emphasizes the role of identification in closed loop as a basic step for controller tuning based on data obtained in closed-loop operation.

Fig. 1.15 Schematic diagram of the multiple-model adaptive control approach



1.3.6 Multiple Model Adaptive Control with Switching

When large and rapid variations of the plant model parameters occur, the adaptation transients in classical indirect adaptive control schemes are often unsatisfactory. To improve the adaptation transients the use of the so called “multiple model adaptive control” offers a very appealing solution. The basic idea of this approach is to select in real time the best model of the plant from an a priori known set of models and apply the output of the corresponding predesigned controller to the plant. The performance can be improved by on-line adaptation of an adjustable model in order to find a more accurate plant model. The block diagram of such a system is presented in Fig. 1.15. The system contains a bank of fixed models (G_1, G_2, G_3), an adaptive model estimator \hat{G} (using a closed-loop type parameter estimation scheme) and an adjustable controller.

The system operates in two steps:

- Step 1: The best available fixed model (with respect to an error criterion) is selected by a switching procedure (implemented in the supervisor).
- Step 2: The parameters of an adjustable plant model are updated. When its performance in term of the error criterion is better than the best fixed model, one switches to this model and one computes a corresponding controller.

This approach has been developed in Morse (1995), Narendra and Balakrishnan (1997), Karimi and Landau (2000) among other references.

1.3.7 Adaptive Regulation

Up to now we have considered that the plant model parameters are unknown and time varying and implicitly it was assumed the disturbance (and its model) is known.

However, there are classes of applications (active vibration control, active noise control, batch reactors) where the plant model can be supposed to be known (obtained by system identification) and time invariant and where the objective is to reject the effect of disturbances with unknown and time varying characteristics (for example: multiple vibrations with unknown and time varying frequencies). To reject disturbances (asymptotically), the controller should incorporate the model of the disturbance (the internal model principle). Therefore in adaptive regulation, the internal model in the controller should be adapted in relation with the disturbance model. Direct and indirect adaptive regulation solutions have been proposed. For the indirect approach the disturbance model is estimated and one computes the controller on the basis of the plant and disturbance model. In the direct approach, through an appropriate parametrization of the controller, one adapts directly the internal model. These techniques are discussed in Chap. 14. Among the first references on this approach (which include applications) see Amara et al. (1999a, 1999b), Valentinotti (2001), Landau et al. (2005).

1.3.8 Adaptive Feedforward Compensation of Disturbances

In a number of applications (including active vibration control, active noise control) it is possible to get a measurement highly correlated with the disturbance (an image of the disturbance). Therefore one can use an (adaptive) feedforward filter for compensation of the disturbance (eventually on top of a feedback system). This is particularly interesting for the case of wide band disturbances where the performance achievable by feed back only may be limited (limitations introduced by the Bode “integral” of the output sensitivity function).

The feedforward filter should be adapted with respect to the characteristics of the disturbance. It is important to mention that despite its “open-loop character”, there is an inherent positive feedback in the physical system, between the actuator and the measurement of the image of the disturbance. Therefore the adaptive feedforward filter operates in closed loop with positive feedback. The adaptive feedforward filter should stabilize this loop while simultaneously compensating the effect of the disturbance. The corresponding block diagram is shown in Fig. 1.16. These techniques are discussed in Chap. 15.

1.3.9 Parameter Adaptation Algorithm

The *parameter adaptation algorithm* (PAA) forms the essence of the adaptation mechanism used to adapt either the parameter of the controller directly (in direct adaptive control), or the parameters of the adjustable predictor of the plant output.

The development of the PAA which will be considered in this book and which is used in the majority of adaptive control schemes assumes that the “models are linear




Fig. 1.16 Schematic diagram of the adaptive feedforward disturbance compensation

in parameters”³, i.e., one assumes that the plant model admits a representation of the form:

$$y(t + 1) = \theta^T \phi(t) \tag{1.8}$$

where θ denotes the vector of (unknown) parameters and $\phi(t)$ is the vector of measurements. This form is also known as a “linear regression”. The objective will be to estimate the unknown parameter vector θ given in real time y and ϕ . Then, the estimated parameter vector denoted $\hat{\theta}$ will be used for controller redesign in indirect adaptive control. Similarly, for direct adaptive control it is assumed that the controller admits a representation of the form:

$$y^*(t + 1) = -\theta_c^T \phi(t) \tag{1.9}$$

where $y^*(t + 1)$ is a desired output (or filtered desired output), θ_c is the vector of the unknown parameters of the controller and $\phi(t)$ is a vector of measurements and the objective will be to estimate θ_c given in real time y^* and ϕ .

The parameter adaptation algorithms will be derived with the objective of minimizing a criterion on the error between the plant and the model, or between the desired output and the true output of the closed-loop system.

The parameter adaptation algorithms have a recursive structure, i.e., the new value of the estimated parameters is equal to the previous value plus a correcting term which will depend on the most recent measurements.

The general structure of the parameter adaptation algorithm is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} \text{New estimated} \\ \text{parameters} \\ \text{(vector)} \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} \text{Previous estimated} \\ \text{parameters} \\ \text{(vector)} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \text{Adaptation} \\ \text{gain} \\ \text{(matrix)} \end{bmatrix} \\ &\times \begin{bmatrix} \text{Measurement} \\ \text{function} \\ \text{(vector)} \end{bmatrix} \times \begin{bmatrix} \text{Prediction error} \\ \text{function} \\ \text{(scalar)} \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

³The models may be linear or nonlinear but linear in parameters.

which translates to:

$$\hat{\theta}(t+1) = \hat{\theta}(t) + F(t)\phi(t)v(t+1) \quad (1.10)$$

where $\hat{\theta}$ denotes the estimated parameter vector, $F(t)$ denotes the adaptation gain, $\phi(t)$ is the observation (regressor) vector which is a function of the measurements and $v(t+1)$ denotes the adaptation error which is the function of the plant-model error.

Note that the adaptation starts once the latest measurements on the plant output $y(t+1)$ is acquired (which allows to generate the plant-model error at $t+1$). Therefore $\hat{\theta}(t+1)$ will be only available after a certain time δ within $t+1$ and $t+2$, where δ is the computation time associated with (1.10).

1.4 Examples of Applications

1.4.1 *Open-Loop Adaptive Control of Deposited Zinc in Hot-Dip Galvanizing*

Hot-dip galvanizing is an important technology for producing galvanized steel strips. However, the demand, particularly from automotive manufacturers, became much sharper in terms of the coating uniformity required, both for use in exposed skin panels and for better weldability. Furthermore, the price of zinc rose drastically since the eighties and a tight control of the deposited zinc was viewed as a means of reducing the zinc consumption (whilst still guaranteeing the minimum zinc deposit). Open-loop adaptive control is one of the key elements in the Sollac hot-dip galvanizing line at Florange, France (Fenot et al. 1993).

The objective of the galvanizing line is to obtain galvanized steel with formability, surface quality and weldability equivalent to uncoated cold rolled steel. The variety of products is very large in terms of deposited zinc thickness and steel strip thickness. The deposited zinc may vary between 50 to 350 g/m² (each side) and the strip speed may vary from 30 to 180 m/mn.

The most important part of the process is the hot-dip galvanizing. The principle of the hot-dip galvanizing is illustrated in Fig. 1.17. Preheated steel strip is passed through a bath of liquid zinc and then rises vertically out of the bath through the stripping “air knives” which remove the excess zinc. The remaining zinc on the strip surface solidifies before it reaches the rollers, which guide the finished product. The measurement of the deposited zinc can be made only on the cooled finished strip and this introduces a very large and time-varying pure time delay. The effect of air knives depends on the air pressure, the distance between the air knives and the strip, and the speed of the strip. Nonlinear static models have been developed for computing the appropriate pressure, distance and speed for a given value of the desired deposited zinc.

The objective of the control is to assure a good uniformity of the deposited zinc whilst guaranteeing a minimum value of the deposited zinc per unit area. Tight




Fig. 1.17 Hot-dip galvanizing process

control (i.e., small variance of the controlled variable) will allow a more uniform coating and will reduce the average quantity of deposited zinc per unit area. As a consequence, in addition to quality improvement, a tight control on the deposited zinc per unit area has an important commercial impact since the average consumption for a modern galvanizing line is of the order of 40 tons per day.

The pressure in the air knives, which is the control variable, is itself regulated through a pressure loop, which can be approximated by a first order system. The delay of the process will depend linearly on the speed. Therefore a continuous-time linear dynamic model relating variations of the pressure to variations of the deposited mass, of the form:

$$H(s) = \frac{G e^{-s\tau}}{1 + sT}; \quad \tau = \frac{L}{V}$$

can be considered, where L is the distance between the air knives and the transducers and V is the strip speed. When discretizing this model, the major difficulty comes from the variable time-delay. In order to obtain a controller with a fixed number of parameters, the delay of the discrete-time model should remain constant. Therefore, the sampling period T_s is tied to the strip speed using the formula:

$$T_s = \frac{\frac{L}{V} + \delta}{d}; \quad (d = \text{integer})$$

where δ is an additional small time-delay corresponding to the equivalent time-delay of the industrial network and of the programmable controller used for pressure regulation and d is the discrete-time delay (integer). A linearized discrete-time model can be identified.

However, the parameters of the model will depend on the distance between the air knives and the steel strip and on the speed V .

In order to assure satisfactory performances for all regions of operation an “open-loop adaptation” technique has been considered. The open-loop adaptation is made with respect to:

- steel strip speed;
- distance between the air knives and the steel strip.

The speed range and the distance range have been split into three regions giving a total of nine operating regions. For each of these operating regions, an identification has been performed and robust controllers based on the identified models have been designed for all the regions and stored in a table.

A reduction of the dispersion of coating is noticed when closed-loop digital control is used. This provides a better quality finished product (extremely important in the automotive industry, for example). The average quantity of deposited zinc is also reduced by 3% when open-loop adaptive digital control is used, still guaranteeing the specifications for minimum zinc deposit and this corresponds to a very significant economic gain.

1.4.2 Direct Adaptive Control of a Phosphate Drying Furnace

This application has been done at the O.C.P., Beni-Idir Factory, Morocco (Dahhou et al. 1983). The phosphate, independently of the extraction method, has about 15% humidity. Before being sold its humidity should be reduced to about 1.5% using a rotary drying furnace. The drying process requires a great consumption of energy. The objective is to keep the humidity of the dried phosphate close to the desired value (1.5%) independently of the raw material humidity variations (between 7 and 20%), feedflow variations (100 to 240 t/h) and other perturbations that may affect the drying process.

The dynamic characteristics of the process vary as a consequence of the variable moisture and the nature of the damp product. A direct adaptive control approach has been used to achieve the desired performances over the range of possible changes in the process characteristics.

A block diagram of the system is shown in Fig. 1.18. The drying furnace consists of a:

- feeding system,
- combustion chamber,
- rotary drying tube,
- dust chamber,
- ventilator and chimney.

The combustion chamber produces the hot gas needed for the drying process. The hot gas and the phosphate mix in the rotary drying tube. In the dust chamber, one recaptures the phosphate fine particles which represent approximately 30% of the dried phosphate. The final product is obtained on the bottom of the dust chamber and recovered on a conveyor. The temperature of the final product is used as an indirect measure of its humidity. The control action is the fuel flow while the other variable for the burner (steam, primary air) are related through conventional loops to the fuel flow.




Fig. 1.18 Phosphate drying furnace


Significant improvement in performance was obtained with respect to a standard PID controller (the system has a delay of about 90 s). The improved regulation has as a side effect an average reduction of the fuel consumption and a reduction of the thermal stress on the combustion chamber walls allowing to increase the average time between two maintenance operations.

1.4.3 Indirect and Multimodel Adaptive Control of a Flexible Transmission

The flexible transmission built at GIPSA-LAB, Control Dept. (CNRS-INPG-UJF), Grenoble, France, consists of three horizontal pulleys connected by two elastic belts (Fig. 1.19). The first pulley is driven by a D.C. motor whose position is controlled by local feedback. The third pulley may be loaded with disks of different weight. The objective is to control the position of the third pulley measured by a position sensor. The system input is the reference for the axis position of the first pulley. A PC is used to control the system. The sampling frequency is 20 Hz.

The system is characterized by two low-damped vibration modes subject to a large variation in the presence of load. Fig. 1.20 gives the frequency characteristics of the identified discrete-time models for the case without load, half load (1.8 kg) and full load (3.6 kg). A variation of 100% of the first vibration mode occurs when passing from the full loaded case to the case without load. In addition, the system features a delay and unstable zeros. The system was used as a benchmark for robust digital control (Landau et al. 1995a), as well as a test bed for indirect adaptive control, multiple model adaptive control, identification in open-loop and closed-loop operation, iterative identification in closed loop and control redesign. The use of various algorithms for real-time identification and adaptive control which will be discussed throughout the book will be illustrated on this real system (see Chaps. 5, 9, 12, 13 and 16).

Fig. 1.19 The flexible transmission (GIPSA-LAB, Grenoble), (a) block diagram, (b) view of the system



1.4.4 Adaptive Regulation in an Active Vibration Control System

The active vibration control system built at GIPSA-LAB, Control Dept. (CNRS-INPG-UJF), Grenoble, France for benchmarking of control strategies is shown in Fig. 1.21 and details are given in Fig. 1.22. For suppressing the effect of vibrational disturbances one uses an inertial actuator which will create vibrational forces to counteract the effect of vibrational disturbances (inertial actuators use a similar principle as loudspeakers). The load is posed on a passive damper and the inertial actuator is fixed to the chassis where the vibrations should be attenuated. A shaker posed on the ground is used to generate the vibration. The mechanical construction of the load is such that the vibrations produced by the shaker, are transmitted to the upper side of the system. The controller will act (through a power amplifier) on the




Fig. 1.20 Frequency characteristics of the flexible transmission for various loads

position of the mobile part of the inertial actuator in order to reduce the residual force. The sampling frequency is 800 Hz.

The system was used as a benchmark for direct and indirect adaptive regulation strategies. The performance of the algorithms which will be presented in Chap. 14 will be evaluated on this system.

1.4.5 Adaptive Feedforward Disturbance Compensation in an Active Vibration Control System

The system shown in Fig. 1.23 is representative of distributed mechanical structures encountered in practice where a correlated measurement with the disturbance (an image of the disturbance) is made available and used for feedforward disturbance compensation (GIPSA-LAB, Control Dept., Grenoble, France). A detailed scheme of the system is shown in Fig. 1.24. It consists on five metal plates connected by springs. The second plate from the top and the second plate from the bottom are equipped with an inertial actuator. The first inertial actuator will excite the structure (disturbances) and the second will create vibrational forces which can counteract the effect of these vibrational disturbances. Two accelerometers are used to measure the displacement of vibrating plates. The one posed on the second plate on the bottom measures the residual acceleration which has to be reduced. The one posed above

Fig. 1.21 Active vibration control system using an inertial actuator (photo)




Fig. 1.22 Active vibration control using an inertial actuator (scheme)




Fig. 1.23 An active vibration control using feedforward compensation (photo)




Fig. 1.24 An active vibration control using feedforward compensation (scheme)

gives an image of the disturbance to be used for feedforward compensation. As it results clearly from Figs. 1.23 and 1.24, the actuator located down side will compensate vibrations at the level of the lowest plate but will induce forces upstream beyond this plate and therefore a positive feedback is present in the system which modifies the effective measurement of the image of the disturbance. The algorithms which will be presented in Chap. 15 will be evaluated on this system.

1.5 A Brief Historical Note

This note is not at all a comprehensive account of the evolution of the adaptive control field which is already fifty years old. Its objective is to point out some of the moments in the evolution of the field which we believe were important. In particular, the evolution of discrete-time adaptive control of SISO systems (which is the main subject of this book) will be emphasized (a number of basic references to continuous-time adaptive control are missed).

The formulation of adaptive control as a stochastic control problem (dual control) was given in Feldbaum (1965). However, independently more ad-hoc adaptive control approaches have been developed.

Direct adaptive control appeared first in relation to the use of a model reference adaptive system for aircraft control. See Whitaker et al. (1958). The *indirect adaptive control* was probably introduced by Kalman (1958) in connection with digital process control.

Earlier work in model reference adaptive systems has emphasized the importance of *stability* problems for these schemes. The first approach for synthesizing stable model reference adaptive systems using Lyapunov functions was proposed in Butchart and Shakhlov (1966) and further generalized in Parks (1966). The importance of positive realness of some transfer functions for the stability of MRAS was pointed out for the first time in Parks (1966). The fact that model reference adaptive systems can be represented as an equivalent feedback system with a linear time invariant feedforward block and a nonlinear time-varying feedback block was pointed out in Landau (1969a, 1969b) where an input-output approach based on hyperstability (passivity) concepts was proposed for the design. For detailed results along this line of research see Landau (1974, 1979). While initially direct adaptive control schemes have only been considered in continuous time, synthesis of discrete-time direct adaptive schemes and applications appeared in the seventies. See Landau (1971, 1973), Bethoux and Courtiol (1973), Ionescu and Monopoli (1977). For an account of these earlier developments see Landau (1979).

The *indirect adaptive control* approach was significantly developed starting with Åström and Wittenmark (1973) where the term “self-tuning” was coined. The resulting scheme corresponded to an adaptive version of the minimum variance discrete-time control. A further development appeared in Clarke and Gawthrop (1975). In fact, the *self-tuning minimum variance controller* and its extensions are a *direct adaptive control* scheme since one estimates directly the parameters of the controller. It took a number of years to understand that discrete-time model reference adaptive control systems and stochastic self-tuning regulators based on minimization of the error variance belong to the same family. See Egardt (1979), Landau (1982a).

Tsytkin (1971) also made a very important contribution to the development and analysis of discrete-time parameter adaptation algorithms.

Despite the continuous research efforts, it was only at the end of the 1970's that full proofs for the stability of discrete-time model reference adaptive control and stochastic self-tuning controllers (under some ideal conditions) became available.

See Goodwin et al. (1980b, 1980a) (for continuous-time adaptive control see Morse 1980; Narendra et al. 1980).

The progress of the adaptive control theory on the one hand and the availability of microcomputers on the other hand led to a series of successful applications of direct adaptive controllers (either deterministic or stochastic) in the late 1970's and early 1980's. However, despite a number of remarkable successes in the same period a number of simple counter-examples have since shown the limitation of these approaches.

On the one hand, the lack of robustness of the original approaches with respect to noise, unmodeled dynamics and disturbances has been emphasized. On the other hand, the experience with the various applications has shown that one of the major assumptions in these schemes (i.e., the plant model is a discrete-time model with stable zeros and a fixed delay) is not a very realistic one (except in special applications). Even successful applications have required a careful selection of the sampling frequency (since fractional delay larger than half of the sampling period generates a discrete-time unstable zero). The industrial experiences and various counter-examples were extremely beneficial for the evolution of the field. A significant research effort has been dedicated to robustness issues and development of robust adaptation algorithms. Egardt (1979), Praly (1983c), Ortega et al. (1985), Ioannou and Kokotovic (1983) are among the basic references. A deeper analysis of the adaptive schemes has also been done in Anderson et al. (1986). An account of the work on robustness of adaptive control covering both continuous and discrete-time adaptive control can be found in Ortega and Tang (1989). For continuous-time only, see also Ioannou and Datta (1989, 1996).

The other important research direction was aimed towards adaptive control of discrete-time models with unstable zeros which led to the development of indirect adaptive control schemes and their analysis. The problems of removing the need of persistence of excitation and of the eventual singularities which may occur when computing a controller based on plant model parameter estimates have been addressed, as well as the robustness issues (see Lozano and Zhao 1994 for details and a list of references). Various underlying linear control strategies have been considered: pole placement (de Larminat 1980 is one of the first references), linear quadratic control (Samson 1982 is the first reference) and generalized predictive control (Clarke et al. 1987). Adaptive versions of pole placement and generalized predictive control are the most popular ones.

The second half of the nineties has seen the emergence of two new approaches to adaptive control. On one hand there is the development of plant model identification in closed loop (Gevers 1993; Van den Hof and Schrama 1995; Landau and Karimi 1997a, 1997b) leading to the strategy called "iterative identification in closed loop and controller redesign" (see Chap. 9). On the other hand the "multiple model adaptive control" emerged as a solution for improving the transients in indirect adaptive control. See Morse (1995), Narendra and Balakrishnan (1997), Karimi and Landau (2000) and Chap. 13.

End of the nineties and beginning of the new century have seen the emergence of a new paradigm: *adaptive regulation*. In this context the plant model is assumed to

be known and invariant and adaptation is considered with respect to the disturbance model which is unknown and time varying (Amara et al. 1999a; Valentinotti 2001; Landau et al. 2005 and Chap. 14). In the mean time it was pointed out that adaptive feedforward compensation of disturbances which for a long time has been considered as an “open-loop” problem has in fact a *hidden feedback* structure bringing this subject in the context of adaptive feedback control. New solutions are emerging, see Jacobson et al. (2001), Zeng and de Callafon (2006), Landau and Alma (2010) and Chap. 15.

1.6 Further Reading

It is not possible in a limited number of pages to cover all the aspects of adaptive control. In what follows we will mention some references on a number of issues not covered by this book.

- Continuous Time Adaptive Control (Ioannou and Sun 1996; Sastry and Bodson 1989; Anderson et al. 1986; Åström and Wittenmark 1995; Landau 1979; Datta 1998)
- Multivariable Systems (Dugard and Dion 1985; Goodwin and Sin 1984; Dion et al. 1988; Garrido-Moctezuma et al. 1993; Mutoh and Ortega 1993; de Mathelin and Bodson 1995)
- Systems with Constrained Inputs (Zhang and Evans 1994; Feng et al. 1994; Chaoui et al. 1996a, 1996b; Sussmann et al. 1994; Suarez et al. 1996; Åström and Wittenmark 1995)
- Input and Output Nonlinearities (Tao and Kokotovic 1996; Pajunen 1992)
- Adaptive Control of Nonlinear Systems (Sastry and Isidori 1989; Marino and Tomei 1995; Krstic et al. 1995; Praly et al. 1991; Lozano and Brogliato 1992a; Brogliato and Lozano 1994; Landau et al. 1987)
- Adaptive Control of Robot Manipulators (Landau 1985; Landau and Horowitz 1988; Slotine and Li 1991; Arimoto and Miyazaki 1984; Ortega and Spong 1989; Nicosia and Tomei 1990; Lozano 1992; Lozano and Brogliato 1992b, 1992c)
- Adaptive Friction Compensation (Gilbart and Winston 1974; Canudas et al. 1995; Armstrong and Amin 1996; Besançon 1997)
- Adaptive Control of Asynchronous Electric Motors (Raumer et al. 1993; Marino et al. 1996; Marino and Tomei 1995; Espinoza-Perez and Ortega 1995)

1.7 Concluding Remarks

In this chapter we have presented a number of concepts and basic adaptive control structures. We wish to emphasize the following basic ideas:

1. Adaptive control provides a set of techniques for automatic adjustment of the controllers in real time in order to achieve or to maintain a desired level of control system performance, when the parameters of the plant model are unknown and/or change in time.

2. While a *conventional feedback control* is primarily oriented toward the elimination of the effect of disturbances acting upon the controlled variables, an *adaptive control system* is mainly oriented toward the elimination of the effect of parameter disturbances upon the performances of the control system.
3. A control system is truly *adaptive* if, in addition to a conventional feedback, it contains a closed-loop control of a certain *performance index*.
4. *Robust control design* is an efficient way to handle known parameter uncertainty in a certain region around a nominal model and it constitutes a good underlying design method for adaptive control, but it is not an *adaptive control system*.
5. *Adaptive control* can improve the performance of a robust control design by providing better information about the nominal model and expanding the uncertainty region for which the desired performances can be guaranteed.
6. One distinguishes adaptive control schemes with *direct* adaptation of the parameters of the controller or with *indirect* adaptation of the parameters of the controller (as a function of the estimates of plant parameters).
7. One distinguishes between adaptive control schemes with non-vanishing adaptation (also called continuous adaptation) and adaptive control schemes with vanishing adaptation. Although in the former, adaptation operates most of the time, in the latter, its effect vanishes in time.
8. The use of adaptive control is based on the assumption that for any possible values of the plant parameters there is a controller with a fixed structure and complexity such that the desired performances can be achieved with appropriate values of the controller parameters. The task of the adaptation loop is to search for the *good* values of the controller parameters.
9. There are two control paradigms: (1) *adaptive control* where the plant model parameters are unknown an time varying while the disturbance model is assumed to be known; and (2) *adaptive regulation* where the plant model is assumed to be known and the model of the disturbance is unknown and time varying.
10. Adaptive control systems are nonlinear time-varying systems and specific tools for analyzing their properties are necessary.



<http://www.springer.com/978-0-85729-663-4>

Adaptive Control

Algorithms, Analysis and Applications

Landau, I.D.; Lozano, R.; M'Saad, M.; Karimi, A.

2011, XXII, 590 p. With online files/update., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-0-85729-663-4