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Abstract- Resonant power converters offer improved levels of efficiency and power density. In order to implement such systems, advanced control techniques are required to take the most of the power converter. In this context, model predictive control arises as a powerful tool that is able to consider nonlinearities and constraints, but it requires the solution of complex optimization problems or strong simplifying assumptions that hinder its application in real situations. Motivated by recent theoretical advances in the field of deep learning, this paper proposes to learn, offline, the optimal control policy defined by a complex model predictive formulation using deep neural networks so that the online use of the learned controller requires only the evaluation of a neural network. The obtained learned controller can be executed very rapidly on embedded hardware. We show the potential of the presented approach on a Hardware-in-the-Loop setup of an FPGA-controlled resonant power converter.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Resonant power conversion [1-3] has become a key enabling technology in most industrial, medical and domestic applications of power electronic systems due to its high performance that leads to high efficiency and power density implementations. In conjunction with this, advances in power electronic devices in recent years, including improved IGBT technology, superjunction MOSFETs and wide bandgap devices [4], have enabled the design of power electronic systems with a superior performance grade.

The design of such systems also requires advanced control techniques to take the most of these power converters. In the past, control techniques applied to power electronics [5] have included linear control, hysteresis control, fuzzy control, or sliding mode control, among others. The application of these techniques has been backed by the development of modern digital control architectures [6], based either on FPGA [7, 8] or microprocessor/DSP that have enabled the implementation of such systems in a cost and time effective fashion. New development techniques such as high level synthesis [9-11] and automatic code generation [12] have enabled the design of more advanced and optimized controller implementations.

In recent years, model predictive control (MPC) has arisen as an effective tool to control complex systems [13] even when fast sampling times are required. MPC uses a mathematical model that describes the systems dynamics to predict the future trajectories of the system states and to compute a sequence of optimal control inputs by solving an optimization problem.

MPC has been applied to power electronics converters [5, 14], specially to control electrical machines and drives. However, among the many applications presented in literature [15], little research has been published concerning resonant power converters.

Because of the computational complexity of MPC, most research and applications of MPC for power electronics has focused on strongly simplified formulations. The most commonly used [14], is the Finite Control Set (FCS) approach, which chooses a control action between a discrete amount of possible switching strategies by testing all possibilities. However, considering long horizons or variable switching frequencies is more challenging. Other approaches such as Explicit MPC [14] implement MPC as a look up table and are suitable for small linear systems. While there exist improvements for both the FCS and advanced Explicit MPC methods, it is still very challenging to design a controller that can consider simultaneously nonlinearities, long horizons, varying switching frequencies, time-varying constraints and can be easily implemented. The motivation of this work is to propose an approach that can achieve all these goals.

Instead of starting from strong simplifications, in this paper we design a rigorous nonlinear MPC problem.
Motivated by the latest advances in the field of deep learning [16, 17], we use a deep neural network to directly learn the MPC solution. The online implementation of the controller is thus reduced to the evaluation of a neural network, which requires less resources than explicit MPC and can cope with nonlinear systems and long horizons, as recently shown in [18, 19].

The aim of this paper is to propose a new approach to design advanced MPC controllers to control resonant power converters. More specifically, the proposed MPC scheme will be applied to the control of a resonant inverter for induction heating (IH) applications. This application has a wide range of operating conditions which severely affect the resonant converter tuning, opening a wide field for control optimization using MPC. In the past, few research studies have dealt with IH applications. As far as the authors know, only in [20] a model predictive controller is proposed, with limited insight into the controller itself. Further contributions of this paper include a novel time transformation that enables a simple MPC formulation to explicitly handle important constraints such as zero-voltage switching. This paper extends the results presented in [21] by including novel contributions as the approximation of the MPC control law based on deep learning and incorporating FPGA implementation and HIL simulations.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section II reviews IH technology and Section III covers model predictive control and its application to the half-bridge series resonant converter. Section IV and V summarizes the main neural network and FPGA implementation results, respectively. Finally, Section VI summarizes the main conclusions of this paper.

II. RESONANT POWER CONVERSION FOR IH SYSTEMS

Induction heating [22] has become the leading heating technology due to its benefits in terms of efficiency, safety and performance. The applications of IH have been extended in recent years to cover a wide range of industrial, domestic and medical applications. Among these, domestic IH appliances are a relevant example where cookers (Fig. 2) ranging from simple burners to complex multiload systems [23, 24] are being developed.

Resonant power conversion plays a key role in such systems to create an alternating voltage to supply the induction coil, typically in the 20 kHz to 100 kHz frequency range. Usually, domestic IH systems implement the series-resonant half-bridge converter (Fig. 3) due to its good balance between cost and performance. The half-bridge series resonant inverter is composed of two switching devices, $S_H$ and $S_L$, typically implemented using IGBTs, and the resonant tank. The resonant tank is composed of the equivalent impedance of the coil-pot system, $R$, and the resonant capacitor $C_r$. Thus, the differential equation system that describes the dynamics of the resonant tank is defined by the current in the inductor, $i_L$:

$$R_iL_i(t) + L_i \frac{di_L(t)}{dt} + \frac{1}{C_r} \int i_L(t) \, dt = v_o(t).$$ (1)

The modulation strategies typically used to control the output power include square wave modulation and asymmetrical duty cycle [25]. The former is based on modifying the switching frequency and the latter is based on modifying both, duty cycle $D$ and switching frequency $f_{sw}$. The maximum output power is obtained at the resonant frequency, defined as $f_o = 1/2\pi \sqrt{L_r C_r}$. In order to achieve zero voltage switching to reduce switching losses, $f_{sw}$ and $D$ are increased to reduce the output power. If the required output power is too low, typically pulse density modulation [26] (PDM) is applied in order to limit the maximum $f_{sw}$.

The control strategy of the series resonant inverter for IH applications is usually constrained by several aspects inherent to the application, being the most important the following:

Load variability: The IH load, geometry and coupling, and required output power vary within a wide range, changing the resonant tank and, consequently, being challenging the design of the controller [27, 28].

Soft-switching: In order to optimize the converter efficiency and safe operation, it is essential to guarantee soft-switching in the whole operational range [25], i.e. achieve ZVS conditions. This is specially challenging when using linear controllers, where some external constraints are difficult to be taken into account and may lead to unexpected performance and/or instability.

Multi-load control: Induction heating systems are usually composed by several loads that may operate simultaneously. Under these circumstances, it is essential to guarantee that they operate synchronously, and no acoustic noise is generated due to switching frequencies intermodulation.
Special operating conditions: Under some conditions, the controller must be adapted due to excessive temperature, low electromagnetic coupling, maximum power consumed by several loads or limiting flicker emissions [26].

All these constraints severely limit the control possibilities of the converters and possess a significant challenge to design the control strategy. Moreover, these constraints are difficult to be implemented using classical linear control schemes, increasing the complexity of the controller and limiting its scalability. For these reasons, MPC is explored as an effective control scheme to provide improved control and versatility for resonant power converters applied to IH.

III. MODEL PREDICTIVE CONTROL

A. General formulation

Model predictive control uses the mathematical model of a dynamic system to predict its future behavior and compute a sequence of optimal control inputs that satisfies given constraints and optimizes a desired performance measure.

The model of a dynamic system can be written in a discrete-time setting as:

\[ x_{k+1} = f(x_k, u_k), \]

(2)

Where \( x_k \in \mathbb{R}^n \) denotes the state of the system at time \( k \) and \( u_k \in \mathbb{R}^m \) the control inputs. One of the main strengths of MPC is that it can consider nonlinear systems, general constraints, as well as control tasks different than classical set-point tracking.

The central challenge, especially for applications in power electronics, is that the implementation of MPC requires the online solution of the following optimization problem at each sampling time:

minimize \[ J(x_k, u_k) \]

subject to \[ x_{k+1} = f(x_k, u_k), x_0 = \hat{x} \]

(3)

where, \( g \) describes general constraints and \( \hat{x} \) is the current state of the system, which need to be measured or estimated every time a new control should be computed. The performance metric, usually called cost function, is denoted by \( J \) and \( N \) is the prediction horizon.

In model predictive control, from the computed sequence of optimal control inputs \( (u_0, \ldots, u_{N-1}) \) only the first element \( (u_0) \) is applied to the system and the same optimization problem is solved at the next step with the new state of the system. For applications that require sampling times in the range of microseconds, solving (2) in real-time can be very challenging despite of the recent progress in hardware, algorithms and tailored implementations [29] that have enabled the application of MPC to fast systems.

In the field of power electronics, most implementations of MPC [14] are based on a discretization of all control possibilities (FCS-MPC). A different possibility is the use of explicit MPC [30] which computes the solution of the optimization problem for all possible states, so that the online implementation reduces to a search algorithm.

Explicit MPC has been very successful for small linear systems but its implementation is more complex in the nonlinear case and for long horizons, because the amount of memory needed to store the controller grows exponentially with the prediction horizon and the number of constraints. A comparison of both CSS and FCS-MPC is presented in [31].

We propose in this work the use of deep learning to learn the optimal control policy, as done in approximate explicit MPC [32], by means of a deep neural network (DNN) that can be easily implemented in an FPGA. This approach opens the door for the implementation of complex nonlinear MPC schemes with constraints and long horizons, which can be implemented in FPGAs with a small need of digital resources that could be massively deployed in most power converters.

B. MPC for Resonant Inverters

The resonant tank described in (1) can be modeled using the state-space paradigm considering two states \( x = [i_o, v_o] \), the dynamics of which can be written as:

\[ \frac{di_o}{dt} = \frac{1}{L_r}(R_{l}i_o - v_o - v_o), \]

\[ \frac{dv_o}{dt} = \frac{1}{C_r}i_o. \]

(4)

The available control inputs are the switching frequency and the duty cycle \( u = [f_{sw}, D] \), which determine the signal \( v_o \). One of the main challenges for the control of the half-bridge series resonant tank is the switched nature of \( v_o \) which makes the dynamic system (3) a hybrid system. The signal \( v_o \) can be written as:

\[ v_o = \begin{cases} V_r & \text{if } t \in (t_i, t_i + D / f_{sw}) \\ 0 & \text{if } t \in (t_i + D / f_{sw}, t_{i+1}] \end{cases} \]

(5)

Solving general MPC problems of switched systems is a very difficult problem that leads to difficult optimization problems, especially if non-linearities and time-dependent constraints are considered, as it occurs for the computation of the average power or the consideration of ZVS constraints.

Relying on the finite control set (FCS) MPC technique is difficult in this case because we need to include time-varying constraints and make use of varying frequencies and duty cycles to improve efficiency. Instead, we propose to consider the full nonlinear model, with long horizons if necessary, and with flexible frequency and duty cycle in an efficient formulation that facilitates the offline solution of a large number of MPC problems. To enable the real-time implementation of the scheme, we propose to generate large amounts of data by solving rigorous nonlinear MPC problems and learn the control law using deep learning as will be explained in Section IV.
The proposed nonlinear model predictive controller for induction heating has three key elements: a time transformation, the average power computation, and the consideration of ZVS constraints. We explain these components in the remainder of the section.

C. Time transformation

The switching frequency and the duty cycle determine the switching instants \( t_k \) of the system defined in (3). The direct consideration of the switching instants can be modeled using integer variables. However, if combined with long prediction horizons and time-varying constraints, it results in very complex mixed-integer optimization problems. We propose to perform a double time transformation that transforms the mixed-integer optimization problem into a standard optimization problem.

We propose a time-varying transformation that maps the original time \( t \) to the new scaled time units \( \tau \) as follows:

\[
\tau = \begin{cases} 
\frac{f_{sw,i} t}{D_i} & \text{if } t \in (t_i, t_i + D_i / f_{sw,i}] \\
\frac{f_{sw,i} t}{1 - D_i} & \text{if } t \in (t_i + D_i / f_{sw,i}, t_{i+1}]
\end{cases} \tag{6}
\]

The main advantage of this transformation is that the switchings in the new time units occur exactly at \( \tau = 1, 2, 3, \ldots \). We make use of this property to discretize the differential equations (3) in the new time units with a discretization time of \( \tau = 1 \) units. The model that is used in the MPC formulation can be written as:

\[
x_{k+1}[\text{mp]} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{D_i}{f_{sw,i}} f^{(on)}(x_i, u_i) \\
\frac{D_i - 1}{f_{sw,i}} f^{(off)}(x_i, u_i) \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{if } k = 0, 2, 4, \ldots, N \\
\frac{D_i}{f_{sw,i}} f^{(on)}(x_i, u_i) \\
\frac{D_i - 1}{f_{sw,i}} f^{(off)}(x_i, u_i) \quad \text{if } k = 1, 3, 5, \ldots, N - 1. \tag{7}
\]

Where \( f^{(on)} \) and \( f^{(off)} \) denote discretized version of the differential equations (3) when \( v_o = V_o \) and \( v_o = 0 \) respectively.

This reformulation greatly simplifies the MPC formulation, as it is possible to consider long prediction horizons \( N \) without the use of integer variables. It is also possible to use varying switching frequencies and duty cycles for each switching interval.

D. Average Power Computation

To discretize the time-transformed version of the dynamics (3) to be used in the prediction of the MPC, we use orthogonal collocation on finite elements [33]. Each control interval is divided into finite elements, on which the state trajectory is parametrized using Lagrange polynomials. This discretization scheme is often used in nonlinear model predictive control as it provides a superior accuracy compared to simpler Euler discretization schemes. Using orthogonal collocation, the states of the system can be computed at any point in time and are directly available at the collocation points, which are new optimization variables.

The average power, calculated for each switching interval, can be computed as:

\[
P_k = \int \sum_{i=1}^{n_{sw}} i_s(t) v_o(t) \, dt \tag{8}
\]

To achieve a tractable online computation of the average power, we use the value of the states at the collocation points within each control interval. Because of the time transformation previously described, each switching interval is composed of two control intervals (one step \( k \) is used for the ON semi-cycle and one for the OFF semi-cycle). The average power at each control interval can be thus calculated as:

\[
P_{n, k} = \begin{cases} 
\sum_{i=1}^{n_{sw}} i_s[i] v[o] k (\tau[i] - \tau[i-1]), & \text{if } k = 0, 2, \ldots, N \\
\sum_{i=1}^{n_{sw}} i_s[i] v[o] k, & \text{if } k = 1, 3, \ldots, N - 1,
\end{cases} \tag{9}
\]

Where \( n_{sw} \) denotes the number of collocation points in each control interval and the \( i_s[i] \) denotes the value of the current at control step \( k \) for collocation point \( i \). The integral is approximated by a simple quadrature in which \( \tau[i] \) denotes the time of collocation point \( i \) in the control interval \( k \).

This implies that the average power can be predicted in advance, even during transient behavior, regardless of the inputs used (frequency, duty cycle, etc …) provided that the model is correct. Several techniques can be used to obtain good estimations of \( R_i \) and \( L_o \) see [28, 34] for an overview of possible methods. We also showed in [21] that it is possible to adapt the MPC formulations to deal with uncertainty in \( R_i \) and \( L_o \).

E. ZVS Constraints

Another strength of the proposed time transformation is that enforcing zero-voltage-switching reduces to imposing static constraints at the end of each control interval. These constraints can be easily incorporated in any MPC framework. It is straightforward to introduce any additional constraints that might be required by a specific application, as the ones described in Section II.

The optimization problem that should be solved after each switching cycle, based on the current measurements of the states \( i_s \), \( v_o \), and the power set-point \( P^{des}_{sw} \) is:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{minimize} & \quad \sum_{k=1}^{N} (P_{k} - P^{des}_{sw})^2 + \alpha f_{sw,k} \\
\text{subject to} & \quad \text{model in (7)} \\
& \quad 30 \leq f_{sw,k} \leq 100 \text{ kHz}, \quad (b) \\
& \quad 0.2 \leq D_i \leq 0.8, \quad (c) \\
& \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n_{sw}} i_s[i] \geq 0, \text{if } k = 1, 3, 5, \ldots, N - 1, \quad (d) \\
& \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n_{sw}} i_s[i] \leq 0, \text{if } k = 0, 2, 4, \ldots, N, \quad (e) \\
& \quad D_i = D_{k-1}, \text{if } k = 1, 3, 5, \ldots, N - 1, \quad (f) \\
& \quad f_{sw,k} = f_{sw,k-1}, \text{if } k = 1, 3, 5, \ldots, N - 1. \quad (h)
\end{align*} \tag{10}
\]

The tuning parameter \( \alpha \) in the cost function (10a) weights the relative importance between using a small frequency and tracking the desired power. It is usually desired to choose the
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(500 W, 3000 W and 1000 W). It can be seen that the
frequency is chosen as \( \alpha = 5 \times 10^{-8} \).

The simulation results obtained by solving Problem (10) at
each switching interval are shown in Fig. 4. The NMPC
controller is switched on after 5 cycles and three different
steps in the desired power are performed after 5 cycles each
(500 W, 3000 W and 1000 W). It can be seen that the
different power setpoints (red dashed line in the bottom plot
of Fig. 4) can be tracked accurately while using both control
inputs and respecting the ZSV constraints continuously, also
during the transient behavior. As shown in [21], the proposed
scheme can be adapted to deal with uncertainties in the
parameters \( R_i \) and \( L_i \).

The solution of each NMPC problems takes in average
around 500 ms in a laptop computer (Macbook Pro, 3.5 GHz
Intel Core i7 with 16 GB RAM). To obtain an implementable
controller, we propose to approximate the solution using a
minimum possible frequency, as this maximizes the
efficiency [25]. The discretized equations and power
computation are included in constraints (10b), and (10c, 10d)
denote the input constraints. The ZVS constraints are
enforced by (10e, 10f). The fact that the inputs cannot be
changed within a switching interval is enforced by (10g, 10h).
The optimization problem is nonconvex because of the power
computation and because of the control-dependent time
transformation.

The results presented here use the toolbox do-mpc [35]
which uses CasADi [36] to compute the derivatives using
automatic differentiation that are then passed to IPOPT [37]
to solve the resulting optimization problem. The real system
is simulated with the numerical integrator Sundials [38]. We
use a prediction horizon of \( N = 10 \) steps, which equals 5
switching intervals. The model is discretized with orthogonal
collocation based on Lagrange polynomials of degree 2, with
100 finite elements in each control interval to achieve an
accurate average power computation. The tuning parameter
that weights the importance in reducing the switching
frequency is chosen as \( \alpha = 5 \times 10^{-8} \).

The latest theoretical advances [17] have shown that
deep neural networks have greater expressivity than shallow
networks, leading to better approximation capabilities of
complex functions. This idea has been recently exploited in
[19] to propose deep neural networks to approximate the
function defined by the solution of the MPC problem. In that
case, the inputs for the neural network are the current state of
the system (and potentially also other parameters), and the
outputs of the network are the optimal control inputs. Since
the control strategy is defined via a neural network, our
proposed approach could take advantage of future computing
hardware tailored for the fast and efficient computation of
machine learning tasks.

IV. IMPLEMENTATION USING DEEP NEURAL NETWORKS

The embedded implementation of described controller is
usually a challenging task due to real-time requirements and
hardware restrictions. In this paper, an effective deep neural
network implementation taking advantage of fast and parallel
computing in FPGA will be proposed (Fig. 5).

The approximation of the solution of MPC control laws
has been usually studied under the headline of approximate
explicit MPC [32]. While neural networks had been
previously proposed to learn the mapping between states and
control inputs [39], using deep neural networks for this
purpose has been studied only very recently (see e.g. [18,
19]).

Using deep neural networks (with several hidden layers),
instead of classical shallow ones (with only one hidden layer)
has been one of the key developments that have enabled to
the practical successes of deep learning in previous years
[16]. The latest theoretical advances [17] have shown that
deep neural networks have greater expressivity than shallow
networks, leading to better approximation capabilities of
complex functions. This idea has been recently exploited in
[19] to propose deep neural networks to approximate the
function defined by the solution of the MPC problem. In that
case, the inputs for the neural network are the current state of
the system (and potentially also other parameters), and the
outputs of the network are the optimal control inputs. Since
the control strategy is defined via a neural network, our
proposed approach could take advantage of future computing
hardware tailored for the fast and efficient computation of
machine learning tasks.
A deep neural network (Fig. 6) is a sequence of layers of neurons that determines a function \( \mathcal{N} \) with inputs \( \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^n \) that can be defined as:

\[
\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{z}) = f_{L+1} \circ g_L \circ f_L \circ \ldots \circ g_1 \circ f_1(\mathbf{z}),
\]

(11)

where \( L \) is the number of hidden layers and \( M \) the number of neurons in each layer and \( \circ \) denotes function composition. Each hidden layer consists of an affine function

\[
f_l(\mathbf{\xi}_{l-1}) = W_l \mathbf{\xi}_{l-1} + \mathbf{b}_l,
\]

(12)

where \( \mathbf{\xi}_{l-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{M_{l-1}} \) is the output of the previous layer and \( \mathbf{\xi}_0 = \mathbf{z} \). The matrices \( W_l \) and the vectors \( \mathbf{b}_l \) are called the weights and biases at layer \( l \) and their value is determined by training the neural network with known input-output pairs.

The second component of the neural network is the nonlinear function \( g_l(\cdot) \), which is called activation function. Usual choices for \( g_l(\cdot) \) include the rectifier linear unit (ReLU), the sigmoidal function or the \( \tanh \) function.

Neural networks are trained offline, which means that the optimal values of the weights \( W_l^{(i)} \) and biases \( b_l^{(i)} \) are computed by minimizing the mean squared error:

\[
\frac{1}{N_s} \sum_{t=0}^{N_s} (u^*(\mathbf{x}_t, p^{des}) - N(\mathbf{x}_t, p^{des}))^2,
\]

(13)

where \( u^* \) denotes the optimal solution obtained when solving the MPC Problem (10) which is a function of the current state and the current setpoint. The inputs of the neural network \( \mathcal{N} \) are also the current states and the current power setpoint and \( N_s \) is the number of samples that are used for the training.

Fig. 7 shows the results of the deep-learning based controller for the same control task as the one shown in Fig. 4. It can be seen that the desired power setpoint is successfully tracked and the ZVS constraints are not violated. Both trajectories, for the exact solution of the NMPC and the proposed deep learning-based NMPC are very similar.

Table I presents a systematic evaluation of the performance of the proposed controller. We run 150 different simulations (similar to the ones shown in Fig. 4) for randomly chosen power setpoints. As shown in Table I, the proposed controller achieves almost the same tracking performance as the exact solution of the NMPC problem and does not result in any violation of the ZVS constraints.

These promising results suggest that using the proposed method, it is possible to approximate very accurately a high-performance NMPC solution using a deep neural network that can be easily deployed on embedded hardware, as we show in the next section.
V. EMBEDDED IMPLEMENTATION RESULTS

A. FPGA Implementation

The proposed MPC controller using deep neural networks is implemented using FPGA technology to take advantage of fast and parallel processing. Moreover, recent advances in FPGA technology [6] have led to cost-effective devices with an increasing amount of digital resources, enabling high-performance and competitive implementations.

Neural Networks can be implemented with low precision arithmetic without degrading performance [43]. In order to quantize and normalize coefficients, in this work we use Ristretto [44], an automated Neural Networks approximation tool which condenses 32-bit floating point networks. Ristretto is an extension of Caffe [45] and allows to test, train and fine-tune networks with limited numerical precision.

In order to explore the design space and obtain an optimized implementation, automatic code generation using high level synthesis (HLS) [9, 46] has been applied. The implementation has been optimized to achieve the desired timing performance while minimizing the required digital HW requirements. As it is shown in Fig. 8, each neuron in each layer is calculated sequentially in order to minimize HW resources while achieving the required timing performance (see Table II). By using the following HLS directive, the maximum number of multipliers is limited to 10:

\[
\text{HLS ALLOCATION instances=mul limit=10 operation}
\]

After that, the same digital HW is used to calculate the next layer, improving the final implementation. This is done by using directive:

\[
\text{HLS ALLOCATION instances=fcc limit=1 function}
\]

Finally, in order to optimize usage, each layer coefficients are stored in the same memory using dual-port memories. By doing that, only 5 memories are required to feed data to the 10 multipliers. This is implemented by using:

\[
\text{HLS array_map variable=weights_1 instance=weights horizontal}
\]

\[
\text{HLS array_map variable=weights_2 instance=weights horizontal}
\]

Table I shows the performances for floating point and 16 bits implementation. The fixed-point version reaches the target latency of 1 µs while keeping the digital HW resources to low levels. The error respect to the floating-point implementation is less than 5% in the worst case.

B. HIL results

Simulation and verification of induction heating systems are challenging due to the high variety of operating conditions including output power levels and different resonant tanks determined by the pot materials, geometry and temperature. In this context, HIL has proven to be a very effective tool to simulate and test proposed controllers and control strategies under a wide variety of conditions [10, 28, 47] and, consequently, it will be used in this paper.

Fig. 9 shows an example of a post-layout simulation with 16-bit arithmetic. In this figure, the current through the resonant tank, the target output power and the controller error are represented. As it can be seen, the controller works as expected, achieving the desired output power while keeping ZVS constraints. These results prove the feasibility of the proposed controller, as well as its FPGA-implementation using deep neural networks and high-level synthesis.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

Resonant power conversion enables the implementation of power converters with superior performance, efficiency and power density. Among the multiple applications, induction heating systems are a relevant example which outperforms other technologies due to its superior efficiency and performance. However, the accurate control of the resonant converter under a wide variety of constraints of different
nature still remains a challenge. This paper has proposed how high-performance NMPC solutions can be easily accurately approximated using deep neural networks. The resulting neural networks can be easily used in a High-Level Synthesis framework to obtain FPGA designs that enable the real time advanced control of power converters.

The proposed scheme has been detailed, and the controller performance has been successfully validated in simulations and in a Hardware-in-the-loop setup. As a conclusion, the proposed approach opens the door to the application of complex NMPC-schemes for future higher-performance higher-complexity III systems.
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