

Optimal bounded flow metering and lane-changing control at motorway bottlenecks

Jaarlijks Recensie

► To cite this version:

Jaarlijks Recensie. Optimal bounded flow metering and lane-changing control at motorway bottlenecks. 2022. hal-03602610

HAL Id: hal-03602610 https://hal.science/hal-03602610

Preprint submitted on 17 Mar 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Optimal flow metering and lane-changing control at motorway bottlenecks

Jaarlijks Recensie School of Engineering Espoo, Finland jaarlijksrecensie21@gmail.com

Abstract-In the near future, the appearance of vehicle automation and connectivity will revolutionise the features and capabilities of individual vehicles. Among the wide range of potentially introduced technology, some may be exploited to interfere with the driving behaviour via recommending, supporting, or even executing appropriately designed traffic control tasks, providing unprecedented opportunities to improve traffic control performance [1]-[3]. It has been shown that, particularly at bottleneck locations (e.g., lane-drops, on-ramp merges), human drivers usually perform suboptimal lane-changes based on erroneous perceptions, which may trigger congestion, and, thus, deteriorate the overall travel time (e.g., [4]-[7]). Furthermore, some of the mentioned empirical investigations indicate that, in conventional traffic, capacity flow is not reached simultaneously at all lanes, a feature that reduces the potentially achievable cross-lane capacity. For these reasons, a promising new feature that may be exploited for traffic management, independently or in combination with other strategies, is lane-changing control.

Index Terms—Optimal flow, ramp metering, lane-changing, control, bottleneck

I. INTRODUCTION

We address here the problem of maximising the outflow at motorway bottlenecks via a combined exploitation of flow metering and lane-changing control [8]. It is well known that a bottleneck, which is a location where the flow capacity upstream is higher than the flow capacity downstream of the bottleneck location, is activated when the arriving flow is higher than the overall capacity or when the lane-changing behaviour leads to exceeding the capacity in at least one lane. In conventional traffic, in order to avoid or delay the activation of a bottleneck, and the related capacity drop phenomenon, various traffic control measures have been proposed and applied [9]–[12]. In the context of automated and connected vehicles, only a limited number of works have considered to exploit optimal lane distribution (e.g., [13]-[16]). We presented in [17] an optimal feedback control strategy for lanechanging control, formulated as a linear quadratic regulator. which is highly efficient in real-time even for large-scale networks. The method has been extended in [18] in order to achieve different traffic density distribution for the various lanes at the bottleneck area.

We propose here a novel coordinated and integrated approach [19]–[21] that allows to jointly exploit mainstream or ramp flow metering together with lane-changing control, while accounting for unmeasured demand flows and incomplete



Fig. 1. Simple network example

measurements. The control strategy aims at regulating the on-ramp flow and the lane assignment of vehicles upstream of a bottleneck location so as to maximise the bottleneck throughput. Moreover, the proposed strategy is capable of handling efficiently the case of mixed traffic, where manual vehicles may not receive or may not follow the prescribed lane-changing commands. We first present the formulation of our strategy, which is based on a simplified linear macroscopic traffic flow model, with appropriate augmented dynamics to handle unmeasured flows. The model is employed to design a controller that aims at regulating the flow metered at an onramp together with the lane assignment of vehicles upstream of a bottleneck location in order to maximise the bottleneck throughput, targeting critical densities at bottleneck locations as set-points. Since the critical densities may be a-priori unknown and they may vary over time, we also employ a non-model-based real-time optimisation technique [22]-[25], namely, extremum seeking [26], to identify them, with the aim of minimising [27], [28] a performance index, namely the total time spent over a finite time horizon. Finally, we present simulation experiments, employing a first-order multilane macroscopic traffic flow model featuring the capacity drop phenomenon [29], in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the developed methodology and to highlight the different traffic behaviour in terms of generated queues and per-lane flow distribution.

II. PREVIOUS FORMULATION

Let us consider the network in Fig. 1. This system can be described as follows:

$$\underline{x}(k+1) = A\underline{x}(k) + B\underline{u}(k) + \underline{d} \tag{1}$$

$$\underline{x} = \begin{bmatrix} \rho_{0,1} \\ \rho_{0,2} \\ \rho_{1,1} \\ \rho_{1,2} \\ \rho_{2,1} \\ \rho_{2,2} \end{bmatrix}, \underline{u} = \begin{bmatrix} f_{0,1} \\ f_{1,1} \end{bmatrix}, \underline{d} = \begin{bmatrix} d_{0,1} \\ d_{0,2} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ d_{2,1} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \frac{T}{\Delta}v & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 - \frac{T}{\Delta}v & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{T}{\Delta}v & 0 & 1 - \frac{T}{\Delta}v & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{T}{\Delta}v & 0 & 1 - \frac{T}{\Delta}v & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{T}{\Delta}v & 0 & 1 - \frac{T}{\Delta}v & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{T}{\Delta}v & 0 & 1 - \frac{T}{\Delta}v \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{T}{\Delta}v & 0 & 1 - \frac{T}{\Delta}v \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{T}{\Delta}v & 0 & 1 - \frac{T}{\Delta}v \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{T}{\Delta}v & 0 & 1 - \frac{T}{\Delta}v \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{T}{\Delta}v & 0 & 1 - \frac{T}{\Delta}v \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{T}{\Delta}v & 0 & 1 - \frac{T}{\Delta}v \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{T}{\Delta}v & 0 & 1 - \frac{T}{\Delta}v \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{T}{\Delta}v & 0 & \frac{T}{\Delta}v \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{T}{\Delta}v & 0 & \frac{T}{\Delta}v & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{T}{\Delta}v & 0 & \frac{T}{\Delta}v & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{T}{\Delta}v & 0 & \frac{T}{\Delta}v & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{T}{\Delta}v & 0 & \frac{T}{\Delta}v & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{T}{\Delta}v & \frac{T}{\Delta}v & \frac{T}{\Delta}v & \frac{T}{\Delta}v & 0 & \frac{T}{\Delta}v & \frac{T}{\Delta}$$

The controller is supposed to obtain the optimal (net) lateral flows u, given the set-points at the bottleneck area (i.e., $\rho_{2,1}^{2}$, $\rho_{2,2}^{2}$) and the external inflows d.

III. PROBLEM DESIGN WITH INTEGRAL CONTROL

We reformulate the problem, treating the flow entering from the ramp as controlled input and we introduce 2 integrators (one for each targeted cell). This allow to remove the need for measuring the external inflows d. The resulting augmented system is

$$\underbrace{\tilde{x}}_{\tilde{x}} = \begin{bmatrix} \underline{x}\\ z_1\\ z_2 \end{bmatrix}, \underbrace{\tilde{u}}_{\tilde{u}} = \begin{bmatrix} \underline{u}\\ d_{2,1} \end{bmatrix}, \underline{d} = \begin{bmatrix} d_{0,1}\\ d_{0,2}\\ 0\\ 0\\ 0\\ 0\\ -\hat{y} \end{bmatrix} \tag{4}$$

$$\widetilde{A} = \begin{bmatrix} A & 0\\ C & 1 & 0\\ C & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \widetilde{B} = \begin{bmatrix} 0\\ B & 0\\ B & 0\\ -\frac{T}{2}\\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \tag{5}$$

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \hat{y} = \begin{bmatrix} -\rho_{2,1} \\ -\rho_{2,2} \end{bmatrix}$$
(6)

The system is observable and stabilisable, thus we may derive an LQR/LQI gain

$$\tilde{K} = \begin{bmatrix} K & K_I \end{bmatrix} \tag{7}$$

0 0

0 0

0

Δ

which can applied in the control law

$$\underline{\tilde{u}} = -\tilde{K}\underline{\tilde{x}}(k) \tag{8}$$

Equation (8) corresponds to the dynamic compensator

$$\underline{z}(k+1) = \underline{z}(k) + C\underline{x}(k) - \underline{\tilde{y}}$$
(9)

$$u^{\star} = -Kx(k) - K_I z(k) \tag{10}$$

In practice, it may be not always possible to achieve the desired set-point y (e.g., due to lack of demand), therefore it $\frac{T}{\Delta}$ *is* necessary to include an anti windup scheme in the controller. I selected the one proposed in [?] (see also [?], [?]), which, in our case, modifies the dynamic controller as

$$\underline{z}(k+1) = (I - MK_I)\underline{z}(k) + (C + MK)\underline{x}(k) + M\underline{u}_{sat}(k) - \underline{\tilde{y}}$$
(11)

$$u^{\star} = -K\underline{x}(k) - K_I\underline{z}(k) \tag{12}$$

where

(2)

$$\underline{u}_{sat}(k) = sat(u^{\star}(k)) \tag{13}$$

Matrix M should be chosen in order that $I - MK_1$ has stable eigenvalues, for example, via an algorithm proposed in [3] or via classical pole placement. I tested both methods, obtaining no substantial differences (however some tuning of Q and R may be necessary).

IV. PROBLEM DESIGN WITH INPUT SATURATION OF BOTTLENECK AREA

The previous integral controller spends more effort on the inputs of segment 2 $(d_{2,1} \text{ and } f_{2,1})$ to eliminate the integral errors for the bottleneck area. As a result, the controller requests more flow from ramp and consequently send more vehicles to the adjacent line. Considering the saturation for ramp input, although the $f_{2,1}$ is under saturation $d_{10,1}$ is mostly saturated, thus the density of segment 11 at line 1 increases and the other decreases which indicates the first line will be congested. To avoid the saturation, we considered an upper limitation a as a constraint(section 5.3 of [30] also section 7.6 of [31]) for the $d_{2,1}$ and rewrite the Hamiltonian equation as following:

$$d_{2,1} \le a \tag{14}$$

$$g(x) = a - d_{2,1} \ge 0 \tag{15}$$

$$f_{N+1} = H|g(x)|$$
 (16)

$$H = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } g(x) \ge 0\\ 1 & \text{if } g(x) < 0 \end{cases}$$
(17)

$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{1}{2}x^{T}Qx + \frac{1}{2}u^{T}Ru + \sum_{i=1}^{N}\lambda_{i}f_{i} + \lambda_{N+1}f_{N+1}$$
(18)

Which f_{N+1} is a representative for the constraint. Then the new state x_{N+1} is extracted as bellow which shows a positive error between $f_{10,1}$ and a.

$$x_{N+1}(k+1) = x_{N+1}(k) + T\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial \lambda} = x_{N+1}(k) + Tf_{N+1}(k)$$
(19)

To find the new A, B and C matrix of dynamic equation, $d_{2,1}$ must be defined based on the states thus from the previous section we have:

$$d_{2,1} = u(3,k) = -K(3,:)\underline{x}(k)$$
(20)

$$f_{N+1} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } g(x) \ge 0\\ -K(3, :)\underline{x}(k) - a & \text{if } g(x) < 0 \end{cases}$$
(21)

$$\underline{\tilde{x}}^{n} = \begin{bmatrix} \underline{x} \\ x_{N+1} \\ z_{1} \\ z_{2} \end{bmatrix}, \underline{\tilde{u}}^{n} = \underline{\tilde{u}}, \underline{d}^{n} = \begin{bmatrix} d_{0,1} \\ d_{0,2} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -\hat{y} \end{bmatrix}$$
(22)

According to equation (21), we need to design two sets of gains, one for $g(x) \ge 0$ and one for g(x) < 0. If we assume that $u_{initial} = 0$ then at k = 1 the controller effort is below the bounds thus A, B and C would be considered as following.

$$\underline{\tilde{C}}_{0}^{n} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ & C & & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ & & C & & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$
(24)

Again, the system is observable and stabilisable, thus we may derive an LQR/LQI gain

$$\tilde{K}_0^n = \begin{bmatrix} K_0 & K_{C0} & K_{I0} \end{bmatrix}$$
(25)

In case the system exceeds from the upper bound the A, B and C would be considered as following.

$$\underline{\tilde{A}}_{1}^{n} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ A & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -K_{0}(3,:) & 1 - K_{C0}(3,:) & -K_{I0}(3,:) \\ C & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$
$$\underline{\tilde{B}}_{1}^{n} = \underline{\tilde{B}}_{0}^{n}$$
(26)

$$\underline{\tilde{C}}_{1}^{n} = \underline{\tilde{C}}_{0}^{n} \tag{27}$$

The system is observable and stabilisable, thus we may derive an LQR/LQI gain

$$\tilde{K}_1^n = \begin{bmatrix} K_1 & K_{C1} & K_{I1} \end{bmatrix}$$
(28)

And based on the region (above or bellow the bound) the controller may switch between \tilde{K}_0^n or \tilde{K}_1^n .

V. EXPERIMENTAL TESTING WITH THE NON-LINEAR MODEL

The network we use is the following.

we employ the non-linear multilane traffic model with trapezoidal demand at each entry, a no-control scenario is defined. Looking at Figure (3) below, you may notice that a strong congestion starts at the merge area and spills-back until segment

- 1) Capacity drop also occurs at the end of the stretch, which worsens the congestion.
- 2) The reasons for the congestion are a) the high inflow entering from the ramp, since the total demand during the peak period is about 4600 veh/h, while the overall capacity is 4200 veh/h; as well as b) the bad "natural" lane-changing flow, since it is particularly high at the merge segment.

To control the model, we implement 3 types of controllers as LQI, LQI considering the upper bound, and Adaptive-LQI considering the upper bound. And the results will be investigated as following.



Fig. 2. Bigger network example



Fig. 3. Density, no-control case

A. Part 1- LQI

We apply the linear dynamic compensator(eq (11, 12)) to the non-linear traffic model, excluding segment 0 and segment 11. The operator sat u_m is defined as follows

$$\begin{cases}
 u_m^{min}, & u_m < u_m^{min} \\
 u_m^{max}, & u_m > u_m^{min} \\
 u_m, & otherwise
\end{cases}$$
(29)

While bounds for the ramp accounts for the available flow entering from the ramp and a maximum ramp capacity (arbitrarly set as 1800 veh/h):

$$u_m^{min} = 0 \tag{30}$$

$$u_m^{max} = min(\frac{\omega(k)}{T} + d_{2,1}, 1800)$$
(31)

Note that these bounds, in practice, do not need to be specified a priori, but may be measured as the ordered flow (lateral and/or ramp) that is successfully implemented. The optimal control values are directly implemented in the nonlinear traffc model. Lateral flow in segment 1 is computed via the non-linear (nocontrol) formulation, while it is inhibited at segment 11.

Congestion fully disappears and the densities at the bottleneck area remain at their critical values (see Figure (4). Consequently, no capacity drop is occurring.

A (quite long) queue is created at the on-ramp during the peak period. However, currently, the ramp flow has some sort of oscillatory behaviour, (see Figure (5)). The TTS improvement is about 33%.



Fig. 4. Density, controlled case



Fig. 5. Ramp queue (left) and ramp ow (right)

Although the system is controlled, the density at segment 10, line 2 didn't drop which shows that the controller request for more on-ramp demand and tries to send more flow to line 2 while the on-ramp input is saturated. Thus, the congestion of lane 2 doesn't drop.

B. Part 2- LQI considering the upper bound

To avoid the congestion on lane 2, we employ an upper constraint for the on-ramp input which expected to send more lateral flow to the lane 2. The results are indicted as the following.

And the performance of the controller for on-ramp input is mentioned as bellow.

According to the figure, the controller tries to eliminate the errors between demand and upper bound. A (quite long) queue is created at the on-ramp during the peak period. And the TTS improvement is about 33%.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper we investigated the otimal lanechanging and rampmetering control considering an upper bound for the



Fig. 6. Density, controlled considering the upper bound



Fig. 7. Controller performance for input constraint.

ram-metering in the control methodology. Accordignly, we designed two sets of control gains in wich the controller switches between them for the ramp-metering saturation and no-saturation conditions. The method is evaluated via simulation experiments, through a first-order, multi-lane, macroscopic traffic flow model featuring the capacity drop phenomenon, which allows to show the effectiveness of the developed methodology. We are currently investigating stability properties of the controller, as well as producing further simulation experiments to investigate robustness to parameter choices and to different type of disturbances, which are going to appear in a future publication.



Fig. 8. Ramp queue (left) and ramp flow (right).

REFERENCES

- F. Tajdari, A. Ghaffari, A. Khodayari, A. Kamali, N. Zhilakzadeh, and N. Ebrahimi, "Fuzzy control of anticipation and evaluation behaviour in real traffic flow," in 2019 7th International Conference on Robotics and Mechatronics (ICRoM). IEEE, 2019, pp. 248–253.
- [2] F. Tajdari, C. Roncoli, N. Bekiaris-Liberis, and M. Papageorgiou, "Integrated ramp metering and lane-changing feedback control at motorway bottlenecks," in 2019 18th European Control Conference (ECC). IEEE, 2019, pp. 3179–3184.
- [3] F. Tajdari, C. Roncoli, and M. Papageorgiou, "Feedback-based ramp metering and lane-changing control with connected and automated vehicles," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 2020.
- [4] F. Tajdari, N. E. Toulkani, and N. Zhilakzadeh, "Intelligent optimal feedback torque control of a 6dof surgical rotary robot," in 2020 11th Power Electronics, Drive Systems, and Technologies Conference (PEDSTC). IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [5] F. Tajdari and C. Roncoli, "Adaptive traffic control at motorway bottlenecks with time-varying fundamental diagram," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. 271–277, 2021.
- [6] F. Tajdari, A. Golgouneh, A. Ghaffari, A. Khodayari, A. Kamali, and N. Hosseinkhani, "Simultaneous intelligent anticipation and control of follower vehicle observing exiting lane changer," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 70, no. 9, pp. 8567–8577, 2021.
- [7] C. Roncolia, F. Tajdaria, N. Bekiaris-Liberisb, and M. Papageorgioub, "Integrated control of motorway bottlenecks via flow metering and lane assignment."
- [8] A. Khodayari, A. Ghaffari, A. Kamali, and F. Tajdari, "A new model of car following behavior based on lane change effects using anticipation and evaluation idea," *Iranian Journal of Mechanical Engineering Transactions of the ISME*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 26–38, 2015.
- [9] A. Golgouneh, A. Bamshad, B. Tarvirdizadeh, and F. Tajdari, "Design of a new, light and portable mechanism for knee cpm machine with a user-friendly interface," in 2016 Artificial Intelligence and Robotics (IRANOPEN). IEEE, 2016, pp. 103–108.
- [10] A. Ghaffari, A. Khodayari, A. Kamali, F. Tajdari, and N. Hosseinkhani, "New fuzzy solution for determining anticipation and evaluation behavior during car-following maneuvers," *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part D: Journal of automobile engineering*, vol. 232, no. 7, pp. 936–945, 2018.
- [11] F. Tajdari, E. Khodabakhshi, M. Kabganian, and A. Golgouneh, "Switching controller design to swing-up a two-link underactuated robot," in 2017 IEEE 4th International Conference on Knowledge-Based Engineering and Innovation (KBEI). IEEE, 2017, pp. 0595–0599.
- [12] F. Tajdari, M. Kabganian, E. Khodabakhshi, and A. Golgouneh, "Design, implementation and control of a two-link fully-actuated robot capable of online identification of unknown dynamical parameters using adaptive sliding mode controller," in 2017 Artificial Intelligence and Robotics (IRANOPEN). IEEE, 2017, pp. 91–96.
- [13] F. Tajdari, T. Huysmans, Y. Yang, and Y. Song, "Feature preserving nonrigid iterative weighted closest point and semi-curvature registration," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 2022.
- [14] F. Tajdari, C. Eijck, F. Kawa, C. Versteegh, T. Huysmans, and Y. Song, "Optimal position of cameras design in a 4d foot scanner," in *International Design Engineering Technical Conferences and Computers and Information in Engineering Conference*, vol. 2022. American Society of Mechanical Engineers, 2022, pp. 1–9.
- [15] F. Tajdari and N. Ebrahimi Toulkani, "Implementation and intelligent gain tuning feedback–based optimal torque control of a rotary parallel robot," *Journal of Vibration and Control*, p. 10775463211019177, 2021.
- [16] F. Tajdari, M. Tajdari, and A. Rezaei, "Discrete time delay feedback control of stewart platform with intelligent optimizer weight tuner," in 2021 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA). IEEE, 2021, pp. 12701–12707.
- [17] C. Roncoli, N. Bekiaris-Liberis, and M. Papageorgiou, "Optimal lanechanging control at motorway bottlenecks," in 2016 IEEE 19th International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC). IEEE, 2016, pp. 1785–1791.
- [18] —, "Lane-changing feedback control for efficient lane assignment at motorway bottlenecks," *Transportation Research Record*, vol. 2625, no. 1, pp. 20–31, 2017.

- [19] B. Tarvirdizadeh, A. Golgouneh, E. Khodabakhshi, and F. Tajdari, "An assessment of a similarity between the right and left hand photoplethysmography signals, using time and frequency features of heartrate-variability signal," in 2017 IEEE 4th international conference on knowledge-based engineering and innovation (KBEI). IEEE, 2017, pp. 0588–0594.
- [20] B. Tarvirdizadeh, A. Golgouneh, F. Tajdari, and E. Khodabakhshi, "A novel online method for identifying motion artifact and photoplethysmography signal reconstruction using artificial neural networks and adaptive neuro-fuzzy inference system," *Neural Computing and Applications*, vol. 32, no. 8, pp. 3549–3566, 2020.
- [21] T. Bahram, G. Alireza, T. Farzam, and K. Erfan, "A novel online method for identifying motion artifact and photoplethysmography signal reconstruction using artificial neural networks and adaptive neuro-fuzzy inference system," *Neural Computing & Applications*, vol. 32, no. 8, pp. 3549–3566, 2020.
- [22] M. Tajdari, A. Pawar, H. Li, F. Tajdari, A. Maqsood, E. Cleary, S. Saha, Y. J. Zhang, J. F. Sarwark, and W. K. Liu, "Image-based modelling for adolescent idiopathic scoliosis: mechanistic machine learning analysis and prediction," *Computer methods in applied mechanics and engineering*, vol. 374, p. 113590, 2021.
- [23] M. Tajdari, F. Tajdari, A. Pawar, J. Zhang, and W. Liu, "2d to 3d volumetric reconstruction of human spine for diagnosis and prognosis of spinal deformities," in *Conference: 16th US National Congress on Computational Mechanics*, 2021.
- [24] F. Tajdari, M. Kabganian, N. F. Rad, and E. Khodabakhshi, "Robust control of a 3-dof parallel cable robot using an adaptive neuro-fuzzy inference system," in 2017 Artificial Intelligence and Robotics (IRA-NOPEN). IEEE, 2017, pp. 97–101.
- [25] Y. Yang, T. Yuan, T. Huysmans, W. S. Elkhuizen, F. Tajdari, and Y. Song, "Posture-invariant three dimensional human hand statistical shape model," *Journal of Computing and Information Science in Engineering*, vol. 21, no. 3, 2021.
- [26] F. Tajdari, N. E. Toulkani, and N. Zhilakzadeh, "Semi-real evaluation, and adaptive control of a 6dof surgical robot," in 2020 11th Power Electronics, Drive Systems, and Technologies Conference (PEDSTC). IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [27] F. Tajdari, F. Kawa, C. Versteegh, T. Huysmans, and Y. Song, "Dynamic 3d mesh reconstruction based on nonrigid iterative closest-farthest points registration," in *International Design Engineering Technical Conferences* and Computers and Information in Engineering Conference, vol. 2022. American Society of Mechanical Engineers, 2022, pp. 1–9.
- [28] A. Minnoye, F. Tajdari, E. Zjenja, L. Doubrovski, J. Wu, F. Kwa, W. S. Elkhuizen, T. Huysmans, and Y. Song, "Personalized product design through digital fabrication," in *International Design Engineering Technical Conferences and Computers and Information in Engineering Conference*, vol. 2022. American Society of Mechanical Engineers, 2022, pp. 1–10.
- [29] F. Tajdari, N. E. Toulkani, and M. Nourimand, "Intelligent architecture for car-following behaviour observing lane-changer: Modeling and control," in 2020 10th International Conference on Computer and Knowledge Engineering (ICCKE). IEEE, 2020, pp. 579–584.
- [30] D. E. Kirk, Optimal control theory: an introduction. Courier Corporation, 2004.
- [31] D. S. Naidu, Optimal control systems. CRC press, 2002.