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Abstract—A peak-seeking control method is presented which utilizes a linear time-varying Kalman filter. Performance function coordinate and magnitude measurements are used by the Kalman filter to estimate the gradient and Hessian of the performance function. The gradient and Hessian are used to command the system toward a local extremum. The method is naturally applied to multiple-input multiple-output systems. Applications of this technique to a single-input single-output example and a two-input one-output example are presented.

I. INTRODUCTION

Peak-seeking control, also referred to as extremum-seeking control, is concerned with on-line optimization across an unknown performance function of some physical system or process. Given noisy coordinate and magnitude measurements of the performance function, it attempts to move a plant to a local extremum. It has been studied in relation to many applications, such as formation flight for drag reduction [1], bio-reactors [2], and axial-flow compressor [3].

Peak-seeking control has gained much attention in the 1950s and 1960s [4], [5], [6], [7] but interest in this field declined in the 1970s and 1980s. It has since had a resurgence of attention in the past 15 years [2], [8], [9].

In general, peak-seeking control methods can be divided into three categories: classical-gradient methods, parametric methods, and nonlinear methods. The classical-gradient methods estimate the performance function gradient using classical-control techniques and move the system accordingly [10]. Parametric methods parameterize the performance function to estimate the extremum position and move the system accordingly [11]. Nonlinear methods utilize nonlinear control techniques such as adaptive control and numerical optimization with line searches to estimate the gradient and move the system toward the extremum [11], [9].

The earliest work used classical-gradient methods partly due to ease of implementation in analog devices and the lack of inexpensive digital computers. The classical-gradient methods have recently been further developed in work by Ariyur [12], Krstic [13], and others who have developed a general design technique and proved local convergence of this approach [10]. The parametric methods are a newer approach. Some examples of work in this area are Najson [14], Chichka [1], Popovic [8]. Examples of nonlinear approaches can be found in [11] and [9].

This paper discusses a parametric method of peak-seeking control. It uses a linear time-varying Kalman filter to estimate the gradient and Hessian of the performance function and a Newton-method to drive the system toward an extremum. The method uses position measurements directly to estimate the gradient and Hessian. The method uses position measurements directly to estimate the gradient and Hessian. This requires the use of a linear time-varying Kalman filter. Use of a Kalman filter allows designers to utilize an array of Kalman filter design

II. OVERVIEW OF PEAK-SEEKING CONTROL METHOD

The goal of peak-seeking control is to move the position, \( x(t) \), of a plant, \( P \), to the extremum of a performance function \( f(x(t)) \). Figure 1 displays this peak-seeking scheme’s overall interconnection. Here, \( x(t) \) is one of a number of states of \( P \). Performance function magnitude may also affect the plant; in the figure, this is indicated by a dashed line. At a given iteration \( k \), the difference between the current plant position, \( x_k \), and the previous position, \( x_{k-1} \), is calculated. The difference between the current performance function magnitude, \( f(x_k) \), and the previous, \( f(x_{k-1}) \), is also calculated. These differences are used by a linear time-varying Kalman filter (KF) to estimate the current gradient, \( b_k \), and Hessian, \( M_k \). The gradient and Hessian are combined to form a position command, \( x_c = b_k M_k^{-1} \), to drive the plant toward the performance function extremum. A filter (Filt) smoothes and scales the command to avoid providing \( P \) large step commands which can create unwanted actuator movements. A persistent excitation signal (PE) is added to the smoothed position command to ensure observability of the performance function. In practice, an initial position command initializes movement of the system. The plant is assumed to be stabilized by an inner-loop control.

The method uses position measurements directly to estimate the gradient and Hessian. This requires the use of a linear time-varying Kalman filter. Use of a Kalman filter allows designers to utilize an array of Kalman filter design
techniques. This provides flexibility to the scheme and allows it to be applied to many problems.

III. KALMAN FILTER DESIGN

Performance function gradient and Hessian are estimated using a linear time-varying Kalman filter whose states consist of elements at the current position. This is accomplished by parameterizing the performance function using first- and second-order terms of a Taylor series expansion.

Consider the Taylor series expansion of a performance function \( f(x) \) about \( x_k \)

\[
f(x) \approx f(x_k) + b_x^T(x - x_k) + \frac{1}{2}(x - x_k)^T M x_k (x - x_k) + o(x - x_k)
\]

where \( b_x \) is the gradient at \( x_k \), \( M_x \) is the Hessian at \( x_k \), and \( o(\cdot) \) represents higher order terms. Evaluating (1) at \( x_{k-1} \) and rearranging yields

\[
\Delta f_k = b_x^T \Delta x_k + \frac{1}{2} \Delta x_k^T M x_k \Delta x_k
\]

where \( \Delta x_k = x_k - x_{k-1} \) and \( \Delta f_k = f(x_{k-1}) - f(x_k) \).

The higher-order terms have been dropped by assuming the performance function is adequately modeled as a quadratic function at any particular position.

For simplicity, we restrict ourselves to a two-dimensional case. Denote the positions in the two dimensions at time \( k \) as \( x_{1k} \) and \( x_{2k} \). Denote the corresponding gradients as \( b_{1k} \) and \( b_{2k} \) and the corresponding Hessian as

\[
M_k = \begin{bmatrix} M_{11k} & M_{12k} \\ M_{12k} & M_{22k} \end{bmatrix}
\]

Further denote

\[
\Delta x_{1k} = x_{1k-1} - x_{1k} \\
\Delta x_{2k} = x_{2k-1} - x_{2k}
\]

Equation (2) is then written as

\[
\Delta f_k = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \Delta x_{1k}^2 & \frac{1}{2} \Delta x_{2k}^2 \\ \Delta x_{1k} \Delta x_{2k} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} M_{11k} & M_{12k} \\ M_{12k} & M_{22k} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta x_{1k} \\ \Delta x_{2k} \end{bmatrix}
\]

Equation (3) implies that a parameter estimation technique may be used to estimate the gradient and Hessian. Since the gradient and Hessian may change with \( x \), and measurements of \( \Delta x_{1k}, \Delta x_{2k} \) and \( \Delta f_k \) may be noisy, a Kalman filter is an appropriate choice of estimator. The Kalman filter states are chosen to be

\[
\zeta_k = \begin{bmatrix} M_{11k} \\ M_{22k} \\ M_{12k} \\ M_{21k} \\ b_{1k} \\ b_{2k} \end{bmatrix}
\]

This allows the measurement equation of a linear time-varying Kalman filter to take the form

\[
\Delta f_k = H_k \zeta_k + v_k
\]

where

\[
H_k = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \Delta x_{1k}^2 \\ \frac{1}{2} \Delta x_{2k}^2 \\ \Delta x_{1k} \Delta x_{2k} \\ \Delta x_{1k} \Delta x_{2k} \\ \Delta x_{1k} \Delta x_{2k} \end{bmatrix}
\]

and \( v_k \) represent a zero-mean Gaussian white-noise process with variance \( V_k \).

The gradient and Hessian are modeled as a Brownian motion process since they may change in an unknown manner with \( x \). The Kalman filter process equation is, therefore, given by

\[
\zeta_{k+1} = I \zeta_k + w_k
\]

where \( I \) is a \( 5 \times 5 \) identity matrix and \( w_k \) represents a zero-mean Gaussian white noise process with variance \( W_k \).

The linear time-varying Kalman filter is implemented with the following equations:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{P}_{k+1} &= \dot{P}_k + W_k \\
\zeta_{k+1} &= \dot{P}_k H_k V_k^{-1} (\Delta f_k - H_k \zeta_k) \\
\hat{P}_k &= (\dot{P}_k^{-1} + H_k V_k^{-1} H_k^{-1})^{-1}
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \hat{P} \) is the state covariance matrix, \( \dot{P} \) the predicted state covariance matrix, and \( \zeta \) the state vector. The values of \( W_k \) and \( V_k \) are used as tuning parameters. Typically, initial guesses of \( W_k \) and \( V_k \) are based on previously-obtained measurements of the noise or on a noise model. A trial-and-error process is then used to adjust the values in order to improve the estimates. Detailed derivations of the linear time-varying Kalman filter can be found in [15] and [16].

The Kalman filter may be expanded to include \( N \) measurements at each iteration \( k \). Define

\[
\begin{align*}
\Delta f_{k,n} &= f(x_{1k,n}, x_{2k,n}) - f(x_{1k,n-1}, x_{2k,n-1}) \\
\Delta x_{1k,n} &= x_{1k,n} - x_{1k,n-1} \\
\Delta x_{2k,n} &= x_{2k,n} - x_{2k,n-1}
\end{align*}
\]

and \( v_{k,n} \) as the corresponding process noise. The index \( n \) takes values between 1 and \( N \). The expansion is implemented by modifying the measurement equation (4) as

\[
\begin{bmatrix} \Delta f_{k,1} \\ \Delta f_{k,2} \\ \vdots \\ \Delta f_{k,N} \end{bmatrix} = H_k \zeta_k + \begin{bmatrix} v_{k,1} \\ v_{k,2} \\ \vdots \\ v_{k,N} \end{bmatrix}
\]

Here

\[
H_k = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \Delta x_{1k,n}^2 & \frac{1}{2} \Delta x_{2k,n}^2 & D_{k,1} & \Delta x_{1k,1} & \Delta x_{2k,1} \\
\frac{1}{2} \Delta x_{1k,n}^2 & \frac{1}{2} \Delta x_{2k,n}^2 & D_{k,2} & \Delta x_{1k,2} & \Delta x_{2k,2} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
\frac{1}{2} \Delta x_{1k,n}^2 & \frac{1}{2} \Delta x_{2k,n}^2 & D_{k,N} & \Delta x_{1k,N} & \Delta x_{2k,N} \end{bmatrix}
\]

and \( D_{k,n} = \Delta x_{1k,n} \Delta x_{2k,n} \). The process equation remains as it is shown in equation (5). The Kalman filter is implemented
as shown in equation (6) with
\[ \Delta f_k = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta f_{k,1} \\ \Delta f_{k,2} \\ \vdots \\ \Delta f_{k,N} \end{bmatrix} \]
and
\[ V_k = \begin{bmatrix} V_{k,1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & V_{k,2} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & V_{k,N} \end{bmatrix} \]
where \( V_{k,n} \) is the variance of \( v_{k,n} \).

The number of measurements is used as a tuning parameter. A larger \( N \) increases the observability and tolerance to noise by providing a over-determined set of equations. It also increases the area of the performance function to which the gradient and Hessian are fit. For a performance function in which the Hessian changes as a function of position, a too-large \( N \) may slow convergence.

IV. ONE-DIMENSIONAL EXAMPLE

A one-dimensional example of the method is presented in this section. Consider the problem presented in [14]. A continuous linear plant model given by
\[
A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -5 & -9 & -5 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad C = [1 \ 0 \ 0]
\]
seeks the extremum of a performance function. In this example the performance function was chosen to be 
\[ f(x) = (\cos(x/8.4) + 1.5)(x/6 - 0.4)^2 \]
in place of the quadratic function used in [14]. This performance function provides a gradient and Hessian that change as a function of position. The performance function magnitude measurements were corrupted with Gaussian distributed noise with a standard deviation of 0.1. There was no noise on the position measurements. The system was implemented in a 1.0 Hz fixed-step discrete simulation. The Kalman filter operated at 0.25 Hz. The matrix \( H_k \) in equation (8) was selected to have 10 rows. The other elements of equation (8) were selected to be of compatible size. The command filter was set to 1 and the persistent excitation, PE in Figure 1, was set to 0.

An initial command was provided to the plant. As the system responded to the command, position and performance function magnitude measurements were provided to the Kalman filter. Estimates of the gradient and Hessian from the Kalman filter were combined, \( x_c = b_k M_k^{-1} \), to command the plant toward the local extremum.

As the system approached the extremum, \( \Delta f_k \) became small and was buried in noise, leading to poor estimates. Typically, the Hessian estimate suffers more than the gradient estimates. To partially compensate for this, the system switched between a steepest-descent approach and a Newton approach. When the smallest singular value of the Kalman filter’s error covariance, \( \sigma(P_k) \leq 0.005 \), a Newton approach was used. When \( \sigma(P_k) > 0.005 \), a steepest-descent approach was used. The switching threshold was used as a tuning parameter and selected by trial and error.

The plant position as a function of time is presented in Figure 2. The minimum position is depicted by a solid line and is reached by the system in approximately 80 seconds, after which noisy estimates cause the plant to deviate from the minimum.

The gradient and Hessian estimates are shown in Figure 3. The Kalman filter estimates are represented by dashed lines. The true gradient and Hessian are represented by solid lines. The system required three measurements before beginning estimation, thus, the figures show the first non-zero estimate at 12 seconds. It is apparent that the estimations began to suffer once the system neared the minimum. If the simulation were allowed to execute for a longer time period, position would have randomly moved about the minimum. This example illustrated application of the method to a simple one-input one-output problem. The gradient and Hessian estimates track the true values well and the system quickly reaches the extremum. The next example illustrates the natural extension of the method to multiple-input problems.
V. TWO-DIMENSIONAL EXAMPLE

A two-dimensional example of the scheme is presented in this section. Consider the problem of formation flight for drag reduction. In this problem, a trailing aircraft attempts to fly its wingtip in the wingtip vortex of a leading aircraft to reduce the induced drag. Substantial fuel savings can be achieved by employing such a technique.

This problem has been studied in multiple papers. A formation of two Dornier Do 28-D1 aircraft has been flown under automatic control achieving 15% flight power reduction [17], and two F/A-18 aircraft have achieved 20% drag reduction and 18% fuel flow reduction [18]. More details of formation flight including theoretical derivations of the drag reduction achievable in formation flight can be found in [1] and [17].

In this example, a two-ship formation of transport class aircraft is modeled and a peak-seeking control system is designed to maximize drag reduction. It is assumed that the lead aircraft flies in a straight-and-level path. This allows the vortex generated by the lead aircraft to be modeled as static maps of induced drag coefficient and rolling moment on the trailing aircraft as a function of lateral and vertical relative position. The induced drag coefficient map is used as the performance function. The magnitude of the rolling moment map for any given position is used as a disturbance input to the trailing aircraft model. The maps were generated using a vortex-lattice method with the trailing aircraft wingtip positioned inside the leading aircraft wingtip vortex. For each position of the map, the aircraft was first trimmed for straight-and-level flight and then the induced drag coefficient and rolling moment were calculated. It is assumed that the vortex changes little with respect to relative longitudinal spacing.

The trailing aircraft is modeled with a 11-state, 4-input, 10 Hz discrete state-space model. The modeled states are body-axis vertical, lateral, and longitudinal velocities; roll, pitch, and yaw angles; roll, pitch, and yaw rates; and inertial-axis lateral and vertical relative positions between aircraft. The inputs are elevator deflection, aileron deflection, rudder deflection, and thrust. The effects due to a changing induced drag coefficient are not modeled.

Normally distributed random noise with a standard deviation of 0.001 is superimposed on the induced drag coefficient performance function magnitude. In addition, normally distributed random noise with a standard deviation of 0.012 meter is superimposed on the position measurements.

A. Inner-Loop Control Design

The primary goal of the inner-loop control law is to move the trailing aircraft to track relative vertical and lateral position commands between the leading and trailing aircraft. The secondary goal is to minimize roll angle to ensure the trailing aircraft wing remains in the vortex during lateral movement. The third goal is to maintain a constant relative longitudinal velocity to prevent the trailing aircraft from slowly drifting out of formation.

In order to meet these goals, an inner-loop control system was designed which penalizes roll angle and change in longitudinal velocity. It follows relative lateral and vertical position commands by commanding elevator, rudder, aileron, and thrust. An LQR-tracker control design methodology was selected for construction of the control system. The aircraft model was augmented with integral states of the lateral position error, vertical position error, longitudinal velocity command, and roll angle. Controller gains were computed by minimizing the standard LQR cost function

$$\int_0^\infty x^T Q x + u^T R u \, dt$$

where $Q$ and $R$ are designer selected weightings on the states, $x$, and inputs, $u$, respectively. The resulting gains were used in the interconnection shown in Figure 4. In the figure, $h$

![Fig. 4. Inner-loop-control-system interconnection.](image)

represents vertical relative position, $y$ lateral relative position, $\phi$ roll angle, and $u$ longitudinal velocity. Vertical, lateral, and longitudinal velocities; roll, pitch, and yaw angles; and roll, pitch, and yaw rates are contained in $\xi$. Elevator deflection is represented by $\delta_E$, aileron deflection by $\delta_A$, rudder deflection by $\delta_R$, and thrust by $\delta_T$. Control gains on the aircraft states are represented by $K_x$, and control gains on the errors by $K_e$. The subscript $c$ on the loop inputs indicates a command to the system.

B. Kalman Filter Design

A Kalman filter was designed as discussed in section III above. It was chosen to iterate at 0.1 Hz to allow the aircraft to travel some distance between iterations. Measurements were taken at 10 Hz in between the iterations and averaged to form $f_{k,n}$, $x_{1k,n}$, and $x_{2k,n}$ of (7). The Kalman filter rate was used as a tuning parameter and selected by trial and error. The matrix $H_k$ in equation (8) was selected to have 15 rows ($N = 15$). The other elements of equation (8) were selected to be of compatible size.

A persistent excitation was chosen as a 3 rad/sec 0.7 meter sinusoidal signal superimposed on the relative-position command. This allowed $N$ values of $f_{k,n}$, $x_{1k,n}$, and $x_{2k,n}$ to be distributed over a full excitation period.

The command filter was chosen to be an 10 Hz integrator, $\text{Filt} = 0.1/(z - 1)$. This resulted in a ramping position command in place of the step command generated by the 0.1 Hz Kalman filter estimates. In addition, the system was implemented to switch between a steepest-descent and a
Newton approach. When the Hessian estimate was positive definite and the minimum singular value of the Kalman filter error covariance $\sigma (P_k) < 6$ a Newton approach was used. Gradient descent was used when this was not the case. The switching threshold was used as a tuning parameter and selected by trial and error.

C. Simulation Results

The system was tested by simulation. In the simulation, the aircraft was initially positioned to the left and above the leading aircraft right wingtip vortex core. Figure 5 depicts the path the aircraft followed during the peak-seeking simulation. The contours represent induced drag coefficient. The system was initially commanded to trace a 0.7 meter radius circle to generate initial gradient and Hessian estimates. It was then allowed to move toward the minimum. The system primarily moved orthogonally through the contours of the plot as it moved to the minimal location. The system reached the local minimum in 300 seconds.

Fig. 5. Aircraft path along induced drag coefficient performance function.

Figures 6 and 7 show the gradient and Hessian estimates as a function of time. The solid lines in the figures represent the true gradient and Hessian while the dashed lines represent the estimates at each Kalman filter iteration. The gradient estimate approximates the true gradient well over the length of the entire simulation, as shown in Figure 6; however, the Hessian estimate illustrated in Figure 7 is less accurate.

The error between position commands and the aircraft response is depicted in Figure 8. The error never exceeds 0.8 meters. The oscillatory behavior is due to the excitation command.

The aircraft Euler angles are depicted in Figure 9. The aircraft angles stay within reasonable values, never exceeding 5 degrees. The high-frequency oscillatory appearance of the angles is due to non-smooth commands being provided to the aircraft. Improvement to the command filter could minimize these oscillations. The slower-period oscillations are due to the excitation. The roll and yaw angles share the task of moving the aircraft laterally. By changing the weightings contained in $R$ of the inner-loop control design (9), surface movements can be tuned to use more roll or yaw angle.

The aircraft surface deflections are displayed in Figure 10. As with the Euler angles, the high-frequency oscillation is due to the non-smooth commands to the aircraft and the slower oscillation is due to the excitation. Aileron deflection goes to 10 degrees and rudder deflection goes to 5 degrees when the aircraft is tracing the initially-commanded circle. The simulation ends with all surface deflections except aileron near 0. Aileron deflection remains at 3 degrees because the aileron continues to counteract the vortex-induced rolling moment.

This example has demonstrated the application of the method to a two-input one-output problem. The method can also be applied to problems with larger numbers of inputs; however, the number of estimation parameters grows with the number of inputs, $m$, as $\sum_{i=1}^{m} i + m$. The estimation problem then demands a larger number of measurements, $N$.

VI. Conclusion

A parametric peak-seeking control technique has been presented. It utilizes a linear time varying Kalman filter to directly use coordinate and magnitude measurements of the performance function to estimate the gradient and Hessian. The Kalman filter is developed from a Taylor
series approximation of the performance function about the current coordinate measurement. It uses the difference between subsequent measurements of position and performance function magnitude. The estimates are used in a Newton method optimization approach to drive the plant toward the performance function extremum. Both a one-dimensional and a two-dimensional example are provided to illustrate the technique. Both demonstrate good results. In the one-dimensional example, the scheme reaches the minimum in 80 seconds and displays good gradient and Hessian estimates while using noisy performance function magnitude measurements. Application to a two-dimensional problem is exhibited with the problem of formation flight for drag reduction. In this example, the minimum is reached in 300 seconds and exhibits good gradient and Hessian estimates. This example used noisy performance function magnitude and coordinate measurements. The flexibility of the linear time-varying Kalman filter allows applicability of the method to a large number of problems.
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