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Abstract - This paper presents characterization methods for a large class of industrial processes using a critical experiment as well as modern methods of design, analysis, optimization and implementation of conventional control algorithms. Special attention is set to the process characterization methods using relay techniques and phase-locked loops in order to form a general process model which serves as a base for adequate controller design. This general process model adequately approximates processes which behaviour can be described with linear mathematical models with finite and infinite degrees of freedom including conventional finite dimension systems, time-delay systems, systems whose behaviour is dominated by a wave and transport problems such as mass and energy transfer, systems described with fractional differential equations etc. Based on characterization, an important accent is also put on the design of PI/PID controller due to their large application in industry which exceeds 93% compared to all the other controllers according to Honeywell’s surveys. In order to illustrate validity of characterization model and effectiveness of presented design method, the paper provides an example of optimal PID controller designed under constraints on robustness and sensitivity to the measurement noise. Digital implementation is considered for both the controllers with rational and those with non-rational transfer functions. At the end, controller analytical design methods are elaborated and analytical formulae for PI/PID controllers tuning are presented.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Characterization of the processes by application of the critical experiment for purpose of tuning a controller is originally suggested by Ziegler and Nichols (ZN) in 1942 [1]. As a result of critical experiment in frequency domain, critical (ultimate) gain \(k_u\) and critical frequency \(\omega_u\) are obtained and used to form an approximate model of the process \(G_{m}^{ZNI}(s) = \exp(-Ls)/(bs)\), and \(G_{m}^{ZNI}(s) = \exp(-Ls)/(bs + \alpha)\) including known \(G_p(0)\). On the basis of these and more complex models, a large number of tuning controller parameters formulae, including ZN rules are developed with a special emphasis on PI/PID controllers. A permanent progress in technology has led to the need for improving control algorithms [2]. This implies better process characterization including optimization design methods of controllers under constraints on performance and robustness of the control system. Need for better process characterization using the original idea, i.e. method of the critical experiment suggested by ZN, is still actual and inspiring for process dynamics estimation regardless if it is performed in the time or in the frequency domain. These two directions in the process characterization through critical experiment under certain conditions imply analysis of the process response in the time domain (the first direction) and in the frequency domain (the second direction) for assumed form of the transfer function of the process model [3-14]. Many of developed methods are referred to uncontrolled process (open-loop system), so their application is limited. Furthermore, the presence of the measurement noise, immeasurable disturbance and limitation on amplitude of critical oscillations also present limited conditions to be faced within the process characterization. Frequency characteristic of the process which is of concern for the process characterization and controller design is in the range \(0.5\omega_n \leq \omega \leq 2.5\omega_n\) including \(G_p(0)\) [3]. In accordance with these conditions, for better process characterization and adequate controller design, an efficient method has been recently reported in [15-25]. In addition to the parameters \(k_u\)
and $\omega_n$, this method proposes to determine the angle (critical angle) of the tangent to the Nyquist curve in critical point ($-1/k_n$, $i0$) using critical experiment. On the basis of estimated parameters, one obtains a general model process

$$G_m^{SM}(s) = \frac{1}{k_n} \frac{A\omega_n}{s^2 + \omega_n^2} \exp(-\tau s),$$  \tag{1}$$

where $\tau = \omega/\omega_n$ and $A = \omega_n k_n G_p(0)/(1 + k_n G_p(0))$ or

$$A \approx \frac{2}{k_n} \left[ \frac{G_p(\omega_n i)}{\omega_n} \right]^{-1}$$

if $G_p(0)$ is unknown. By using this characterization approach, selection of the process model is reduced to the unified model for all processes which satisfy critical experiment. This general model adequately approximates processes which behaviour can be described with linear mathematical models with finite and infinite degrees of freedom, including conventional systems of finite dimension, time-delay systems, systems with dominant wave and transport problems, such as mass and energy transfer, systems described with fractional differential equations etc. A partial drawback of this model occurs for the processes with dominant zeros. Let us emphasize that methods for estimation of parameters $k_n, \omega_n, \tau$ and $A$ of the processes using modified relay critical experiment and modified phase-locked loops [15–24], as well as methods based on the time response to the step excitation [25], can be performed with controlled process (process in the closed-loop with controller) or with the uncontrolled process (process in the open-loop) under certain conditions. Besides, other general identification techniques may be used for process characterization such as ARX (AutoRegressive with eXternal input), ARMA (AutoRegressive Moving Average), ARMAX (AutoRegressive Moving Average with eXogenous inputs), BJ (Box and Jenkins), OE (Output Error) [26–28], etc.

Modern requirements within controller design are usually given in the form of certain optimality criteria with constraints. High-quality automatic control system (ACS) is the one which efficiently suppresses a load disturbance and tracks a desired reference. This problem mostly has two different solutions in terms of control signals which is a disadvantage, because these two problems cannot be considered separately from each other, since they are part of the same system. However, this can be solved with control structures which enable separate design of controller for load disturbance and the controller for reference tracking. Both the subsystems may be formally reduced to the simplified block diagram of ACS shown in Fig. 1.

![Simplified structure block diagram of ACS](image-url)

In the rest of this paper the following notation is used: $G_p(s)$ is the process transfer function, $C(s)$ is controller transfer function, $y_{ref}$ is reference signal, $y$ is output signal, $d$ is load disturbance, and $n$ is measurement noise. Load disturbance is modelled at the input of the process which is emphasized in [29] by Shinskey citing that it is the most frequent case in the industry and $G_d(s)$ is feed forward filter.

The requirements within controller design are usually given in the form of four basic sensitivity functions: sensitivity function $S(s) = 1/(1 + C(s)G_p(s))$, complementary sensitivity function $T(s) = 1 - S(s)$, sensitivity function to the load disturbance $S_d(s) = G_p(s)/(1 + C(s)G_p(s))$ and sensitivity function to the measurement noise $S_n(s) = C(s)/(1 + C(s)G_p(s))$ [30–51]. A measure of robustness can be expressed through functions $S(s)$ and $T(s)$ with the form of their maximum values as $M_s = \max |S(\omega)|$ and $M_p = \max |T(\omega)|$. For stable processes of ACS, $M_s$ should be in range $1.2 \leq M_s \leq 2$, while $M_p$ should be as small as possible thus making system more robust. One of the performance measures is to maximize suppression of the load disturbance and is expressed in the form of function $S_d(s)$. This condition may be expressed equivalently by requiring that integral criterion (the most common choice is IAE (Integral of Absolute Error) [29]) applied to the time response of the sensitivity function $S_d(s)$ with respect to the disturbance $d$ is minimal. Typical test signals of load disturbance are unit step and unit ramp. Besides, the measurement noise can cause large variations of control signal and thereby actuator damage. Therefore, design procedure should take into consideration sensitivity to the measurement noise which can be quantitatively defined as $M_n = \max |S_n(\omega)|$ with aim to have acceptable values [33].

By applying optimization design procedures under constraints on robustness/performance one obtains a controller which may or may not be realizable in his original form. For example, it is common case for complex controllers with fractional differential and integral effect. Solution to this problem may be found in [52–54] where efficient techniques have been recently developed for rational approximations of complex transfer functions, which has made possible an adequate implementation of control algorithms and structures. Due to large application of PI/PID controllers, which exceeds 93% in industry according to Honeywell’s surveys [55] compared to all the other regulators, many modern design methods have been developed in recent years. Thus, on the basis of general process model described with four parameters $k_n, \omega_n, \tau$ and $A$, formulae for PI/PID controller under constraints to previously defined sensitivity functions in terms of adequate robustness/performance have been derived [17, 18].

II. THE APPLICATION OF RELAY TECHNIQUES AND PHASE-LOCKED LOOPS FOR PROCESS CHARACTERIZATION

Since the beginning of the harmonic linearization of nonlinear systems it has been concluded that replacement of the controller $C(s)$ with a conventional two-position relay with symmetric static characteristic in many control loops has led to a self-oscillation mode in the absence of an input signal
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$r$ regardless of the amplitude $\mu$ of the output signal from the relay. If it is assumed that the relay characteristic is without hysteresis, it turns out that $k_s \approx 4\mu/(\pi A_1)$ is valid, where established oscillations have amplitude $A_1$ of the first harmonic with angular frequency $\omega \approx \omega_1$. By using these principles a lot of methods for estimation of process parameters $k_s, \omega_s, G_p(0)$ and corresponding models have been developed [3-10]. Then, methods of the critical experiment based on the PLL (Phase Locked Loop) principle for process characterization have been developed [11, 12], etc. In accordance with these techniques for estimation of model parameters $k_s, \omega_s, \phi$ and $A$ and controller design (control adaptation), certain modifications of the relay experiment and PLLs have been developed [15-24]. The basic schemes of these structures, e.g. for process characterization with control are shown in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3. Block $F$ is realized with cascade connection of adaptive band-pass filters defined with transfer function (2):

$$A_{Fi} = \prod_{n=1}^{m} \frac{\beta_n \omega_n s + \omega_n^2}{\beta_m + \beta_n \omega_n s + \omega_n^2}; \beta_m = 2 \cos(\pi(2m-1)/16) \tag{2}$$

Block denoted with $F_{mod}$ in Fig. 2 presents a modification of AF$1$ filter [19].

The estimation of the angle $\varphi = \arg \left( \frac{\partial G_p(i\omega)}{\partial \omega} \right)$ of the tangent to the Nyquist curve of the process $G_p(i\omega)$ in critical point $(-1/k_u, i0)$ is determined by the formula

$$\varphi \approx \left( \varphi^* + \varphi^- \right)/2 \tag{15},$$

where

$$\varphi^* = \arctan \left( \frac{\rho^* \sin \phi^*}{\rho^* \cos \phi^* - 1} \right), \quad 0 < \varphi^* < 2\pi, \quad \rho^* = \frac{k_u}{k_y^*} \tag{3}$$

for $\theta_{ref} = -\pi + \phi$, $\phi^* = \phi$, $\phi^- = -\phi$, $\phi > 0$, $k_y^* = 1/\left| G_p(i\omega)^* \right|$ as it is shown in Fig. 4.

Let us mention that angle $\varphi$ can be estimated from two close points, i.e. for small angle $\phi$ but because of the small difference between measured parameters ($k_u, k_y^*$), and ($k_u, k_u^*$), measurement uncertainty can be rather large. In order to decrease the measurement uncertainty of parameters $k_u, k_y^*$, great angle $\phi$ should be used. However, this approach leads to large error in the estimation of the angle $\varphi$. Compromise found for adequate estimation of angle $\varphi$ is using three points at Nyquist curve as shown in Fig. 4.

Properties and the working principle of the structure shown in Fig. 3 for estimation of parameter $|G_p(i\omega)|$ and $\omega$, for assigned values $\theta_{ref}$ are particularly analysed in [20].

The estimation of the angle $\varphi = \arg \left( \frac{\partial G_p(i\omega)}{\partial \omega} \right)$ of the tangent to the Nyquist curve of the process $G_p(i\omega)$ in critical point $(-1/k_u, i0)$ is determined by the formula

$$\varphi \approx \left( \varphi^* + \varphi^- \right)/2 \tag{15},$$

where

$$\varphi^* = \arctan \left( \frac{\rho^* \sin \phi^*}{\rho^* \cos \phi^* - 1} \right), \quad 0 < \varphi^* < 2\pi, \quad \rho^* = \frac{k_u}{k_y^*} \tag{3}$$

for $\theta_{ref} = -\pi + \phi$, $\phi^* = \phi$, $\phi^- = -\phi$, $\phi > 0$, $k_y^* = 1/\left| G_p(i\omega)^* \right|$ as it is shown in Fig. 4.

Let us mention that angle $\varphi$ can be estimated from two close points, i.e. for small angle $\phi$ but because of the small difference between measured parameters ($k_u, k_y^*$), and ($k_u, k_u^*$), measurement uncertainty can be rather large. In order to decrease the measurement uncertainty of parameters $k_u, k_y^*$, greater angle $\phi$ should be used. However, this approach leads to large error in the estimation of the angle $\varphi$. Compromise found for adequate estimation of angle $\varphi$ is using three points at Nyquist curve as shown in Fig. 4.
Series of simulations show that suitable angle is $\phi \approx \pi/36$. Estimation of the process parameter $A = \omega_L k_d G_p(0)/(1 + k_d G_p(0))$ in some working regime in the presence of measurement noise and load disturbance [16, 17] can be determined from formula $A = A_0$ where

$$A_0 = \frac{2}{k_u} \left| \frac{d G_p(i \omega)}{d \omega} \right|_{\omega = \omega_L} \approx A^+_0 + A^-_0,$$

ie.

$$A^+_0 = \frac{2|\omega_L - \omega_L^0|}{\sqrt{1 - 2 \rho^2 \cos \theta^* + (\rho^*)^2}}, \quad \rho^* = \frac{k_u}{k_L},$$

for $\phi^* = \phi, \phi^* = -\phi, \phi > 0$ , $k_L^0 = 1/|G_p(i \omega^0)|$ as illustrated in Fig. 4. For integral processes equality $A = \omega_L$ holds true [15]. Since the general model does not require $G_p(0)$, but the estimated parameter $A$, such model is suitable for controller design and process classification [15–23].

Let us note that sensitivity of the parameter $A$ with respect to $k_d G_p(0)$ is small, thus reverse estimation $k_d G_p(0)$ from $A_0$ is not practical (it is unacceptable) because it may cause large deviations. More accurate estimation of parameter $A$ of the process in working regime in presence of measurement noise and load disturbance can be achieved by direct estimation of $k_d G_p(0)$ using another methods, either in the frequency or in the time domain [25]. For example, the estimation of $k_d G_p(0)$ from Nyquist curve $G_p(i \omega)$ at several points for specified values $\theta_L = \arg\{G_p(i \omega_L)\}$, etc. In the case of multiple solution of the equation $\theta_L = \arg\{G_p(i \omega_L)\}$, as well as those solutions with $\arg\{G_p(i \omega_L)\} > 2\pi$, PLL approach requires that frequency of interest is known a priori. Approaches using relay experiment have advantage in that sense, because they give unique solution and experimental procedures are shorter.

For example, Fig. 5 shows Nyquist curves of distributed process described with transfer function $G_p(i \omega)(s) = 1/ \cosh \sqrt{2} s$ and corresponding model $G^{SM}_{m}(s)$, for $k_u = 11.5919$.
\[
G_{p1}^c(s) = \frac{e^{-Ls}}{(s^2 + 0.1s + 1)}, \quad L = 0.5; 1; 2, \\
G_{p21}^r(s) = \frac{e^{-Ls}}{(5s - 1)(2s + 1)(0.5s + 1)}, \quad L = 0.5; 1, \\
G_{p12}^2(s) = \frac{4e^{-Ls}}{4s - 1}, \quad L = 0.5; 1; 2, \quad G_{p12}(s) = 1/\cosh(\sqrt{2}s), \quad G_{p14}(s) = e^{-\varphi}.
\]

Figure 6. Classification of the large class of the processes \(G_{\mu}(s), \mu = 1, 14\) in the parameter \(\rho = \varphi\) parameter plane [18] in the parameter plane.

The classification of processes enables a designer to develop a priori look-up tables and controller structure which can satisfy assigned performance/robustness as well as an ability for adequate adaptation of the control system [15–25].

IV. MODERN CONTROLLER DESIGN METHODS

In order to achieve high-quality ACS with adequate performance and robustness indices it is necessary to efficiently suppress the load disturbance (min(IAE) [29]) and achieve the desired reference tracking under specified conditions on the sensitivity functions \(S, T, S_s\) and [30–51]. Besides these conditions, alternative constraints such as: gain and phase margins, location of dominant poles, settling time, overshoot etc. may be used. In this sense, criterion functions for optimization of controller parameters under specified constraints on sensitivity functions or by using alternative conditions are formed. To do this, specific types of controller should be assumed, and adequate control chosen, whether the design procedure is performed in the time or in the frequency domain. For example, a fractional PID controller (PI\(^\alpha\)D\(^\beta\)) described with transfer function

\[
C(s) = \frac{k + k_1s^\alpha + k_2s^\beta}{(T_s + 1)^\gamma},
\]

may be used, corresponding to the cascade connection of PI\(^\alpha\)D\(^\beta\) controller with fractional compensator \(((bs + 1)/(as + 1))^{\gamma}\).

As it can be seen from (7) and (8), the degree of the controller complexity and number of unknown parameters could make the design of ACS more difficult. This has motivated many researchers to develop new design methods of control algorithms including, at the first place, different optimization algorithms [30-51].

For example, for distributed process \(G_{p1}(s), \) with approximate model \(G_{mi}^{\alpha\beta}(s)\) obtained by some of the characterization methods, optimal PID controller is designed under constraint on \(M = 2\) and \(M = 2k_u\) with control structure shown in Fig. 8.

\[
\beta
\]

Figure 7. Parameter plane of PI\(^\alpha\)D\(^\beta\) controller [56]

In a similar way, fractional PIDC controller (PI\(^\alpha\)D\(^\beta\)C) described with transfer function

\[
C(s) = \frac{k + k_1s^\alpha + k_2s^\beta}{(T_s + 1)^\gamma}
\]

Figure 8. Structure block diagram of ACS with separated differential and proportional gain of PID controller and included elements with integral antiwindup [30-32].

As a result, an efficient suppression of load disturbance and desired reference tracking is achieved shown in Fig. 9, [15, 17, 18, 40], and corresponding control signal is shown in Fig. 10.
A. Digital implementation of control algorithms

Implementation of control systems is nowadays performed in digital domain while controller design may be performed in both, continuous and digital domain. If process and controller are described with rational transfer functions, both of these approaches are equal because of effective transformations from continuous to digital domain without disturbing the quality of the control. If the controller \((6), (7)\) or process is non-rational transfer function, the design is performed in continuous domain and then controller is approximated in continuous or digital domain [52-57]. It is important that rational approximation should include amplitude and phase frequency characteristic of complex controller with minimal deviation in order to preserve quality control. In general, continuous to digital domain transformations are actual whether the design has been performed in the time or in the frequency domain.

![Output signal](image1)

**Figure 9.** Output signal \(y(t)\) of ACS for reference signal \(Y_{ref}(s) = \frac{1}{s}\) and load disturbance \(D(s) = \exp(-4s)/s\)

![Control signal](image2)

**Figure 10.** Control signal \(u(t)\) of ACS for reference signal \(Y_{ref}(s) = \frac{1}{s}\) and load disturbance \(D(s) = \exp(-4s)/s\)

For criterion function in the optimization procedure for PID controller under constraints in frequency domain [18], the proportional gain of controller \((\text{max } k)\) which gives the best compromise in performance/robustness is used [40]. In literature, the integral gain for criterion function \((\text{max } k_i)\) is usually used [31–39]. In general case, optimization procedures in the time domain are more demanding because of process with controller transfer function complexity in ACS and corresponding mapping to the time domain. Integral part of such procedures consists of numerical calculations of inverse Laplace transform and other numerical techniques within optimization procedure. The most common used criterions are IAE or ITAE (Integral of Time-weighted Absolute Error) with respect to the load disturbance input [29]. Also, depending on complexity of controller and optimization procedure, multi-criterion functions under certain constraints are often used.

**TABLE I. APPROXIMATION FORMULAE FOR SOME KNOWN DISCRETIZATION RULES GIVEN IN [52]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(\alpha)</th>
<th>(f(z, \alpha))</th>
<th>Name of approximation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>(\frac{z-1}{T})</td>
<td>Forward-Euler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>(\frac{2}{T} \frac{z-1}{z+1})</td>
<td>Tustin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(\frac{1}{T} \frac{z-1}{z})</td>
<td>Backward-Euler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\alpha)</td>
<td>(\frac{1}{T} \frac{z-1}{1+\alpha(z-1)})</td>
<td>Fractional approximation of the first order</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Without loss of generality, let us consider the controller design performed in continuous domain. If controller transfer function is rational then different numerical approximations such as: Forward-Euler, Backward Euler, Tustin approximation may be used. These approximation methods are indirect methods since they approximate the operator \(s^1\), and may be generalized with fractional approximation of the first order as elaborated in [52]. Approximation formulae for these common discretization rules are given in Table I.

Another possibility to discretize rational transfer function is to use transformation polynomials for \(1/s^n, k=0,\ldots, n\) where \(n\) is the order of the considered continuous transfer function. In this way, discrete transfer function is obtained by replacing \(s^k\) with \(f_k(z)\) from Table II. This approximation method is elaborated in detail in [52].

However, when transfer function is non-rational, then some of rational approximation must be used. Different proposed methods for rational approximation can be found in literature such as: interpolation of frequency characteristic (IFC) [54], ARX-based methods [57], expansions in Taylor series, use of Padé approximation [56] etc. In this way continuous transfer function becomes rational and we can apply some of the abovementioned discretization rules.
TABLE II. APPROXIMATION EQUIVALENTS OF TRANSFORMATION POLYNOMIALS OF S^k FOR k=1,2,3,4,5 GIVEN IN [52]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>k</th>
<th>s^k</th>
<th>f_0(z)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>s^-1</td>
<td>( T \frac{z+1}{2} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>s^-2</td>
<td>( \frac{T^2 z^2 + 10z + 1}{12} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>s^-3</td>
<td>( \frac{T^3 z^3 + (1 + 10z + 1)}{2} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>s^-4</td>
<td>( \frac{T^4 - z^4 + 12z^3 + 47z^2 + 12z - 1}{720} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>s^-5</td>
<td>( \frac{T^5 z^5 + (1 + 10z + 1)}{24} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Analytical design methods of PI/PID controller

The main idea for analytical design methods of PI/PID controllers comes from Ziegler-Nichols in 1942 [1], who were the first to give analytical tuning formulae. From then until now, great number of analytical formulae for tuning PI/PID controller has been developed [2]. Drawbacks of numerical methods for controller design are unknown initial values which on the final solution depends. Modern controller design requirements have led to need for efficient analytical formulae of PI/PID controller due to their large application in industry [58]. Thus, novel general analytical tuning formulae of PI/PID controllers have been developed recently for all processes which satisfy a critical oscillation requirement [17, 18, 22-24].

The basic rule for design of any controller is the efficient suppression of the load disturbance. Considering that \( Y_p(s) = S_p(s)D(s) \) is valid for the structure in Fig. 1 which is equivalent with \( Y_p(s) = (1 - T(s))G_p(s)D(s) \). Ideal case would be if sensitivity function \( S_p(s) \) suppressed load disturbance for all frequencies to zero, i.e. \( T(s) = 1 \), which is not possible. The idea is to choose \( T_i(s) \) on the basis of known process transfer function [17, 51]. In order to design a controller \( C(s) \), the control structure with the controller \( C'(s) \) is introduced in [51] for the equivalent model

\[
G_p'(s) = \frac{A_{0\omega} \exp(-\tau s)}{s^2 + \omega_0^2} \approx \frac{k_G G_p(s)}{1 + k_G G_p(s)}. \tag{9}
\]

Thereby, dynamics of load suppression at the input of \( G_p(s) \) and at the input of \( G_p'(s) \) is equivalent [51].

For model \( G_p'(s) \) complementary sensitivity function is selected in the form:

\[
T_i(s) = \frac{N(s) \exp(-\tau s)}{P(s)}. \tag{9}
\]

where \( N(s) = (\eta_1 s^2 + \eta_2 s + 1) \) and \( P(s) = (\lambda^2 s^2 + 2\zeta\lambda s + 1)^2 \), with \( \lambda > 0 \) is the time constant, \( \zeta > 0 \) is relative damping factor, and \( \eta_1 \) and \( \eta_2 \) are free parameters determined to efficiently suppress the load disturbance.

TABLE III. ANALYTICAL TUNING FORMULAE FOR PARAMETERS OF PI/PID CONTROLLERS FOR GENERAL PROCESS MODEL DEFINED WITH FOUR PARAMETERS \( k_a, \alpha_a, \varphi \) AND \( A \) [17]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General process model</th>
<th>PI controller</th>
<th>PID controller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( G_m^{SM}(s) = \frac{1}{k_a s^2 + \omega_0^2} - \frac{A_{0\omega} \exp(-\tau s)}{A_{0\omega} \exp(-\tau s)} )</td>
<td>( C_{PT}(s) = k + \frac{k_s}{s} )</td>
<td>( C_{PID}(s) = \frac{k_i + k_s + k_i s^2}{s(T_i s + 1)} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_i = a_0 ), ( k = a_1 )</td>
<td>( T_i = \frac{a_2}{(M-a_1)} ), or ( T_i = \lambda / N ), ( N &gt; 2 )</td>
<td>( k_i = a_0 ), ( k = a_1 + a_2 T_i ), ( k_d = a_2 + a_3 T_i )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
a_0 = k_a \beta_1, \quad a_1 = a_2(\eta_2 - \beta_2) + k_a, \quad a_2 = a_0(\eta_2 - \beta_1 + 1/\omega_0^2) - (a_1 - k_a) \beta_2
\]

\[
\beta_1 = \frac{\omega_0}{A(-\eta + \tau + 4\zeta \lambda)}, \quad \beta_2 = \frac{-\eta_a + \tau \eta_a - \tau^2/2 + 2\lambda \zeta^2 + 4\zeta^2 \lambda^2}{-\eta + \tau + 4\zeta \lambda}, \quad \beta_3 = \frac{-\eta_a + \tau \eta_a - \tau^2/2 + \tau^2/6 + 4\zeta \lambda^3}{-\eta + \tau + 4\zeta \lambda}
\]

\[
\eta_1 = \frac{\alpha_1 \sin(\omega_0 \tau) + \alpha_2 \cos(\omega_0 \tau)}{\omega_0}, \quad \eta_2 = \frac{\alpha_1 \sin(\omega_0 \tau) - \alpha_2 \cos(\omega_0 \tau) + 1}{\omega_0^2}, \quad \alpha_1 = \lambda^2 \omega_a^2 - 2\lambda \omega_a^2 (1 + 4\zeta^2) + 1, \quad \alpha_2 = 4\zeta \lambda \omega_a (1 - \lambda^2 \omega_a^2)
\]
Controller $C(s)$ is defined with relation

$$C(s) = \frac{T_1(s)}{1 - T_1(s)G_p(s)},$$

(11)

from where

$$C^*(s) = \frac{1}{A_0} \frac{(s^2 + \omega_0^2)(\eta_1 s^2 + \eta s + 1)}{\lambda\omega_0^2 + 2\zeta\omega_0 + 1 - e^{-\eta}(\eta_2 s^2 + \eta_3 s + 1)}.$$  

(12)

The next step is shaping of dynamic error which can be done by cancelling poles $s_{p1,2} = \pm i\omega_0$ of model $G_p(s)$ with zeros of the following polynomial

$$((\lambda\omega_0^2 + 2\zeta\omega_0 + 1) - e^{-\eta}(\eta_2 s^2 + \eta_3 s + 1))|_{s=\infty} = 0.$$  

(13)

Parameters $\eta_1$ and $\eta_2$ are determined from equation (13).

In this way by selecting free parameter $\lambda$, a designer can adequately suppress the load disturbance without violating other restrictions of ACS.

Parameters of a conventional PID controller in form (7) for $\alpha = \beta = 1$, are obtained by expanding the function

$$f(s) = s(T_1 s + 1)(C^*(s) + 1)k_1,$$

(14)

in Maclaurin series in variable $s$ using the first three members of expansion, i.e.

$$f(s) \approx f(0) + f'(0)s + 0.5f''(0)s^2.$$  

Parameters of PID controller are connected with coefficients of Maclaurin expansion through relations

$$k_1 = f(0), \quad k = f'(0), \quad k_2 = f''(0)/2.$$  

(15)

Filter time constant is defined with $T_f = \frac{\text{sign}(k_2)k_3}{M_n}$, which is determined from equation

$$2T_f M_n - \text{sign}(k_2)f'(0) = 0.$$  

(16)

Values of $T_f$ and other parameters of PID controllers for all processes which satisfy condition of critical oscillations are given in Table III. Analogous approach is used to obtain parameters of PI controller which analytical formulae are also given in Table III. This methodology is successfully applicable and up-to-date for design of complex controllers and control structures.

V. CONCLUSION

Synthesis of an automatic control system (ACS) starts from the process model, thus this paper presents a general model $G_m(s)$ for all processes which satisfy critical experiment. The general model is defined with four parameters $k_*, \omega_0, \phi$ and $A_0$ which are determined using one of characterization methods e.g. relay techniques and phase-locked loops as the most popular ones. Besides, large class of processes can be classified in $p - \phi$ parameter plane, from where parameters of PID controller are directly obtained for specified $M_i$ and $M_a$, from look-up tables on the basis of previously defined design procedure. The aim of ACS is to suitably select criterion function for optimization of controller under specified constraints on sensitivity functions $S, T, S_i$ and $S_0$ and achieve efficient suppression of load disturbance and adequate indices of robustness and performance. At the end of the paper, analytical tuning formulae of PI/PID controllers are presented because of their dominant use in process industry.
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