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Abstract:
In the chemical and petrochemical industry, the Continuous Stirred Tank Reactors (CSTR) are, without doubt, one of the most popular processes. From a control point of view, the mathematical model describing the temporal evolution of the CSTR has a strongly nonlinear cross-coupled character. Moreover, modeling errors such as external disturbances, neglected dynamics, and parameter variations or uncertainties make its control task a very difficult challenge. Even though this problem has been the subject of a wide number of control strategies, this article attempts to propose a viable, robust, nonlinear decoupling control scheme. The idea behind the proposed approach lies in the design of two nested control loops. The inner loop is responsible for the compensation of the nominal model nonlinear cross-coupled terms via static nonlinear feedback; whereas, the outer loop, designed around an Extended State Observer (ESO) of which the additional state gathers the global effect of modeling errors, is charged to instantaneously estimate, and then to compensate the ESO extended state. This way, the CSTR complex dynamics are reduced to a series of decoupled linear subsystems easily controllable using a simple Proportional-Integral (PI) linear controller to ensure the robust pursuit of reference signals respecting the desired performance. The presented control validation was performed numerically by an objective comparison to a classical PID controller. The obtained results clearly show the viability and the effectiveness of the proposed control strategy for dealing with such nonlinear, strongly cross-coupled plants subject to a wide range of disturbances despite the precision of their described mathematical model.
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1. Introduction

The CSTR is one of the most used pieces of equipment in process engineering. Its main role is to convert reactants into finished or semi-finished products; therefore, it plays a primary role in many chemical processes [1–4]. CSTRs are generally controlled around a certain equilibrium point, where it is approximated by a locally valid linear model. This approach has the advantage of simplifying the synthesis of the controllers because it allows the use of all classical linear control theory tools.

One of the examples of these classical tools is the PID controller widely used in industrial applications [5–7].

Unrivalled since it appeared in 1922 [8], the PID controller has dominated the industrial scene all over the past century, allowing the propulsion of the technological revolution toward new horizons even in its simple form. The huge success of PID control in the practitioner’s society lies essentially in the simplicity of the design and implantation tasks. Nevertheless, pressed by modern industry demands increasingly more and more exigent in terms of efficiency, control theory was always constrained to develop new control mechanisms satisfying the newly imposed requirements [9, 10]. In search of new advanced control schemes, theories have evolved in several directions, giving a very rich bibliography over 80 years.

For the CSTR control example, various control strategies, such as the exact feedback linearization control [11, 12], the nonlinear backstepping control [2], the model predictive control [4, 13–19], different optimal control strategies [20–23], the adaptive control approaches [24–27], and the sliding mode control theory [1, 28–32] have been proposed among others. We can also find several articles based on successful combinations between advanced nonlinear control theories and soft computing tools such as artificial neural networks (ANN) [33, 34], fuzzy inference systems (FIS) [3, 35], and many bio-inspired optimization algorithms such as the genetic algorithm (GA) [7, 36], etc. These combinations have been addressed, in general, to overcome some specific difficulties related to certain synthetic difficulties induced by the mathematical rigor of the original approaches, or to alleviate some disadvantages presented by the previously cited controls.

However, in the midst of this theoretical revolution in the control field, the industry seems uninterested in most of the proposed modern control approaches by presenting a high inflexibility for PID control, even knowing its shortcomings well, despite the improvements introduced to it during the past decades. This fact, probably, lies in their pragmatic way of reflection, aiming most of the time to achieve a sufficiently acceptable compromise between the controller design simplicity and the required performance. On the other hand, it seems that they are missing out on the opportunities offered by the great digital revolution as they
cannot fully take profit from the modern digital processor’s capacities [9, 10].

Born as a necessity to establish new bridges between modern industry demands and modern control advances, the Active Disturbance Rejection Control (ADRC) was introduced for the first time in the original text in [37] and a few years later for the Anglophone society in [38]. It was the fruit of much work fed by a deep comprehension of both practitioners’ and academic researchers’ way of reflecting when it comes to addressing control systems problems, the constraints and the challenges facing them, and the opportunities offered by the accelerated development of digital technology.

Even the ADRC original framework is composed from five main components; the Extended State Observer (ESO) represents the controller’s cornerstone. The ADRC idea is based on the real time estimation and the active compensation of the total influence of the model nonlinearities combined with the different disturbance types, such as external disturbances, modeling errors, parameters variations or uncertainties, etc. The global effect of the model nonlinearities and disturbances is considered as the observer’s augmented state.

Owing to its great potential for dealing with a wide range of disturbance structures, ESO based robust control, including the ADRC original version, has presented an unmistakable viability to address a large set of practical control applications before even having a rigorous proof of theoretical fundamental questions such as the ESO convergence or the closed loop stability which came several years later [39–43]. Moreover, it has shown a high flexibility to handle many more applications than PID control, such as time delayed systems control, multivariable decoupled control, cascade control, and parallel system control [10]. Also, ESO based control has known some major advances in the context of its generalization to more complex problems in the last few past years, such as stochastic systems control [44] and distributed parameter control systems [43].

Motivated by the huge potential, the simplicity of the design procedure, and the wide immergence of ESO based robust control paradigm in simulation and engineering applications, readers can refer to the literature [45–49]. In this paper, we attempt to illustrate how to use the ESO for improving the nonlinear multivariable decoupled control robustness in a simple and clear manner. The proposed method’s main idea lies in the use of conventional exact feedback linearization control, widely used for dealing with multivariable affine nonlinear plants in association with an extended state observer charged to estimate in real-time and then actively compensate the whole effect of modeling errors caused by the total difference between the real plant dynamics and the nominal descriptive model used for the design of the decoupling static state feedback. The desired, robust closed loop dynamics are achieved using a proportional-integral controller in a second external loop.

The present article is organized as follows: After presenting this introduction, the second section is devoted to the process presentation and modeling. Then, the theoretical development of the proposed control is exposed in detail. Once the process model and the controller design are presented, the simulation results are shown and commented on in the third section. Finally, the conclusion summarizing and highlighting main advantages of the proposed control strategy is given in the fourth and last section.

2. The CSTR Mathematical Model

The proposed CSTR model, shown in Figure 1, is described by the equations given below as found in [50]:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{dC_A}{dt} &= \frac{1}{V} \Delta F_c (C_{AI} - C_A) - k_0 \exp \left( \frac{-E_a}{RT} \right) C_A \\
\frac{dT_R}{dt} &= \frac{1}{V} \Delta F_c (T_i - T_R) - \frac{\Delta H k_0}{\rho \cdot C} \exp \left( \frac{-E_a}{RT} \right) C_A \\
&\quad + \frac{U}{V \cdot \rho \cdot C} (T_c - T_R)
\end{align*}
\]

(1)

It is obvious that the model (1) is of the form:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x} &= F(x) + G(x)u \\
y &= h(x)
\end{align*}
\]

(2)

where:
- \( x = [x_1 \ x_2]^T = [C_A \ T_R]^T \): is the state vector.
- \( u = [u_1 \ u_2]^T = [F_L \ F_c]^T \): the control input.
- \( y = h(x) = x \): the controlled output.

\[
F(x) = \begin{bmatrix}
-k_0 \exp \left( \frac{-E_a}{RX_2} \right) x_1 \\
-\frac{\Delta H k_0}{\rho \cdot C} \exp \left( \frac{-E_a}{RX_2} \right) x_1 + \frac{U}{V \cdot \rho \cdot C} (T_i - x_2)
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(3)

\[
G(x) = \begin{bmatrix}
\frac{1}{V} (C_{AI} - x_1) & 0 \\
0 & \frac{1}{V} (T_i - x_2)
\end{bmatrix}
\]

(4)

Control inputs, controlled outputs, and process parameters are given in Table 1.

3. Feedback Linearization Control

The necessary and sufficient condition allowing the existence of static, nonlinear feedback ensuring the exact linearization of the system (2) is guaranteed if and only if the output’s global relative degree equals to the system’s order.
By definition, the output relative degree is the least number of the output's time derivatives to get at least one control input [51]:

\[ \dot{y} = \left[ \frac{\dot{h}_1(x)}{\dot{h}_2(x)} \right] = \frac{L_F h_1(x) + L_C h_1(x)u}{L_F h_2(x) + L_C h_2(x)u} \]

\[ = -k_0 \exp \left( \frac{-E_a}{R x_2} \right) x_1 + \frac{1}{V} \left( C_{Al} - x_1 \right) u_1 \]

\[ = \frac{\Delta H k_0}{\rho C} \exp \left( \frac{-E_a}{R x_2} \right) x_1 + \frac{U A}{V \rho C} (T_i - x_2) u_1 + \frac{1}{V} (T_i - x_2) u_2 \]

(5)

From (5), it is clear that \( C_A \) and \( T_R \) relative degrees are equal respectively to \( r_1 = 1 \) and \( r_2 = 1 \).

Therefore, the output vector global relative degree is equal to \( r = r_1 + r_2 = 2 \), and noting that the system order \( n = 2 \), the existence of a static nonlinear feedback allowing the exact linearization of (2) is then ensured.

Equation (5) can be rewritten as described below:

\[ \dot{y} = \left[ \frac{\dot{h}_1(x)}{\dot{h}_2(x)} \right] = A(x) + D(x)u \]  

(6)

where:

\[ A(x) = \begin{bmatrix} L_F h_1(x) \\ L_F h_2(x) \end{bmatrix} = F(x) \]  

(7)

\[ D(x) = \begin{bmatrix} L_G h_1(x) \\ L_G h_2(x) \end{bmatrix} = G(x) \]  

(8)

\( L_F, L_G \) denotes the Lie derivatives [51].

### 3.2. Linearizing Feedback Control Design

From the equation (5), it is obvious that the searched static nonlinear feedback linearization control is defined as:

\[ u = D^{-1}(x)[V - A(x)] \]  

(9)

where, \( A(x) \) and \( D(x) \) are given by the equations (3) and (4) respectively. The term \( V = [v_1 v_2]^T \) is the new control input issued from the external control loop.

Applying the control law (9) to the system (2) leads to the following linear decoupled system:

\[ \begin{align*}
\dot{x}_1 &= v_1 \\
\dot{x}_2 &= v_2
\end{align*} \]

(10)

### 3.3. Outer Loop Controller Synthesis

Applying the following PI control law to the outer control loop:

\[ \begin{align*}
v_1 &= -K_{L1} C_A - K_{L2} \int (C_A - C_A^{ref}) dt \\
v_2 &= -K_{L1} T_R - K_{L2} \int (T_R - T_R^{ref}) dt
\end{align*} \]

(11)

yields the following closed loop transfer function:

\[ G(s) = \begin{bmatrix} K_{L1} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{K_{L2}}{s^2 + K_{L1}s + K_{L2}} \end{bmatrix} \]

\[ = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\omega_1^2}{s^2 + 2\zeta_1\omega_1s + \omega_1^2} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\omega_2^2}{s^2 + 2\zeta_2\omega_2s + \omega_2^2} \end{bmatrix} \]

(12)

where, \( s \) is the Laplace operator, \( \zeta_1 \) and \( \omega_1 \) are respectively the closed loop desired damping ratios and band-width frequencies.
3.4. Extended State Observer Based Robust Feedback Linearization Control

First, let us introduce the modeling errors by considering them as parameters variations and uncertainties in the nominal model (2). This leads to the following perturbed model:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x} &= F(x) + \Delta F(x) + (G(x) + \Delta G(x))u \\
y &= h(x)
\end{align*}
\]

By applying the nonlinear control feedback (9) to the perturbed system (13), the exactly linearized system (10) becomes of the form:

\[
\dot{x} = V + \eta(x, V)
\]

where:

\[
\eta(x, V) = \Delta G(x)G^{-1}(x)(V - F(x)) + \Delta F(x)
\]

The system (14) can be re-expressed as:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x}_1 &= v_1 + \eta_1(x, V) \\
\dot{x}_2 &= v_2 + \eta_2(x, V)
\end{align*}
\]

The next step consists of designing two extended state observers, allowing the estimation of the system states and the two unknown disturbances functions \(\eta_1\) and \(\eta_2\). So, each subsystem of equation (16) can be re-written in the following state form:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x}_{i1} &= x_{i2} + v_i \\
\dot{x}_{i2} &= \eta_i
\end{align*}
\]

The proposed nonlinear extended states observers (NLESO) are defined as given in [41]:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{\hat{x}}_i &= A\hat{x}_i + Bx_i + L_i g_i(\hat{e}_i) \\
\dot{\hat{e}}_i &= \hat{x}_i - \hat{x}_i
\end{align*}
\]

where:

\[
A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, B = \begin{bmatrix} b \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \hat{x}_i = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}_{i1} \\ \hat{x}_{i2} \end{bmatrix}, L_i = \begin{bmatrix} L_{i1} \\ L_{i2} \end{bmatrix}
\]

The nonlinear function \(g_i(\hat{e}_i)\) is defined as:

\[
g_i(\hat{e}_i) = \begin{cases} |\hat{e}_i|^\alpha_i \text{sign}(\hat{e}_i) & \text{if } |\hat{e}_i| > \delta_i \\ \hat{e}_i & \text{else} \end{cases}, i = 1, 2
\]

where:

\[
0 < \alpha_i < 1, \delta_i > 0, \hat{e}_i = y_i - \hat{y}_i
\]

when \(|\hat{e}_i| < \delta_i\), the nonlinear state observer (18) takes the form of the well known linear Luenberger observer (LESO):

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{\hat{x}}_{i1} &= \dot{x}_{i2} + \beta_{i1}\hat{e}_i + v_i \\
\dot{\hat{x}}_{i2} &= \beta_{i2}\hat{e}_i
\end{align*}
\]

Therefore, \(\beta_i\) are calculated to ensure an observer dynamic faster than the close loop tracking dynamic as described by the given below condition:

\[
P_{\text{LESO}}(s) = s^2 + \beta_{i1}s + \beta_{i2} = (s + \omega_{i0})^2
\]

The small value \(\omega_{i0}\) represents the outer loop control \(\eta_i\) as given in [52] to ensure the best compromise between the observing convergence speed and the sensors noise insensitivity:

\[
\omega_{i0} = (3 to 5)\omega_i, i = 1, 2
\]

The small value \(\delta_i\) represents the set point limiting the NLESO (18) high gain.

By redefining the outer loop control (11) as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{\nu}_1^{\text{rob}} &= v_1 + \Delta \nu_1 \\
\dot{\nu}_2^{\text{rob}} &= v_2 + \Delta \nu_2
\end{align*}
\]

the controlled outputs in presence of modeling errors computed in the Laplace domain become:

\[
\begin{align*}
C_A(s) &= \frac{\omega_2^2}{s^2 + 2\zeta_1\omega_1s + \omega_1^2}C_A^{\text{ref}}(s) \\
+ \frac{1}{s^2 + 2\zeta_2\omega_2s + \omega_2^2}(\eta_1(s) - \dot{\hat{x}}_{12}(s)) \\
T_R(s) &= \frac{\omega_2^2}{s^2 + 2\zeta_2\omega_2s + \omega_2^2}T_R^{\text{ref}}(s) \\
+ \frac{1}{s^2 + 2\zeta_2\omega_2s + \omega_2^2}(\eta_2(s) - \dot{\hat{x}}_{22}(s))
\end{align*}
\]

It is obvious that when the estimated states converge to the system states:

\[
\begin{align*}
\eta_1(s) &\rightarrow \hat{x}_{12}(s) \\
\eta_2(s) &\rightarrow \hat{x}_{22}(s)
\end{align*}
\]

the controlled outputs dynamics converge to the given below expressions:

\[
\begin{align*}
C_A(s) &\equiv \frac{\omega_2^2}{s^2 + 2\zeta_1\omega_1s + \omega_1^2}C_A^{\text{ref}}(s) \\
T_R(s) &\equiv \frac{\omega_2^2}{s^2 + 2\zeta_2\omega_2s + \omega_2^2}T_R^{\text{ref}}(s)
\end{align*}
\]

It is clear from (29) that the closed loop dynamic and static desired performances are guaranteed. However, we shall emphasize that the analytical convergence proof of the NLESO (18) is out of the scope of this paper, and we are limited just to suppose the assumptions given in [42, p. 421] are satisfied and the validity of the proposed control is demonstrated through numerical simulations.
4. Simulation Results and Discussion

The proposed control method is validated using numerical simulations by comparing it objectively to the conventional PI controller designed basing on a locally valid linear model developed around a pre-selected operating point. The conventional PI synthesis method is given below choosing the following operating state:

\[ \begin{bmatrix} x_0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 2.88 & 297 \end{bmatrix}^T \quad \begin{bmatrix} u_0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 244.96 & 212.56 \end{bmatrix}^T \]

Hence, the linear state model is given by the following matrices:

\[ \begin{bmatrix} A_0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -35.44 & -61.80 \\ -22.08 & -7.25 \end{bmatrix} ; \quad \begin{bmatrix} B_0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.30 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.38 \end{bmatrix} \\
\begin{bmatrix} C_0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} ; \quad \begin{bmatrix} D_0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \]

Notice that the local behavior of the given above model is unstable at the chosen operating point. The calculation of the matrix \( A_0 \) eigenvalues yields:

\[ \lambda(A_0) = \begin{bmatrix} -60.88 & 18.19 \end{bmatrix}^T \]

To introduce the integral action in the control law using state feedback closed loop pole placement method, let us consider the following augmented system:

\[ x = \begin{bmatrix} C_A & T_R \end{bmatrix} e_1 = C_A - C_A^{ref} \quad e_2 = T_R - T_R^{ref} \]

Choosing the closed loop poles as follows:

\[ \lambda(A_C) = \begin{bmatrix} -61 & -20 & -61 & -20 \end{bmatrix}^T \]

the closed loop PI controller is described by the following equations:

\[ u = u_0 + \Delta u \]

where:

\[ \Delta u = K_p \begin{bmatrix} C_A \\ T_R \end{bmatrix} + K_i \int \left( C_A - C_A^{ref} \right) \left( T_R - T_R^{ref} \right) \quad dt \]

\[ K_p = 10^3 \begin{bmatrix} 0.15 & -0.21 \\ -0.06 & 0.20 \end{bmatrix} \quad K_i = 10^3 \begin{bmatrix} 4.11 & 0 \\ 0 & 3.25 \end{bmatrix} \]

The comparative study that follows is based on two scenarios:

**Scenario 1:** Both proposed controls are applied to the nominal nonlinear model of which the parameters are given in Table 1.

The proposed ESO based robust controller parameters are defined as given in Table 2.

**Scenario 2:** The compared controllers are applied to the uncertain model in order to test their performance robustness against parameter’s, uncertainties, and variations of parameters are given in table below:

The proposed ESO based robust feedback linearization control bloc scheme and the obtained simulation results for each proposed scenario are presented in Figures 2–16.

### Table 2. ESO based controllers’ parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loop</th>
<th>Controller/ESO parameters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( L_a )</td>
<td>( \zeta_1 = 1; \omega_1 = 61; \omega_{10} = 183; \delta_1 = 0.1; \alpha_1 = 0.5; \alpha_{12} = 0.05 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( L_R )</td>
<td>( \zeta_2 = 1; \omega_2 = 20; \omega_{20} = 100; \delta_2 = 10^{-5}; \alpha_{21} = 0.495; \alpha_{22} = 0.005 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3. Parameters uncertainties or variations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uncertainties/variations</th>
<th>Absolute value</th>
<th>Relative value (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta V(t) )</td>
<td>( 0.25 \times 24 \times \sin(t) )</td>
<td>([-25 + 25])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta A(t) )</td>
<td>( 0.25 \times 24 \times \sin(t) )</td>
<td>([-25 + 25])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta C_A(t) )</td>
<td>( 0.2 \times 10 \times \sin(t) )</td>
<td>([-20 + 20])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta T_i(t) )</td>
<td>( 0.02 \times 306 \times \sin(t) )</td>
<td>([-2 + 2])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta \Delta )</td>
<td>( -0.01 \times 2100 )</td>
<td>(-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta k_0 )</td>
<td>( -0.05 \times 59.063 )</td>
<td>(-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta p )</td>
<td>( +0.05 \times 800 )</td>
<td>(+5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta U )</td>
<td>( -0.1 \times 4300 )</td>
<td>(-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta C )</td>
<td>( +0.01 \times 3 )</td>
<td>(+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta )</td>
<td>( -0.01 \times 2100 )</td>
<td>(-10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.** The proposed ESO based robust feedback linearization control scheme

**Figure 3.** Desired and actual product’s concentration curves for scenario 1

**Figure 4.** Desired and actual product’s temperature curves for scenario 1
Figure 5. Reactant fluid flow rate control input curves for scenario 1

Figure 6. Coolant fluid flow rate control input curves for scenario 1

Figure 7. Measured and observed product’s concentration curves for scenario 1

Figure 8. Measured and observed product’s temperature curves for scenario 1

Figure 9. Calculated and observed product’s concentration dynamics uncertainties curves for scenario 1

Figure 10. Calculated and observed product’s temperature dynamics uncertainties curves for scenario 1

Figure 11. Desired and actual product’s concentration curves for scenario 2

Figure 12. Desired and actual product’s temperature curves for scenario 2
4.1. Results Discussion When the Process is Operating in Nominal Conditions

When the parameters’ uncertainties and variations are equal to zero, the responses of the CSTR under the both proposed controllers, shown in the Figures 3 and 4, remain very close to the desired set point after the transient phases. It is also clear in Figure 3 that the ESO based robust feedback linearizing controller ensures a better decoupling between the controlled outputs and a faster convergence of the product concentration to its desired value. The strong inertia of the process against the conventional PI controller disappears after a certain elapsed period of time. Concerning the temperature responses, it clearly illustrated in Figure 4 that the conventional PI control exhibits a slightly superior convergence speed although the chosen closed loop poles were the same. This result is due to the fact that for the conventional PI control, the closed loop temperature dynamics are regulated as a first order subsystem, whereas it is chosen as a second order critically damped subsystem for the ESO based robust controller.

The control signals depicted in Figures 5 and 6 confirm the high inertia of the controlled process against the conventional PI controller by illustrating the high control effort needed to achieve the desired values when the process is started or when the set point changes suddenly, this remark is more evident for the supply control flow FL.

From Figures 9 and 10, it is seen clearly that convergence of the proposed ESO is very satisfactory. The estimate of the total modeling errors supposed unknown and considered as an additional state remain near zero. This expected result is logical since in this scenario the model’s uncertainties were neglected by setting their values to zero.

4.2. Results Discussion When the Process is Operating in Presence of Parameters’, Uncertainties, or Variations

In scenario 2, our aim was to compare the transient and steady performances of the proposed controllers under the suppositions of the existence of uncertain or time varying parameters. The results presented in Figures 11 and 12 show that even the nominal performances were relatively degraded compared to the nominal case; both proposed controllers were able to achieve sufficiently good control performance in the sense that the system responses were maintained around the desired set points within a narrow band. Also, it is clear that the proposed ESO based robust feedback controller robustness exceeds that obtained with the conventional PI since it was capable of ensuring a better static precision by rejecting actively the real-time observed modeling errors as depicted in Figures 15 and 16.
In term of control energy, the Figures 13 and 14 highlight the main future of the proposed ESO based robust feedback control, which lies in the fact that it needs a net inferior energetic consumption to achieve the desired set points when these desired values change instantaneously and especially when the process starts functioning. This major feature, clearly visible in Table 4, is due to the potential of the proposed method to decouple the whole process dynamics into two independent dynamics and thus control them separately, dispensing less energy compared to the PI controller.

The above presented comparative study is summarized based on the rooted mean square error and the mean control power criterions for each scenario in Table 4.

The error RMS and the mean control power criterions are defined as:

$$\text{RMS}(e(t)) = \frac{1}{T} \int_{0}^{T} e^2(t)dt$$

$$\text{Mean power}(u(t)) = \frac{1}{T} \int_{0}^{T} u^2(t)dt$$

where:

- T: is the simulation time.
- u(t): represents the control input.

5. Conclusion

The main objective of this article was to propose a viable extended state observer based robust feedback linearization controller applied to the control of an industrial CSTR. The idea behind this particular choice was to associate the decoupling capacity of the exact feedback linearization control, and therefore guaranteeing high tracking performance, and the high potential of the nonlinear extended state observer to estimate the modeling errors and the external disturbances in order to reject actively their undesirable effects. The obtained results via numerical simulations have objectively demonstrated the effectiveness of the proposed control strategy compared to the conventional PI in terms of:

1) Providing a better tracking performance by ensuring a better decoupling between the two controlled dynamics.

2) Presenting a remarkable energetic efficiency improvement by diminishing the power consumption.

3) Showing a strong robustness against the nominal model’s uncertainties by decreasing the necessity to get a highly accurate mathematical model in the controller design by adopting an extended state observer charged to compensate the model/plant mismatch.
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