Abstract: The high thermal efficiency and reliability of the compression-ignition engine makes it the first choice for many applications. For this to continue, a reduction of the pollutant emissions is needed. One solution is the use of machine learning (ML) and model predictive control (MPC) to minimize emissions and fuel consumption, without adding substantial computational cost to the engine controller. ML is developed in this paper for both modeling engine performance and emissions and for imitating the behaviour of a Linear Parameter Varying (LPV) MPC. Using a support vector machine-based linear parameter varying model of the engine performance and emissions, a model predictive controller is implemented for a 4.5 Cummins diesel engine. This online optimized MPC solution offers advantages in minimizing the NO\textsubscript{x} emissions and fuel consumption compared to the baseline feedforward production controller. To reduce the computational cost of this MPC, a deep learning scheme is designed to mimic the behavior of the developed controller. The performance in reducing NO\textsubscript{x} emissions at a constant load by the imitative controller is similar to that of the online optimized MPC compared to the Cummins production controller. In addition, the imitative controller requires 50 times less computation time compared to that of the online MPC optimization.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Compression Ignition (CI) engines are commonly used in various transportation applications, from public transportation to personal vehicles. The diesel engine has a high thermal efficiency, long lifetime as well as fuel economy advantages at full-load and part-load conditions when compared to spark ignition engines (Norouzi et al., 2021a,b). Although diesel engines have many advantages and are widely used, they play a significant role in the environmental pollution problems worldwide (Resitoğlu et al., 2015). Hybridization and electrification are proceeding rapidly for passenger vehicles, but there has been a low uptake for commercial heavy-duty trucks due to the high battery costs and decrease cargo capacity (Heid et al., 2017).

Real Driving Emissions (RDE) requirements have been implemented beginning with Euro 6d. The challenge with RDE requirements are that test results are significantly affected by various external factors including the ambient conditions, traffic, and driver behavior. Based on RDE legislation, engines should operate cleanly under all conditions, which makes engine design and calibration much more challenging (Norouzi et al., 2021b). Complying with RDE legislation is a large shift from the previous legislation. Intelligent engine emission control strategies that take advantage of Machine Learning (ML) methods and utilize model-based feedback control are one way to make substantial progress toward meeting the rigorous emission regulations.

Model Predictive Control (MPC) has been shown to be an effective model based control strategy. This a result of MPC considering constraints on inputs, outputs, and states implicitly. Additionally, MPC offers optimal performance control by utilizing a future horizon while optimizing the current control law (Winkler et al., 2021). MPC has been used in CI control with different sized engines from light-duty to heavy duty and for broad range of applications Liao-McPherson et al. (2020); Zhao et al. (2014); Asprion et al. (2014); Yin et al. (2020); Liu et al. (2021). Despite the many MPC benefits, it has a high computational cost and the performance depends on the accuracy of the embedded model. There is a trade-off between the complexity of the model and computation time. This is the main reason that physics-based based
models, such as detailed 3D combustion models, which offer a high prediction accuracy, have seen limited MPC implementation due to high computational times. These models first need to be simplified or linearized to be feasible for MPC implementation (Shahpouri et al., 2021a; Norouzi et al., 2019).

A state-space Linear Parameter Varying (LPV) model is capable of providing an accurate combustion model while utilizing a simpler structure Irdmousa et al. (2019). LPV is a state-space system that updates the system matrices based on scheduling parameters. The LPV model can fill the gap between complex nonlinear models and inaccurate but simple linear models. It employs an array of linear models characterized by scheduling variables. The LPV model has been used in internal combustion control within an MPC framework in literature for both CI and Spark Ignition (SI) engines (Irdmousa et al., 2019; Basina et al., 2020).

The traditional use of an LPV model requires the evaluation of a complex model in a grid of scheduling parameters; however, using ML provides a systematic way to create a state-space LPV model directly from measurement data. SVM-LPV (Rizvi et al., 2015) uses a Least-Square Support Vector Machine (LS-SVM) framework to update state-space matrices. This method has been applied to Internal Combustion (IC) engine LPV performance modeling (Irdmousa et al., 2019; Basina et al., 2020). In this paper, a Support Vector Machine-based state-space LPV algorithm (SVM-LPV) is used to model engine performance and the engine-out NO\textsubscript{x} emissions to show the capability of the SVM-LPV technique. To the best of authors’ knowledge, this paper presents the first study to use this technique for emission modeling and control of an IC engine. To make this algorithm reach the optimum solution, a Bayesian optimization has been added to optimize hyperparameters of the SVM.

Modeling a system is the first use of ML in this paper. Cloning the behaviour of an MPC is the second use of ML in this paper which is called learning or approximate cloning the behaviour of an MPC is the second use of ML in this paper. However, using ML provides a systematic way to create a state-space LPV model directly from measurement data. SVM-LPV (Rizvi et al., 2015) uses a Least-Square Support Vector Machine (LS-SVM) framework to update state-space matrices. This method has been applied to Internal Combustion (IC) engine LPV performance modeling (Irdmousa et al., 2019; Basina et al., 2020). In this paper, a Support Vector Machine-based state-space LPV algorithm (SVM-LPV) is used to model engine performance and the engine-out NO\textsubscript{x} emissions to show the capability of the SVM-LPV technique. To the best of authors’ knowledge, this paper presents the first study to use this technique for emission modeling and control of an IC engine. To make this algorithm reach the optimum solution, a Bayesian optimization has been added to optimize hyperparameters of the SVM.

Based on the current literature, this paper has the following contributions:

(1) Machine Learning based modeling for MPC design
(a) An SVM-LPV model is adapted to develop a linear parameter-varying model for engine-out NO\textsubscript{x} emissions and engine performance metrics
(b) An LPV MPC based on a ML model to minimize engine-out emissions and fuel consumption while maintaining same output torque performance and comparing with a benchmark model (Cummins calibrated ECU-based GT-power model)
(2) Machine Learning based control to reduce computational time of MPC

(a) Developed imitation based controller using deep neural network to clone behavior of LPV-MPC to reduce the computational time of optimization

2. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP AND ENGINE SIMULATION MODEL

A 4.5-liter medium-duty Cummins Diesel engine is the focus of this work. The Cummins QSB4.5 160 Diesel engine is a turbocharged inter cooled engine that meeting Tier 3 emissions legislation. A dSPACE MicroAutoBox II is used to control the intake manifold pressure, engine speed, load, injected fuel amount, and fuel rail pressure. A Kistler piezoelectric pressure sensor is used to measure the in-cylinder pressure. Engine-out Nitrogen Oxides (NO\textsubscript{x}) emissions from the engine are measured using a Bosch sensor with ECM electronics (P/N: 06-05). Further experimental setup details can be found in (Norouzi et al., 2021a, 2020).

A Detailed Physical Model (DPM) of the real engine was created using GT-Power to test the proposed control strategies in an Engine Simulation Model (ESM) platform. This model contains several chemical and physical sub-models that are used to simulate the complex combustion processes and gas exchange processes. This experimentally validated model is from our previous studies with an accuracy of ±5.8%, ±4.6%, and ±18.1% in the prediction of the maximum in-cylinder pressure, intake manifold pressure, and NO\textsubscript{x}, respectively (Shahpouri et al., 2021b,a).

3. METHODOLOGY

In this paper, two methods of combining ML and MPC are used consisting of ML-based modeling and ML imitation control. An overview of the methodology is depicted in Figure 1. First, randomly generated inputs are fed into ESM and the output engine performance is recorded for control modeling. A Least-square Support Vector Machine based Linear Parameter-Varying (SVM-LPV) model is developed using the input-output data. This model is used for the design of the LPV-MPC controller. Finally, this MPC controller is used to train the ML based imitation controllers. To assess, the LPV-MPC controller performance it is compared to a Linear Autoregressive with Extra Input (ARX) based linear MPC using a GT-power/MATLAB/SIMULINK co-simulation platform.

4. MODELING

4.1 Support Vector Machine based Linear Parameter Varying (LPV) Model

LPV model is defined as:

\[ x(k+1) = A(p(k)) x(k) + B(p(k)) u(k) \]
\[ y(k) = C(p(k)) x(p(k)) + D(p(k)) u(k) \]

(1)

Where the state matrices (A,B,C and D) are a function of scheduling parameters, p(k). An SVM-based algorithm is used to update the state matrices. In this study u(k), x(k), and y(k) are defined as

\[ x(k+1) = A(p(k)) x(k) + B(p(k)) u(k) \]
\[ y(k) = C(p(k)) x(p(k)) + D(p(k)) u(k) \]
Fig. 1. Modeling and controller design procedure based on Engine Simulation Model (ESM)

\begin{align}
    u(k) &= [FQ(k)\ SOI(k)\ VGT(k)]^T, \\
    x(k) &= [T_{out}(k)\ P_{man}(k)\ NO_x(k)]^T, \\
    y(k) &= [T_{out}(k)\ NO_x(k)]^T,
\end{align}

where \( FQ(k) \) is Fuel Quantity (FQ), \( SOI(k) \) is Start Of Injection (SOI) for main injection, \( VGT(k) \) is Variable Geometric Turbine (VGT) rate, \( T_{out} \) is engine output torque, \( P_{man} \) is intake manifold pressure, and \( NO_x(k) \) is engine-out Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) emissions. The SVM-LPV algorithm developed in (Rizvi et al., 2015) is then adapted for this specific problem. Additionally, to tune the hyperparameters of the SVM-LPV, a Bayesian optimization is implemented. It is assumed that the output of the model is equal or partially equal to states of the system and that the system states are measurable. Thus, the matrix \( C \) is not scheduled, and matrix \( D \) is identically zero. Then, the model can be simplified as

\begin{align}
    x(k+1) &= A(p(k)) x(k) + B(p(k)) u(k) \quad (3)
\end{align}

where \( u(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \), \( x(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \), and \( p(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_p} \) are inputs, states, and scheduling parameter at \( k \), and \( A \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_x \times n_x)} \) and \( B \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_x \times n_u)} \) are state-space model matrices \((n_x)\) and \((n_u)\) are number of states and manipulated variable, respectively. To formulate our problem in an SVM framework, \( A(p(k)) \) and \( B(p(k)) \) are written as

\begin{align}
    A(p(k)) &= W_1 \phi_1(p(k)), \quad B(p(k)) = W_2 \phi_2(p(k)) \quad (4)
\end{align}

where \( \phi_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_x \times n_v)} \) is the high dimension feature space. Substituting Eq. 4 into Eq. 3 results in

\begin{align}
    x(k+1) &= \frac{1}{W} \left[ \phi_1(p(k)) x(k) \right]^T + \phi_2(p(k)) u(k)^T \quad (5)
\end{align}

The residual error of modeling, \( e(k) \), can be added to Eq. 5 as

\begin{align}
    x(k+1) &= W \Phi(j)^T + e(k) \quad (6)
\end{align}

The LS-SVM cost function is then defined as

\begin{align}
    \text{Minimize:} \quad 1 \over 2 |x|^2_2 + \sum_{j=1}^{N} e(x(j)^T \gamma e(j) \quad (7)
\end{align}

Subject to: \( x(j+1) = W \Phi(j)^T + e(j) \quad (8) \)

where \( N \) is the number of training samples used for modeling and \( j \) is the discrete time sample defined from 1 to \( N \). In this LS-SVM formulation, \( \gamma \) is a diagonal matrix of size \( n_y \) that acts as the regularization parameters. The Lagrangian function can then be calculated based on Eq. 7 as

\begin{align}
    L(W) &= \sum_{j=1}^{N} \alpha_j (W \Phi(j)^T + e(j) - x(j+1)) \quad (9)
\end{align}

where \( \alpha_j \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \) are the discrete time Lagrange multipliers. To find the optimum \( W \), the derivatives of Lagrangian, Eq. 8, with respect to optimization variables must be zero as

\begin{align}
    \frac{\partial L}{\partial W} &= 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad W = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \alpha_j \Phi(j) \quad (9a)
\end{align}

\begin{align}
    \frac{\partial L}{\partial e} &= 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \alpha = \gamma e \quad (9b)
\end{align}

\begin{align}
    \frac{\partial L}{\partial \alpha} &= 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad x(j+1) = W \Phi(j)^T + e(j) \quad (9c)
\end{align}

Substituting Eqs. 9a and 9c into Eq. 6 results in

\begin{align}
    x(k+1) &= \sum_{j=1}^{N} \alpha_j \Phi(j) \Phi(j)^T + \gamma^{-1} \alpha(k) \quad (10)
\end{align}

where \( \Phi(j) \Phi(k)^T \) is the kernel matrix, \( [\Phi] \), and can be defined as

\begin{align}
    [\Omega] &= x(j)^T K(p(j),p(k)) x(k) \\
    &+ u(j)^T K(p(j),p(k)) u(k) \quad (11)
\end{align}

where \( K(p(j),p(k)) \) is a nonlinear kernel function. Usually, a Radial Basis Function (RBF) kernel, \( K_{RBF} \), is used as the kernel function, which is defined as

\begin{align}
    K_{RBF}(p(j),p(k)) &= \exp \left( -\frac{|p(j) - p(k)|^2}{2\sigma} \right) \quad (12)
\end{align}

where \( \sigma \) is a free parameter that is tuned during the hyperparameter optimization and \( |p(j) - p(k)|^2 \) is the L2 norm between the two feature vectors. Writing Eq. 10 in a compact notation yields

\begin{align}
    x = \alpha \Omega + \gamma^{-1} \alpha \quad (13)
\end{align}
where \( X = [x(1) \ldots x(N)] \). Solving this equation for \( \alpha \) results in

\[
\alpha = (I_N \otimes \gamma^{-1} + \Omega^T \otimes I_n_x)^{-1} X
\]

where \( I_N \) and \( I_n_x \) indicate identity matrix in dimension of training sample size and \( x \) and \( \otimes \) is element-wise or Kronecker product. By calculating \( \alpha \), the state-space model matrices can be calculated as

\[
A(p(k)) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \alpha_j x(j)^T K_{RBF}(p(j), p(k))
\]

\[
B(p(k)) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \alpha_j u(j)^T K_{RBF}(p(j), p(k))
\]

where the \( j \) index shows the data used in the training set. Where the model is developed using the training set of \( x(j) \quad j \in (1,2,\ldots,N) \) and \( u(j) \quad j \in (1,2,\ldots,N) \). Additionally, the scheduling parameter, \( p \) is also given in the training set as \( p(j) \quad j \in (1,2,\ldots,N) \).

4.2 Bayesian Hyperparameters Optimization

The SVM-LPV model has two main hyperparameters: \( \gamma \), the regularization coefficient, and \( \sigma \) the kernel free parameters. The cost function of the hyperparameter optimization is defined as

\[
J(\gamma, \sigma) = \frac{1}{N_{CV}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{CV}} \left( \hat{X}(i) - X(i) \right)^2
\]

where \( \hat{X}(i) \) is the modeled output and \( X(i) \) is the measured states and \( N_{CV} \) is the validation dataset that is used for optimizing the parameters. Bayesian Optimization utilizes Bayes Theorem to direct a search of a global optimization problem. The cost function versus iteration number for 100 iterations of the Bayesian optimization is shown in Figure 2. In this figure, the Bayesian optimization approaches to the global optimum after 76 iterations. The

![Fig. 2. Bayesian optimization results for LPV-SVM model parameter optimization showing the cost function (J) values versus the integration number](image)

Bayesian-optimized SVM-LPV can capture all states with an accuracy of 7.3%, 1.1%, and 1.9% for NO\(_x\), \( T_{out} \), and \( P_{man} \) respectively when using the training data. As this model will be used for the Model Predictive Controller (MPC), the accuracy of this model for a new data-set is critical. The SVM-LPV is compared to a standard model, a linear state-space model called Autoregressive with Extra Input (ARX). The ARX-based discrete-time state-space model of the Diesel engine emissions and performance is trained using the same training dataset as the SVM-LPV resulting in:

\[
A = \begin{bmatrix} 0.7286 & 7.1252 & -0.0019 \\ 0.0002 & 0.9859 & 8.9878 \times 10^{-6} \\ -0.6105 & 33.94287 & 0.9076 \end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
B = \begin{bmatrix} 1.2639 & -1.0899 & 1.0084 \times 10^{-5} \\ -0.0007 & 0.0014 & -1.01397 \times 10^{-5} \\ 2.936 & -8.2453 & -0.0106 \end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
C = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}
\]

The linear ARX and SVM-LPV model are both run simultaneously in one simulation. The ML models are compared against the ESM. Both models are evaluated for the test data that is unseen for both models. Figure 3 shows the model comparison and both models have a high accuracy within 5% normalized root mean square error (NRMSE) for estimating the output torque. However, the linear model fails to provide an accurate estimation for intake manifold pressure and NO\(_x\) emissions. For the intake manifold pressure, the SVM-LPV model has significantly better estimations than linear model where NRMSE is 0.95% in comparison to 14.81% for the linear model. For NO\(_x\), the SVM-LPV estimates with less than 7% error. While the linear ARX model is unable to accurately capture the exact emission level resulting in a NRMSE of 32.3%. Next, using the developed SVM-LPV model, an MPC combustion controller will be designed.

![Fig. 3. Linear ARX, LPV-SVM and ESM comparison for engine-out emissions and performance using ESM co-simulation: a) engine-out NO\(_x\), b) intake manifold pressure (\( P_{man} \), c) engine output torque (\( T_{out} \), d) Fuel quantity (\( FQ \), e) Start of injection (\( SOI \), f) Variable Geometry Turbine (\( VGT \) rate](image)
5. MODEL PREDICTIVE CONTROLLER DESIGN

5.1 Controller Design

The controller’s objective in this study is to minimize engine-out NO\textsubscript{x} emissions and fuel consumption while maintaining the desired engine output torque. The cost function \( J(u(k), s(k)) \) of the finite horizon optimal control problem (OCP) with horizon length \( N_p \) is defined as

\[
J(u(k), s(k)) = \sum_{i=0}^{N_p-1} \left[ \|T_{\text{out}}(k+i) - T_{\text{out, ref}}(k+i)\|^2_{w_{\text{torq}}} + \|NO_x(k+i)\|^2_{w_{\text{NOx}}} + \|FQ(k+i)\|^2_{w_{\text{FQ}}} \right. \\
\left. + \|u(k+i) - u(k+i-1)\|^2_{w_{\text{u}}} \right] + s(k)^2 \\
\text{subject to: } x(0) = \bar{x}(0), \quad \forall k \in [0, N_p-1], \quad \bar{x} \leq x_k \leq \bar{x} \\
\bar{u} \leq u_k \leq \bar{u} \quad \forall k \in [0, N_p-1]
\]

where \( s(k) \) is a slack variable that added to the cost function to penalized possible violation on constraints. In this equation, \( w, v \in [T_{\text{out}}, NO_x, FQ, \Delta u, s] \) are the MPC weights. The optimization decision, \( u(k) \), is defined as

\[
u(k) = [u(k)\ T \ u(k+1)\ ... \ u(k+N_p-1)]^T
\]

Based on the defined cost function, the Optimal Control Problem (OCP) that is solved in each discrete-time instance as

\[
\min_{u(k)} J(u(k), s(k))
\]

\[
\text{s.t. } x(0) = \bar{x}(0), \quad x(k+1) = f(x(k), u(k)) \quad \forall k \in [0, N_p-1], \quad \bar{x} \leq x_k \leq \bar{x} \\
\bar{u} \leq u_k \leq \bar{u} \quad \forall k \in [0, N_p-1]
\]

Where \( f(x(k), u(k)) \) are based on Eq. 3 which are the SVM-LPV model of system and \( x \) are the states of model. A five step prediction horizon due to the dynamics of NO\textsubscript{x} emission and a single step control horizon are used. For the linear MPC, \( A \) and \( B \) are constant matrices. The optimization is subject to the constraints listed in Table 1. The 500 ppm maximum NO\textsubscript{x} is chosen as the upper limit on NO\textsubscript{x} to keep the emissions below the maximum experimentally measured NO\textsubscript{x} output from the Cummins calibrated engine controller. However, this constraint can be adjusted depending on emission legislation. The limit on FQ is used to prevent exceeding the fuel flammability limit. Limits in SOI are added to avoid early combustion which can lead to combustion noise and late combustion which can lead to low thermal efficiency and high exhaust gas temperatures. The turbocharger characteristic map is used to set the VGT limit.

5.2 Controller Results

The developed MPC based on the SVM-LPV model, the linear ARX-based linear MPC and benchmark (BM) ESM calibrated ECU based on the Cummins production ECU are compared and shown in Figure 4. Except for a slight violation in NO\textsubscript{x} constraints (for example at engine cycle 600), both controllers are able to keep NO\textsubscript{x} emissions below the specified constraint. For the NO\textsubscript{x} emissions, both linear MPC and BM controller have higher overall emissions levels than the LPV-MPC controller. This is likely due to the simple linear model used in the linear MPC that is unable to capture the non-linear NO\textsubscript{x} formation trends.

Table 1. Constraint Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Min Value (( x, u ))</th>
<th>Max Value (( x, u ))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 ppm</td>
<td>NO\textsubscript{x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 mg/cycle</td>
<td>FQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−2 aTDC CAD</td>
<td>SOI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 %</td>
<td>VGT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
controller does fail to reach the target torque and remains slightly below the set-point over each step.

The LPV-SVM model contains a gain scheduling matrix $A$ and $B$ which are dependent on the inputs SOI and FQ. The scheduling parameters as a function of inputs for matrix $A$ are shown in Figure 5 which shows that the relationship between the model inputs and the scheduling parameters are non-linear for the Diesel combustion process. This non-linearity of the gain scheduling variables of the LPV-SVM model are an advantage of using the LPV model for the combustion instead of using only a few points of linearization. The gain scheduling matrix $B$ is similarly non-linear.

![Fig. 5. “A” matrix elements for the LPV-SVM model at the engine speed of 1500 rpm](image)

The LPV model is developed at a constant speed of 1500 rpm. To evaluate the robustness of the controllers, each controller with same constraints are tested at an engine speed of 1200 rpm. As shown in Figure 6, both the LMPC and LPV-MPC perform significantly better than BM. Here the benchmark controller tends to advance injection timing at lower speeds which results in significant increases in NO$_x$ emissions. Due the increased accuracy of the LPV model, LPV-MPC performs slightly better. In the next section MPC will be replaced by imitation ML to reduce computation.

### 6. IMITATION OF MPC USING A DEEP NEURAL NETWORK

Machine learning was used to model the system in section 5. Here ML is used to replace the MPC with a learning controller called imitative LPV-MPC. The goal is to avoid the high computational time of MPC, that requires solving MPC optimization online. Instead, a function, in this case a deep network, is trained to approximate the MPC and deploy it with a much lower computational cost.

The schematic of imitative LPV-MPC was previously shown in Section 4 of Figure 1 (step 4). First, the LPV-MPC are implemented on ESM. Second, input and output are recorded, and a deep neural network, including a Long-Short-Term Memory (LSTM) layer, are used to mimic the behavior of the MPC as shown schematically in Fig. 7. The inputs of this network are engine output torque, the error in output torque ($e_{Tout}$), engine-out NO$_x$, intake manifold pressure ($P_{man}$), and engine speed ($n_{rpm}$) and the outputs are fuel quantity ($FQ$), start of injection ($SOI$), and VGT. This network includes four main layers where the first, third and fourth layer are fully connected (FC) layers with a layer size (neuron) of 32. The second layer is an LSTM layer with the same layer size. The reason for using an FC layer around the LSTM to create a deep network is to increase the complexity of the model without increasing the hidden and cell states of the entire network. Finally, the online MPC is replaced with the designed imitative LPV-MPC.

![Fig. 6. Linear MPC, LPV-MPC and Benchmark comparison in 1200 rpm: a) engine-out NO$_x$, b) intake manifold pressure ($P_{man}$), c) engine output torque ($T_{out}$), d) Fuel quantity ($FQ$), e) Start of injection ($SOI$), f) Variable Geometry Turbine (VGT) rate](image)

To train the imitative controller network, the LPV-MPC is evaluated for 2000 seconds at different engine speeds with randomly generated output torque targets. Of these 2000 seconds, 1600 seconds are devoted to training and
the remainder to validation. To train this network, the mini-batch size is 512, initial learn rate is 0.01, learn rate drop period is 200 Epochs with a drop factor of 0.5. In this training, an L2 Regularization with value of 0.8 is used. The training accuracy for FQ, SOI, and VGT is 4.3%, 6.3%, and 8.3% while for the validation data are 4.3%, 8.9%, 10.3%. To test the imitative LPV-MPC, the controller is tested on a previously unseen reference and compared to the LPV-MPC in Figure 8. The results show that the imitative controller can successfully clone the behaviour of LPV-MPC and generate almost the same optimal control without performing the online optimization.

The performance of the controllers at engine speeds of 1500 and 1200 rpm are compared to the baseline model and are summarized in Table 2. As the LPV controller was designed only based on constant speed data at 1500 rpm, the LPV-MPC and imitative controller’s performance show the controller robustness to a different speed. Here significant NO\textsubscript{X} emissions reduction can be seen for all the controllers over the baseline model except for the LMPC model at 1500 rpm which can be attributed to the use of a simplified linear model. In addition to the reduced emissions for all controller, they maintain or improve fuel consumption compared to the baseline. This demonstrates the advantage of the optimized controllers over the calibration based baseline. One disadvantage of the developed models is an increase in load tracking error in comparison to the baseline model at 1500 rpm. However, this 2% discrepancy in load tracking results in significant emission reduction of 18-70% and fuel consumption reduction of 1-10%.

The imitative LPV-MPC controllers provide similar improvements to the full MPC controllers over the baseline model, while providing significantly improved computational times. As presented in table 2, imitative controller are 50 and 77 times faster than online MPC optimization in 1500 and 1200 rpm, respectively. All these simulation carried on a computer equipped with Intel Core i7-6700K processor with 32.0 GB of RAM. This computation requirement with respect to online MPC optimization makes future real-time implementation of this controller feasible.

### 7. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This paper presents the integration of machine learning and model predictive control for both modeling and controller implementation for diesel engine application. First, a support vector machine based linear parameter varying model is developed to design an LPV-MPC. When comparing the results of linear and LPV models for newly generated inputs, the LPV model showed better prediction accuracy for all engine outputs. Using these models a linear MPC and an LPV-MPC are designed.

Then, LPV-MPC is implemented and the controller input and output data are collected from the MPC and used to train a deep neural network. Replacing the full online MPC with a deep network aim to reduce the computational time of the MPC. After testing the imitative LPV-MPC controller at two different engine speeds, the imitative controller performs very closely to the full online optimized MPC performance but with a significant reduction in the processing time. In addition, the MPC and imitative models showed significant improvements in NO\textsubscript{X} emissions and a reduction in fuel consumption while providing similar load following capabilities as the feed-forward production controller. Both LPV-MPC and imitative controller are able to reduce NO\textsubscript{X} emissions by 18-70% while reducing fuel consumption by 1-10% compared to the Cummins production controller and the imitative controller requires 1/50 computation time compared to online MPC optimization.
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### Table 2. Percentage of improvement for proposed MPC and imitative LPV-MPC with respect to the Benchmark for engine speeds of 1500 and 1200 rpm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NO\textsubscript{x} [%]</th>
<th>FQ [%]</th>
<th>load error [%]</th>
<th>Average time per cycle [ms]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1500 rpm</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMPC</td>
<td>+6.71</td>
<td>-10.00</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPV-MPC</td>
<td>-18.98</td>
<td>-3.48</td>
<td>+0.99</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imitative LPV-MPC</td>
<td>-18.05</td>
<td>-3.70</td>
<td>+1.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1200 rpm</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMPC</td>
<td>-66.20</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPV-MPC</td>
<td>-69.77</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imitative LPV-MPC</td>
<td>-70.48</td>
<td>-1.85</td>
<td>-3.56</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


