Optimal Yaw Regulation and Trajectory Control of Biorobotic AUV Using Mechanical Fins Based on CFD Parametrization

This paper treats the question of control of a biorobotic autonomous undersea vehicle (BAUV) in the yaw plane using a biomimetic mechanism resembling the pectoral fins of fish. These fins are assumed to undergo a combined sway-yaw motion and the bias angle is treated as a control input, which is varied in time to accomplish the maneuver in the yaw-plane. The forces and moments produced by the flapping foil are parametrized using computational fluid dynamics. A finite-difference-based, Cartesian grid immersed boundary solver is used to simulate flow past the flapping foils. The periodic forces and moments are expanded as a Fourier series and a discrete-time model of the BAUV is developed for the purpose of control. An optimal control system for the set point control of the yaw angle and an inverse control law for the tracking of time-varying yaw angle trajectories are designed. Simulation results show that in the closed-loop system, the yaw angle follows commanded sinusoidal trajectories and the segments of the intersample yaw trajectory remain close to the discrete-time reference trajectory. It is also found that the fins suitably located near the center of mass of the vehicle provide better maneuverability. [DOI: 10.1115/1.2201634]
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1 Introduction

Aquatic animals present a wide diversity of maneuvering behaviors and hydrodynamic mechanisms for their locomotion. Fish use a variety of fins (dorsal, caudal, pectoral, pelvic fins, etc.) for maneuvering and propulsion [1,2]. Biological studies are motivating researchers to design biorobotic autonomous underwater vehicles (BAUVs) actuated by oscillating fins for naval applications [3,4]. Readers may refer to a special issue of IEEE Journal of Oceanic Engineering on biologically inspired science and technology for autonomous underwater vehicles (AUVs) for excellent review articles and related research [5–9].

Detailed studies have been conducted on fish morphology [4,5,10–13] and locomotion based on which mechanical fins have been designed. Extensive work has been conducted on the measurement of the forces and moments produced by the oscillating fins in various laboratory experiments [10–12,14,15]. Fin movements, such as lead-lag, feathering, and flapping, are identified as the basic oscillating patterns responsible for producing large lift, side force, and thrust, which can be used for the control and propulsion of BAUVs [12,15–17]. Forces and moments associated with the fin movements have also been extracted from computational fluid dynamic (CFD) simulations [18–29], where a number of different fin movement patterns have been considered.

Considerable research has been done for controlling AUVs using traditional control surfaces [31]. A sliding mode control system has been designed for the dive plane control of BAUVs by continuous cambering of dorsal fins [11]. However for fishlike maneuvering, control system design using oscillating fins is essential. Experimental results and CFD simulations of oscillating pectoral fins indicate that these fins produce periodic forces and moments, and the oscillating parameters (the amplitude of oscillation, frequency, bias angle, phase angle, etc.) can be used as control variables for maneuvering BAUVs [12–14]. Recently, control of AUVs using pectoral fins have been attempted [15–17].

An inverse controller has been designed to maneuver BAUVs in the dive plane using pectoral fins [32]. Although, the characterization of forces and moments generated by oscillating fins, when the chosen control inputs (oscillation parameters) vary in a continuous manner, is important; it seems from literature that this kind of research remains yet to be done. For simplicity, usually numerical simulations using CFD are obtained for a set of fixed oscillation parameters. Thus, for a meaningful utilization of the data obtained using CFD for modeling the forces and moments of the oscillating fins for the purpose of control, it is apparent that the control input (the oscillation parameters) should be changed at discrete intervals only after the completion of a few cycles of the fin motion. Such an attempt to parametrize the forces and moments of a plunging and pitching foil for the dive-plane control of an AUV by switching the bias angle at discrete intervals has been done in [32]. Two-dimensional foil and low Reynolds number flow conditions were chosen for the CFD simulations. The control system designed in [32] is only applicable for the control in the dive plane. Thus, it is of interest to explore the applicability of the pectoral fin control system in the yaw-plane as well. Moreover, the development of parametrizations of the fin forces and moments using new CFD algorithms is certainly desirable for the precision in control.

The contribution of the current paper lies in the parametrization of forces and moments of oscillating pectoral-like fins using CFD; and the design of an optimal control system for the regulation of the yaw angle and an inverse control system for the time-varying yaw trajectory tracking of the AUV. The mechanical foils are assumed to undergo a combined yaw-sway mode of oscillation with the bias angle of the foil as the key control parameter, which is altered at discrete intervals for maneuvering the AUV. For the computation of the fin force and moment, a finite-difference-
based, Cartesian grid immersed boundary solver for simulating the flow past the flapping foils is used. Three-dimensional foils with finite aspect ratio as well as high Reynolds number flow conditions are chosen in the CFD studies. This makes the simulations more realistic. Moreover, large eddy simulations (LES) are also implemented in current simulations to resolve the turbulence structures. The periodic force and moment obtained using CFD are represented by Fourier series, and a discrete-time AUV model is constructed for the design of two control systems. First, an optimal control law is designed for the control of the yaw (heading) angle by minimizing an appropriate quadratic performance index. The choice of performance criterion gives flexibility in shaping the transient responses. This is followed by the design of an inverse control law for the trajectory control of the yaw angle. It is seen that the number of unstable zeros of the transfer function of the AUV is a function of the position of the pectoral fins on the AUV and the sampling rate. Since the AUV model considered is nonminimum phase, an approximate discrete-time system is obtained by eliminating the unstable zeros from the pulse transfer function of the BAUV. Then an inverse control law is derived for the trajectory tracking based on the approximate minimum phase representation of the transfer function. Simulation results are obtained for the optimal control of the yaw angle and for the tracking of sinusoidal reference yaw angle trajectories using the inverse controller.

The organization of the paper is as follows. Section 2 describes the mathematical model of the BAUV. The CFD-based parametrization and discrete-time representation are obtained in Sec. 3. Sections 4 and 5 present the optimal control law derivation and the inverse controller design, respectively. The simulation results and conclusion are provided in Secs. 6 and 7, respectively.

2 Yaw-Plane Dynamics

Let the vehicle be moving in the yaw plane \((X_B Y_B)\) plane where \(O_B X_B Y_B\) is an inertial coordinate system. \(O_B X_B Y_B\) is a body-fixed coordinate system, \(X_B\) is in the forward direction, and \(Y_B\) points to the right. In the moving coordinate frame \(O_B X_B Y_B\) fixed at the vehicle’s geometric center, the dynamics for neutrally buoyant vehicle in the yaw plane are given by [33]

\[
m(x + Ur + X_B ˙r - Y_B r^2) = Y_B ˙r + (Y_B ˙\psi + Y_BUr) + Y_B ˙uv + F_y
\]

\[
I, ˙r + m(X_B ˙\psi + X_BUr + Y_B ˙\psi) = N_r ˙r + (N_r ˙\psi + N_rUr) + N_r ˙uv + M_r
\]

\[
\dot{\psi} = \dot{r} \quad (1)
\]

where \(\dot{\psi}\) is the heading angle, \(\dot{r}\) is the yaw rate, \(\dot{v}\) is the lateral velocity, \(X_B ˙\psi\) is the forward velocity, \(Y_B ˙\psi\) is the lateral velocity, \(I\) is body length, \(m\) is the mass of the AUV, \(l\) is the moment of inertia, \(Y_B\) is the yaw angle, etc., are the hydrodynamic coefficients. \(F_y\) and \(M_r\) denote the net lateral (sway) force and yawing moment acting on the vehicle due to the pectoral fins. Here, \((X_B, Y_B)\)\((=0)\) and \((X_G, Y_G)\) denote the coordinates of the center of buoyancy and center of gravity (CG), respectively. Although, the design approach considered in this paper can be used for speed control, here for simplicity, it is assumed that the forward velocity is held steady \((\dot{u}=0)\) by a control mechanism and only lateral maneuvers are considered. In this study, only small maneuvers of the vehicle are considered. As such linearizing the equations of motion about \(\dot{v} = 0, \dot{r} = 0, \dot{\psi} = 0\), one obtains

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
-m - Y_B & m X_B - Y_B & 0 & 0 & \dot{v} \\
m X_B - N_r & I - N_r & 0 & 0 & 1 & \dot{\psi}
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
Y_B U & Y_B U - m U & 0 & 0 & v \\
N_r U & N_r U - m X_G U & 0 & 0 & r \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \psi
\end{bmatrix}
+ \begin{bmatrix}
F_y \\
M_r
\end{bmatrix}
\]  

(2)

3 Parametrization Based on CFD and Discrete State Variable Representation

It is assumed that the BAUV model has one pair of pectoral fins that are arranged symmetrically around the body of the AUV. Figure 1 shows a schematic of a typical AUV. Each fin is assumed to undergo a combined sway-yaw motion described as follows:

\[
s(t) = s_1 \sin(\omega t)
\]

\[
\theta(t) = \beta + \theta_1 \sin(\omega t + \nu_1)
\]

(4)

where \(s\) and \(\theta\) correspond to the sway and yaw angle of the oscillating fin, respectively. The swaying is assumed to occur about the center-chord location. Furthermore, \(\omega, s_1, \theta_1\) are the frequency and amplitudes of oscillations, \(\beta\) is yaw bias angle, and \(\nu_1\) is the phase difference between the yawing and swaying motions.

As a result of this flapping motion, each fin experiences a time-varying hydrodynamic force that can be resolved into a sway force component \(F_s\) and yawing moment \(M_y\). The pectoral fin can be suitably attached to the vehicle to produce rolling and yawing moments on the BAUV, which affect its dynamics. However, since yaw-plane dynamics and maneuvering is assumed to be affected by the sway force and yawing moment only, we limit our discussion to these components.
where it is assumed that the fins produce dominant \( N \) harmonically related components and the harmonics of higher frequencies are negligible. The Fourier coefficients \( f_n \) and \( m_n \), \( a \in \{s, c\} \), capture the characteristics of the time-varying signals \( f_s(t) \) and \( m_s(t) \). Parametrization of these coefficients is therefore needed in order to complete the equations that govern the motion of the BAUV in the yaw plane.

3.1 CFD Based Parametrization. A finite-difference-based, Cartesian grid immersed boundary solver [22] has been used to simulate the flow past flapping foils in the current study. The key feature of this method is that simulations with complex moving bodies can be carried out on stationary nonbody conformal Cartesian grids, and this eliminates the need for complicated remeshing algorithms that are usually employed with conventional Lagrangian body-conformal methods. The Eulerian form of the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations is discretized on a Cartesian mesh and boundary conditions on the immersed boundary are imposed through a “ghost-cell” procedure [19]. The method employs a second-order center-difference scheme in space and a second-order accurate fractional-step method for time advancement. The code employs the large-eddy simulation (LES) approach in order to account for the effect of the small subgrid flow scales on the large resolved scales. A Lagrangian dynamic model [27] is used to estimate the subgrid-scale eddy viscosity. The details of the numerical method and validation of the code can be found in [28].

Thin ellipsoidal foils are employed in the current study. The geometry of the foil is defined by its three major axes denoted by \( a_x, a_y, \) and \( a_z \), as shown in Fig. 2. The surface of the foil is represented by a fine, unstructured mesh with triangular elements. Note that the foil is oriented with the \( x \)-axis along the streamwise direction and the \( z \)-axis along the spanwise direction. Furthermore, \( a_x \) is also the chord of the foil, which in these simulations is set equal to unity, and \( a_s \) is the foil thickness. The ratio \( a_s/a_x \) in the current study is equal to 0.12 and 2.0, respectively. In addition to these foil geometric parameters, the following are the other key nondimensional parameters in the current study: Reynolds number \( Re=U_a a_x/\nu \), normalized sway amplitude \( s_1/a_s \), yaw-bias angle \( \beta \), yaw amplitude \( \theta_1 \), phase advance of yawing over swaying \( \varphi_1 \), and Strouhal number based on the wake thickness \( S=s_1 \omega_1/\alpha U \). In the current simulations, Reynolds number, \( s_1/a_s \), \( \theta_1 \), \( \varphi_1 \), and \( S \) are fixed at value equal to 1000, 0.5, 30 deg, 90 deg, and 0.6, respectively. The yaw-bias angle, \( \beta \) which is the main control parameter, is varied from 0 deg to 20 deg. A nonuniform \( 177 \times 129 \times 105 \) Cartesian mesh is employed in the simulations where the grid is clustered in the region around the flapping foil and in the foil wake. The size of computational domain as well as the number of grids have been chosen so as to ensure the simulation accuracy.

In the current study, the sway force coefficient and moment coefficient are defined as

\[
C_Y = \frac{f_s}{\frac{1}{2} \rho U_a^2 A_{\text{plan}}} \\
C_M = \frac{m_s}{\frac{1}{2} \rho U_a^2 A_{\text{plan}} a_s}
\]

where \( f_s \) and \( m_s \) are the sway force and yawing moment, respectively, and \( A_{\text{plan}} \) is the projected area of the foil which is equal to...
Forces and moments are calculated by directly integrating the computed pressure and shear stress on the foil surface.

The side views of wake topologies of a yawing-swaying flapping foil with different yaw bias angles, \( \beta = 0 \) deg and 20 deg, are shown in Fig. 3. The isosurfaces of the eigenvalue imaginary part of the velocity gradient tensor of the flow are plotted in order to clearly show the vortex topology. The key feature observed in Fig. 3 is the presence of two sets of interconnected vortex loops that slowly convert into vortex rings as they convect downstream in the case of \( \beta = 0 \) deg. The jets formed by these two sets of rings contribute equally to the thrust production of the flapping foil, and zero mean sway force is expected. As seen in Fig. 3b, when yaw-bias angle increases, one of those two sets of vortex rings becomes weaker and the other one grows. This asymmetry is associated with the production of a mean sway-force on the fin. Figure 4 shows the time-averaged streamwise velocity contours for both of these cases. For the \( \beta = 0 \) deg foil, two oblique jets with equal strength are observed. As yaw-bias angle increases, the lower jet becomes stronger while the upper jet essentially disappears. As a result of this, the sway force is modified significantly.

Table 1 shows the changes in the mean sway force coefficients and the mean yawing moment coefficients for different bias angles. It can be seen that small changes in the yaw-bias angle can produce large changes in the mean sway force as well as the yawing moment. This clearly suggests that the yaw-bias angle is an effective control parameter for precise maneuvering.

Expanding the fin force and moment of each fin in a Taylor series about \( \beta = 0 \) gives

\[
\begin{align*}
  f_y(t, \beta) &= f_y(t, 0) + \frac{\partial f_y}{\partial \beta}(t, 0) \beta + O(\beta^2) \\
  m_y(t, \beta) &= m_y(t, 0) + \frac{\partial m_y}{\partial \beta}(t, 0) \beta + O(\beta^2)
\end{align*}
\]

where \( O(\beta^2) \) denotes higher-order terms. We assume here that for a fixed \( \beta \in \mathbb{R} \), \( f_y(t+T_0, \beta) = f_y(t, \beta) \) and \( m_y(t+T_0, \beta) = m_y(t, \beta) \)

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
Yaw-bias angle (deg) & \( C_Y \) & \( C_M \) \\
\hline
0 & 0.00 & 0.00 \\
10 & 1.52 & -0.14 \\
20 & 2.74 & -0.26 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{\( C_Y \) and \( C_M \) for different yaw-bias angles}
\end{table}
Table 2 Table showing various components of force and moment coefficient for the $\beta_y=0$ deg case

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$f_n$</th>
<th>$f'_n$</th>
<th>$m'_n$</th>
<th>$m''_n$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-5.62</td>
<td>-5.16</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$>0$ ($T_0$ denotes the fundamental period). Then, the partial derivatives of $f_y$ and $m_y$ with respect to $\beta$ are also periodic functions of time. Using Eq. (7), one can approximately express $f_y$ and $m_y$ as

$$f_y = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} f'_n (0) \sin n\omega_T t + f''_n (0) \cos n\omega_T t$$

$$m_y = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} m'_n (0) \sin n\omega_T t + m''_n (0) \cos n\omega_T t$$

(8)

where $O(\beta^2)$ terms are ignored in the series expansion. Thus, we get

$$f_y(t) = \phi^T (f_0 + \beta f_0)$$

$$m_y(t) = \phi^T (m_0 + \beta m_0)$$

(9)

where $f_0, f_0, m_0, m_0 \in R^{2N+1}$ and can be obtained from Eq. (8).

4 Optimal Yaw-Plane Control

In this section, the design of an optimal feedback yaw-plane control law for the regulation of the yaw angle is considered. For the precise yaw control, it is desirable to include a feedback term in the control law that is proportional to the integral of the yaw tracking error. For this purpose, a new state variable $x_c$ is introduced that satisfies

$$x_c[(k+1)T^*] = \phi^* - y(kT^*) + x_c(kT^*)$$

(14)

where $\phi^*$, a constant, is the desired yaw angle and $y(kT^*)$ is the tracking error.

Defining the state vector $x_c(x_T, x_T) \in R^8$ and using Eqs. (12) and (14), the augmented system takes the form

$$x_c[(k+1)T^*] =$$

$$x_c[(kT^*)] + A_c x_c[(kT^*)] + B_c \beta_k + d_c$$

(15)

where the constant matrices $A_c, B_c$, and $d_c$ are defined in Eq. (15).

The control of the system, Eq. (15) can be accomplished by following the servomechanism design approach [34] in which $d_c$ is treated as a constant disturbance input. The design is completed by computing a feedback control law of the form

$$\beta(kT^*) = -\phi + \beta_k + d_c$$

where $\phi$ is a constant vector such that the closed-loop matrix

$$A_c = (A_c + B_c K)$$

is stable. It is well known that one can assign the eigenvalues of $A_c$ arbitrarily if $(A_c, B_c)$ is controllable [35,36]. For the discrete-time system, this implies that one must choose $K$ such that the eigenvalues of $A_c$ are strictly within the unit disk in the complex plane.

In this study, an appropriate value of $K$ is obtained by using the linear quadratic optimal control theory [35]. For this one chooses a performance index of the form

$$J = \int_0^T (x^T P x + u^T R u) dt$$

(16)
where $Q$ is a positive definite symmetric matrix and $\mu > 0$. The weighting matrix $Q$ associated with $x_j$ and the parameter $\mu$ penalizing the level of the bias angle are chosen to provide a trade-off between the convergence rate of the state variables to the equilibrium point and the bias angle magnitude.

The optimal control law is obtained by minimizing $J_o$ for the system

$$
x_o[(k+1)T^*] = A_o x_o(kT^*) + B_o \beta_k
$$

which is obtained from Eq. (15) by setting $d_o=0$. The feedback matrix $K$ is obtained by solving the discrete Riccati equation [35]

$$
P = Q + A_o^T P A_o - A_o^T P B_o (\mu + B_o^T P B_o) A_o^T P A_o
$$

and then setting the feedback matrix as

$$
K = -(\mu + B_o^T P B_o)^{-1} B_o^T P A_o
$$

Using the feedback law Eq. (16), the yaw angle can be regulated to prescribed constant values $\psi^*$, but the BAUV cannot follow time-varying yaw angle trajectories. In Sec. (6), an inverse control law is derived for the tracking of time-varying trajectories.

5 Inverse Control System

The transfer function relating the output $y(kT^*)$ and the input $\beta_k$ of Eq. (12) (assuming $d_o$ is given by

$$
\ddot{\hat{y}}(z) = G(z) = C_o(zI - A_o)^{-1} B_o = k_p \frac{(z + \mu_1)(z + \mu_2)}{z^2 + a_1 z^2 + a_1 z + a_0}
$$

where $z$ denotes the Z-transform variable, $\mu_i (i=1,2)$ are real or complex numbers, and $k_p$, $a_1$, and $a_0$ are real numbers. It is assumed that the pectoral fins are attached between the cg and the nose of the vehicle. For the AUV model under consideration, the number of unstable zeroes (i.e., the zeros outside the unit disk in the complex plane) depend on the distance $(d_{cg})$ of the pectoral fins from the cg, $\omega_p$, and the sampling time $T^*$. It has been found that for the values of interest of the oscillation frequencies and the attachment point $(d_{cg})$ of the fins, there exists a single unstable zero (i.e., the transfer function is nonminimum phase).

It is well known that the inverse control design can be accomplished only when the system is minimum phase (i.e., the zeros of the transfer function are stable). For this purpose, the original transfer function is simplified by ignoring its unstable zero. Let us assume that $\mu_1 > 1$ and $\mu_2 < 1$. For obtaining a minimum phase approximate system, one removes the unstable zero of $G(z)$ but retains the zero frequency (dc) gain. Thus the approximate transfer function $\hat{G}_a(z)$ obtained from Eq. (21) takes the form

$$
\hat{G}_a(z) = k_p \frac{(1 + \mu_1)(z + \mu_2)}{\Delta(z)}
$$

where $\Delta(z) = \text{det}(zI - A_o)$.

We are interested in deriving a new controlled output variable $\hat{y}_a$ such that

$$
y_o(kT^*) = G_o x_o(kT^*)
$$

$$
\ddot{\hat{y}}(z) = \hat{G}_a(z) = C_o(zI - A_o)^{-1} B_o
$$

where $C_o$ is a new output matrix. Since the relative degree of $G_o(z)$ is 2, one has

$$
C_o B_o = 0
$$

Using the Leverrier algorithm, the approximate transfer function $\hat{G}_a(z)$ can be expanded as [35]

$$
\hat{G}_a(z) = \Delta^{-1}(z)\left[(z + \alpha_2)C_o A_o B_o + C_o A_o^2 B_o\right]
$$

Comparing Eqs. (21) and (25), one can easily show that

$$
C_o B_o = [0 \ K_p (1 + \mu_1) \ K_p (1 + \mu_2)]
$$

Solving Eq. (27), one obtains the modified output matrix. For the modified system, one has

$$
y_o[(k+1)T^*] = A_o x_o(kT^*) + B_o \beta_k + d
$$

Suppose a reference trajectory $y_r(kT^*)$ is given that is to be tracked by $y_o(kT^*)$. Using Eq. (28), one has that

$$
y_o[(k+1)T^*] = C_o A_o x_o(kT^*) + C_o d
$$

In view of Eq. (29), for following the reference trajectory $y_r(kT^*)$, we choose the control input $\beta_k$ as

$$
\beta_k = (C_o A_o B_o)^{-1} \left[-C_o A_o^2 x_o(kT^*) - \sum_{i=0}^{3} C_o A_o^i d + v_k\right]
$$

where the signal $v_k$ is selected as

$$
u_k = y_r[(k+1)T^*] - p_1 [(C_o A_o x_o(kT^*) + C_o d - Y_r[(k+1)T^*])

+ p_2 Y_r(kT^*) - Y_r(kT^*)]
$$

where $p_0$ and $p_1$ are real numbers.

Defining the tracking error $e(kT^*) = y_r(kT^*) - y_o(kT^*)$ and using the control law Eqs. (30) and (31) in Eq. (29) gives

$$
e(kT^*) + p_1 e[(k+1)T^*] + p_2 e(kT^*) = 0
$$

The tracking error equation (32) satisfies a second-order difference equation. The characteristic polynomial associated with Eq. (32) is

$$
(z^2 + p_1 z + p_0) = 0
$$

The parameters $p_i$ are chosen such that the roots of Eq. (33) are strictly within the unit disk. Then it follows that for any initial condition $x(0), e(kT^*) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$ and the controlled output $y_o(kT^*)$ asymptotically converges to the reference sequence $y_r(kT^*)$. In Sec. 6, it will be seen that the inverse controller designed based on the approximate transfer function accomplishes accurate yaw angle trajectory control. This completes the inverse controller design.

6 Simulation Results for Yaw Maneuvers

In this section, simulation results using the MATLAB/SIMULINK software is presented. The performance of the optimal and inverse controllers for different values of frequencies of oscillation of the pectoral fin and for different points of attachment of the fins to the BAUV $(d_{cg})$ from the center of gravity of the AUV is examined.

The parameters of the model are taken from [33]. The AUV is assumed to move with a constant forward velocity of 0.7 m/s with the help of a control mechanism. The vehicle parameters are $t=1.991$ m, mass $= 18.826$ kg, $I=1.77$ kgm$^2$, $X_G=-0.012$, $Y_G=0$. The hydrodynamic parameters for a forward velocity of 0.7 m/s derived from [33] are $Y_G=0.3781$, $Y_G=-5.6198$, $Y_G=1.1694$, $V_o = -12.0868$, $N_o=-0.3781$, $N_o=-0.8967$, $N_o=-1.0186$, and $N_o=-4.9587$. 
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Experimental results indicate that for zero bias angle, the mean values of \( f_a \) and \( m_a \) are nearly zero. Therefore, the vectors \( f_a, f_b, m_a, \) and \( m_b \) are found to be

\[
\begin{align*}
  f_a &= (0, -40.0893, -43.6632, -0.3885, 0.6215, 6.2154, -10.17, -0.1554, 0.6992) \\
  f_b &= (68.9975, 0.4451, -16.4704, 64.1009, -19.5864, -0.3885, -0.2493, 0.1246, 0.0312) \\
  m_a &= (-0.5297, -0.3739, -0.0935, -0.2493, 0.1246, 0.0312, -0.0935) \\
  m_b &= (-0.5297, -0.3739, -0.0935, -0.2493, 0.1246, 0.0312, -0.0935)
\end{align*}
\]

It is pointed out that these parameters are obtained from the force and moment Fourier coefficients and are computed by multiplying the Fourier coefficients by \( (1/2)p_W \), \( U^2_c \), and \( (1/2)p_W \), \( U^2_c \) chord. \( U^2_c \), respectively, where \( W_c \) is the surface area of the foil. For simulation, the initial conditions of the vehicle are assumed to be \( x(0) = 0 \) and \( x_s(0) = 0 \).

6.1 Optimal Yaw-Plane Control. In this section, the feedback discrete control law Eq. (16) is simulated. The bias angle is changed to a new value every \( T = n_0T_0 \) where \( T_0 = 1/f_0 \) is the fundamental period of \( f_a \) and \( m_a \). Choosing a small value of \( n_0 \) increases the transients produced due to switching. Parametrization of these transients is quite difficult since they introduce a number of additional parameters into the problem. On the other hand, a large value of \( n_0 \) increases the magnitude of the intersample oscillations, which is also not desirable.

The terminal state is chosen as \( x^* = (0, 0, 0.15)^T \) with \( \psi^* = 15 \) deg. Thus, one desires to control the BAUV to a heading angle of 15 deg. For optimal control design, the weighting matrix and parameter are selected as \( Q = 1000I_{16} \) and \( \mu = 1.5 \). Simulation results are provided for fin frequencies of 8 Hz and 6 Hz.

Case 1. Optimal Control: Frequency of Fin Oscillation 8 Hz, \( d_{c_{gf}} = 0 \) and \( d_{c_{gf}} = 0.15 \) (m). First simulation is done for the higher frequency of 8 Hz and the fin attachment point is chosen such that \( d_{c_{gf}} = 0 \). Note that with this value of \( d_{c_{gf}} \), the sway force itself does not produce any yawing moment on the BAUV. The control law is updated every four cycles, i.e., \( T = 4T_0 = 0.5 \) s. The value of \( n_0 = 4 \) is found to be an appropriate compromise between minimizing transients and intersample oscillations. The transfer function \( G(z) \) has a stable zero at 0.0965 and an unstable zero at −1.5545. As such \( G(z) \) is minimum phase. Figure 6 shows the simulated results. It can be seen that the optimal controller achieves accurate heading angle control to the target set point in ~5 s. The control input (bias angle) magnitude required is <3 deg, which is small and can easily be provided by the pectoral fins. The plots of the lateral force and moment produced by the fins are also provided in the figure.

Simulation results for the same frequency, but for a \( d_{c_{gf}} \) value of 0.15 m are also presented (Fig. 7). Note that with a nonzero value of \( d_{c_{gf}} \), the sway force also produces additional yawing
moment on the BAUV. Unlike the previous case, the zeros of $G(z)$ are now at 1.48 and −0.75. It is seen that the stable zero at 0.0965 of the model for $d_{cf}=0$ has moved to a lesser stable position at −0.75 in the unit disk for the model with $d_{cf}=0.15$ m. The transient response for $d_{cf}=0.15$ m is not as good as in Fig. 6, and the settling time is larger. It is also observed that, initially, the vehicle heading angle swings in the wrong direction, but the target yaw angle is attained in the steadystate.

Case 2. Optimal control: Frequency of Oscillation 6 Hz, $d_{cf}=0$ and $d_{cf}=0.15$ m. This simulation is done for a lower value of fin frequency of 6 Hz with a $d_{cf}$ value of 0. The sampling period $T$ is still kept equal to 4$T_0$, which for this case is equal to 2/3 s. Thus, compared to the case of 8 Hz, the control is updated at a slower rate. The zeros of $G(z)$ are at −1.6813 and 0.0331. The simulation results are shown in Fig. 8. One can observe that the yaw angle control is accomplished; however, intersample oscillations of larger magnitude compared to Fig. 6 are present. This is an expected phenomenon because the bias angle switches after a longer period, but the convergence time of the yaw angle is found to be almost the same. The maximum magnitude of control input required for the maneuver is also larger, and the sway force and moment were found to be less than 60 N and 1 Nm, respectively.

Simulation for a $d_{cf}$ value of 0.15 m was also performed at this frequency, and the results are shown in Fig. 9. In this case, it is found that the zeros (1.7138, −0.7058) of $G(z)$ have moved away from the origin compared to the model for $d_{cf}=0$. It is observed that although the heading angle is controlled, the magnitude of the intersample oscillations has increased.

6.2 Inverse Yaw-Plane Control. For the tracking of time-varying reference trajectories, the designed inverse control system is suitable. In this subsection, simulation results for sinusoidal heading angle trajectory tracking for different fin-flapping frequencies are presented. Smooth sinusoidal reference trajectories are generated by command generators of the form

$$(E^3 + p_{c2}E^2 + p_{c1}E + p_{c0})y(kT^*) = (1 + p_{c0} + p_{c1} + p_{c2}) \times d' \sin(w_kT^*)$$

where $E$ denotes the advance operator $(Ey(kT^*)=y(k+1)T^*)$ and $d'$ is the amplitude of the sine wave and the parameters $p_{c_i}$ are chosen to be zero so that the poles of the command generator are at $z=0$. The reference trajectory generator is simulated using its state variable form with states $x=\begin{bmatrix} x_1 \ x_2 \ x_3 \end{bmatrix}^T$. For the simulation, $d'=15$ deg and $w_k=0.2$ rad/s.

Simulation results for fin frequencies of 8 Hz and 6 Hz are presented in the following subsection.

Case 3. Inverse control: Frequency of Oscillation 8 Hz, $d_{cf}=0$ and $d_{cf}=0.15$ (m). Figure 10 shows the inverse controller performance for a $d_{cf}=0$. The sampling period is 4$T=1/2$. It can be observed that smooth heading angle trajectory control is achieved. One can observe that the modified output equals the reference trajectory at all sample instants. The maximum control input (bias angle) required is −3 deg. The lateral force and moment produced by the fins are less than 40 N and 0.4 Nm, respectively. As expected, the yaw rate and the lateral velocity are sinusoidal.

Simulation are also done for $d_{cf}=0.15$ m. The plots are shown in Fig. 11. Although the heading angle tries to follow the command trajectory, in the initial period, the yaw angle trajectory is not smooth and there is a larger tracking error compared to Fig. 10. For $d_{cf}=0$, the tracking performance is extremely good as seen in Fig. 10. The performance of the inverse controller for time-varying trajectory tracking for nonzero $d_{cf}$ deteriorates because the zero dynamics (the residual dynamics) for $d_{cf}$
Fig. 8 Optimal control: Frequency of flapping=6 Hz, $d_{crg}=0 \text{ m}$ for $\psi=15 \text{ deg}$: (a) heading angle, $\psi$ (deg); (b) bias angle (control input), $\beta$ (deg); (c) yaw rate, $r$ (deg/s); (d) lateral velocity, $v$ (m/s); (e) lateral force, $F_y$ (N); and (f) side moment, $M_y$ (Nm)

Fig. 9 Optimal control: Frequency of flapping=6 Hz, $d_{crg}=0.15 \text{ m}$ for $\psi=15 \text{ deg}$: (a) heading angle, $\psi$ (deg); (b) bias angle (control input), $\beta$ (deg); (c) yaw rate, $r$ (deg/s); (d) lateral velocity, $v$ (m/s); (e) lateral force, $F_y$ (N); and (f) side moment, $M_y$ (Nm)
Fig. 10  Inverse control: Frequency of flapping=8 Hz, \( d_{cp}=0 \) m for \( \dot{\psi}=15 \) deg: (a) reference heading angle, \( \dot{Y}_r \) (staircase); modified heading angle \( \dot{Y}_a \) (broken line); and actual heading angle \( \dot{\psi} \) (solid line) (deg); (b) Bias angle (control input), \( \beta \) (deg); (c) yaw rate, \( \dot{r} \) (deg/s); (d) lateral velocity, \( \dot{v} \) (m/s); (e) lateral force, \( F_y \) (N); and (f) side moment, \( M_y \) (Nm).

Fig. 11  Inverse control: Frequency of flapping=8 Hz, \( d_{cp}=0.15 \) m for \( \dot{\psi}=15 \) deg: (a) reference heading angle, \( \dot{Y}_r \) (staircase); modified heading angle \( \dot{Y}_a \) (broken line); and actual heading angle \( \dot{\psi} \) (solid line) (deg); (b) Bias angle (control input), \( \beta \) (deg); (c) yaw rate, \( \dot{r} \) (deg/s); (d) lateral velocity, \( \dot{v} \) (m/s); (e) lateral force, \( F_y \) (N); and (f) side moment, \( M_y \) (Nm).
Fig. 12 Inverse control: Frequency of flapping=6 Hz, $d_{cgf}=0$ m for $\psi=15$ deg: (a) reference heading angle, $Y_r$ (staircase); modified heading angle, $Y_a$ (broken line); and actual heading angle, $\psi$ (solid line) (deg). (b) Bias angle (control input), $\beta$ (deg); (c) yaw rate, $r$ (deg/s); (d) lateral velocity, $v$ (m/s); (e) lateral force, $F_y$ (N); and (f) side moment, $M_y$ (Nm).

Fig. 13 Inverse control: Frequency of flapping=6 Hz, $d_{cgf}=0.15$ m for $\psi=15$ deg: (a) reference heading angle, $Y_r$ (staircase); modified heading angle, $Y_a$ (broken line); and actual heading angle, $\psi$ (solid line) (deg). (b) Bias angle (control input), $\beta$ (deg); and (c) yaw rate, $r$ (deg/s); (d) lateral velocity, $v$ (m/s); (e) lateral force, $F_y$ (N); and (f) side moment, $M_y$ (Nm).
=0.15 m are relatively less stable compared to the zero dynamics for d_{cf} = 0. Note that G_{y}(c) has a zero at 0.0965 for d_{cf} = 0 and at a lesser stable location −0.75 for d_{cf} = 0.15 m.

Case 4. Inverse control: Frequency of Oscillation 6 Hz, d_{cf} = 0 and d_{cf} = 0.15 m. The first simulation performed here is for d_{cf} = 0 and frequency 6 Hz. The results are shown in Fig. 12. Yaw angle tracking is achieved although interspersed oscillations of comparatively large magnitude are observed. The bias angle (control input) required is < 3 deg.

Simulation for d_{cf} = 0.15 m has also been performed, and results are shown in Fig. 13. In the closed-loop system, approximate yaw angle tracking is accomplished, but larger interspersed oscillations appear. Again it is found that the inverse controller designed for d_{cf} = 0 performs better compared to the controller designed for d_{cf} = 0.15 m precisely due to the reasons indicated in case 3 for the frequency of oscillation 8 Hz.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, optimal as well as inverse yaw-plane control of a biorobotic AUV using pectoral-like fins was considered. For maneuvering the BAUV, the bias angle was treated as control input. CFD and Fourier series expansion were used to parameterize the effect of this control input on the hydrodynamical force and moment produced by the flapping foil. For the purpose of design, a discrete-time model was obtained and a minimum phase representation was derived for controller design. Then an optimum control law for the regulation of the yaw angle to set points and an inverse control law for the trajectory control of the modified output were derived. The bias angle of the flapping foils was updated at discrete intervals (multiple of the fundamental period). In the closed-loop system, the modified output and the actual yaw trajectory were found to be sufficiently close to the desirable heading angle commands. From these results, one concludes that accurate yaw angle control along time-varying paths can be accomplished using oscillating fins with relatively small (<3 deg) overall changes in the bias angle. Furthermore, improved performance of the control system can be obtained when the frequency of oscillation of the fins increases.

This paper provides an interdisciplinary approach, which combines the CFD analysis and control theory, for the design of control systems for BAUVs. But there are several questions remain to be answered in this area. Certainly, the treatment of nonlinearities; sensor and actuator dynamics; noise, wave forces, and parameter uncertainties; etc., is important. The effect of vortices shed by the body on the fins is yet another interesting problem for future research.
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