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ABSTRACT
This paper presents archimedes optimization algorithm (AOA) and dispersive flies optimization (DFO) to optimally tune gain parameters of PID control scheme in order to regulate DC motor’s speed. These suggested techniques tune the controller by the minimization of the fitness function represented by the integral of time multiplied by absolute error (ITAE). The modelling and simulation are carried out in MATLAB/Simulink. The transient response of unit step input obtained from AOA-PID-ITAE and DFO-PID-ITAE controllers were compared to those obtained from Ziegler-Nichols (ZN) method and particle swarm optimization (PSO). The results indicate that AOA-PID-ITAE and DFO-PID-ITAE are more efficient than ZN method and PSO in reducing rise time and settling time. Likewise, DFO converge faster to the optimal solution with lower overshoot than AOA and PSO.
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1. INTRODUCTION
DC motors are actuators that produce angular rotation when supplied with electrical energy. They have significant importance in various electrical systems employed in domestic and industrial applications such as electrical vehicles, industrial mills and cranes, robots, and multiple home appliances [1], [2]. This importance is due to their advantageous characteristics like precision, convenience, and continuous control [3]. In order to drive the DC motor at appropriate speed or torque, it is necessary to have a proper control scheme.

PID controller is one of such control schemes employed in numerous industrial applications [4]. The term PID is an abbreviation for “proportional integral derivative” and a PID controller is a control system incorporating these three components. The integrator mitigates the controlled system’s error, and the derivative provides improved output, adding to other advantageous reasons as to why PID controller has been preferred for more than eight decades [5]. The parameters of proportional, integrator and derivation gains, denoted respectively as $K_p$, $K_i$, $K_d$, are tuned to obtain desired output from the controlled process [6].

There are several classical approaches to tune the PID controller namely Ziegler-Nichols [7], Cohen-Coon [8], Chien-Hrones-Reswick [9], Astrom and Hagglund [10]. However, these conventional methods typically consume a great deal of time as tuning of parameters must be done iteratively until optimal solution is obtained [11] and results in undesirable overshoot [12]. To overcome these disadvantages, number of PID tuning methods have been proposed in the literature. One of such approaches is the usage of meta-heuristic techniques.
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Metaheuristic optimization techniques are stochastic techniques that provide sufficiently acceptable solution(s) iterating the candidate solution(s) improving a certain metric, often referred to as the fitness value. Metaheuristic algorithms can effectively overcome the problem of getting stuck in local optima while exploration in the feasible solution domain and provide effective optimization in problems with complexities of time or dimensions [13], [14]. Control of DC motor has been a popular area where several meta-heuristic algorithms find application [15], [16].

In this paper, two metaheuristic algorithms are presented as tuning methods to tune parameters of speed-controlled DC motor, namely, archimedes optimization algorithm (AOA) and dispersive flies optimization (DFO). The paper is set in the following order: Section 2 outlines the methodology employed in the study with a brief description of meta-heuristic algorithms, Section 3 illustrates results and relevant discussions, and Section 4 concludes the study.

2. METHOD
2.1. Modelling of DC motor

An externally excited DC motor is employed in this study. The schematic of armature-controlled DC motor is illustrated in Figure 1. The voltage \( E_a \) is employed to regulate the angular velocity \( \omega \) of the motor.

![Figure 1. Schematic of armature-controlled DC motor](image)

Rotating rotor interacts with the fixed field at right angle. So, the voltage induced across its terminal i.e, the motor back EMF \( e_b \) is proportional to the speed \( \omega \)

\[
e_b = K_b \frac{d\theta}{dt}
\]

(1)

Where \( K_b \) is the back EMF constant. The governing mathematical model for armature loop is

\[
E_a = L \frac{di_a}{dt} + R i_a + e_b
\]

(2)

Where \( i_a \) is the armature current, \( L \) is the inductance of armature winding, and \( R \) is the armature resistance. Since the torque established by the motor \( T_m \) is proportionate to current \( i_a \) in the armature

\[
T_m = K_t i_a
\]

(3)

Where \( K_t \) is the motor torque constant. The dynamic equation with coefficient of friction \( f \) and moment of inertia \( J \) is

\[
T_m = J \frac{d^2\theta}{dt^2} + f \frac{d\theta}{dt}
\]

(4)

Since, \( \omega(s) = s\theta(s) \). The resulting transfer function for the speed-controlled DC motor is

\[
G_M(s) = \frac{\omega(s)}{E_a(s)} = \frac{K_t}{(J_s + f)(J_s + f) + K_b K_t}
\]

(5)
For the model parameters considered, the resulting transfer function is

\[ G_M(s) = \frac{\omega(s)}{\omega_\text{ref}(s)} = \frac{1}{0.222866s^2 + 0.77067s + 1} \]  

(6)

2.2. PID controller

This study assumes to achieve a disturbance rejection controller by using a step input as reference. The controller efficacy is evaluated with regards to overshoot, rise time, peak time, and settling time of the closed-loop step response. The transfer function of the PID controller is

\[ G_{\text{PID}}(s) = K_p + \frac{K_i}{s} + K_d s = K_p \left( 1 + \frac{1}{T_i} + T_d s \right) \]  

(7)

where \( K_p, K_i \) and \( K_d \) represent proportional gain, integral gain, and derivative gain, respectively. Likewise, \( T_i \) and \( T_d \) represent the integral and derivative time constant. Also, \( K_i = K_p/T_i \), and \( K_d = K_pT_d \).

The schematic diagram of the proposed controller for speed control of DC motor is illustrated in Figure 2. Finally, for no-load condition with PID speed controller, the closed-loop transfer function is given by (8).

\[ G_{\text{closed-loop}}(s) = \frac{\omega(s)}{\omega_\text{ref}(s)} = \frac{G_{\text{PID}}(s)G_M(s)}{1 + G_{\text{PID}}(s)G_M(s)} = \frac{K_d s^2 + K_p s + K_i}{0.222866s^2 + (0.77067 + K_d)s^2 + (1 + K_p)s + K_i} \]  

(8)

Figure 2. Block diagram of parameter optimization process of the PID controller

2.3. Ziegler-Nichols (ZN) method

The ZN method [17] to find \( K_p, T_i, \) and \( T_d \) is developed on the transient response of the system to be controlled. In this study, step response (open loop) method is employed. The open loop method involves locating the inflection point in the response curve where the slope of the response curve starts decreasing. The procedure is as, a) ensure that the response curve looks like an S-shaped curve as shown in Figure 3, for the open loop step response, b) draw a line tangent to the inflection point and measure the delay time (\( L \)) and time constant (\( T \)), c) measure the steady state gain of the plant (\( K' \)), and d) finally, compute the controller parameters from Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controller type</th>
<th>( K_p )</th>
<th>( T_i )</th>
<th>( T_d )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>( T/L )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>0.9( T/L )</td>
<td>( L/0.3 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID</td>
<td>1.2( T/L )</td>
<td>2( L )</td>
<td>( 0.5L )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Ziegler-Nichols tuning formula [17]
2.4. Meta-heuristic algorithms
2.4.1. Archimedes optimization algorithm

Archimedes optimization algorithm, in short AOA, is a physics-inspired metaheuristic technique proposed in 2020 [18]. It is based on the Archimedes’ principle which states that for an object, submerged partially or fully in a fluid, buoyancy force acting on the object equates the displaced portion of the fluid’s weight. In AOA, objects refer to the individuals of the population. The objects have physical properties like acceleration, volume, and density. AOA tries to converge to an optimum where these individuals are in equilibrium. In other words, resultant force acting on the object is zero and the object floats on the fluid. In initial stage of AOA, each object has random position in fluid. With iteration, AOA updates each object’s density and volume. Iterations continue until termination criteria is met. The algorithm’s implementation in optimization problem is illustrated by the pseudo-code.

**procedure** AOA

Define population size $N$, maximum iterations $T_{\text{max}}$, constants $C_1, C_2, C_3$ and $C_4$

Initialize population individuals with random positions, densities, and volumes

Evaluate each individual’s fitness and choose the optimum from these fitness values

Set iteration counter $T = 1$

while $T \leq T_{\text{max}}$

for each object $i$

update density and volume

update transfer and density decreasing factors $T_F$ and $d$ respectively

if $T_F \leq 0.5$

(Exploration Phase)

update acceleration and normalize acceleration

update position

else

(Exploitation Phase)

update acceleration and normalize acceleration

update direction flag $F$

update position

end if

end for

evaluate each object’s fitness and select the best fitness

set $T = T + 1$

end while

return object with best fitness
end procedure

2.4.2. Dispersive flies optimization

Dispersive flies optimization, introduced in 2014 [19], is inspired from two behaviours of flies: their swarming behaviour when they find a food source and their retreating and dispersing behaviour when encountered a threat. It has been employed in several discrete and continuous search spaces problems in the domain of medical imaging [20], training of deep neural network [21], optimization of machine learning algorithms [22]. DFO’s implementation in optimization problem is illustrated by the pseudo-code.

while $FE < 300,000$

for $k = 1 \rightarrow N$

$\vec{x}_i$, fitness $\leftarrow f(\vec{x}_i)$

end for

$sb \leftarrow \{s_b, \forall f(\vec{x}_{s_b}) = \min(f(\vec{x}_1), f(\vec{x}_2), \ldots, f(\vec{x}_N))\}$

$nb \leftarrow \{n_b, \forall f(\vec{x}_{n_b}) = \min\{f(\vec{x}_{left}), f(\vec{x}_{right})\}\}$

for $i = 1 \rightarrow N$

for $d = 1 \rightarrow D$

$r_{d} \leftarrow x_{s_{d,n}}^{\pm 1} + u(0,1) \times (x_{s_{d,n}}^{\pm 1} - x_{d,n}^{\pm 1})$

if ($r < d$) then

$r_{d} \leftarrow x_{\min,d} + r(x_{\max,d} - x_{\min,d})$

end if

end for

$\vec{x}_i \leftarrow \vec{I}$

end for

end while

2.4.3. Particle swarm optimization

Kennedy and Eberhart [23] suggested PSO which has its motivation in the collective behaviour of fauna which commute in groups. Each member in swarm is referred as a “particle” which moves around in the solution space. Their movements are governed by pre-defined rules. Each of these members, or particles, is assigned, a velocity value and a position value. The change in position is brought up by adjustment in velocity, which in turn depends on each member’s best position and entire population’s best position until
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```
For member p
    Initialize member
End
Do
    For member p
        Evaluate the fitness
        If new fitness value optimal than personal best (pfbest)
            pfbest ← new fitness value
        End
    End
    Select the member with the best pfbest value as global best (gfbest)
    For member p
        Evaluate velocity using (1)
        Update position using (2)
    End
While stopping criteria not true
```

The update equations are as

\[
V(k+1,p) = W(p)V(k,p) + C_1Rand[X(pf_{best},p) − X(p)] + C_2Rand[X(gf_{best}) − X(p)]
\]

(9)

\[
X(k+1,p) = X(k,p) + V(k+1,p)
\]

(10)

Where \( k \)=iteration number, \( p \)=particle number, \( V \)=velocity, \( X \)=position, \( C_1, C_2 \)=acceleration constants, \( X(pf_{best},p) \)=personal best position of \( p \)th particle, and \( X(gf_{best}) \)=global best position in population.

2.5. Performance index and response criteria

ITAE is a common performance index used in the design of a PID control. This index was selected to be our objective function because integral of square error and integral of absolute error, ISE and IAE respectively, weigh all error equally resulting in longer settling time. ITAE overcomes this limitation [27]. ITAE is evaluated using the (18).

\[
ITAE = \int_0^T t |e(t)|dt
\]

(11)

Three response characteristics, particularly, the settling time, rise time and the overshoot of the plant introduced with the step input were observed. Then the response of the suggested algorithms, ZN method and PSO were compared. The data obtained are compared with that of PSO as it is the most used algorithm for synonymous task in literature.

2.6. Algorithm parameters

The simulations of transient response analyses of meta-heuristic algorithms are performed in MATLAB/Simulink environment. Results are obtained after 10 runs for each algorithm in laptop running 64-bit Windows 10, Intel(R) Core™, i7-1067G7CPU @1.30GHz, 1.5 GHz, 8GB RAM. The initialization values used for the variables, kept fixed during each run of the code execution, of the metaheuristic algorithms are listed in the Tables 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Initialization parameters for AOA, DFO, and PSO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material numbers = 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF threshold for exploration phase ≤ 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum iterations = 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_1 = 2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_2 = 6 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_3 = 2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_4 = 1 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The dimension of the problem to be optimized by the algorithms is three, referring to the three gain values of PID controller: $K_p$, $K_i$, $K_d$. The range of these gains used is

$$0.01 \leq K_p, K_i, K_d \leq 20$$

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To investigate the efficacy of AOA and DFO, their performance in transient response were compared with ZN and PSO. The chosen algorithms for performance comparison are AOA-PID-ITAE, DFO-PID-ITAE and PSO-PID-ITAE. Transient response criteria mainly include percentage overshoot ($M_p$), rise time ($T_r$), settling time ($T_s$), and peak time ($T_p$).

3.1. Open loop response

Table 3 provides transient response criteria for the system when introduced with step input in the absence of controller. A mild overshoot of 1.1809% and settling time of 1.8354s is observed in the open loop step response suggesting the implementation of derivative action in the controller to mitigate the overshoot and reduce settling time. Also, the rise time of 1.1945s is observed in the open loop step response suggesting the incorporation of proportional and integrative action in the controller to reduce the rise time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transient response criteria</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$M_p$ (%)</td>
<td>1.1809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_r$ (s)</td>
<td>1.1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_s$ (s)</td>
<td>1.8354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_p$ (s)</td>
<td>2.5570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2. Ziegler-Nichols method

As per the procedure described in Section 2.3., the parameters for computing the PID gains is obtained from Figure 3. The obtained parameters are $K = 1$, $L = 0.40476$ sec, and $T = 0.64285$ sec. The PID gain parameters computed using these values with the corresponding transient response criteria are incorporated in Table 4. The closed-loop response of the motor using PID gain parameters obtained from Ziegler-Nichols method has rise time of 0.7768s, settling time of 1.2518s, peak time of 5.1184s, and no overshoot. Hence, the Ziegler-Nichols method seems to have improved the system’s transient response by removing the disturbance and reducing rise time and peak time. Although Ziegler-Nichols removed the disturbance form the transient response, peak time increased from 2.5570s to 5.1184s.

![Figure 3. Funding K, L and T from ‘S’ shaped step response curve](image)

3.3. Meta-heuristic algorithms

Table 4 illustrates the best performance of the algorithms to produce optimal PID controller gains. The closed-loop response of the DC motor using PID gain parameters obtained from AOA-PID has rise time of 0.1100s, settling time of 0.1957s, peak time of 0.5516s, and 0.2600% overshoot. Hence, the AOA-PID
has improved the system’s transient response by significantly reducing the peak time, the settling time, and the rise time. Similar conclusion can be derived for the transient response criteria of DFO-PID which has the rise time of 0.1098s, settling time of 0.1951s, peak time of 0.5349s, and 0.4600% overshoot. These response criteria are better when compared to those obtained from ZN method and PSO-PID.

DFO-PID outperforms AOA-PID, ZN-PID, and PSO-PID in terms of rise time, peak time, and settling time. DFO-PID controller has rise time of 0.1098s, settling time of 0.1951s, and peak time of 0.5349s. Likewise, AOA-PID ranks second with rise time of 0.1100s, settling time of 0.1957s, and peak time of 0.5516s. With regards to overshoot, AOA-PID outperforms other meta-heuristic algorithms with 0.26% overshoot. Likewise, DFO-PID ranks second with 0.46% overshoot. Figure 4 shows the closed-loop step response of the system for all these controllers. Although all the meta-heuristic algorithms can reduce the disturbance in comparison to open loop response, small percentage of overshoot is still prevalent in the system. Figure 4 illustrates the closed-loop step response of the system for all these controllers.

Table 4. Controller gains and transient response criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controller type</th>
<th>$K_p$</th>
<th>$K_i$</th>
<th>$K_d$</th>
<th>$M_p$(%)</th>
<th>$T_r$ (s)</th>
<th>$T_s$ (s)</th>
<th>$T_p$ (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AOA-PID</td>
<td>15.4000</td>
<td>19.9704</td>
<td>4.4477</td>
<td>0.2600</td>
<td>0.1100</td>
<td>0.1957</td>
<td>0.5516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFO-PID</td>
<td>15.4367</td>
<td>19.9997</td>
<td>4.4535</td>
<td>0.4600</td>
<td>0.1098</td>
<td>0.1951</td>
<td>0.5349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSO-PID</td>
<td>13.6948</td>
<td>17.7389</td>
<td>3.9468</td>
<td>0.7700</td>
<td>0.1239</td>
<td>0.2198</td>
<td>0.5752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZN-PID</td>
<td>1.9059</td>
<td>2.3543</td>
<td>0.3857</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.7768</td>
<td>1.2518</td>
<td>5.1184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 provides the minimum value of the objective function these metaheuristic algorithms converge to after 100 iterations. This helps one conclude that the proposed tuning methods provide PID controller parameters with comparatively lower ITAE value which is a desired feature. DFO-PID controller, evidently, has the lowest ITAE with lowest standard deviation for 10 independent runs. Hence, the DFO-PID controller is the most accurate meta-heuristic algorithm based on ITAE fitness function. Likewise, DFO-PID is evident to show minimal variance in the result for different runs illustrating the high repeatability of the algorithm. AOA-PID ranks second after DFO-PID in terms of fitness function value as well.

Table 5. Best fitness function value for each controller

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controller type</th>
<th>Best fitness value (ITAE)</th>
<th>Standard deviation in ITAE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AOA-PID</td>
<td>0.002493</td>
<td>4.77E-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFO-PID</td>
<td>0.002484</td>
<td>2.3119E-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSO-PID</td>
<td>0.003153</td>
<td>9.22E-04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5 illustrates the convergence of the meta-heuristic algorithm for the best simulation run. It is observed that the suggested methods take less iteration to converge to provide an optimal PID controller. It is observable that the DFO-PID converges faster than AOA-PID and PSO-PID. While DFO-PID took only 18
iterations to converge to the ITAE of 0.002484, AOA-PID took about 50 iterations to achieve approximately the same. On the contrary, PSO-PID could only converge to ITAE of 0.003153 even with 100 iterations. AOA-PID and DFO-PID outperform ZN method and PSO-method in transient response criteria as well as in minimizing ITAE value. Furthermore, these two proposed methods take comparatively less iterations to converge to optimal ITAE value than PSO-PID.

![Figure 5. Convergence plot of meta-heuristic algorithms](image)

### 4. CONCLUSION

In this study, two new approaches are presented to obtain optimum gain parameters of PID controller to regulate a DC motor’s rotational speed. In controller design process, meta-heuristic algorithms are utilized to minimize the ITAE fitness function. Transient response characteristics of DC motor speed control system were employed to evaluate the efficacy of meta-heuristic algorithms. In this study, AOA, DFO, and PSO algorithms are considered for performance comparison. The numerical figures and graphical simulation results conclude that the proposed techniques outperform the classical ZN method and the popular PSO method. Hence, the proposed technique can be employed to ensure optimum performance of PID controller in large electrical systems, process industry and automation sector, among others.

### REFERENCES


**BIOGRAPHIES OF AUTHORS**

**Bishwa Babu Acharya** received his B.E. in Mechanical Engineering from Institute of Engineering (IOE), Pulchowk Campus, Tribhuvan University, Nepal. His research interests are Dynamics and Controls, Optimization and Sustainable Energy.

**Sandeep Dhakal** is a final year mechanical engineering student at Pulchowk Campus, Institute of Engineering, Tribhuvan University, Nepal. He is actively working in the application of data science techniques in mechanical engineering to generate meaningful information. His research interest includes Data Analytics, Data Science, Operation Research, and Supply Chain Management.
Aayush Bhattarai is an Assistant Professor at the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Pulchowk Campus, Institute of Engineering, Tribhuvan University. Bhattarai is also a founding faculty of Aerospace Engineering for the first time in Nepal. He completed his M.Eng. from the University of Technology Sydney, Australia, and Bachelor of Engineering in Aeronautics from Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics. His research interest includes the field of Aviation, Operation Research, Operations Management, and Project Management.

Associate Professor, Nawraj Bhattarai (PhD.) received his B.E. in Mechanical Engineering degree from Tribhuvan University in 2000. He went on to receive M.Sc. in Renewable Energy Engineering from Tribhuvan University in 2004 and Ph.D. in Energy System Planning from Vienna University of Technology, Austria in 2015. He is currently working as Head of Department in Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Pulchowk Campus, Institute of Engineering, Tribhuvan University, Nepal. His research interest includes the field of Mechanical Engineering, Renewable Energy Engineering, and Energy System Planning.