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Abstract: This paper deals with robust low-order controller design for a medium-scale pilot reactive distillation column. In the first step, a linear model of the column which is identified from experiments is used to compute the attainable control performance. In this step, actuator limitations and model uncertainty resulting from a priori knowledge as well as confidence intervals provided by the identification procedure are considered. In the second step, the result of the optimal control performance computation is employed in a frequency response approximation scheme to generate a low-order controller. Finally, the synthesised controller is validated at the reactive distillation column.
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1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, integrated reactive separation processes have attracted considerable attention in both academic research and industrial applications. In this paper, the operation of a pilot plant scale reactive distillation column operated at the Universität Dortmund is studied. The process exhibits input multiplicities such that, when applying linear control, tight constraints must be adhered to in order to avoid sign changes of the process gains. To fulfil these constraints and to operate the plant efficiently, an examination of potential control approaches was performed. In previous work (Völker (2002)), a control structure was identified which provides good performance with respect to the rejection of disturbances. It was shown by simulation of a rigorous nonlinear plant model that linear control is possible in the vicinity of the nominal operating point which was determined by dynamic optimisation (Fernholz et al. (1999)). A controller that is implemented on the real pilot plant has to satisfy a set of constraints and design specifications such as minimising the control error while keeping bounds on actuator ranges and robust stability. These specifications are met here by using a two-step procedure: In the first step, a high-order multiobjective controller is designed which satisfies the specifications, while in a second step, low-order controllers are synthesized by an order reduction scheme such that the specifications are also met for the reduced controller. In the first step, we follow the lines of Boyd and Barrat (1991); Sznaier et al. (2000); Scherer (1995); Hindi et al. (1998) using finite dimensional Q-parametrisation where reduced conservatism is bought at the expense of computational complexity. In our approach, for increased flexibility, the optimisation is not performed in the state space but employing point-wise matrix descriptions in the time and in the frequency domain as described in Webers and Engell (1996b). The point-
wise approach requires some engineering judgement in choosing the gridding parameters, but, on the other hand, many different performance objectives such as e. g. actuator saturation, overshoot constraints, steady-state accuracy, and arbitrary trajectories of the external inputs etc. (see Webers and Engell (1996b,a); Webers (1997b)) can be handled. Furthermore, it is amenable to intrinsically point-wise constraint descriptions such as e. g. uncertainty bounds resulting from the asymptotic theory of identification (see e. g. Zhu (1989)) which renders it attractive from a practical point of view.

For the design process in the case of the reactive distillation column, the reduced-order controller meets its low order, renders the control scheme practically applicable. The remainder of the paper is organised as follows. We first briefly review the performance optimisation in which, besides robustness, also process constraints such as actuator saturation are imposed. In a second step, a low-order controller is obtained by means of system identification. An unstructured uncertainty description is developed combining the model invalidation method described in Poolla et al. (1994) and heuristic knowledge about the process behaviour. This uncertainty description is then used to set up a multiobjective performance optimisation in which, besides robustness, also process constraints such as actuator saturation are imposed. In the course of the paper, frequent use is made of the following operators which can be applied to frequency- or time-dependent matrices $X$.

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{transpose} & \quad T, \\
\text{complex conjugate transpose} & \quad H, \\
\text{stacking operator} & \quad \text{col}, \\
\text{Kronecker operator} & \quad \otimes, \\
\end{align*} \]

\[ \text{col}(X) := \begin{bmatrix} X_{11} & X_{21} & \ldots & X_{m1} & X_{12} & \ldots & X_{m2} & \ldots & X_{mn} \end{bmatrix}^T, \]

\[ X \otimes Y := \begin{bmatrix} X_{11} \cdot Y & X_{12} \cdot Y & \ldots & X_{1n} \cdot Y \\ X_{21} \cdot Y & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ X_{m1} \cdot Y & \cdot & \cdot & X_{mn} \cdot Y \end{bmatrix}, \]

2. COMPUTATION OF THE OPTIMAL CONTROL PERFORMANCE

2.1 Multiobjective Specifications

The interaction of a linear time invariant plant with a controller $K(s)$ and the relation of the external inputs $w$ to the external outputs $z$ are described by introducing a generalised plant $P(s)$ which is shown in Fig. 1. Here, $u$ denotes the outputs of the controller, and $v$ denotes the inputs of the controller. The relationship between $w$ and $z$, including the controller, is then given by the linear fractional transformation $T_{zw} := P_{11} + P_{12}K(I - P_{22}K)^{-1}P_{21}$. We consider three different types of performance specifications:

- $w_2, z_2$: This performance channel is used in the objective function. Several different objectives can be combined. We will formulate a finite horizon integral squared error problem in the time domain

\[ ||T_{zw}|_{2,t} := \int_0^{t_{end}} \text{foh} \{ z_2^T(t)z_2(t) \} \, dt, \]

where $\text{foh}$ denotes first order hold approximation and $w_2$ is specified a priori.

- $w_1, z_1$: This channel is used to impose limitations

\[ \max_{\forall t \in \text{t}_{\text{spec}}} |z_1(t)| \leq \gamma_1 \quad \forall \, t \in \text{t}_{\text{spec}}, \]

with respect to a set of predefined signals $w_1$ and an arbitrary time window $t_{\text{spec}}$. These constraints include steady-state accuracy, actuator saturation avoidance (e. g. in an impulse-to-peak sense), constraints on the maximum overshoot, just to mention a few (see Webers and Engell (1996b) for more details).

- $w_{\infty}, z_{\infty}$: This channel is used to enforce robustness constraints of the form

\[ \max_{\omega \in \Omega} ||T_{zw_{\infty}}(j\omega)\Delta(j\omega)||_{2} \leq \gamma_{\infty}, \]

where $\Omega$ is a set of frequency points, $s_2$ denotes the induced 2-norm and $I_{\Delta}$ is an uncertainty weighting matrix.

2.2 Finite Dimensional Q-Parametrisation

Using the well-known Youla parametrisation (Youla et al. (1976)), any relationship between the external...
signals \( w(s) \) and the external outputs \( z(s) \) which is attainable by a stabilising controller can be described as
\[
T_{zu}(s) = T_{11}(s) + T_{12}(s) \cdot Q(s) \cdot T_{21}(s),
\]
for some \( Q \in \mathcal{H}_\infty \); all such \( Q \) yield an internally stable closed-loop system. Eq. (6) is a complete and convex description of all possible closed-loop systems. To compute the optimal control performance, the Youla parameter \( Q(s) \) must be parameterised by a finite number of parameters. The usual approach is to represent \( Q \) by a finite series in terms of suitable fixed transfer matrices \( q_i(s) \) and variable coefficients \( x_i \). In the general multivariate case, a finite dimensional \( Q \) can be written as
\[
col(\hat{Q}(s, x)) := I_{n_1 \times n_0} \otimes q^T(s) \cdot x,
\]
with
\[
q^T(s) := [q_0(s) \ldots q_{n_1-1}(s)]
\]
as any appropriate basis of \( \mathcal{H}_\infty \) for \( n_0 \to \infty \).

### 2.3 Finite Horizon and Gridding

The closed-loop relationship (6) can be reformulated to avoid time consuming computations during the optimisation (Webers (1997a)). In the frequency domain, the closed-loop relationship (6) is formulated point-wise as an affine function of the optimisation vector \( x \):
\[
col(T_{zu}(j\omega, x)) = T_A(j\omega) + T_B(j\omega) \cdot x,
\]
\[\omega \in \Omega = [\omega_1 \ldots \omega_n].\]

In the time domain, the reaction of the closed loop to the \( j \)th external input \( w_j \) is given as an affine function of the optimisation vector \( x \):
\[
z_{wj}(t, x) = T_{Awj}(t) + T_{Bwj}(t) \cdot x,
\]
\[t \in \tau = [t_1 \ldots t_{n_1}].\]

Eqs. (9) and (10) give a complete and affine description of all possible closed-loop systems with respect to the optimisation vector \( x \).

### 2.4 Formulation as an Optimisation Problem

Using the point-wise description (10), the integral squared error objective (3) is mapped to a quadratic optimisation problem (Pegel and Engell (2000)):
\[
\min_x \frac{1}{2} \cdot x^T \cdot H \cdot x + c^T \cdot x.
\]
\[:= \Phi(x)\]

The constraints (4) are mapped to a set of linear constraints:
\[A \cdot x \leq b.\]

The constraints (5) are evaluated by a new method of solving a sequence of optimisation problems (11), see Völker and Engell (2004, 2005). Since the multiobjective performance calculation described above is based on a finite dimensional \( Q \)-parametrisation, it usually yields high-order controllers which leads to the necessity of controller reduction.

### 3. FREQUENCY RESPONSE APPROXIMATION

The main idea of the frequency response approximation scheme is that the closed loop containing the low-order controller should behave like the closed loop containing the high-order controller. It was shown in Engell (1988) that this goal can be adequately addressed if the difference between the closed loops is described by the Frobenius norm of its frequency response. For simple controllers, this leads to the minimisation of a convex optimisation functional where stability of the approximated loop can be formulated as an optimisation constraint. Let \( T_{0b}(j\omega) \) be the frequency response of the ideal complementary sensitivity function resulting from the control performance optimisation corresponding to a high-order controller \( K_0(j\omega) \), not necessarily the one presented in this paper. Let \( G(j\omega) \) and \( K(j\omega) \) denote the frequency responses of the plant and the approximated controller. Then it follows from straightforward manipulations that the difference between the approximated complementary sensitivity \( T \) and the ideal \( T_0 \), where we for clarity omit the frequency argument \( (j\omega) \) from here on, satisfies:
\[
\Delta_T := G \cdot (I + G) \cdot K \cdot S_0^{-1} - T_0
= S \cdot (G-K \cdot K_0) \cdot S_0
= S \cdot G \cdot (K-K_0) \cdot S_0,
\]
where we have additionally used the sensitivity functions, \( S_0 \) and \( S \), which fulfil \( S_0 + T_0 = S + T = I \). In contrast to Engell and Müller (1991), no exact minimisation of \( \| \Delta_T \|_{Fro} \) is performed. Instead, we approximate \( S \approx S_0 \) which is reasonable if the reduced-order controller achieves \( T \approx T_0 \approx S \approx S_0 \). Then, (13) becomes affine in \( K \). If \( K \) is chosen to be affine in an optimisation parameter \( x \), e. g. by
\[
col(K) := I_{n_1 \times n_0} \otimes [k_1(s) \ldots k_{n_1}(s)] \cdot x,
\]
the Frobenius norm of the approximation error can be written as:
\[
\| \Delta_T \|^2_{Fro} = \| W_u \cdot \Delta_K \cdot W_y \|^2_{Fro},
= \| \col(W_y K_0 W_y) - \col(W_y K_0 W_y) \|^2
= \| W_y^T \otimes W_u \cdot I_{n_0 \times n_0} \otimes K^T \cdot x
\]
\[:= A \]
\[:= B \]
\[\| W_y^T \otimes W_u \cdot \col(K_0) \|^2 \]
2 We recover \( K_0 \) from a linear fractional transformation of the stabilising Youla observer and \( Q \) (see e. g. Zhou (1998)).


operating point by means of nonlinear optimisation of the productivity using a rigorous nonlinear model (Fernholz et al. (1999)). During the optimisation, constraints ensuring a minimum conversion of acetic acid were added.

4.2 Control Structure Selection

Due to the semi-batch mode of operation, the process does not reach a steady state. For the investigation of the process operability, the quasi-stationary process gains were investigated. To this end, the reaction of potential controlled variables at the end of reasonably long periods where the degrees of freedom were held constant was analysed using a rigorous nonlinear process model. These quasi-stationary diagrams showed that the process exhibits multiple changes of sign with respect to the manipulated variables reflux ratio and acetic acid feed and the heat flow to the reboiler. As was shown in several rigorous simulation studies during which the robustness against typical uncertainty scenarios was checked (see Fernholz et al. (1999); Völker (2002); Sonntag (2004)), the process model can be controlled efficiently at its nominal operating point by a linear control law, if a control structure is chosen that employs as controlled variables (CVs) the liquid phase compositions in the reflux $x_{\text{MeAc}} \text{[mole/mole]}$ and $x_{\text{H}_2\text{O}} \text{[mole/mole]}$ which are measured online by near-infrared (NIR) spectroscopy. In Völker (2002), optimal linear control performance calculation, rigorous nonlinear simulation, and a priori process knowledge were used to corroborate these results. For this control structure, the next step was to design a robust linear controller for the nonlinear mapping $G$:

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
    y_1(x_{\text{MeAc}}) \\
    y_2(x_{\text{H}_2\text{O}})
\end{bmatrix} = G \begin{bmatrix}
    u_1(\text{reflux ratio}) \\
    u_2(\text{feed})
\end{bmatrix},
$$

based on an identified linear model and a description of model uncertainties that remained due to the nonlinear and time-varying process behaviour.

4.3 Identification for Control of a Linear Process Model

On 2004-09-09, an identification experiment was conducted at the real plant during which the process was excited with generalised binary noise signals (see Tulleken (1990)) in an identification region depicted by the gray surfaces in Fig. 3. This figure shows the quasi-stationary behaviour of the controlled variables as a function of the reflux ratio and the feed recorded by simulation of the nonlinear model. A slightly suboptimal operating point, as indicated by the crosses in Fig. 3, was chosen to reduce the risk of gain changes, while the nominally optimal operating conditions were maintained approximately. After the com-

---

3 Here defined as the ratio $\frac{H}{D}$ in the interval $[0, 1]$, see Fig. 2.

4 The general methodology was e. g. presented in Engell et al. (2004).
Fig. 3. Stationary characteristic diagrams of the CVs (heat flow = 3.667 kW).

pensation of time delays, the mean value of the data sets was removed. Scaling of the data was performed according to \( y_s = Ly \) and \( u_s = R^{-1}u \), where the input scaling matrix \( R \) was chosen to represent the identification excitation while the output scaling matrix \( L \) represents the control goal. The matrices are given by:

\[
L = \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 0.06 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0.03
\end{pmatrix}, \quad R = \begin{pmatrix}
0.05 & 0 \\
0 & 0.005
\end{pmatrix}.
\] (18)

In order to reduce the effect of slow drifts on the estimated model, the input and output data was highpass-filtered using a fourth-order lead element \( G_F \) given by \( G_F = \frac{s+3.162 \cdot 10^{-7}}{s+3.162 \cdot 10^{-10}} \), which provides a stopband attenuation of 80 dB. Model estimation was performed employing an estimation algorithm based on orthonormal basis functions (Van Den Hof et al. (1995)). The order of the estimated model was determined using the Final Output Error criterion described in Zhu (2001). Since the estimated model is of high order, model reduction using frequency response approximation was employed. In this step, in order to emphasise the estimated crossover frequency of the closed loop (roughly at \( 10^{-3} \) rad/sec), a weight \( G_W(s) = 0.005 \frac{s+1.581 \cdot 10^{-4}}{s+0.005} \) was used which represents a lead element in series with a first-order delay element.

Fig. 4 depicts a comparison of the identification data and the outputs of the estimated (unscaled) model into which, for simulation purposes, the estimated time delay was incorporated using a standard zero-order-hold transform of Pade’s approximation. The continuous-time version of the corresponding transfer function of the identified system (time unit is seconds) mapping changes in the reflux ratio and the acetic acid feed to changes in the mole fractions \( x_{MeAc} \) and \( x_{H_2O} \) around the nominal operating point is given by:

\[
G_{11}(s) = -0.0026 \frac{(s - 0.0105)(s - 6.73 \cdot 10^{-6})}{(s + 0.0118)(s + 0.0025)(s + 4.46 \cdot 10^{-5})}
\]

\[
G_{12}(s) = -0.0070 \frac{(s - 0.0105)(s + 0.0012)}{(s + 0.0118)(s^2 + 0.010s + 8.28 \cdot 10^{-7})}
\]

\[
G_{21}(s) = 0.0011 \frac{(s + 0.0483)(s - 0.0105)}{(s + 0.0188)(s + 0.0118)(s + 0.0030)}
\]

\[
G_{22}(s) = -0.0011 \frac{(s - 0.0105)(s + 0.0012)}{(s + 0.0118)(s^2 + 0.0011s + 5.39 \cdot 10^{-7})}
\] (19)

Fig. 4 shows that the time-varying and nonlinear process cannot be completely represented by the linear model. Hence, plant-model mismatch must be accounted for when designing the controller. To this end, an invalidation scheme (see Poolla et al. (1994)) was used to derive robustness bounds using the identification data set. In this approach, also potential nonlinearities are considered. Since the identified time delay can also vary due to fluctuations in the heat flow, and it is not possible to identify it with high accuracy from the data set, we used the formula given by Lundström (1994) to account for uncertain time delays of up to 170 sec. The output-multiplicative uncertainty weight \( I_\Delta (\|\Delta\|_2 < 1) \) resulting from the superposition of invalidation and time delay boundaries is shown in Fig. 5.

### 4.4 Control Performance Calculation

Fig. 5. Output-multiplicative uncertainty as a result of the identification scheme.

For the optimisation, we used the generalised plant setup as depicted in Fig. 6, where we employed the
transfer function scaled according to (18). In the objective function, the integral squared control error $e(t)$ to unit steps in the setpoints $r(t)$ is considered. Since we end up with Hessian matrices for each reference-control-error pair which can be superimposed in the optimisation, it is possible to weight the coupling, i.e. the reaction of $c_j$ to $r_i$ for $i \neq j$ less than setpoint tracking ($i = j$). In the context of the reactive distillation column example, the weighting of the coupling was smaller than that of the setpoint tracking by a factor of 2, since disturbance rejection rather than decoupled setpoint tracking was desired. The uncertainties (see Fig. 5) were given in output-multiplicative form such that, with $T_{z\infty}w_{\infty}$ being equal to the negative setpoint-to-output complementary sensitivity ($r \rightarrow y$, Fig. 6), the condition for robust stability is given by:

$$
\|T_{z\infty}w_{\infty}(j\omega)\Delta(j\omega)\|_{\infty} < 1 \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega. 
$$

We also imposed actuator saturation constraints on the manipulated variables, i.e. we specified

$$
|z_i(t)| < \gamma_l \quad \forall t \in t_l = t,
$$

where $z_i = u$ in Fig. 6 and $\gamma_l = 2$. The multiobjective performance computation parameters are summarised in Tab. 1.

![Fig. 6. Generalised plant for multiobjective design.](image)

Table 1. Parameters used in the computation of the optimal control performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis functions</th>
<th>$q^\top = \begin{bmatrix} 1 &amp; \omega_1 &amp; \omega_2 &amp; \cdots &amp; \omega_{n_b-2} \end{bmatrix}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_1 = 10^{-6}; \omega_{n_b-2} = 0.1; n_b = 16$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time discretisation</td>
<td>$t = [t_1 \ldots t_{n_t}]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_1 = 0; t_{n_t} = 30000$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency discretisation</td>
<td>$\Omega = [\omega_1 \ldots \omega_{n_b}]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_1 = 10^{-4}; \omega_{n_b} = 0.1; n_b = 50$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symmetric actuator saturation</td>
<td>$|u|_{\text{max}} \leq 2 \forall t \in t_l = t$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The resulting controller $K_0$ is of 72nd order. This controller was subsequently used in the frequency response approximation scheme outlined in section 3. The final unscaled reduced-order PI-controller is given by:

$$
K(s) = \begin{bmatrix} 0.2168 (s + 0.0015) & -0.9493 (s + 0.0016) \\ 0.1223 (s + 0.0010) & -0.0058 (s + 0.0013) \end{bmatrix}. 
$$

The comparison of the high- and low-order controllers on a setpoint step scenario for the identified linear model is depicted in Fig. 7. It can be seen in Figs. 7 and 8 that the reduced-order controller also satisfies the robustness constraint, the actuator saturation constraint, and that its nominal performance is similar to that of the high-order controller.

![Fig. 7. Closed-loop step responses with optimal control performance controller (ocp) and reduced-order PI controller (red), all variables scaled according to (18).](image)

![Fig. 8. Robustness constraints with optimal control performance controller (ocp) and reduced-order PI controller (red).](image)

### 4.5 Controller Validation at the Pilot Plant

The reduced-order controller was implemented at the real experimental plant and tested at a setpoint change and disturbance scenario. Fig. 9 shows the main variables of the disturbance scenario. When the controller was activated after 2.15 hours, it could settle until, after 3.2 hours, a setpoint change was applied to drive the process to a more efficient mode of operation (see...
Fig. 3). After 4.4 hours, the heat flow to the reboiler was increased to about 4.8 kW using a simple auxiliary control loop which controls the heat flow using an electrical heating system (see Fig. 9 (f)). This increase in the heat flow represents a large disturbance to nominal process operation. Finally, after 6.8 hours, the feed temperature was decreased by switching off the corresponding heating facility (Fig. 9 (g)). The reduced-order controller is capable of coping with the setpoint change and the large increase in the heat flow while it can not completely compensate the disturbance in the feed temperature. This can be attributed to the lack of methanol in the reboiler towards the end of a batch run (see Figs. 9 (e), (f), and (h)) which cannot be completely counteracted by the reduction of the acetic acid feed flow. After 10.5 hours, the controller had to be switched off due to depletion of the methanol supply in the reboiler.

Finally, the controller was validated on the experimental plant twice. Both experiments showed that the controller as a specification for designing a low-order controller performs well, for large setpoint changes and in the face of process disturbances which in open-loop operation would have driven the process far away from its specified operating regime. In future work, the setpoint scenario data presented in Fig. 10 will be used for closed-loop identification.

5. CONCLUSION

We have shown how to design a multiobjective linear high-order controller by means of finite dimensional Q-parametrisation and the point-wise evaluation of the objective function as well as the constraints for the example of a reactive distillation column. The flexibility offered by this approach facilitates the consideration of practical objectives such as e. g. actuator saturation, especially when there are reasons to evaluate such criteria only on a finite horizon as is mandatory for the presented example, because the batch characteristics of the process can not be removed completely by filtering and model reduction. Additionally, the approach was used to handle the issue of robust stability. Generally, in our approach, the only source of conservatism is introduced by the finite dimensional Q-parametrisation which can be traded off against high controller orders. The controller order is not a problem, since we used the optimal high-order controller as a specification for designing a low-order controller which also fulfills the robust stability and actuator saturation specifications and only leads to a slight increase of coupling in the controlled variables. Finally, the controller was validated on the experimental plant twice. Both experiments showed that the controller performs well, for large setpoint changes and in the face of process disturbances which in open-loop operation would have driven the process far away from its specified operating regime. In future work, the setpoint scenario data presented in Fig. 10 will be used for closed-loop identification.
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