MOPSO Based Multi-Objective Robust $H_2/H_\infty$ Vibration Control for Typical Engineering Equipment
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Vibration control is critically important for engineering equipment, and in modern industrial engineering active strategies with robust performance are often adopted. In traditional studies, a single-objective consideration is often taken into account when robust control is performed, while a simultaneous multi-criterial consideration is ignored. The study outlined in this paper focuses on typical equipment, namely machinery and sensitive equipment. Meanwhile, evaluation of robust performances based on feedback control is considered as the vibration control objective, and performance indexes using $H_\infty$ and $H_2$ criterion are regarded as fitness functions. In addition, the latest intelligent algorithm – MOPSO (multi-objective particle swarm optimization) is used and the SPEA2 (strength Pareto evolutionary algorithm 2) is also introduced for comparison as a representative of evolution algorithm.

Numerical results show that the Pareto frontier of MOPSO is much smoother and more uniformly distributed than SPEA2, and even more important is that MOPSO can obtain a unique, global and optimal solution $g_{best}$, which can avoid having to select just one from a group of equivalent solutions. Finally, an analysis of factors which affect the norms is performed, and the numerical verification shows that the disturbance type (single input or multi input) can apparently affect the magnitude of norms, and this finding can provide a broader understanding of robust vibration control. This research proposes a novel multi-objective optimization strategy for robust vibration control, while the traditional approaches can and are still employed. In addition, advanced artificial intelligence plays an important role in vibration detection in engineering application.
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1. Introduction

Modern industry is rapidly becoming high-tech and high-precision, and this is closely accompanied by a key technique of application and innovation of engineering equipment. Such equipment can be divided into two types, one including rotating, reciprocating, impacting and other machinery equipment, and the other mainly including ultra-precision equipment, e.g., for high-precision grinding, measuring, etc. Vibration control is critical and essential issue for the use of such equipment and solving vibration problems associated with this use can effectively reduce the severe force transmitted to the surrounding environment. It is also very important to keep sensitive equipment away from harmful surrounding vibration in order for it to maintain its normal work.

The passive method is the most basic way which does not require any external energy supply, and it is also the simplest method to perform vibration isolation [1–3]. However, passive design is difficult to be implemented for low frequency, and often requires a compromise between isolation performance and supported machinery alignment [4]. To overcome the shortcomings of passive methods, active control methods have recently emerged in research such as Sky-hook [5], LQR/LQG [6], and $H_2/H_\infty$ [7], etc.

Active vibration control can usually be described as optimization of some performance of a specific controller, and closed-loop performance is often indexed as an objective function. It is worth mentioning that the performance requirements of the control system are often not single-some indicators even conflict with each other and then multi-objective control needs to be performed. $H_2/H_\infty$ norms are closely connected with robust performances, $H_\infty$ control does not depend on an exact model of a controlled object, in which the robust stability is mainly considered and other performances are neglected. By contrast, $H_2$ control can compensate this shortfall, and a multi-objective balance of $H_2$ and $H_\infty$ performance is both very important and necessary for robust control.

In general, multi-objective robust controls are usually solved by linear matrix inequality (LMI) toolbox, but this method has many deficiencies. For example only one sub-optimal solution can be found, LMI is required to be a convex set, and the mathematical derivation is very complicated for practical application [8]. With the development of new intelligent algorithms solving multi-objective optimization is becoming simpler and more effective. For example, a genetic algorithm NSGA (non-dominated sorting genetic algorithm), which is based on solving sorting, can generate an optimal Pareto set [9]. Meanwhile, strength Pareto evolutionary algorithm (SPEA) based on clustering approach [10] and SPEA2 improved from SPEA [11] are proposed one after another. In [12], a novel multi-objective robust $H_2/H_\infty$ hybrid controller based on genetic algorithm was proposed, and the main conclusion was that genetic algorithm could significantly
reduce the conservatism problem of the LMI method. In [13], an evolutionary algorithm (EA) was synthesized with a multi-objective $H_2/H_\infty$ controller and this study confirmed that application of EA to design a multi-objective $H_2/H_\infty$ controller was feasible.

Traditional gradient-based optimization requires computations of sensitivity factors and eigenvectors at the iteration process. This causes an essential computational burden and slow convergence. Moreover, there is no local criterion to decide whether a local solution is also the global solution. Thus, the conventional optimization methods using derivatives and gradients are generally not able to locate or identify the global optimum. However, for real-world applications, one is often content with a good solution, even if it is not the best one. Consequently, heuristic methods are widely used for the global optimization problem. A particle swarm optimization (PSO) algorithm was first proposed by EBERHART and KENNEDY [14], it is a novel population-based metaheuristic optimization algorithm that utilizes the swarm intelligence generated by the cooperation and competition between the particles in a swarm. This method has become a useful tool for engineering optimization. FARSHIDIANFAR et al. [15] used the PSO technique to design a $H_\infty$ controller for typical machinery and sensitive equipment, and the numerical results showed that static output feedback controller using PSO algorithm and $H_\infty$ criterion could reach perfect performance to reduce harmful vibrations and disturbances.

Coello et al. [16] first proposed the multi-objective particle swarm optimization (MOPSO) algorithm, with the principal idea being that by determining the flying directions of particles with optimal Pareto sets and a set of non-dominated solutions in the global knowledge base found before, the particles flying directions can be guided. This would enable, finally, a unique, optimal and global solution to be obtained. MOPSO can overcome some disadvantages of traditional multi-objective methods (such as SPEA and SPEA2, etc), such as those where a desired solution must be selected from a group of equivalent solutions [17].

2. Brief introduction to MOPSO

In the PSO algorithm, the state of every particle can be described by a group of position and velocity vectors which respectively represent the possible solutions and movement directions in the search space. The global optimum can be obtained by finding the optimal solutions and updating the optimal neighbor solutions. The main steps of MOPSO are summarized as following:

**Step 1:** Initialize the population, compute the corresponding objective vectors of particles and add the non-inferior solutions to the external archive,
Step 2: Initialize the local optimum $pbest$ of particles and the global optimum $gbest$.

Step 3: Adjust the velocities and positions of the particles by evaluating the following equations so as to generate a new $pbest$:

\begin{align}
(2.1) \quad v_{ij}(t+1) &= \omega v_{ij}(t) + c_1 r_1 (pbest_{ij}(t) - x_{ij}(t)) + c_2 r_2 (gbest_{ij}(t) - x_{ij}(t)), \\
(2.2) \quad x_{ij}(t+1) &= x_{ij}(t) + v_{ij}(t+1),
\end{align}

where $i$ represents the $i$-th particle, $j$ represents the $j$-th dimension of each particle, $v_{ij}(t)$ represents the flight velocity component of $j$-th dimension of particles, $x_{ij}(t)$ represents the flight displacement component of the $pbest$-th dimension in the $t$-th generation, $pbest$ represents the local optimum, $gbest$ represents the global optimum, $c_1, c_2$ are learning factors, $r_1, r_2$ are random numbers between $(0, 1)$ and $\omega$ is the inertia weight factor, which plays a key role in the PSO.

Step 4: Maintain the external archive with the newly obtained non-inferior solution, and select $gbest$ for every and each particle (the archive determines the selection of global optimum).

Step 5: Check whether the maximum iteration has been reached, if not, the program will continue; if yes, terminate the computation and determine the optimal Pareto solution set and the $gbest$.

It is important to point out that direct computation will generate a set of equivalent solutions when traditional multi-objective optimization is performed, and it is difficult to determine the desired one. Pareto domination is the most direct way to solve this problem, namely this is conducted by considering all of the non-inferior solutions in the archive and determining a 'leader'. The density measuring technique is then commonly used to determine the global optimum. The nearest neighbor density estimation method [9] based on nearest neighbor congestion evaluation is adopted in this paper. Certainly, there are also other similar methods, such as kernel density estimation method [18], etc.

3. Brief introduction to $H_2/H_\infty$ controller

Consider the feedback control system shown in Fig. 1. Suppose the state-space form of the controlled system as

\begin{align}
\dot{z} &= A z + B_1 w + B_2 u, \\
Y_\infty &= C_{\infty,1} z + D_{\infty,11} w + D_{\infty,12} u, \\
Y_2 &= C_{2,1} z + D_{2,11} w + D_{2,12} u, \\
y &= C_2 z + D_{21} w + D_{22} u.
\end{align}
In Eq. (3.1), z is the state variable, w is the input disturbance to the plant, \( Y_\infty \) is the \( H_\infty \) performance, \( Y_2 \) is the \( H_2 \) performance, y is the observer’s output, K is the feedback controller, u is the output of controller (\( u = Ky \)), and P is the controlled plant.

In \( H_2/H_\infty \) control, a controller K which makes the closed-loop system asymptotically stable is designed, namely the \( \infty \)-norm of \( T_{wY} \) from \( w \) to \( Y \) is limited so as to ensure the robust stability; simultaneously, the designed \( K \) should make the 2-norm of \( T_{wY} \) as low as possible.

Equation (3.1), to be solved, is usually divided into two steps and the first step can be expressed as

**\( H_\infty \) performance:**

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\min \gamma_1 \text{ s.t.} \\
\begin{bmatrix}
(A+B_2K)X_\infty + X_\infty (A+B_2K)^T & B_1 & X_\infty (C_{\infty,1}+D_{\infty,12}K)^T \\
B_1^T & -I & D_{\infty,11}^T \\
(C_{\infty,1}+D_{\infty,12}K)X_\infty & D_{\infty,11} & -\gamma_1^2 I
\end{bmatrix} < 0, \\
X_\infty > 0.
\end{array}
\]

The second step is

**\( H_2 \) performance:**

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\min \sqrt{\nu} \text{ such that} \\
\begin{bmatrix}
(A+B_2K)X_2 + X_2(A+B_2K)^T & B_1 \\
B_1^T & -I
\end{bmatrix} < 0, \\
\begin{bmatrix}
Q & (C_{2,2} + D_{2,22}K)X_2 \\
X_2(C_{2,2} + D_{2,22}K)^T & X_2
\end{bmatrix} > 0, \\
Trace(Q) < \nu^2, \\
X_2 > 0, \quad Q > 0.
\end{array}
\]
4. $H_2/H_\infty$ VIBRATION CONTROL FOR TYPICAL ENGINEERING EQUIPMENT

4.1. Machinery equipment

Consider the vibration control model of typical machinery equipment shown in Fig. 2.

a) Industrial machinery equipment

b) Model description

Fig. 2. Active vibration control of typical machinery equipment.
In Fig. 2, \( m_1, k_1, c_1 \) are respectively the mass, stiffness and damping of foundation or supporting structure, \( k_2, c_2 \) are respectively the stiffness and damping of isolation system, \( m_2 \) is the mass of machinery equipment, \( u(t) \) is the control force generated by actuator, \( w(t) \) is the dynamic disturbance generated by the machinery equipment, which is denoted as \( w(t) = F \sin(\omega t) \). The motion equations can be written as

\[
\begin{align*}
m_1 \ddot{x}_1 + k_1 x_1 + c_1 \dot{x}_1 - c_2 (\dot{x}_2 - \dot{x}_1) - k_2 (x_2 - x_1) &= u(t), \\
m_2 \ddot{x}_2 + c_2 (\dot{x}_2 - \dot{x}_1) + k_2 (x_2 - x_1) &= w(t) - u(t).
\end{align*}
\]  

Suppose the state variables as \( x_1 = z_1, \ x_2 = z_2, \ \dot{x}_1 = z_3, \ \dot{x}_2 = z_4, \ z = [z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4]^T \), then Eq. (4.1) can be rewritten as the state-space form:

\[
\dot{z} = Az + B_1 w + B_2 u,
\]

\[
A = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
-\frac{k_1 + k_2}{m_1} & \frac{k_2}{m_1} & -\frac{c_1 + c_2}{m_1} & \frac{c_2}{m_1} \\
\frac{k_2}{m_2} & -\frac{k_2}{m_2} & \frac{c_2}{m_2} & -\frac{c_2}{m_2}
\end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
B_1 = \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
1 \\
\frac{1}{m_2}
\end{bmatrix}, \quad B_2 = \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
0 \\
-\frac{1}{m_1} \\
\frac{1}{m_2}
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

Suppose the \( H_\infty \) output of the given system as

\[
Y_\infty = [k_1 x_1 + c_1 \dot{x}_1, x_2, \dot{x}_1, x_2 - x_1, \dot{x}_2]^T.
\]

Then, Eq. (4.3) can be rewritten as the state-space form:

\[
Y_\infty = C_{\infty, 1} z + D_{\infty, 11} w + D_{\infty, 12} u,
\]
\[
C_{\infty,1} = \begin{bmatrix}
  k_1 & 0 & c_1 & 0 \\
  1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
  -k_1 + k_2 & k_2 & c_1 + c_2 & c_2 \\
  m_1 & m_1 & m_1 & m_1 \\
  1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\
  k_2 & -k_2 & c_2 & -c_2 \\
  m_2 & m_2 & m_2 & m_2
\end{bmatrix},
\]

\[
D_{\infty,11} = \begin{bmatrix}
  0 \\
  0 \\
  0 \\
  0 \\
  1/m_2
\end{bmatrix}, \quad D_{\infty,12} = \begin{bmatrix}
  0 \\
  0 \\
  1/m_1 \\
  0 \\
  -1/m_2
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

For convenience, the \(H_2\) output is assumed to be the same as the \(H_\infty\) output in this paper, i.e., \(Y_2 = Y_\infty\).

Set the observed output as \(y = [x_2 - x_1, \dot{x}_1]^T\) and the state-space form can be written as

\[
y = C_2z + D_{21}w + D_{22}u,
\]

\(C_2 = \begin{bmatrix}
  -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
  0 & 0 & 1 & 0
\end{bmatrix}, \quad D_{21} = \begin{bmatrix}
  0 \\
  0
\end{bmatrix}, \quad D_{22} = \begin{bmatrix}
  0 \\
  0
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

According to [15], the closed-loop transfer function with respect to \(Y_\infty\) performance index can be derived as

\[
T_wY_\infty = D_{cl} + C_{cl}(sI_2 - A_{cl})^{-1}B_{cl},
\]

\(A_{cl} = A + B_2K(I_1 - D_{22}K)^{-1}C_2, \quad B_{cl} = B_1 + B_2K(I_1 - D_{22}K)^{-1}D_{21}, \quad C_{cl} = C_{\infty,1} + D_{\infty,12}K(I_1 - D_{\infty,22}K)^{-1}C_2, \quad D_{cl} = D_{\infty,11} + D_{\infty,12}K(I_1 - D_{22})^{-1}D_{21}, \)

\(I_1, I_2\) are identity matrices, \(s = j\omega\) is the Laplace operator and \(\omega\) is the circular frequency.
4.2. Sensitive equipment

Consider the vibration control model of typical sensitive equipment shown in Fig. 3.

(a) Sensitive equipment

(b) Model description

At present, the input disturbance is considered as the ground disturbance, which can be referred to as \( w(t) = [x_g, \dot{x}_g]^T \) and the other parameters are consistent with the aforementioned machinery model. The motion equation can be written as

\[
\begin{align*}
m_1 \ddot{x}_1 - c_2 \dot{x}_2 + (c_1 + c_2) \dot{x}_1 - k_2 x_2 + (k_1 + k_2) x_1 &= c_1 \dot{x}_g + k_1 x_g - u(t), \\
m_2 \ddot{x}_2 + c_2 (\dot{x}_2 - \dot{x}_1) + k_2 (x_2 - x_1) &= u(t).
\end{align*}
\]
Similarly, the state variables are set as $x_1 = z_1$, $x_2 = z_2$, $\dot{x}_1 = z_3$, $\dot{x}_2 = z_4$, $z = [z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4]^T$, then Eq. (4.7) can be rewritten as the state-space form:

$$\dot{z} = Az + B_1w + B_2u,$$

(4.8)

$$A = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
k_1 + k_2 & -k_2 & c_1 + c_2 & -c_2 \\
k_2 & -k_2 & c_2 & -c_2 \\
m_1 & m_1 & m_1 & m_1 \\
m_2 & m_2 & m_2 & m_2
\end{bmatrix},$$

$$B_1 = \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
0 \\
k_1 \\
m_1
\end{bmatrix}, \quad B_2 = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 \\
1 & m_1 \\
1 & m_2
\end{bmatrix}.$$  

For now, the $H_\infty$ output can be assumed as

$$Y_\infty = [x_2, \dot{x}_2]^T.$$  

Equation (4.9) can be rewritten in state-space form as

$$Y_\infty = C_{\infty, 1}z + D_{\infty, 11}w + D_{\infty, 12}u,$$

(4.10)

$$C_{\infty, 1} = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1
\end{bmatrix}, \quad D_{\infty, 11} = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 \\
0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}, \quad D_{\infty, 12} = \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
0
\end{bmatrix}.$$  

Likewise, the $H_2$ output is supposed to be the same as the $H_\infty$ output.

Set the observed output as $y = [x_2 - x_1, \dot{x}_1]^T$, and the state-space form can be written as

$$y = C_2z + D_{21}w + D_{22}u,$$

(4.11)

$$C_2 = \begin{bmatrix}
-1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0
\end{bmatrix}, \quad D_{21} = \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
0
\end{bmatrix}, \quad D_{22} = \begin{bmatrix}
0 \\
0
\end{bmatrix}.$$  

The closed-loop transfer function with reference to $Y_\infty$ performance index can be derived as

$$T_wY_\infty = D_{cl} + C_{cl}(sI_2 - A_{cl})^{-1}B_{cl},$$

$$A_{cl} = A + B_2K(I_1 - D_{22}K)^{-1}C_2, \quad B_{cl} = B_1 + B_2K(I_1 - D_{22}K)^{-1}D_{21},$$

$$C_{cl} = C_{\infty, 1} + D_{\infty, 12}K(I_1 - D_{\infty, 22}K)^{-1}C_2,$$

$$D_{cl} = D_{\infty, 11} + D_{\infty, 12}K(I_1 - D_{22})^{-1}D_{21}.$$
5. Numerical studies

For the two models of active vibration control, the MOPSO technique is used to optimize the $H_2/H_\infty$ norms for the purpose of obtaining the optimal feedback controller. The fitness functions are defined as

$$fitness_1 = \| TwY_\infty \|_\infty,$$

$$fitness_2 = \| TwY_2 \|_2,$$

Parameter settings of the two vibration isolation systems are presented in Table 1 [15].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Machinery equipment model</th>
<th>Sensitive equipment model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$m_1 = 560$ kg</td>
<td>$m_2 = 560$ kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_1 = 2.5 \times 10^5$ N/m</td>
<td>$k_1 = 1.5 \times 10^5$ N/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_2 = 1.5 \times 10^4$ N/m</td>
<td>$k_2 = 2.5 \times 10^4$ N/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_1 = 100$ N/ms$^{-1}$</td>
<td>$c_1 = 100$ N/ms$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_2 = 10$ N/ms$^{-1}$</td>
<td>$c_2 = 10$ N/ms$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For comparison, the SPEA2 is introduced as a representative of typical evolutionary algorithms. Parameters of MOPSO are arbitrarily set as following: population size is 200, maximum iteration is 200, inertia weight coefficients are $\omega_{\text{max}} = 0.9$, $\omega_{\text{min}} = 0.4$ and the learning factors are $c_1 = 2$, $c_2 = 2$.

The parameters of SPEA2 are arbitrarily set as following: population size is 200, maximum iteration is 200, the generation number of mate selection tournament is 2, individual mutation probability is 1, individual recombination probability is 1, variable mutation probability is 1, variable exchange probability is 0.5 and the variable recombination probability is 1.

The searching range of feedback controller $K$ is configured as $[-1 \times 10^5, 1 \times 10^5]$.

Apparently, as seen in Fig. 4, Pareto frontiers based on MOPSO are much smoother and more uniformly distributed, and parameters settings of MOPSO are quite convenient contrary to SPEA2. In addition, the MOPSO based optimization can obtain a unique $g\text{best}$ solution which can make the computation more convenient and reliable. The SPEA2, however, generates a set of equivalent Pareto solutions and a desired solution must be selected by the use of a certain rule. In view of the above, optimal controllers generated by MOPSO are listed in Table 2.
a) Pareto frontiers for comparison (machinery equipment model)

![Graph showing Pareto frontiers for machinery equipment model comparison]

b) Pareto frontiers for comparison (sensitive equipment model)

![Graph showing Pareto frontiers for sensitive equipment model comparison]

Fig. 4. Pareto frontiers of the two models by MOPSO and SPEA2.

Table 2. Obtained optimal feedback controller by MOPSO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Controller Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Machinery equipment model</td>
<td>$K = [-1.5028, -1.9034] \times 10^4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive equipment model</td>
<td>$K = [1.3371, -0.003649] \times 10^4$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Figs. 5, 6, the MOPSO based $H_2/H_\infty$ controller can effectively reduce the undesired vibration of the typical equipment. So far, the multi-objective design of $H_2/H_\infty$ controller is effectively solved.
a) force transmitted to the foundation

b) foundation vibration displacement

c) foundation vibration acceleration

[Fig. 5a,b,c]
d) relative displacement

![Graph showing relative displacement](image1)


e) machinery equipment acceleration

![Graph showing machinery equipment acceleration](image2)

**Fig. 5.** Controlled output with optimal feedback controller vs. uncontrolled condition (machinery equipment).

In addition, a phenomenon in this paper should be pointed out for further study. As seen in Fig. 5, the $H_2/H_\infty$ criterion of the machinery equipment model excited by the single-input has a larger difference of magnitude than the sensitive equipment excited by the double-input type (denoted as $w(t) = [x_g, x_g]^T$), and this may indicate that some factors can affect it more than others. To perform further analysis, an influence of isolation parameters will be considered first and the updated parameters are listed in Table 3 [15].
a) equipment displacement (input $x_g$ to output $x_2$)

![Graph a)

b) equipment displacement (input $\dot{x}_g$ to output $x_2$)

![Graph b)

c) equipment velocity (input $x_g$ to output $\dot{x}_2$)

![Graph c)

[FIG. 6a,b,c]
d) equipment velocity (input $\hat{x}_a$ to output $\hat{x}_2$)

![Fig. 6. Controlled output with optimal feedback controller vs. uncontrolled condition (sensitive equipment model).](image)

Table 3. Isolation parameters variation of the double input system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$m_1$</td>
<td>560 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_2$</td>
<td>10 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_1$</td>
<td>$1.5 \times 10^5$ N/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_2$</td>
<td>$2.5 \times 10^4$ N/m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_1$</td>
<td>10 N/ms$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_2$</td>
<td>100 N/ms$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Fig. 7, isolation parameters do not obviously affect the $H_2/H_\infty$ performance. The second case is that the single-input disturbance is consid-

![Fig. 7. Pareto frontier of case 1.](image)
ered as a double-input type, and the excitation is regarded as a harmonic force $F$ transmitted from the ground or surrounding environment (case 2).

Disturbance type will make the $H_2/H_\infty$ norms undergo tremendous change and the magnitude can be even reduced to $10^{-5}$, as it seen in Fig. 8. For specific vibration isolation systems, the actual input style may affect the controlled system much more than the isolation parameters. In other words, sensitive equipment should be kept away from some traffic-induced ground motions [19] which vibrate in the following form: $[x_g, \dot{x}_g]^T$.

![Fig. 8. Pareto frontier of case 2.](image)

6. Conclusions

Multi-objective robust $H_2/H_\infty$ active vibration control based on MOPSO technique for typical engineering equipment is presented in this paper and the numerical studies can confirm its effectiveness. The presented method can compensate a lot for typical $H_\infty$ control (single-objective optimization), and the artificial intelligence algorithm adopted here allows to obtain a feedback controller.

It is worth mentioning that the $H_2$ performance is assumed in this paper, for convenience, to be the same as the $H_\infty$ performance. In fact, these two performances should be treated seriously in practice, because they should exactly reflect the robustness. In addition, disturbance type is also validated as important for the controlled system when robust controller is performed.

This study can give strong inspiration for multi-objective robust vibration control of traditional engineering equipment; especially the application of artificial intelligence in this $H_2/H_\infty$ problem may promote the traditional method.
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