PI Tuning of A Multivariable Activated Sludge Process with Nitrification and Denitrification with Multi-Objective Optimization

Gilberto Reynoso-Meza [1],* and Elizabeth Pauline Carreño-Alvarado [2]

[1] Industrial and Systems Engineering Graduate Program (PPGEPS), Pontificia Universidade Católica do Paraná (PUCPR), Curitiba, Brazil

[2] Grupo FluIng-IMM Universitat Politècnica de València. Camino de Vera s/n Edif 5C, C.P. 46022 Valencia, España; elcaral@upv.es

* Correspondence: g.reynosomeza@pucpr.br; Tel.: +55-41-3271-2579

Abstract: Wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) are responsible of attenuating the environmental impact that waste in effluent discharged to receiving waters has. As a consequence of this, new techniques for an effective control are valuable, not just for minimising this impact, but also for minimising operational costs using efficiently the energy usage. Such kind of problems, with several objectives to fulfil (and usually in conflict) are termed as multi-objective problems. Within this context, multi-objective optimisation techniques have shown to be a valuable tool in the control engineering field to tune different kinds of controllers for complex systems. To accomplish this, a simultaneous optimisation approach is carried on, in order to approximate a set of Pareto-optimal solutions. Such solutions differ in the level of trade-off exhibited in two (or more) conflicting objectives. The multi-objective approach for controller tuning in one-input/one-output processess is well documented in the literature. Nevertheless, that is not the case of multivariable control. This fact is mainly due to the quantity of design objectives required to evaluate the multi-objective performance of several outputs. In this work we elaborate a proposal to handle multi-objective problems for multivariable processes. Performance evaluation is performed (via simulation) in a multivariable benchmark for the PI control of an activated sludge process with nitrification and denitrification.

1. Introduction

Wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) are responsible of attenuating the environmental impact that waste in effluent discharged to receiving waters has. As a consequence of this, new techniques for an effective control are valuable, not just for minimising this impact, but also for minimising operational costs using efficiently the energy usage [1, 2]. Such kind of problems, with several objectives to fulfil (and usually in conflict) are termed as multi-objective problems (MOPs) [3].

Within this context, multi-objective optimisation (MOO) techniques have shown to be a valuable tool in the control engineering field to tune different kinds of controllers for complex systems [4]. To accomplish this, a simultaneous optimisation approach is carried on, in order to approximate a set of Pareto-optimal solutions. Such solutions differ in the level of trade-off exhibited in two (or more) conflicting objectives.

The multi-objective approach for controller tuning in one-input/one-output processess is well documented in the literature [5]. Nevertheless, that is not the case of multivariable control. This fact is mainly due to the quantity of design objectives required to evaluate the multi-objective performance of several outputs. In this work we elaborate a proposal to handle multi-objective problems for multivariable processes based on thw works of [6] and [7]. In the former, a basic MOP

was stated, merging design objectives without losing the philosophy behindmulti-objective optimisation design; in the latter, an aggregation using physical programming [8] was used. In both instances, case studies under consideration were two-inputs two outputs processes, where the number of desing objectves was manegable. In this paper we introduce a proposal for the general case in multivariable processes.

The proposal will be evaluated (via simulation) in a multivariable benchmark for the PI control of an activated sludge process with nitrification and denitrification [1]. The controller must maintain the DO levels in three aerobic tanks (DO3, DO4 and DO5) by manipulation of oxygen transfer coefficients (KLa2, KLa3 and KLa4).

2. Results

A decentralized PI controller is tuned. As a reference controller a full multivariable PI controller is used. This will allow a comparison in the achivable performance with a less complex control structure. The stated MOP has 3 desing objectives: performance (IAE), control action (TV) and robustness for individual loops (Im/Re reatio of the dominant root of the characteristic polynomial) respectively. The approximated Pareto front is depicted in Figure 1.


Figure 1. Pareto front approximation for the multiobjective problem stated.

3. Discussion

Afeter a multicriteria decision making step, a PI controller has been selected. Time response of this controller is compared with the one of the reference controller (Figure 2) . As it can be noticed, main difference in performance appears with DO3 control. This means that it was possible to have a performance improvement DO3, more control action, but with a simpler structure. Control action has not overshoot or oscilations.

Figure 2. Time response of the selected PI controller (solid line) and the PI reference controller (dashed line).

4. Materials and Methods

4.1. Multi-objective optimization design

A basic multi-objective problem (MOP) with m objectives, can be stated as follows:

$$\min \boldsymbol{J}(\boldsymbol{x}) = [J_1(\boldsymbol{x}), \dots, J_m(\boldsymbol{x})] \tag{1}$$

subject to:

$$\underline{x_i} \leq x_i \leq \overline{x_i}, i = [1, \dots, n] \tag{2}$$

where $\boldsymbol{x} = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$ is defined as the decision vector with $\dim(\boldsymbol{x}) = n$; $\boldsymbol{J}(\boldsymbol{x})$ as the objective vector; $\underline{x_i}, \overline{x_i}$ are the lower and the upper bounds in the decision space. It has been noticed that there is not a single solution in MOPs, because there is not generally a better solution in all the objectives. Therefore, a set of solutions, the Pareto set, is defined. Each solution in the Pareto set defines an objective vector in the Pareto front. All the solutions in the Pareto front are a set of Pareto optimal and non-dominated solutions.

A multi-objective optimization design procedure (MOOD) is used, as described in [7]. It has three main steps:

1. Multi-objective optimization problem: design objectives are stated, as well as decision variables. In this case, decision variables are the tuning parameters of a given controller. Design objectives are related with the expected performance of the control loop.

2. Multi-objective Optimization Process: that is, approximating the Pareto front. For this purpose, the sp-MODEx algorithm. It is used due to its performance for controller tuning applications [7].

3. Multi-criteria Decision Making stage: a given solution is selected, after and analysis of the approximated Pareto front. For this purpose, a simple 3D plots is used.

4.2. Process description

The process is described in [1]. It was implemented in SIMULINK © and the optimization scripts in MATLAB©.

4.3. Multiobjective problem statement

In this work we elaborate a proposal to handle multi-objective problems for multivariable processes based on thw works of [6] and [7] using Physical Programming [8] as aggregate function.

5. Conclusions

As it was shown, the MOP using as design objectives GPP was useful in order to keep interpretability and manegability in the MOP. Future work will focus in bringing design objectives forload rejection and noise sensitibility.

Author Contributions: GRM and EPCA conceived and designed the experiments; GRM performed the experiments; GRM and EPCA analyzed the data; GRM wrote the paper.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used in this manuscript:

MOO: Multi-objective optimization.
MOP: Muti-objective problem.
MCDM: Multi-criteria decision making.
MOOD: Multi-objective optimization design.

References

1. Wahab, N. A., Katebi, R., & Balderud, J. (2009). Multivariable PID control design for activated sludge process with nitrification and denitrification. *Biochemical Engineering Journal*, *45*(3), 239-248.
2. Reynoso-Meza, G., Alves Ribeiro, V., & Carreño-Alvarado, E. (2017). A comparison of preference handling techniques in multi-objective optimisation for water distribution systems. *Water, 9*(12), 996.
3. Kaiser, M. J., & Miettinen, K. M. (2001). Nonlinear multiobjective optimization.
4. Reynoso-Meza, G., Blasco, X., Sanchis, J., & Martínez, M. (2014). Controller tuning using evolutionary multi-objective optimisation: current trends and applications. *Control Engineering Practice*, 28, 58-73.
5. Meza, G. R., Ferragud, X. B., Saez, J. S., & Durá, J. M. H. (2016). Controller Tuning with Evolutionary Multiobjective Optimization: A Holistic Multiobjective Optimization Design Procedure (Vol. 85). Springer.

6. Reynoso-Meza, G., Garcia-Nieto, S., Sanchis, J., & Blasco, F. X. (2012). Controller tuning by means of multi-objective optimization algorithms: A global tuning framework. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, *21*(2), 445-458.

7. Reynoso-Meza, G., Sanchis, J., Blasco, X., & Martínez, M. (2016). Preference driven multi-objective optimization design procedure for industrial controller tuning. *Information Sciences*, *339*, 108-131.

8. Messac, A. (1996). Physical programming-effective optimization for computational design. *AIAA journal*, *34*(1), 149-158.