

An improved FCS-MPC strategy for PMSM based on grey prediction and fuzzy dynamic weighting factors

Hongfei Yang^{*,**}, Tianyu Gu^{**}, Yinghua Zhao^{*}, Dongliang Wang^{*}

**Branch of Qinglongsi Coal Mine, CHN Energy Yulin Energy Co, 719300, China*

(e-mail: 747406119@qq.com).

***College of Electrical and Control Engineering, Xi'an University of Science and Technology, 710054, China (e-mail: 128gt@163.com)*

Abstract: To optimize the performance and minimize transition times of control systems for permanent magnet synchronous motors (PMSM), this study suggests a double closed-loop FCS-MPC approach. Utilizing grey prediction and fuzzy dynamic weighting factors, the strategy is designed for PMSM applications. Initially, the mathematical model of PMSM is implemented in the two-phase synchronous rotation coordinate system to introduce the double closed-loop FCS-MPC method. This includes the use of distinct model predictive controllers for the speed outer loop and current inner loop. Subsequently, the grey system is integrated into the current inner loop to precisely determine the q-axis reference current for an optimal voltage vector, enhancing resistance to interference and dynamic response capabilities. Furthermore, a fuzzy controller is incorporated to minimize transition times by dynamically adjusting weighting factors based on varying operational conditions. This strategy aims to prevent speed overshooting, reduce transition times, and enhance resistance to interference and dynamic response. The efficacy of the proposed approach is verified through simulation and experimental assessments.

Keywords: Permanent magnet synchronous motor, Finite control set model predictive control, Grey prediction, Fuzzy control.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Permanent Magnet Synchronous Motor (PMSM) has attracted considerable interest in recent times because of its impressive power density, efficiency, and dependability. It is utilized in a variety of areas such as electric vehicles, computer numerical control servo systems, wind power, and more (Li et al., 2020). Nevertheless, attaining top-notch performance in different scenarios poses a challenge for traditional control approaches. Consequently, various researchers have suggested fresh control techniques and integrated them into PMSM control systems (Liang et al., 2018).

In recent years, there has been a growing interest in the application of model predictive control (MPC) in the field of PMSM. MPC can be classified into two main types: continuous control set model predictive control (CCS-MPC) and finite control set model predictive control (FCS-MPC) (Zhang and Hou, 2018). CCS-MPC utilizes space vector pulse width modulation to generate continuous voltage vectors, while maintaining a constant switching frequency (Zhang and Hou, 2018). On the other hand, FCS-MPC outputs a limited number of voltage vectors without the need for complex space vector modulation (Yu et al., 2022). Considering the switching characteristics of the inverter, FCS-MPC is more intuitive and simpler in terms of control complexity. A comparison of CCS-MPC and FCS-MPC is proposed in (Yang et al., 2021). It is found that CCS-MPC exhibits better

stability and robustness compared to FCS-MPC, but FCS-MPC has better dynamic characteristics. To enhance the robustness of FCS-MPC, Liu et al. (2020) proposed a predictive current control strategy to address steady-state errors resulting from parameter mismatches, albeit overlooking speed dynamic characteristics. In (Siami et al., 2018), a simplified FCS-MPC strategy is proposed to avoid a large amount of calculation, but still have speed overshoot and fluctuation. The simplification of the FCS-MPC design limits its performance in terms of switching frequency and current distortion. The influencing factors of the FCS-MPC are analyzed in (Karamanakos and Geyer, 2020), and corresponding design guidelines are provided. By introducing MPC in the speed outer loop, the overshoot can be effectively eliminated. Therefore, further research will be conducted on a double closed-loop FCS-MPC model.

In a PMSM system, the controller in the speed outer loop plays a vital role in calculating the reference current of the q-axis for the next time step. Nevertheless, the conventional FCS-MPC approach only takes into account the current moment's current in forecasting the q-axis reference current, disregarding important data from previous instances (Zeng et al., 2022). To address this issue, the grey prediction model is proposed, which can uncover the patterns of uncertain information embedded in historical data (Deng, 1993). The grey prediction model is widely employed in data prediction due to its superior accuracy. For instance, in (Cui et al., 2022), the combination of grey prediction and Markov is used to predict solar power generation, resulting in high reliability and stability. Similarly, in (Guo et al., 2022), the grey prediction model

and discrete prediction algorithm are utilized to diagnose and detect the status of robot power equipment, thereby enhancing safety. Moreover, (Cai et al., 2022) presents an improved grey prediction model to predict the lifespan of ship cables, leading to improved prediction reliability and providing valuable information for cable management. This paper aims to incorporate the grey prediction model into FCS-MPC to leverage uncertain information from historical current data and obtain optimal voltage vector for superior dynamic performance.

The cost function of FCS-MPC plays a crucial role in selecting the optimal voltage vector (Liu and Liu, 2021). In order to differentiate between the prioritization of objectives and establish the weight relationship within the cost function, it is necessary to assign weighting factors (Hu et al., 2019). For PMSM, the optimal weighting factors term is subject to continuous change. However, traditional FCS-MPC uses fixed weighting factors that are typically designed based on experience and have high switching times. This limits its applicability to dynamically changing working conditions and ranges (Liu et al., 2022; Vazquez et al., 2022). The fixed weighting factors are designed based on a single working point, but they have a poor control effect throughout the entire working range of the control system without adjustment. The adjustment of weighting factors can be considered from two aspects: eliminating weighting factors and adjusting weighting factors online. In their recent study (Lin et al., 2020), the weighting coefficients were removed through the conversion of managing the electromagnetic torque and stator flux amplitude to overseeing the stator flux vector. Typically, the elimination of weighting factors is achieved by modifying the cost function. There are diverse techniques available for computing the weighting coefficients on the web. One strategy involves employing an artificial neural network in order to determine the weighting factors. However, this method requires retraining the model for different motors, which entails a complex training process (Dragic'evic' and Novak, 2019; Novak et al., 2021). In (Davari et al., 2021), a simulated annealing algorithm has been successfully employed to adjust the weighting factors and reduce torque ripple in an induction motor driver. However, the impact of this algorithm on the operating points of other drivers has not been explicitly discussed. The technique of particle swarm optimization (Wu et al., 2021) and the normalization method of state (Gong et al., 2020) have been employed for the real-time adjustment of weighting coefficients. However, these methods require significant computational resources and have high hardware requirements. On the other hand, fuzzy control can effectively describe the relationship among system variables, simplifying system design without placing excessive demands on hardware (Eckert et al., 2022). In a study (Chen et al., 2019), a fuzzy controller was applied to self-correct the parameters of a PID controller, resulting in improved load torque anti-disturbance capability and favorable transient performances. Another study (Liu et al., 2019) proposed a cascade-less fuzzy FCS-MPC, which employs fuzzy logic control to dynamically select weighting factors, thereby reducing switching frequency and enhancing computational efficiency. In (Mahmoudi et al., 2016), the authors utilized fuzzy control to adjust the weighting factors of traditional FCS-MPC in order

to minimize current ripple and torque fluctuation. The inverter's switching frequency, unfortunately, was not considered in the study. As a result, this research presents the fuzzy theory as a solution to dynamically modify the weighting factors. The goal is to optimize the distribution of multi-objective weighting factors and decrease the total number of switch occurrences.

This study presents a novel approach to double closed-loop FCS-MPC strategy utilizing grey prediction and fuzzy dynamic weighting factors. The main aim of this strategy is to enhance the performance of PMSM control systems in small to medium scale applications by minimizing switching times and increasing both dynamic and steady-state performance. The key findings of this investigation include:

1. In the current inner loop, a gray prediction model is established based on FCS-MPC. This model can extract uncertain information from historical current data to predict the future current trend. By obtaining a more accurate optimal voltage vector, the dynamic response and anti-interference performance are improved;
2. Considering the fixed weighting factors may not be able to adapt to the diversity of operating conditions, a fuzzy controller is introduced to optimize the weighting factors dynamically. The implementation of the fuzzy controller reduces the number of switching times and enhances the control effectiveness.

2. SYSTEM DESCRIPTION AND FCS-MPC STRATEGY

2.1 Mathematical model of PMSM and inverter

Creating the mathematical representation of a PMSM using the theoretical model, within the d-q axis of two-phase synchronous rotation, results in the subsequent voltage equation:

$$u_d = R i_d + \frac{d\psi_d}{dt} - \psi_q \omega_m \quad (1a)$$

$$u_q = R i_q + \frac{d\psi_q}{dt} + \psi_d \omega_m \quad (1b)$$

where u_d , u_q are the d-q axis components of stator voltage, respectively; i_d , i_q are the d-q axis components of stator current, respectively; $\psi_d = L_d i_d + \psi_f$ represents the flux linkage on the d-axis, $\psi_q = L_q i_q$ represents the flux linkage on the q-axis; ω_m denotes the electrical angular speed; ψ_f represents the flux linkage of the permanent magnet; R indicates the resistance of the stator; The inductances of the d-q axis are denoted as L_d and L_q . The surface-mounted PMSM discussed in this study is characterized by symmetrical d-q axis inductances, referred to as $L_d = L_q = L$.

The electromagnetic torque equation and the mechanical motion equation of the motor is:

$$T_e = 1.5 p \psi_f i_q \quad (2)$$

$$J \frac{d\omega_m}{dt} = T_e - T_L - B\omega_m \quad (3)$$

where p is the number of pole pairs; J represents the moment of inertia; The electromagnetic torque and the load torque are defined as T_e and T_L respectively; B is the damping coefficient.

This paper utilizes a two-level inverter for motor drive in a three-phase system, with the schematic provided in Fig. 1. The inverter circuit is composed of six power switch tubes, including the three bridge arms, denoted as a, b and c. $S_{a,j}$, $S_{b,j}$, $S_{c,j}$, $S'_{a,j}$, $S'_{b,j}$, $S'_{c,j}$ are defined as the switching states of six power switch tubes. To avoid short circuit of DC power supply, the power switch tubes on the same bridge arm will always be in opposite state, and “1”, “0” represent open and off respectively.




Fig. 1 Three-phase two-level inverter.

These switching signals determine the value of the output voltage:

$$u_{aN,j} = S_{a,j} U_{dc} \quad (4a)$$

$$u_{bN,j} = S_{b,j} U_{dc} \quad (4b)$$

$$u_{cN,j} = S_{c,j} U_{dc}, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, 7, \quad (4c)$$

where $u_{aN,j}$, $u_{bN,j}$, $u_{cN,j}$ are the phase neutral voltages of the inverter and U_{dc} is the DC power supply voltage, $U_{dc} = 220$ V.

The single vector $\mathbf{p} = e^{j2\pi/3} = -\frac{1}{2} + j\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$ shows a 120° phase difference and the output voltage vectors can be defined as:

$$\mathbf{u}_j = \frac{2}{3} (u_{aN,j} + \mathbf{p}u_{bN,j} + \mathbf{p}^2 u_{cN,j}), \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, 7. \quad (5)$$

Considering the possible combinations of all the gated signals $S_{a,j}$, $S_{b,j}$ and $S_{c,j}$, eight switching states are obtained, resulting in eight voltage vectors as shown in Table 1. Fig. 2 depicts that due to $\mathbf{u}_0 = \mathbf{u}_7$, a limited collection of solely seven distinct voltage vectors can be achieved within the complex plane.




Fig 2 Voltage vector distribution.

Table 1 Switching states of the inverter

j	$S_{a,j}$	$S_{b,j}$	$S_{c,j}$	The voltage vector $\mathbf{u}_j$
0	0	0	0	$\mathbf{u}_0 = 0$
1	1	0	0	$\mathbf{u}_1 = \frac{2}{3} U_{dc}$
2	1	1	0	$\mathbf{u}_2 = \frac{1}{3} U_{dc} + j \frac{\sqrt{3}}{3} U_{dc}$
3	0	1	0	$\mathbf{u}_3 = -\frac{1}{3} U_{dc} + j \frac{\sqrt{3}}{3} U_{dc}$
4	0	1	1	$\mathbf{u}_4 = -\frac{2}{3} U_{dc}$
5	0	0	1	$\mathbf{u}_5 = -\frac{1}{3} U_{dc} - j \frac{\sqrt{3}}{3} U_{dc}$
6	1	0	1	$\mathbf{u}_6 = \frac{1}{3} U_{dc} - j \frac{\sqrt{3}}{3} U_{dc}$
7	1	1	1	$\mathbf{u}_7 = 0$

2.2 Double closed loop FCS-MPC strategy

2.2.1 Model predictive controller in speed outer loop

This study employs the model predictive control method in the speed outer loop for acquiring a higher level of precision in the q-axis reference current (Huang et al., 2021).

According to (3), the predicted speed $\omega_{pm}(k+1)$ can be expressed as:

$$\omega_{pm}(k+1) = (1-b_0)\omega_m(k) + b_0\omega_m(k-1) + a_0\Delta i_q^*(k) \quad (6)$$

where $a_0 = 1.5p\psi_f(1-e^{-TB/J})/B$, $b_0 = -e^{-TB/J}$, $\Delta i_q^*(k)$ represents the increment of q-axis current control.

The predicted output $\omega_m(k+1)$ is:

$$\omega_m(k+1) = \omega_{pm}(k+1) + e(k), \quad (7)$$

where $e(k) = \omega_m(k) - \omega_{pm}(k)$ is the prediction error.

The reference track of speed $y_p(k+1)$ is:

$$y_p(k+1) = \tau\omega_m(k) + (1-\tau)\omega_s(k), \quad (8)$$

where τ is the flexibility coefficient, $\omega_s(k)$ is the reference speed. To minimize the deviation between the predicted output $\omega_{pm}(k+1)$ and the expected output $y_p(k+1)$ based on the reference trajectory, the secondary performance index is formulated as follows:

$$J = \lambda[\omega_{\text{pm}}(k+1) - y_{\text{p}}(k+1)]^2 + \sigma[\Delta i_{\text{q}}^*(k)]^2, \quad (9)$$

where λ , σ are the degree of inhibition of tracking error and control variation, respectively. $\partial J / \partial \Delta i_q^*(k) = 0$, it can be obtained as follows:

$$\Delta l_q^*(k) = -\frac{\lambda a_0}{\lambda a_0^2 + \sigma} [(1-b_0)\omega_m(k) + b_0\omega_m(k-1) + e(k) - y_p(k-1)]. \quad (10)$$

Then, the given value of q-axis current is:

$$i_q^*(k+1) = i_q(k) + \Delta i_q^*(k). \quad (11)$$

2.2.2 FCS-MPC in current inner loop

As stated by both (1) and (3), if the motor current is chosen as the state variable, the state equation can then be derived:

$$\frac{di}{dt} = Ai + Eu + D, \quad (12)$$

$$\text{where } \mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} -R/L & \omega_m(k) \\ -\omega_m(k) & -R/L \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{E} = \begin{bmatrix} 1/L & 0 \\ 0 & 1/L \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\mathbf{D} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -\omega_f \omega_m(k)/L \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{i} = \begin{bmatrix} i_d & i_q \end{bmatrix}^T, \mathbf{u} = \begin{bmatrix} u_d & u_q \end{bmatrix}^T.$$

If the duration of the control period T within the current inner loop is sufficiently brief, it is assumed that the input voltage u and the back electromotive force D of the system remain consistent throughout a control period $[kT, (k+1)T]$. Under these circumstances, the current forecasting model may be derived by discretizing equation (12):

$$i(k+1) = F(k)i(k) + Gu(k) + M(k), \quad (13)$$

where $i(k) = [i_d(k) \ i_q(k)]^T$, $u(k) = [u_d(k) \ u_q(k)]^T$, $F(k) = \begin{bmatrix} 1-TR/L & T\omega_m(k) \\ -T\omega_m(k) & 1-TR/L \end{bmatrix}$, $G = \begin{bmatrix} T/L & 0 \\ 0 & T/L \end{bmatrix}$, $M(k) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -T\psi_r\omega_m(k)/L \end{bmatrix}$. Using equation (13), the stator current

for each of the seven voltage vectors produced by the inverter can be accurately forecasted.

Cost function can contain multiple control objectives, variables, nonlinear conditions and other system constraints, which is the key to realizing optimal voltage vector selection. The objectives of the multi-objective cost function proposed in this paper are as follows: (1) d-axis current reference tracking; (2) q-axis current reference tracking; (3) optimization of inverter switching times; (4) restriction of current magnitude. Therefore, the cost function can be expressed as:

$$g = Q_1 i_d^2(k+1) + Q_2 (i_q^* - i_q(k+1))^2 + Q_3 \cdot num + \hat{f}(i_d(k+1), i_q(k+1)), \quad (14)$$

where $i_d(k+1)$ and $i_q(k+1)$ represent the predicted d-q axis current components corresponding to a specific voltage vector in the discrete time model of the system. The torque current reference value is denoted by i_q^* . Q_1 and Q_2 represent the weighting factors for the d-q axis current, while Q_3 represents the weighting factor for inverter switching times. The optimal voltage vector, u_o , is established through the minimization of the cost function. In this study, the switching times for each calculation cycle in the voltage source inverter are outlined in equation (15).

$$\begin{aligned} num = & |S_a(k) - S_a(k-1)| + |S_b(k) - S_b(k-1)| \\ & + |S_c(k) - S_c(k-1)|. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

In order to be safe, the nonlinear function of stator current limit of PMSM is designed. Its definition is shown in (16).

$$\hat{f}(i_d(k+1), i_q(k+1)) = \begin{cases} \infty, & |i(k+1)| > i_{\max} \\ 0, & |i(k+1)| \leq i_{\max}. \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

Fig. 2 displays the block diagram of the FCS-MPC double closed-loop system for PMSM. FCS-MPC is responsible for designing the current inner loop, while the MPC algorithm is utilized for designing the speed outer loop. In summary, the algorithm known as "double closed-loop FCS-MPC" can be outlined as follows.




Fig. 3 Control block diagram of double closed loop FCS-MPC.

Algorithm 1

Offline stage:

1. choose the d-axis current $i_d^* = 0$ and the given speed ω_s ;
2. model parameters selected are: rated voltage, number of motor pole pairs p , stator resistance R , L_d and L_q inductance for the d- and q- axis, and magnetic flux ψ_f .

Online stage:

1. Retrieve the q -axis by using the current $i_q^*(k+1)$ from the predictive controller of the speed outer loop model;
2. substitute the reference current i_d^* , $i_q^*(k+1)$, actual rotational speed $\omega_m(k)$, d - and q - axis actual currents $i_d(k)$ and $i_q(k)$ into (13), get the current predicted value $i(k+1)$;
3. calculate the minimum cost function through (14);
4. Choose the voltage vector that has the lowest cost function value, and then output the appropriate switching signal for the optimal voltage vector u_o to apply to the inverter in order to regulate the motor.

In above description, as the input of current inner loop, i_q^* in next step is crucial for the selection of the optimal voltage vector. Algorithm 1 just makes use of current at present to predict i_q^* at next time, attaching less importance to current information at the past time. The accurate selection of the optimal voltage vector is hindered by this issue. Grey prediction can reveal the law of uncertain information contained in historical current data. Therefore, on the basis of Algorithm 1, grey prediction is designed to obtain more accurate optimal voltage vector.

3. Double closed loop FCS-MPC strategy based on grey prediction and fuzzy dynamic weighting factors

3.1 Grey prediction model

In order to improve the operational capabilities of PMSM and effectively harness ambiguous data from past current records to establish a relationship between the current value in the present and the previous output current, a grey forecasting model has been developed to predict the q -axis current and fine-tune the response mechanism.

Grey prediction can reveal the law of uncertain information contained in existing data. In the process of practical problem modeling, considering the randomness of time series data and the finiteness of data amount, it is difficult to measure the potential law of data series accurately. The process of series generation is one of the most important differences between grey prediction model and other prediction methods(Xuan et al., 2017). Grey prediction is used to model the sequence data through the unique cumulative generation transformation, which can weaken the randomness of the original data series. Using a small amount of data, it is possible for grey prediction to dig out the insignificant change trends in the original data series by accumulation transformation. Then, the grey differential equation is occupied to predict the data using accumulation generation. The grey system adopts the feedback current $i(k)$, which includes both definite and indefinite information, and generates a series of original sequences:

$$i^{(0)}(k) = \{i_1^{(0)}(k), i_2^{(0)}(k), \dots, i_n^{(0)}(k)\}, \quad (17)$$

where n is the extent of the sequence, and the superscript "(0)" indicates original without any accumulation. To achieve a new and unique sequence (18b), we can combine (17) into (18a).

$$i_j^{(1)}(k) = \sum_{l=1}^j i_l^{(0)}(k), \quad j=1, 2, \dots, n \quad (18a)$$

$$i^{(1)}(k) = \{i_1^{(1)}(k), i_2^{(1)}(k), \dots, i_n^{(1)}(k)\}, \quad (18b)$$

where the superscript "(1)" indicates one accumulation; the subscript " j " indicates the j -th data to be predicted, with the range of values for l being 1 to j . By utilizing equation (18), the original current sequence can be reconstructed as follows:

$$i_j^{(0)}(k) = i_j^{(1)}(k) - i_{j-1}^{(1)}(k), \quad j=2, 3, \dots, n. \quad (19)$$

The definition of whitening equation is as follows:

$$i_j^{(0)}(k) + az_j^{(1)}(k) = b, \quad j=2, 3, \dots, n \quad (20)$$

$$z_j^{(1)}(k) = \frac{i_j^{(1)}(k) + i_{j-1}^{(1)}(k)}{2}, \quad j=2, 3, \dots, n, \quad (21)$$

where a and b are parameters to be estimated. The whitening equation set is exhibited in (22):

$$i_2^{(0)}(k) + az_2^{(1)}(k) = b \quad (22a)$$

$$i_3^{(0)}(k) + az_3^{(1)}(k) = b \quad (22b)$$

$$\vdots$$

$$i_n^{(0)}(k) + az_n^{(1)}(k) = b. \quad (22c)$$

Through the least square method, the estimated parameters a and b can be acquired:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{a} & \hat{b} \end{bmatrix}^T = (Z^T Z)^{-1} Z^T Y, \quad (23)$$

$$\text{where } Z = \begin{bmatrix} -z_2^{(1)}(k), 1 \\ -z_3^{(1)}(k), 1 \\ \dots \\ -z_n^{(1)}(k), 1 \end{bmatrix}, Y = [i_2^{(0)}(k), i_3^{(0)}(k), \dots, i_n^{(0)}(k)]^T.$$

By solving and recovering the differential equation, the result of grey prediction is presented in the following manner:

$$\hat{i}_{j+1}^{(0)}(k+1) = (i_1^{(0)}(k) - \frac{\hat{b}}{\hat{a}})(1 - e^{\hat{a}k})e^{-\hat{a}k}, \quad j=1, 2, \dots, n. \quad (24)$$

According to (17)-(24), current predicted at the next moment can be deduced as follows:

$$\tilde{i}_q^*(k+1) = \frac{i_q^*(k+1) + \hat{i}_{j+1}^{(0)}(k+1)}{2}. \quad (25)$$

Therefore, the value at the subsequent moment based on the past value is calculated, leading to an improvement in the dynamic capabilities of PMSM. The cost function is then revised to:

$$g' = Q_1 i_d^2(k+1) + Q_2 (\tilde{i}_q^* - i_q(k+1))^2 + Q_3 \cdot \text{num} + \hat{f}(i_d(k+1), i_q(k+1)). \quad (26)$$

According to the description above, the “double closed loop FCS-MPC strategy based on grey prediction” algorithm is as follows:

Algorithm 2

Offline stage:

1. choose the d-axis current $i_d^* = 0$ and given speed ω_s ;
2. choose the model parameters: voltage rating, number of motor pole pairs p , stator resistance R , inductances L_d and L_q of the d- and q- axis, and magnetic flux ψ_f .

Online stage:

1. the actual current $i_q(k)$ of q-axis is input to the grey model equation (17)-(24), and the grey prediction current $\tilde{i}_q^*(k+1)$ required at this moment is obtained through (25);
2. substitute the reference current i_d^* , $\tilde{i}_q^*(k+1)$, actual current $i_d(k)$, $i_q(k)$ and actual rotational speed $\omega_m(k)$ into (13), get the current predicted value $i(k+1)$;
3. the minimum cost function is calculated by (26);
4. select the voltage vector with the minimum cost function value, output the corresponding switching signal of the voltage vector u_o to be applied to the inverter in order to regulate the motor.

Fixed weighting factors are utilized in Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2, which require extensive experimentation to deter-

mine suitable weighting factors. These algorithms result in a significant workload and generate a large number of harmonics and switching times under different working conditions. To address this issue, a fuzzy controller can be employed to dynamically adjust the control strategy's focus and generate dynamic weighting factors, thereby avoiding the need for tedious manual adjustments. Hence, we introduce a fuzzy controller in conjunction with Algorithm 2.

3.2 Fuzzy dynamic weighting factors

In the cost function, specific weighting factors, which can adjust the emphasis ratio of different control objectives, are assigned to corresponding optimization items. In traditional methods, designers usually design a set of fixed weighting factors based on their experience. However, it is challenging for fixed weighting factors to meet both dynamic and steady-state performance requirements. Since the servo system is fundamentally a dynamic process, it proves challenging to consistently model the weighting factors for all individual terms. Therefore, this paper proposes the application of fuzzy theory for dynamically adjusting the weighting factors of multi-objective optimization. Fuzzy conditional statements and algorithms are utilized to describe the complex functional relationship between objectives. The paper presents a method for dynamically adjusting the weighting factors of the cost function, enabling optimal multi-objective assignment.

The speed deviation $\Delta\omega$ and the change rate of speed deviation $\Delta\delta$ are taken as the input variables of the fuzzy controller, where the variation range of the former is $[-500, 500]$, and the latter is $[-1000, 1000]$. Weighting factors Q_1 , Q_2 and Q_3 are used as output variables. The output ranges of Q_1 , Q_2 and Q_3 are defined as $[1, 5]$, $[5, 9]$, and $[0.5, 1]$ respectively. The input and output ranges are discretized, and fuzzy sets are defined as follows: the fuzzy sets of input variables are NB(Negative big), NM(Negative medium), NS(Negative small), ZE(Zero), PS(Positive small), PM(Positive medium), and PB(Positive big), while the fuzzy sets of output variables are ZE(Zero), PS(Positive small), PM(Positive medium), and PB(Positive big). The definition of fuzzy theory domain is shown in Table 2.

The cost function of Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 uses fixed weighting factors, requiring numerous experiments to be repeated for debugging based on different motors and working conditions.




Fig. 4 Input and output curves of fuzzy reasoning.

Table 2 Fuzzy theory domain

Variables	Domain of discourse						
	NB	NM	NS	ZO	PS	PM	PB
$\Delta\omega$	-500	-333	-167	0	167	333	500
$\Delta\delta$	-1000	-666	-333	0	333	666	1000
Q_1	-	-	-	1	2.3	3.5	5
Q_2	-	-	-	5	6.3	7.6	9
Q_3	-	-	-	0.5	0.67	0.83	1

In contrast, fuzzy control does not have such limitations. By adjusting the fuzzy domain in Table 2 using a symmetrical triangle, the dynamic cost function can be achieved without the need to redesign the fuzzy rules.

Since the dynamic cost function requires real-time calculation, the shape of the membership function of the fuzzy state is a symmetric triangle, which is simple in operation, small in memory and easy in online implementation. After fuzzy reasoning rules, the center of gravity method is adopted to de fuzzy and output the fuzzy logic rules as Table 3. The input and output surfaces of fuzzy reasoning are shown in Fig.4. Fig.5 shows the control block diagram of double closed loop FCS-MPC strategy based on grey prediction and fuzzy dynamic weighting factors.

According to the above introduction of double closed loop FCS-MPC strategy based on grey prediction and fuzzy dynamic weighting factors and the structure of the control block diagram in Fig.5, the algorithm is summarized as follows:




Fig. 5 Control block diagram of double closed loop FCS-MPC strategy based on grey prediction and fuzzy dynamic weighting factors.

Algorithm 3

Offline stage:

1. choose the d -axis current $i_d^* = 0$ and given speed ω_s ;
2. choose the model parameters: voltage rating, number of motor pole pairs P , stator resistance R ,

inductances L_d and L_q of the d - and q - axis, and magnetic flux ψ_f .

Online stage:

1. Retrieve the q -axis by using the current $i_q^*(k+1)$ from the predictive controller of the speed outer loop model;
2. the actual current $i_q(k)$ is input to the grey model equation (17)-(24), and the grey prediction current $\tilde{i}_q^*(k+1)$ required at this moment is obtained through (25);
3. substitute the reference current i_d^* , $\tilde{i}_q^*(k+1)$, actual current $i_d(k)$, $i_q(k)$ and actual rotational speed $\omega_m(k)$ into (13), get the current predicted value $i(k+1)$;
4. the dynamic weighting factors Q_1 , Q_2 and Q_3 are obtained from the fuzzy controller.
5. the minimum cost function is calculated by (26);
6. Choose the voltage vector u_o that has the lowest cost function value, and then produce the associated switching signal for the voltage vector in order to regulate the motor through the inverter.

4. Simulation and experiment

4.1 Simulation results and analysis

A MATLAB/Simulink simulation model is created to evaluate three different algorithms using the control block diagrams displayed in Fig.3 and Fig.5. Evaluations were performed to analyze the efficiency of the control strategies in two scenarios: initiating operation with no load and with sudden loading. The duration of each simulation is limited to 0.4 seconds, and the necessary parameters are detailed in Table 4. The grey prediction model is able to reveal the law of the original sequence with only a small amount of data. In this paper, the original sequence length for grey prediction is selected as $n = 4$ in both simulation and experiment. Additionally, the initial value is set as 0 to reduce the computational load. After three control periods, the initial value is cleared and the system enters the normal operation state. Compared with the overall operating time, the duration of three periods is very short, and its impact on control effectiveness can be ignored.

In the control system of PMSM, it is evident from equations (2) and (3) that the current inner loop plays a crucial role in ensuring the motor torque control performance (Wang et al., 2020). The torque and speed are closely related, as the torque and load collectively determine the motor speed. Consequently, enhancing the current inner loop directly affects the evaluation of speed outcomes. Hence, this paper

selects speed and current as the measurement indices.

The stated motor speed is specified at 500 revolutions per minute. Fig. 6 illustrates the speed comparison of the three tactics. It is evident from the graph that Algorithms 1 through 3 are able to reach the desired speed without experiencing any overshoot. Both Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3 have shorter response time than Algorithm 1. When $t = 0.2$ s, a load disturbance of $2.4 \text{ N} \cdot \text{m}$ was added suddenly, the speed decreased in all three strategies, but it is evident that the three algorithms successfully mitigated the speed variation resulting from changes in the load. In the steady state stage, Algorithm 3 has the smallest velocity fluctuation.

The specific index comparison results are shown in Table 5. In the motor startup stage, the rising time of Algorithm 2 and

3 are reduced by 51.34% and 58.92% respectively in comparison with Algorithm 1. Algorithm 3 can reach the steady-state in the shortest time among the three strategies. The speed fluctuation and recovery time of Algorithm 3 is the minimum under sudden load. These specific data indicate the role of grey prediction in fast dynamic response. Compared with Algorithm 1, the switching times of Algorithm 2 and 3 are reduced by 9.14% and 57.71% respectively. Meanwhile, the total harmonic distortion (THD) of A-phase current of algorithm 2 and algorithm 3 is 16.23% and 15.89% respectively, both lower than the 23.85% of algorithm 1. It can be seen that compared with Algorithm 1, Algorithm 2 improves the dynamic and anti-interference performance of the system, and also reduces switching times and THD of A- phase current. This is due to the introduction of grey prediction, which can reveal the law of uncertain

Table 3 Fuzzy logic rules

The change rate of speed deviation	Speed deviation						
	NB	NM	NS	ZO	PS	PM	PB
NB	PS,PB,PS	PS,PB,PS	PS,PB,PS	PS,PB,PS	PS,PB,PS	PS,PB,PS	PS,PB,PS
NM	PS,PB,PS	PM,PM,PM	PM,PM,PM	PM,PM,PM	PM,PM,PM	PM,PM,PM	PS,PB,PS
NS	PS,PB,PS	PM,PM,PM	PB,PS,PB	PB,PS,PB	PB,PS,PB	PM,PM,PM	PS,PB,PS
ZO	PS,PB,PS	PM,PM,PM	PB,PS,PB	ZO,ZO,ZO	PB,PS,PB	PM,PM,PM	PS,PB,PS
PS	PS,PB,PS	PM,PM,PM	PB,PS,PB	PB,PS,PB	PB,PS,PB	PM,PM,PM	PS,PB,PS
PM	PS,PB,PS	PM,PM,PM	PM,PM,PM	PM,PM,PM	PM,PM,PM	PM,PM,PM	PS,PB,PS
PB	PS,PB,PS	PS,PB,PS	PS,PB,PS	PS,PB,PS	PS,PB,PS	PS,PB,PS	PS,PB,PS

information contained in historical current data to obtain the optimized q-axis reference current. With the precise reference current of q-axis from grey prediction, more accurate voltage vectors can be selected, resulting in faster dynamic response performance and fewer switching times of inverter. However, among the three strategies, Algorithm 3 has the least switching times of the inverter and the minimum THD of A-phase current in the whole control system. This is owing to the weighting factor of each term is dynamically adjusted by fuzzy controller in Algorithm 3.

There are some schemes that dynamically adjust the weighting factors in recent literature, among which the simulated annealing algorithm proposed in (Davari et al., 2021) performs relatively well. In order to validate the efficacy of the fuzzy controller introduced in this study, the simulated annealing algorithm is compared with Algorithm 3. From the simulation results of speed waveform comparison, it can be seen that the dynamic response performance of “Algorithm proposed in (Davari et al., 2021)” is similar to that of Algorithm 3, but slightly worse than Algorithm 3 in general. The speed fluctuation of “Algorithm proposed in (Davari et al., 2021)” increases obviously, which is not conducive to the actual motor control. Therefore, Algorithm 3 has obvious advantages.

Table 4 Simulation and experiment parameters

Parameter	Value	Parameter	Value
ω_s	500r/min	U_c	220 V
p	4	R	1.8 Ω
L_d, L_q	4.16 mH	ψ_f	0.1337 Wb
T	0.0001 s	P_e	0.6 kW




Fig. 6 The simulation results of speed waveform comparison.

Through the above analysis, it can be seen that the grey prediction in Algorithm 2 can shorten the system speed rising time and recovery time. Fuzzy controller adopted in Algorithm 3 can greatly decrease the switching times while further enhancing the superior performance of Algorithm 2.

4.2 Experimental results and analysis

Based on the theoretical introduction and simulation results, this paper builds an experimental platform of FCS-MPC system for PMSM. The control methods are implemented using a TMS320F28335. The three strategies are compared in experiments to analyze the motor response speed when starting with no load, and the anti-interference ability after the sudden loading. Motor parameters are shown in Table 4. The experimental platform is shown in Fig. 7.

The comparison of speed waveforms when starting the motor without load is shown in Fig. 8. Algorithm 2 and Algo-

rithm 3, compared to Algorithm 1, effectively enhance dynamic response performance and reduce switching times. After the motor runs smoothly, the magnetic powder brake is used to increase the load torque, and all the three strategies will have speed fluctuation. Experimental results demonstrate that Algorithm 3 exhibits smaller speed fluctuations when the load is abruptly added, indicating superior anti-interference performance compared to the other two strategies. Additionally, Algorithm 3 shows the least speed fluctuation when the motor speed reaches the reference value, further validating the effectiveness of the algorithm in steady state.

Table 5 Comparison of three control strategies in simulation

Indicator	Algorithm 1	Algorithm 2	Algorithm 3	Algorithm proposed in (Davari et al., 2021)
Speed response time t_r (s)	0.0409	0.0199	0.0168	0.0187
Maximum speed fluctuation $\Delta\omega_{max}$ (r/min)	7.665	4.216	3.981	4.861
Speed recovery time t_c (s)	0.020	0.0114	0.0092	0.0102
Switching times num	3138	2851	1327	1563
The THD of A-phase current	23.85%	16.23%	15.89%	16.81%




Fig. 7 The experimental platform of FCS-MPC system.




Fig. 8 The experiment results of speed waveform comparison.

Fig. 9 displays the wave patterns of the metrics. Table 6 outlines the THD of A-phase current and the fluctuations in current for the d- and q-axes. Based on the data, the following deductions can be made: (1) After sudden loading, the q-

The index comparison results are shown in Table 6. It can be observed that Algorithm 3 demonstrates the fastest speed tracking performance among the three strategies. Additionally, Algorithm 2 confirms the effectiveness of grey prediction in improving dynamic and anti-interference performance. The switching times of Algorithm 2 and 3 are reduced by 8.77% and 26.97% respectively compared to Algorithm 1. Furthermore, Algorithm 3 provides evidence of the effectiveness of a fuzzy controller in reducing the switching times of the inverter.

axis current of the three strategies can quickly reach the new stable value. The current responses of Algorithm 3 are better, and the q-axis current ripple of Algorithm 3 is the smallest in the three strategies. (2) The A-phase current waveforms of Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3 exhibit lower harmonic content, better sinusoidal quality, and improved current response. The THD values of Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3 are reduced by 10.88% and 12.27%, respectively, compared to Algorithm 1. (3) The d-axis current of Algorithm 3 is more stable, and the performance is better following the reference d-axis current, that is, $i_d^* = 0$.


Based on the data from the algorithm proposed in (Davari et al., 2021) in Table 6, it is evident that the speed response performance of the algorithm is comparable to that of Algorithm 3. However, it is observed that the current ripple of d-q axes and the THD value of A-phase current of the algorithm proposed in (Davari et al., 2021) increase significantly when compared to Algorithm 3. This increase in ripple and THD value will inevitably lead to a decline in the overall control performance. The effectiveness of fuzzy control in dynamically adjusting the weighting factors of the cost function is proven to offer superior performance.

The feasibility of Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3 has been verified through experiments. The double closed loop FCS-MPC strategy, which is based on grey prediction, can improve the system's dynamic response and anti-interference performance. The double closed loop FCS-MPC strategy based on grey prediction and fuzzy dynamic weighting factors can drastically reduce the switching times and THD value of A-phase current while further improving the control performance.


To evaluate the robustness of Algorithm 3 under parameter mismatch, experiments were conducted to test the control

Table 6 Comparison of three control strategies in experiment


Indicator	Algorithm 1	Algorithm 2	Algorithm 3	Algorithm proposed in (Davari et al., 2021)
Speed response time t_r (s)	0.055	0.039	0.024	0.035
Maximum speed fluctuation $\Delta\omega_{\max}$ (r/min)	36.362	30.512	28.438	30.917
Speed recovery time t_c (s)	0.029	0.023	0.014	0.016
Switching times num	3671	3349	2681	2945
The THD of A-phase Current	32.45%	28.92%	28.47%	30.71%
Current ripple of d-axis (A)	0.0581	0.0552	0.0527	0.0638
Current ripple of q-axis (A)	0.0843	0.0821	0.0792	0.0913
Algorithm execution time (μs)	49.21	53.86	59.34	57.81




(a) Algorithm 1



(b) Algorithm 2



(c) Algorithm 3




(d) Algorithm proposed in (Davari et al., 2021)


Fig. 9 The experimental results under load torque change.

performance of Algorithm 3 under resistance and inductance mismatch with no load. Fig. 10 illustrates the current waveform of 0.2~0.3s in the case of parameter mismatch of Algorithm 3. In this scenario, the d-axis current remains stable near 0, the q-axis current remains stable, and the sinusoidal degree of A-phase current remains good. These experimental results demonstrate that Algorithm 3 exhibits good robustness under parameter mismatch. Additionally, Fig. 11 displays the waveform of the weighting factors in Algorithm 3. It is evident that the fuzzy controller can dynamically adjust the weighting factors of the cost function and utilize optimized weighting factors in different running stages to achieve superior dynamic performance.

To compare the computational burden of the three strategies, the execution times are shown in Table 6. It can be observed that Algorithm 1 has a lower computational burden compared to Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3. Although the grey prediction and fuzzy dynamic weighting factors slightly increase the computational burden, the execution times do not exceed the control period, and the calculations can be completed without the need for hardware improvement.



(a) Resistance mismatch



(b) Inductance mismatch

Fig. 10 The experimental waveform comparison under parameter mismatch in Algorithm 3.




Fig. 11 Waveforms of weighting factors in Algorithm3.

By comparing Table 5 and Table 6, slight differences can be observed between the simulation and experimental results. This can be attributed to the fact that the simulation model is established under ideal conditions, whereas actual experiments are subject to various unavoidable factors such as inaccurate motor parameters, temperature changes, and unstable power quality. These factors contribute to the deviation between simulation and experimental results. However, it is noteworthy that the overall trend of the corresponding index data changes remains consistent, thereby validating the applicability of the control algorithm in practical scenarios.

5. Conclusions

This study introduces a dual closed-loop strategy for FCS-MPC that utilizes grey prediction and fuzzy dynamic weighting factors. We introduce the grey prediction and fuzzy control theory to compare and analyze three strategies. Through simulation and experimental results, we have confirmed the efficacy and superiority of the proposed strategy. Upon examining the aforementioned analysis, our conclusion is that the FCS-MPC strategy with a double closed loop, utilizing grey prediction and fuzzy dynamic weighting factors, has the capability to efficiently eliminate speed overshoot and enhance dynamic response. This strategy achieves the optimal allocation of multi-objective weighting factors in the cost function. Additionally, it optimizes the switching times of the inverter to a certain extent and reduces the THD value of A-phase current, thereby enhancing the system's dynamic capabilities and resistance to interference. Therefore, the double closed loop FCS-MPC strategy based on grey prediction and fuzzy dynamic weighting factors offers significant advantages. However, it should be noted that this strategy slightly increases the computational burden.

REFERENCES

- Cai, L., Lin, J., and Liao, X. (2022). Life prediction of ship CXF cable using a non-equidistant grey model with small samples. *IEEE Transactions on Power Delivery*, 37(6), 5094–5101.
- Chen, D., Li, J., Chen, J., and Qu, R. (2019). On-line compensation of resolver periodic error for PMSM drives. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Applications*, 55(6), 5990–6000.
- Cui, C., Li, Z., and Zhang, J. (2022). Building a prediction model of solar power generation based on improved grey markov chain. *International Journal of Global Energy Issues*, 44(2-3), 139–149.
- Davari, S.A., Nekoukar, V., Garcia, C., and Rodriguez, J. (2021). Online weighting factor optimization by simplified simulated annealing for finite set predictive control. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, 17(1), 31–40.
- Deng, J. (1993). The grey control system. *Journal of Huazhong University of Science & Technology*, 10(3), 9–18.
- Dragic'evic', T. and Novak, M. (2019). Weighting factor design in model predictive control of power electronic converters: An artificial neural network approach. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, 66(11), 8870–8880.
- Eckert, J.J., Silva, F.L., da Silva, S.F., Bueno, A.V., de Oliveira, M.L.M., and Silva, L.C. (2022). Optimal design and power management control of hybrid biofuel-electric powertrain. *Applied Energy*, 325, 119903.
- Gong, C., Hu, Y., Ma, M., Gao, J., and Shen, K. (2020). Novel analytical weighting factor tuning strategy based on state normalization and variable sensitivity balance for PMSM FCS-MPTC. *IEEE/ASME Transactions on Mechatronics*, 25(3), 1690–1694.
- Guo, H., Meng, Z., Yu, H., Chen, R., Li, L., and Cheng, L. (2022). State diagnosis and monitoring method of robot electric power equipment based on data mining. *International Transactions on Electrical Energy Systems*, 2022, 7.
- Hu, W., Nian, H., and Zheng, T. (2019). Torque ripple suppression method with reduced switching frequency for open-winding PMSM drives with common DC bus. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, 66(1), 674–684.
- Huang, X., Guan, P., Pan, H., Liu, S., Du, G., Huang, X., and Wang, X. (2021). Research on grey predictive control of PMSM based on reduced-order luenberger observer. *Journal of Electrical Engineering & Technology*, 16(5), 2635–2646.
- Karamanakos, P. and Geyer, T. (2020). Guidelines for the design of finite control set model predictive controllers. *IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics*, 35(7), 7434–7450.
- Koiwa, K., Kuribayashi, T., Zanma, T., Liu, K.Z., and Wakaiki, M. (2019). Optimal current control for PMSM considering inverter output voltage limit: model predictive control and pulse-width modulation. *IET Electric Power Applications*, 13(12), 2044–2051.

- Li, L., Xiao, J., Zhao, Y., Liu, K., Peng, X., Luan, H., and Li, K. (2020). Robust position anti-interference control for PMSM servo system with uncertain disturbance. *CES Transactions on Electrical Machines and Systems*, 4(2), 151–160. doi: 10.30941/CESTEMS.2020.00020.
- Liang, D., Li, J., Qu, R., and Kong, W. (2018). Adaptive second-order sliding-mode observer for PMSM sensorless control considering VSI nonlinearity. *IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics*, 33(10), 8994–9004.
- Lin, X., Huang, W., Jiang, W., Zhao, Y., and Zhu, S. (2020). Predictive torque control for PMSM based on weighting factor elimination and fast voltage vector selection. *IEEE Journal of Emerging and Selected Topics in Power Electronics*, 8(4), 3736–3750.
- Liu, S. and Liu, C. (2021). Virtual-vector-based robust predictive current control for dual three-phase PMSM. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, 68(3), 2048–2058.
- Liu, X., Zhou, L., Wang, J., Gao, X., Li, Z., and Zhang, Z. (2020). Robust predictive current control of permanent magnet synchronous motors with newly designed cost function. *IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics*, 35(10), 10778–10788.
- Liu, X., Qiu, L., Wu, W., Ma, J., Fang, Y., Peng, Z., and Wang, D. (2022). Neural predictor-based low switching frequency FCS-MPC for MMC with online weighting factors tuning. *IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics*, 37(4), 4065–4079.
- Liu, X., Wang, D., and Peng, Z. (2019). Cascade-free fuzzy finite-control-set model predictive control for nested neutral point-clamped converters with low switching frequency. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, 27(5), 2237–2244.
- Mahmoudi, H., Aleenejad, M., Moamaei, P., and Ahmadi, R. (2016). Fuzzy adjustment of weighting factor in model predictive control of permanent magnet synchronous machines using current membership functions. In 2016 IEEE Power and Energy Conference at Illinois (PECI), 1–5.
- Novak, M., Xie, H., Dragicevic, T., Wang, F., Rodriguez, J., and Blaabjerg, F. (2021). Optimal cost function parameter design in predictive torque control (PTC) using artificial neural networks (ANN). *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, 68(8), 7309–7319.
- Siami, M., Arab Khaburi, D., and Rodriguez, J. (2018). Simplified finite control set-model predictive control for matrix converter-fed PMSM drives. *IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics*, 33(3), 2438–2446.
- Vazquez, S., Marino, D., Zafra, E., Pen˜a, M.D.V., Rodr´ıguezAndina, J.J., Franquelo, L.G., and Manic, M. (2022). An artificial intelligence approach for real-time tuning of weighting factors in FCS-MPC for power converters. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, 69(12), 11987–11998.
- Wang, Z., Yang, M., Gao, L., Wang, Z., Zhang, G., Wang, H., and Gu, X. (2020). Deadbeat predictive current control of permanent magnet synchronous motor based on variable step-size adaline neural network parameter identification. *IET Electric Power Applications*, 14(11), 2007–2015.
- Wu, M., Tian, H., Li, Y.W., Konstantinou, G., and Yang, K. (2021). A composite selective harmonic elimination model predictive control for seven-level hybrid-clamped inverters with optimal switching patterns. *IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics*, 36(1), 274–284.
- Xuan, J., Wang, X., Lu, D., and Wang, L. (2017). Research on the safety assessment of the brushless DC motor based on the gray model. *Advances in Mechanical Engineering*, 9(3).
- Yang, J., Liu, Y., and Yan, R. (2021). A comparison of finite control set and continuous control set model predictive control schemes for model parameter mismatch in three phase APF. *Frontiers in Energy Research*, 9.
- Yu, B., Song, W., Yang, K., Guo, Y., and Saeed, M.S.R. (2022). A computationally efficient finite control set model predictive control for multiphase PMSM drives. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, 69(12), 12066–12076.
- Zeng, X., Wang, W., and Wang, H. (2022). Adaptive PI and RBFNN PID current decoupling controller for permanent magnet synchronous motor drives: Hardware-validated results. *Energies*, 15(17).
- Zhang, X. and Hou, B. (2018). Double vectors model predictive torque control without weighting factor based on voltage tracking error. *IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics*, 33(3), 2368–2380.