Study on IMC-PID Control for Single-phase Voltage-source UPS Inverters
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Abstract—A novel control scheme with PD output voltage instantaneous-value feedback inner loop for voltage-source inverter is proposed. The inner loop is designed to improve dynamic performance and the IMC-PID (internal model control-proportion integral derivation) external loop can ensure stable performance. The design methods of inner loop PD controller based on pole-assignment and external loop IMC-PID controller are discussed in detail. The control system is very simple and only the output voltage needs to be sampled. The PD inner controller and IMC-PID external controller are both easy to design and analyze. Simulation and experimental results are given to validate that the control scheme for voltage-source inverter proposed has not only nice dynamic and static performance but also strong robustness. The control scheme proposed has not only strong robustness, nice dynamic and static characteristics, but also easy to realization of the control algorithm in analog or digital.

I. INTRODUCTION

Uninterruptible power supplies (UPS) are used to interface critical loads such as computers and communication systems to the utility system. The output voltage of the UPS inverter is required to be sinusoidal with minimum total harmonic distortion (THD) and invariant under large variation in loads[1]. Thus, many advanced techniques have been proposed, such as multiple feedback loop control[2], dead-beat control[3]-[4], repetitive control[5]-[7], sliding mode control. The multiple feedback loop control is simple and easy to implement but this approach requires a comprehensive analysis on both open-loop and closed-loop frequency responses of the inverter control system for various controller parameters; The dead-beat control is sensitive to parameter variations and is complex to implement; The repetitive control can achieve low THD output in a few fundamental cycles, but its dynamic performance is not excellent; The sliding mode control has been proved quite useful against uncertainty. However, the well-known chattering problem must be especially taken care in analog or digital realization of the control algorithm[1].

In order to overcome the above disadvantages, the paper puts forward IMC–PID control scheme with the PD instantaneous-value feedback inner loop which is designed to improve dynamic performance while the IMC–PID external loop to ensure stable performance. The inner loop with a PD controller based on pole assignment technique not only improves the ability of the dynamic tracking and disturbance restraining, but also improves the robustness stability and static characteristics. The control scheme proposed has strong robustness, nice dynamic and static characteristics. Its control algorithm is also easy to realize in analog or digital control system.

The paper is organized as follow: Section II discusses the inter-model-control structure. How to select the nominal model of single-phase voltage-source inverter is presented in Section III. Section IV presents a design procedure for inner loop PD controller based on pole-assignment and external loop IMC-PID controller. The control block, static and dynamic performance and robustness performance of the proposed control scheme are presented in section V. A case design and its experimental results are presented in section VI. Finally, conclusions are drawn in section VII.

II. INTERNAL MODEL CONTROL

Fig. 1 shows the IMC control system block diagram. P is the plant to be controlled, $\dot{q}$ is the nominal model of plant, q is the controller and $r, u, y$ are the reference, controller output and system output.

The IMC structure can be related to a classical feedback structure by the following equation,

$$c = \frac{q}{1 - \dot{q}p} \quad (1)$$

where $c$ is the classical feedback controller and the control structure is as shown in Fig. 2. The controller $c$ has not only the simple structure of classical control but also IMC advantages such as excellent tracking performance, attenuation disturbance ability and strong robustness with little modeling effort[8]-[9].

![Fig. 1 Block diagram of IMC system](image)

![Fig. 2 Diagram of relationship between IMC and classical control system](image)
III. INVERTER MODEL

A single phase full-bridge inverter is shown in Fig.3. The symbol \( U \) represents the DC voltage source, \( u_i \) is the inverter bridge output voltage; \( u_i \) is the voltage of filter capacitance \( C \), \( i_L \) is the current of filter inductance \( L \) and \( i_o \) is the load current; \( R \) is the equivalent damping resistance.

The differential equation model can be derived by applying KVL and KCL as follow:

\[
\frac{d u_i}{dt} = \frac{1}{C} i_L - \frac{1}{C} i_o \tag{2}
\]

\[
\frac{d i_L}{dt} = \frac{1}{L} u_i - \frac{1}{L} i_o - \frac{R}{L} i_L \tag{3}
\]

The inverter transfer function with no load can be derived from equation (2) and (3) as follow:

\[
G_i(s) = \frac{U_c(s)}{U_i(s)} = \frac{\omega_0^2}{s^2 + 2\xi \omega_0 s + \omega_0^2} = \frac{1}{LCs^2 + RCS + 1} \tag{4}
\]

where \( \omega_0 \) is the undamped natural frequency, \( \omega_n = \sqrt{1/LC} \); \( \xi \) is the damping ratio, \( \xi = R/2\sqrt{C/L} \).

In order to simplify the multiplicative uncertainty function, the paper chooses the mathematical model \( G_i(s) \) at no load as the inverter nominal model and regards the load current as disturbance. The multiplicative uncertainty function \( l_m(s) \) is:

\[
l_m(s) = \frac{(L - L)C^2 s^2 + (RC - R)C^2 s + 1}{LC^2 s^2 + R^2C^2 s + 1} \tag{5}
\]

where \( L', C', R' \) are practical inductance, capacitance and damped resistance, respectively.

IV. IMC-PID CONTROLLER DESIGN

A Inner Loop Controller Design

From Fig.1, the relationship as follow can be derived:

\[
Y(s) = \frac{P(s)Q(s)\cdot R(s)}{1 + Q(s)[P(s) - P(s)] + \left[1 - \hat{P}(s)Q(s)\right]D(s)} \tag{6}
\]

Assuming that the nominal model is accurate, \( \hat{P}(s) = P(s) \), then the follow equation can be gotten.

\[
Y(s) = P(s)Q(s)R(s) + (1 - P(s)Q(s))D(s) \tag{7}
\]

Equation (7) shows that the response of system input \( R(s) \) and the attenuation of system disturbance \( D(s) \) all have the relation with the plant pole. The damping ratio \( \xi \) of \( G_i(s) \) is so small that the inverter has bad dynamic performance and the THD of inverter output voltage with nonlinear load is high. However, the IMC hasn’t the ability to improve it in this case [9]. To overcome the shortcoming of IMC, the paper puts forward IMC-PID control scheme with the PD instantaneous-value feedback inner loop. The PD inner loop is designed to improve the inverter dynamic performance.

The inner PD controller is designed based on pole assignment[5]. Selecting capacitor voltage \( u_i \) and capacitor current \( i_o \) as state variables, and inverter bridge output voltage \( u_i \) as the input, the state different equation at no load is:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
    u_c \\
    i_c
\end{bmatrix} =
\begin{bmatrix}
    0 & 1/C \\
    -1/L & -R/L
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
    u_i \\
    i_c
\end{bmatrix} +
\begin{bmatrix}
    0 \\
    1/L
\end{bmatrix} u_i \tag{8}
\]

\[
y = \left[\begin{array}{c}
1 \\
0
\end{array}\right]
\begin{bmatrix}
    u_c \\
    i_c
\end{bmatrix} \tag{9}
\]

By adding state feedback: \( k_x = (k_1 u_i + k_2 i_c), \) we can get the expect close-loop poles as follow.

\[
p_{1,2} = -\xi \omega_n \pm j \sqrt{(1-\xi^2)\omega_n} \tag{10}
\]

where \( \xi \) is the expect damping ratio, \( \omega_n \) is the expect undamped natural frequency. State feedback gain \( k_1, k_2 \) are as follow:

\[
k_1 = \omega_n^2 LC - 1, \quad k_2 = 2\xi \omega_n LC - R
\]

The product of \( C \) and \( du_i/dt \) is \( i_o \), so the capacitor current feedback \( i_o \) can be changed to capacitor voltage differential feedback \( du_i/dt \). Thus, the equipment of voltage test doesn’t be needed and the cost of inverter is reduced. From above analysis, the parameters of inner PD loop can be gotten as follow.

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
    \hat{K}_p = k_1 = \omega_n^2 LC - 1 \\
    \hat{K}_d = k_2 = 2\xi \omega_n LC - RC
\end{bmatrix} \tag{11}
\]

B External Loop IMC-PID Controller design

There are many methods to design the IMC controller. The widely used method is as follow.

Step1 Factor the nominal model \( \hat{P}(s) \).

The nominal model \( \hat{P}(s) \) is decomposed as follow.

\[
\hat{P}(s) = \hat{P}_1(s)\hat{P}_2(s)
\]

where \( \hat{P}_1(s) \) contains all the time delays and the parts whose poles in the right complex plane of \( \hat{P}(s) \); \( \hat{P}_2(s) \) is stable and does not involve predictors. The nominal model of inverter with the inner PD loop is as follow.
\[ \tilde{P}(s) = \frac{\omega_n^2}{s^2 + (2\xi\omega_n + K_p\omega_n^2)s + (1 + K_p)\omega_n^2} \quad (12) \]

where \( \tilde{P}(s) = \frac{\omega_n^2}{s^2 + (2\xi\omega_n + K_p\omega_n^2)s + (1 + K_p)\omega_n^2} \).

**Step 2** Get the IMC controller and classical controller

Define the IMC controller \( Q(s) \) by

\[ Q(s) = \tilde{P}(s)F(s) = F(s)[s^2 + (2\xi\omega_n + K_p\omega_n^2)s + \omega_n^2] / \omega_n^2 \]

where \( F(s) \) is the first order filter, \( F(s) = 1/(\tau s + 1) \).

According to equation (1), the classical controller can be derived as follow.

\[ C(s) = \frac{s^2 + (2\xi\omega_n + K_p\omega_n^2)s + (1 + K_p)\omega_n^2}{\tau\omega_n^2} \quad (13) \]

**Step 3** Change the classical controller to traditional PID controller.

The PID controller structure is assumed as follow.

\[ G_{PID} = k_p + k_i \frac{1}{s} + k_d s = k_p s^3 + k_p s + k_i \]

\[ (14) \]

From equation (13) and (14), we can get:

\[ k_p = (2\xi\omega_n + K_p\omega_n^2) / \tau\omega_n^2, \quad k_i = (1 + K_p) / \tau, \quad k_d = 1 / \tau \omega_n^2, \]

where \( \tau \) is the filter coefficient.

The inverter nominal model with inner PD loop is shown in equation (12). The multiplicative uncertainty function \( I_u(s) \) is:

\[ I_u(s) = \frac{(LC - L'C)^2 + (RC - R'C)s}{L'C^2 + (R'C + K_o)s + 1 + K_p} \]

\[ (15) \]

In order that the control system has robust stability, the following equation must be satisfied.

\[ |\eta(j\omega)I_u(\omega)| \leq 1 \]

where \( \eta(j\omega) \) is the complementary sensitivity function; \( I_u(\omega) \) is the bound of multiplicative uncertainty function.

This paper first gets the \( I_u(\omega) \) in the case of \( 0.5L \leq L' \leq 1.5L, \quad 0.5C \leq C' \leq 1.5C, \quad 0.5R \leq R' \leq 1.5R \), then confirms the filter constant \( \tau \) by \( \eta(j\omega) \).

The smaller \( \tau \) is, the better dynamic and static performance the system has. On the other hand, the bigger \( \tau \) is, the stronger robustness the system has. Thus, in principle, the filter coefficient \( \tau \) should be determined such that an optimal compromise between the performance and robustness is reached[8]-[9].

V. SYSTEM PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

A. Block Diagram of Control System

**Fig. 4.** Block diagram of Inverter IMC-PID control system with PD instantaneous-value feedback inner loop.

**Fig. 4** shows the block diagram of the inverter control system based on IMC-PID control scheme with the PD instantaneous-value feedback inner loop.

In Fig 4, \( U_i \) is the sinusoidal input reference. According to block diagram above, the closed-loop transfer function of output voltage \( U_i \) and the sinusoidal input reference \( U_i \), and the load current disturbance signal \( I_o \) is shown as

\[ U_i(s) = \frac{(k_p s^2 + k_p s + k_i)U_i(s)}{L'C^2 + (R'C + K_o)s + 1 + K_p} \]

\[ (16) \]

\[ U_i(s) = \frac{L'C^2 + (R'C + K_o)s + 1 + K_p}{1 + \tau s}U_i(s) \]

**B. Dynamic Characteristics**

The system response of suddenly switching on or switching off load shows the inverter dynamic characteristics. From equation (16), the closed-loop transfer function of output voltage \( U_i \) with the load current \( I_o \) is shown as

\[ U_i(s) = \frac{(Ls + r)I_o(s)}{L'C^2 + (R'C + K_o)s + 1 + K_p} \]

\[ (17) \]

The system load response performance is mainly determined by the poles of the transfer function in equation (17). \( \tau \) is much small, so the transfer function is equivalent to a second-order system. The dynamic characteristic can be satisfied with expected \( \xi, \omega_i \).

**C. Static Characteristics**

The frequency response of closed-loop output voltage \( U_i \) can be derived by equation (16) with \( s = j\omega \). The static value of \( U_i \) is composed of two parts: one part caused by input voltage \( U_i \) and the other part caused by load current disturbance \( I_o \). The former one is regarded as the output voltage of the closed-loop system at no load, while the latter one as the voltage drop on the system inner impedance. Without considering the harmonic current, the output voltage \( U_i \) can be shown as

\[ U_i(j\omega) = U_{ir}(j\omega) + U_{id}(j\omega) \]

\[ (18) \]

The output \( U_{ir} \) caused by \( U_i \) and the voltage drop \( U_{id} \) caused by fundamental load current can be derived from equation (16).
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D Robustness Performance Analyze

The model uncertainty caused by parameter uncertainty is called structure uncertainty, which is the main reason of inverter model uncertainty at no load. The inverter nominal model structure uncertainty is mainly caused by change of damping resistance $R$, output filter inductance $L$ and output filter capacitance $C$. It exist error in parameter $L$, $C$ and $R$ because of the difficulty of measuring the damping resistance and deviation of inductance and capacitance rating value. The closed-loop frequency characteristic indicates the tracking performance, and the disturbance frequency characteristic indicates the ability to attenuate disturbance. So, the control system robustness performance can be analyzed by its closed-loop frequency characteristic and disturbance frequency characteristic. The closed-loop transfer function $G_c(s)$ and load disturbance transfer function $G_{dL}(s)$ can be derived from equation (16)

$$G_c(s) = \frac{k_1s^3 + k_2s + k_3}{LCs^3 + (rC + K_D + K_P)s^2 + (1 + K_P + K_P s + s)}$$

$$G_{dL}(s) = \frac{U_c(s)}{-I_c(s)} \frac{Ls + r}{LCs^2 + (rC + K_D)s + 1 + K_P 1 + ts}$$

![Fig.5](image1.png)  
(a) Fig.5. Frequency characteristic when $L$ changes between ±50%  
(b) Fig.6. Frequency characteristic when $C$ changes between ±50%

![Fig.6](image2.png)  
(a) Fig.6. Frequency characteristic when $C$ changes between ±50%  
(b) Fig.7. Frequency characteristic when $R$ changes between ±50%

![Fig.7](image3.png)  
(a) Fig.7. Frequency characteristic when $R$ changes between ±50%

![Fig.8](image4.png)  
(a) Fig.8(a) shows the simulated output voltage and current waveforms, respectively. In Fig. 8(a), the results are achieved at the rating resistance load. In Fig. 8(b), the outputs are achieved at 85% of rating resistance load. Output voltage THD in simulation and experiment are both less than 1%.

![Fig.9](image5.png)  
(a) Fig.9(a) shows the simulated output voltage and current waveforms at suddenly switching on or switching off 70% rating resistance load. Fig.9(b) shows the experimental output voltage and current waveforms at suddenly switching on 70% rating resistance load. The dynamic processes of simulation or experiment are less than 1.5ms. And the output voltage changes are less than 7%.

![Fig.10](image6.png)  
(a) Fig.10(a) shows the simulated output voltage and current waveforms at suddenly switching on or switching off 70% rating resistance load. Fig.10(b) shows the experimental output voltage and current waveforms at suddenly switching on 70% rating resistance load. The dynamic processes of simulation or experiment are less than 1.5ms. And the output voltage changes are less than 7%.

![Fig.11](image7.png)  
(a) Fig.11(a) shows the simulated output voltage and current waveforms at suddenly switching on or switching off 70% rating resistance load. Fig.11(b) shows the experimental output voltage and current waveforms at suddenly switching on 70% rating resistance load. The dynamic processes of simulation or experiment are less than 1.5ms. And the output voltage changes are less than 7%.

![Fig.12](image8.png)  
(a) Fig.12(a) shows the simulated output voltage and current waveforms at suddenly switching on or switching off 70% rating resistance load. Fig.12(b) shows the experimental output voltage and current waveforms at suddenly switching on 70% rating resistance load. The dynamic processes of simulation or experiment are less than 1.5ms. And the output voltage changes are less than 7%.

![Fig.13](image9.png)  
(a) Fig.13(a) shows the simulated output voltage and current waveforms at suddenly switching on or switching off 70% rating resistance load. Fig.13(b) shows the experimental output voltage and current waveforms at suddenly switching on 70% rating resistance load. The dynamic processes of simulation or experiment are less than 1.5ms. And the output voltage changes are less than 7%.

![Fig.14](image10.png)  
(a) Fig.14(a) shows the simulated output voltage and current waveforms at suddenly switching on or switching off 70% rating resistance load. Fig.14(b) shows the experimental output voltage and current waveforms at suddenly switching on 70% rating resistance load. The dynamic processes of simulation or experiment are less than 1.5ms. And the output voltage changes are less than 7%.

![Fig.15](image11.png)  
(a) Fig.15(a) shows the simulated output voltage and current waveforms at suddenly switching on or switching off 70% rating resistance load. Fig.15(b) shows the experimental output voltage and current waveforms at suddenly switching on 70% rating resistance load. The dynamic processes of simulation or experiment are less than 1.5ms. And the output voltage changes are less than 7%.

![Fig.16](image12.png)  
(a) Fig.16(a) shows the simulated output voltage and current waveforms at suddenly switching on or switching off 70% rating resistance load. Fig.16(b) shows the experimental output voltage and current waveforms at suddenly switching on 70% rating resistance load. The dynamic processes of simulation or experiment are less than 1.5ms. And the output voltage changes are less than 7%.

![Fig.17](image13.png)  
(a) Fig.17(a) shows the simulated output voltage and current waveforms at suddenly switching on or switching off 70% rating resistance load. Fig.17(b) shows the experimental output voltage and current waveforms at suddenly switching on 70% rating resistance load. The dynamic processes of simulation or experiment are less than 1.5ms. And the output voltage changes are less than 7%.

![Fig.18](image14.png)  
(a) Fig.18(a) shows the simulated output voltage and current waveforms at suddenly switching on or switching off 70% rating resistance load. Fig.18(b) shows the experimental output voltage and current waveforms at suddenly switching on 70% rating resistance load. The dynamic processes of simulation or experiment are less than 1.5ms. And the output voltage changes are less than 7%.

![Fig.19](image15.png)  
(a) Fig.19(a) shows the simulated output voltage and current waveforms at suddenly switching on or switching off 70% rating resistance load. Fig.19(b) shows the experimental output voltage and current waveforms at suddenly switching on 70% rating resistance load. The dynamic processes of simulation or experiment are less than 1.5ms. And the output voltage changes are less than 7%.

![Fig.20](image16.png)  
(a) Fig.20(a) shows the simulated output voltage and current waveforms at suddenly switching on or switching off 70% rating resistance load. Fig.20(b) shows the experimental output voltage and current waveforms at suddenly switching on 70% rating resistance load. The dynamic processes of simulation or experiment are less than 1.5ms. And the output voltage changes are less than 7%.

![Fig.21](image17.png)  
(a) Fig.21(a) shows the simulated output voltage and current waveforms at suddenly switching on or switching off 70% rating resistance load. Fig.21(b) shows the experimental output voltage and current waveforms at suddenly switching on 70% rating resistance load. The dynamic processes of simulation or experiment are less than 1.5ms. And the output voltage changes are less than 7%.
TABLE I. Power Circuit CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Circuit Characteristic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IGBT 1200V/100A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>output filter inductance (mH)</td>
<td>0.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equivalent resistance (Ω)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>output filter capacitance (uF)</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>switch frequency (kHz)</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rating output voltage (V)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rating output resistant current (A)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rating power factor</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This paper proposes the inverter IMC-PID control system with the PD instantaneous-value feedback inner loop for the first time. The control system is easy to design, analyze and implement, which only needs the output voltage to be sampled. The simulation and experimental results show that the proposed control system has good dynamic and static performance and strong robustness. It has no need to measure the damping resistance because the error of damping resistance has no effect on system performance. Compared with the other control scheme, the proposed inverter control scheme has simpler structure, lower cost and stronger robustness. So, the IMC-PID inverter control system with PD instantaneous-value feedback inner loop is a good inverter control scheme with practicable value.
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Fig. 10(a) and (b) show the simulated and experimental output voltage and current waveforms at nonlinear load when the load current peak value is 38A, respectively. Output voltage THD in simulation and experiment are 0.36% and 1.59%, respectively.

The simulation and experiment results both show that the proposed control system has good dynamic performance, high static precision and is suitable for various load conditions especially nonlinear load condition because of its strong ability to restrain the waveform distortion.

VII. CONCLUSION