

Fractional Order Version of the HJB Equation*

Abolhassan Razminia
Ph.D. in Control Systems,
Associate Professor,
Electrical Engineering Department,
School of Engineering,
Persian Gulf University,
P. O. Box 75169, Bushehr, Iran
Email: razminia@pgu.ac.ir

Mehdi AsadiZadehShiraz
M.Sc. in Control Systems,
Electronic and Electrical
Engineering Department,
Shiraz University of Technology,
P. O. Box 71555-313, Shiraz, Iran
Email: M.Asadizadehshiraz@sutech.ac.ir

Delfim F. M. Torres[†]
Ph.D. and D.Sc. (Habilitation) in Mathematics,
Full Professor, Coordinator of the R&D Unit CIDMA,
Center for Research and Development in Mathematics and Applications,
Department of Mathematics, University of Aveiro, Aveiro 3810-193, Portugal
Email: delfim@ua.pt

We consider an extension of the well-known Hamilton–Jacobi–Bellman (HJB) equation for fractional order dynamical systems in which a generalized performance index is considered for the related optimal control problem. Owing to the nonlocality of the fractional order operators, the classical HJB equation, in the usual form, does not hold true for fractional problems. Effectiveness of the proposed technique is illustrated through a numerical example.

Keywords: optimal control, HJB equation, optimality principle, fractional calculus

MSC 2010: 26A33, 49L20, 49M05

1 Introduction

During the last sixty years, dynamic optimization and issues related to optimal control theory have received a lot of attention. Various theories, and a large number of applications of optimal control, can be considered as an indicator of the impact of the theory on the science and industry. As a short list of applications, we can mention the technology of wave energy converters in an optimal manner [1], optimal control of gantry cranes [2], emission management in diesel engines [3], thermic processes [4], and epidemiology [5].

As is well known, one of the most basic requirements in optimal control theory is the modeling of the process. The

more accurate the model, the better the control obtained. Parallel to advancement in optimal control theory, several mathematical tools have been developed to model the process to be controlled. One of these tools is fractional calculus (FC), which is an extension of the traditional integer order calculus [6, 7]. FC has affected the control engineering discipline in two aspects: getting superior models for the processes, and a robust structure of the closed-loop control system [8, 9]. Applications of FC have been explored to various fields of science and engineering, including control engineering [10], chaotic systems [11, 12], reservoir engineering [13], diffusive processes [14], and so on [15]. For the design of variable-order fractional proportional–integral–derivative controllers for linear dynamical systems, see [16]. For applications of fractional calculus on the nutrition of pregnant women and the health of newborns and nursing mothers, see [17]; fractional models of HIV-infection and their potential to extract new hidden features of biological complex systems are investigated in [18]. In [19], a time-fractional modified Kawahara equation, describing the generation of non-linear water-waves in the long-wavelength regime, is proposed and studied. A fractional model for convective straight fins with temperature-dependent thermal conductivity is found in [20], while a fractional model for ion acoustic plasma waves is investigated in [21]. In [22], a fractional Fitzhugh–Nagumo equation is employed to describe the transmission of nerve impulses; in [23], a fractional model of Lienard’s equation is used to describe oscillating circuits.

Generally, there are two main approaches in solving an optimal control problem: Bellman’s Dynamic Programming and Pontryagin’s Maximum Principle (PMP). The former

*This is a preprint of a paper whose final and definite form is with *Journal of Computational and Nonlinear Dynamics*, ISSN 1555-1415, eISSN 1555-1423, CODEN: JCNDDM. Submitted 28-June-2018; Revised 15-Sept-2018; Accepted 28-Oct-2018.
[†]Corresponding author.

presents a necessary and sufficient condition of optimality whereas the latter provides necessary conditions. Extending the optimal control problem to the fractional order context has been done via PMP using different approaches [24–30]. In [31], an efficient optimal control scheme is proposed for nonlinear fractional-order systems with disturbances, while optimization of fractional systems with derivatives of distributed order is investigated in [32]. In [33, 34], the dynamic programming procedure has been extended for fractional discrete-time systems. However, to the best of our knowledge, the fractional order version of the well-known HJB equation has not been studied thoroughly. A controlled continuous time random walk, and their position-dependent extensions, have been studied in the framework of fractional calculus [35], but their scope and nature are completely different from the study in the current manuscript.

Here, a general version of the HJB equation is presented. Our main contributions are twofold: we define the performance index of the optimal control problem in a very general form, with the help of a fractional order operator, and, based on the optimality principle, we develop the HJB equation in the fractional context, which we denote as the Fr-HJB equation. Since the problem is inherently difficult, analytical solutions, even for very simple problems, are in general impossible or very difficult to obtain. Moreover, numerical simulations for the Fr-HJB equation are not an obvious issue. Although different approaches exist for solving the classical HJB equation, for the case of the Fr-HJB a reliable numerical technique must be chosen, guaranteeing convergence and stability.

The paper is organized as follows. Some preliminaries on FC are given in Section 2. Section 3 is devoted to the problem statement, in which a formal definition of the optimal control problem and some necessary tools are presented. The Hamilton–Jacobi–Bellman equation, in the context of fractional order systems, namely the Fr-HJB equation, is investigated in Section 4. In Section 5, an optimal control problem is explored via the Fr-HJB equation. Finally, Section 6 concludes the paper with some remarks and future research directions.

2 Preliminaries

Let $x \in L_1[t_0, t_f]$ be a function of $t \in [t_0, t_f]$. The fractional integral of order $\nu \geq 0$ is defined, in the sense of Riemann–Liouville, as follows:

$$\text{Left operator, } {}_{t_0}I_t^\nu x(t) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\nu)} \int_{t_0}^t (t-\tau)^{\nu-1} x(\tau) d\tau, \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Right operator, } {}_tI_{t_f}^\nu x(t) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\nu)} \int_t^{t_f} (\tau-t)^{\nu-1} x(\tau) d\tau, \quad (2)$$

where $\Gamma(\cdot)$ is given by

$$\Gamma(\nu) = \int_0^\infty z^{\nu-1} e^{-z} dz. \quad (3)$$

For $\nu > 0$, we denote the space of functions that can be represented by a left (right) RL-integral of order ν of some $C([a, b])$ -function by ${}_aI_t^\nu([a, b])$ (${}_tI_b^\nu([a, b])$), where $a < t < b$.

Based on the definition of fractional integrals, the (left) fractional derivative operators in the sense of Riemann–Liouville and Caputo are defined, respectively, as follows:

$${}_aD_t^q = D^n \circ {}_aI_t^{n-q}, \quad (4)$$

$${}_a^C D_t^q = {}_aI_t^{n-q} \circ D^n, \quad (5)$$

where $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $n-1 \leq q < n$. The relationship between Caputo and Riemann–Liouville derivatives is given by the following formula:

$${}_a^C D_t^q x(t) = {}_aD_t^q x(t) - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{x^{(k)}(a)}{\Gamma(k-q+1)} (t-a)^{k-q}, \quad (6)$$

where $n-1 \leq q < n$. Along the work, we consider $0 < q < 1$. In this case, the above relation reduces to

$${}_a^C D_t^q x(t) = {}_aD_t^q x(t) - \frac{x(a)}{\Gamma(1-q)} (t-a)^{-q}, \quad (7)$$

which implies that the difference between Caputo and Riemann–Liouville derivatives depends on the initial value of $x(t)$. In addition, as stated in [36], for $0 < q < 1$ we have, in the limit,

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow 1^-} {}_a^C D_t^q x(t) = \lim_{q \rightarrow 1^-} {}_aD_t^q x(t) = \dot{x}(t). \quad (8)$$

Therefore, the Caputo and Riemann–Liouville derivatives are consistent with the standard integer order derivatives.

One of the important relationships between fractional order derivatives and the integer ones can be stated as in [37]:

$${}_aD_t^q x(t) = A(q)(t-a)^{-q} x(t) + B(q)(t-a)^{1-q} \dot{x}(t) - \sum_{p=2}^{\infty} C(q, p)(t-a)^{1-p-q} W_p(t), \quad (9)$$

where for $p = 2, 3, \dots$ function $W_p(t)$ solves the initial value problem

$$\begin{cases} \dot{W}_p(t) = (1-p)(t-a)^{p-2} x(t), \\ W_p(a) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

and the coefficients $A(q), B(q)$ and $C(q, p)$ are determined by

the following formulas:

$$A(q) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-q)} \left(1 + \sum_{p=2}^{\infty} \frac{\Gamma(p-1+q)}{\Gamma(q)(p-1)!} \right), \quad (11)$$

$$B(q) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(2-q)} \left(1 + \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \frac{\Gamma(p-1+q)}{\Gamma(q)(p-1)!} \right), \quad (12)$$

$$C(q, p) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(2-q)\Gamma(q-1)} \cdot \frac{\Gamma(p-1+q)}{(p-1)!}. \quad (13)$$

The backward compatibility of relation (9) for the case $q \rightarrow 1$ can be easily proven by considering the properties of the gamma function.

3 Problem statement

Consider a plant with the dynamical control system

$${}_{t_0}^C D_t^{\mathbf{q}} \mathbf{x}(t) = \mathbf{f}(t, \mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{u}(t)), \quad (14)$$

where $\mathbf{q} = [q_1 \ q_2 \ \dots \ q_n]$ is the order of differentiation in the sense of Caputo, so that $0 < q_i < 1$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, \mathbf{f} is a smooth vector field for the pseudo-states $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbf{u}(t) \in \mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ is the control input vector, where \mathcal{U} is a compact set. Moreover, the initial state is assumed to be known as $\mathbf{x}(t_0) = \mathbf{x}_0$, where the initial time $t = t_0$ is the starting point of the dynamic system, which implicitly assumes that all information from $-\infty$ to t_0 is summarized in \mathbf{x}_0 .

Let $\mathfrak{D} = [O_1 \ O_2 \ \dots \ O_r]$ be a vector-operator and $\mathbf{g} = [g_1 \ g_2 \ \dots \ g_r]$ be a vector function so that the operator O_j affects the operand g_j . Then, the generalized dot-product is defined as follows:

$$\mathfrak{D} \odot \mathbf{g} = \sum_{j=1}^r O_j g_j, \quad (15)$$

where $O_j g_j \in \mathbb{R}$. Let us define the vector operator as

$${}_{t_0} \mathbf{I}_{t_f}^{\mathbf{v}} := [{}_{t_0} I_{t_f}^{v_1} \ {}_{t_0} I_{t_f}^{v_2} \ \dots \ {}_{t_0} I_{t_f}^{v_r}], \quad (16)$$

where $0 \leq v_i \leq 2$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, r$ is called the tuning factor of the performance index. Here, we study the fixed-final-time problem in which t_f is specified beforehand. Therefore, the Riemann–Liouville integral of left type is preferable than the right one:

$${}_{t_0} I_{t_f}^v g(t) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(v)} \int_{t_0}^{t_f} (t_f - \tau)^{v-1} g(\tau) d\tau. \quad (17)$$

The main motivation for introducing such performance index can be explained by noticing the kernel. Depending on the nature of the problem, we can choose the order of integration, v , so that the desired criterion is achieved. Indeed, there are two highlighted cases:

Expensive initial behavior, when the initial behavior is more important than the final ones, so that we can select the order of the integral greater than one: $1 < v_j < 2$. By this choice, the kernel $(t_f - \tau)^{v-1}$ is a larger quantity for initial times, whereas for the final times it will be smaller.

Cheap initial behavior, for which, in contrast, the final behavior is more important, so that we can select the tuning factor of the performance index v_j as $0 < v_j < 1$. For this case, a bigger weight is imposed on the final time behavior and smaller weights on the initial times.

Apparently, the tuning factor \mathbf{v} weights the integrand naturally in the time basis. Such time-filtering cannot be so easily included in the classical performance index. Moreover, since a vector type of order \mathbf{v} has been chosen, both expensive and cheap cases can be considered compactly in an unified expression. Moreover, under some mild assumptions, we can generalize the performance index for $v_j < 0$, which implies that, using a unified framework, we can consider a derivative cost functional:

$${}_{t_0} I_t^{v_j} \rightarrow {}_{t_0} D_t^{-v_j}. \quad (18)$$

Such issues may appear in limited-saturation control problems in which the derivative of the control signal has to be constrained. In addition to these cases, a combined expression can be constituted, in which some integrals, with different orders, depending on the nature of the problem, and some derivatives with different orders, appear. Therefore, the proposed generalized performance index provides a general format for evaluating the optimality of a dynamical system.

Based on this short motivation to the use of a generalized performance index, we formulate an optimum behavior of the given plant by minimizing the following cost functional:

$$J = {}_{t_0} \mathbf{I}_{t_f}^{\mathbf{v}} \odot \mathbf{g}, \quad (19)$$

where the minimization is taken over the control signal \mathbf{u} , assumed to be measurable. The operand g_j can be considered as the modified Lagrangian for the dynamical system, which is in general a mapping $g_j(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ when its related operator $O_j = {}_{t_0} I_{t_f}^{v_j}$ has nonzero order, $v_j \neq 0$. For the operator of order zero (nonintegral part), the operand is assumed to be $g_j(t_f, \mathbf{x}(t_f))$.

Remark 1. *It can be easily seen that the classical Bolza problem of optimal control theory is a special class of the above generalized problem in which $r = 2$, $v_1 = 0$, $v_2 = 1$, $g_1 = h(t_f, \mathbf{x}(t_f))$, and $g_2 = g(t, \mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{u}(t))$. In this case, the performance index is in the Bolza form [38]:*

$$J = h(t_f, \mathbf{x}(t_f)) + \int_{t_0}^{t_f} g(t, \mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{u}(t)) dt. \quad (20)$$

As can be seen, the fractional order performance index (19) has the backward compatibility property, i.e., considering in-

teger order parameters, the classical optimal control problem is obtained.

An action-like integral for problems of the calculus of variations has been introduced in [39–41]. However, our main motivation here to define such generalized performance index is completely different and relies, basically, on the natural weighting and backward compatibility properties.

4 HJB equation: fractional order version

Consider a generalized performance index over the interval $[t, t_f]$, $t \leq t_f$, of any control sequence $\mathbf{u}(\tau)$, $t \leq \tau \leq t_f$:

$$J(t, \mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{u}(\tau)) = {}_t\mathbf{I}_{t_f}^{\mathbf{v}} \odot \mathbf{g}. \quad (21)$$

Based on Bellman's optimality principle [38], the first step is computing the optimal cost at the final time t_f . This value can be obtained by observing the non-integral terms of J , i.e., the terms whose integration order is zero: $v_k = 0$. Let us denote these indexes by the set \mathcal{K} :

$$\mathcal{K} = \{k : v_k = 0, k = 1, 2, \dots, r\}. \quad (22)$$

For such terms, the optimum values of V at the final time are

$$V(t_f, \mathbf{x}(t_f)) = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} g_k. \quad (23)$$

For the empty set \mathcal{K} , we consider $V(t_f, \mathbf{x}(t_f)) = 0$ as the boundary value of the V -function. Now we use the backward trend of the dynamic programming procedure. Clearly, the goal is to pick $\mathbf{u}(\tau)$, $t \leq \tau \leq t_f$, to minimize the cost functional

$$J^*(t, \mathbf{x}(t)) = V(t, \mathbf{x}) = \inf_{\substack{\mathbf{u}(\tau) \in U, \\ t \leq \tau \leq t_f}} J(t, \mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{u}(\tau)). \quad (24)$$

By writing the value function explicitly, and then splitting the control horizon $[t, t_f]$ into two subinterval $[t, t + \Delta t]$ and $[t + \Delta t, t_f]$, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} V(t, \mathbf{x}(t)) &= \inf_{\substack{\mathbf{u}(\tau) \in U, \\ t \leq \tau \leq t_f}} \left\{ {}_t\mathbf{I}_{t_f}^{\mathbf{v}} \odot \mathbf{g} \right\} \\ &= \inf_{\substack{\mathbf{u}(\tau) \in U, \\ t \leq \tau \leq t_f}} \left\{ {}_t\mathbf{I}_{(t+\Delta t)}^{\mathbf{v}} \odot \mathbf{g} + ({}_{(t+\Delta t)}\mathbf{I}_{t_f}^{\mathbf{v}} \odot \mathbf{g}) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

In this stage, at time $t + \Delta t$, the system will be implicitly at pseudo-state $\mathbf{x}(t + \Delta t)$. But from the principle of optimality, we can write the optimal cost-to-go from this state as

$$V(t + \Delta t, \mathbf{x}(t + \Delta t)).$$

Thus, we can rewrite the cost calculation in Eq. (25) as:

$$\begin{aligned} V(t, \mathbf{x}(t)) &= \inf_{\substack{\mathbf{u}(\tau) \in U, \\ t \leq \tau \leq t_f}} \left\{ {}_t\mathbf{I}_{(t+\Delta t)}^{\mathbf{v}} \odot \mathbf{g} + V(t + \Delta t, \mathbf{x}(t + \Delta t)) \right\} \\ &\approx \inf_{\substack{\mathbf{u}(\tau) \in U, \\ t \leq \tau \leq t_f}} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^r \frac{1}{\Gamma(v_j)} (t_f - t)^{v_j - 1} g_j(t, \mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{u}(t)) \Delta t \right. \\ &\quad \left. + V(t + \Delta t, \mathbf{x}(t + \Delta t)) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Assuming that V has bounded second derivatives in both arguments, one can expand this cost as a Taylor series about $(t, \mathbf{x}(t))$:

$$\begin{aligned} V(t + \Delta t, \mathbf{x}(t + \Delta t)) &\simeq V(t, \mathbf{x}(t)) + \left[\frac{\partial V}{\partial t}(t, \mathbf{x}(t)) \right] \Delta t \\ &\quad + \left[\frac{\partial V}{\partial \mathbf{x}}(t, \mathbf{x}(t)) \right]^T (\mathbf{x}(t + \Delta t) - \mathbf{x}(t)) \\ &\approx V(t, \mathbf{x}(t)) + V_t(t, \mathbf{x}(t)) \Delta t + V_{\mathbf{x}}^T(t, \mathbf{x}(t)) \dot{\mathbf{x}} \Delta t, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

in which for small Δt , the term $(\mathbf{x}(t + \Delta t) - \mathbf{x}(t))$ has been replaced by $\dot{\mathbf{x}} \Delta t$. Now, resorting to Eqs. (9) and (6), we can replace $\dot{\mathbf{x}}$ by the following relation (component wise):

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i &= \frac{{}_a D_t^{q_i} x_i(t) - A(q_i)(t - a)^{-q_i} x_i(t)}{B(q_i)(t - a)^{1 - q_i}} \\ &\quad + \frac{\sum_{p=2}^{\infty} C(q_i, p)(t - a)^{1 - p - q_i} W_p(t)}{B(q_i)(t - a)^{1 - q_i}} \\ &= \frac{{}_a^C D_t^{q_i} x_i(t) - k_i(t, q_i, x_i)}{B(q_i)(t - a)^{1 - q_i}}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} k_i(t, q_i, x_i) &= -\frac{x_i(a)}{\Gamma(1 - q_i)} (t - a)^{-q_i} + A(q_i)(t - a)^{-q_i} x_i(t) \\ &\quad - \sum_{p=2}^{\infty} C(q_i, p)(t - a)^{1 - p - q_i} W_p(t) \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

and $A(\cdot)$, $B(\cdot)$, $C(\cdot)$ and $W_p(\cdot)$ are defined in (10)–(13). Let

$$\tilde{\mathbf{f}} = \left[\frac{f_1 - k_1(t, q_1, x_1)}{B(q_1)(t - a)^{1 - q_1}} \quad \frac{f_2 - k_2(t, q_2, x_2)}{B(q_2)(t - a)^{1 - q_2}} \quad \dots \quad \frac{f_n - k_n(t, q_n, x_n)}{B(q_n)(t - a)^{1 - q_n}} \right]^T. \quad (29)$$

By this transformation, the equivalent equation describing the system is $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \tilde{\mathbf{f}}(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$. Therefore, Eq. (27) reduces to

$$V(t + \Delta t, \mathbf{x}(t + \Delta t)) \approx V(t, \mathbf{x}(t)) + V_t(t, \mathbf{x}(t)) \Delta t + V_{\mathbf{x}}^T(t, \mathbf{x}(t)) \tilde{\mathbf{f}} \Delta t.$$

Thus, we can simplify Eq. (26) in the following form:

$$V(t, \mathbf{x}(t)) \approx \inf_{\substack{\mathbf{u}(\tau) \in \mathcal{U} \\ t \leq \tau \leq t_f}} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^r \frac{1}{\Gamma(v_j)} (t_f - t)^{v_j - 1} g_j(t, \mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{u}(t)) \Delta t \right. \\ \left. + V(t, \mathbf{x}(t)) + V_t(t, \mathbf{x}(t)) \Delta t + V_{\mathbf{x}}^T(t, \mathbf{x}(t)) \tilde{\mathbf{f}} \Delta t \right\}.$$

Since the minimization is taken over $\mathbf{u}(\cdot)$, the term $V(t, \mathbf{x}(t))$ can be canceled from both sides. The result just proved is summarized in the following theorem.

Theorem 1 (Fractional HJB equation). *Consider the plant described by Eq. (14) and the performance index (19). Assume that (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}) is the optimal pair, which minimizes the performance index J . Then the value-function $V(t, \mathbf{x})$ satisfies*

$$-V_t(t, \mathbf{x}) = \min_{\substack{\mathbf{u}(\tau) \in \mathcal{U} \\ t \leq \tau \leq t_f}} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^r \frac{1}{\Gamma(v_j)} (t_f - t)^{v_j - 1} g_j(t, \mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{u}(t)) \right. \\ \left. + V_{\mathbf{x}}^T(t, \mathbf{x}(t)) \tilde{\mathbf{f}} \right\}, \quad (30)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}$ is defined in Eq. (29) and the boundary value of V is set as Eq. (23). Moreover, the optimal cost of the system is given by

$$J^* = V(t_0, \mathbf{x}_0). \quad (31)$$

Remark 2. *Theorem 1 is backward compatible. Indeed, it is easy to see that for the limit case where $q_i = 1$, $r = 2$, $v_1 = 0$, $v_2 = 1$, $g_1 = h(t_f, \mathbf{x}(t_f))$ and $g_2 = g(t, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$, the result reduces to the classical HJB equation. In this reduction, we can resort to Eq. (8).*

5 Discussion

In this section some discussions about the considered problem are presented. Several examples for the simplest case $v = r = 1$ have been investigated in [42], wherein the dynamic of the system has been assumed to be described by the Riemann–Liouville derivative. Here, we formulate a more general problem and consider the Fr-HJB equation developed in the previous two sections.

Consider a plant with the following dynamics described by the Caputo derivative:

$${}_0^C D_t^{0.2} x_1(t) = x_2(t) + u(t), \quad (32)$$

$${}_0^C D_t^{0.7} x_2(t) = -x_1(t), \quad (33)$$

subject to the initial conditions $x_1(0) = 1$ and $x_2(0) = 0.5$. It is desired to find a control u such that the following performance index is minimized:

$$J = {}_0 I_1^{0.3} (x_1^2(t) + x_2^2(t)) + {}_0 I_1^{0.4} (x_1^2(t) + u^2(t)). \quad (34)$$

As can be seen, the performance index is free of nonintegral terms. Thus, the final value of the V -function is set as zero:

$$V(1, x_1(1), x_2(1)) = 0. \quad (35)$$

In this case, the fractional HJB equation is given by

$$-\frac{\partial V}{\partial t}(t, \mathbf{x}) = \min_{\substack{\mathbf{u}(\tau) \in \mathcal{U} \\ t \leq \tau \leq 1}} \left\{ \frac{1}{\Gamma(0.3)} (1-t)^{-0.7} (x_1^2(t) + x_2^2(t)) \right. \\ \left. + \frac{1}{\Gamma(0.4)} (1-t)^{-0.6} (x_1^2(t) + u^2(t)) + \left(\frac{\partial V}{\partial \mathbf{x}}(t, \mathbf{x}(t)) \right)^T \tilde{\mathbf{f}} \right\}.$$

Let us constitute the components of the fractional HJB equation:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{f}} = \left[\frac{x_2(t) + u(t) - k_1(t, 0.2, x_1)}{B(0.2)t^{0.8}} \quad \frac{-x_1(t) - k_2(t, 0.7, x_2)}{B(0.7)t^{0.3}} \right]^T, \\ k_1(t, 0.2, x_1) = -\frac{t^{-0.2}}{\Gamma(0.8)} + A(0.2)t^{-0.2}x_1(t) \\ - \sum_{p=2}^{\infty} C(0.2, p)t^{0.8-p}W_{p1}(t), \\ k_2(t, 0.7, x_2) = -\frac{t^{-0.7}}{2\Gamma(0.3)} + A(0.7)t^{-0.7}x_2(t) \\ - \sum_{p=2}^{\infty} C(0.7, p)t^{0.3-p}W_{p2}(t),$$

where

$$\begin{cases} \dot{W}_{pi}(t) = (1-p)t^{p-2}x_i(t), \\ W_{pi}(0) = 0. \end{cases}$$

In the numerical implementation, the infinite series in $A(\cdot)$, $B(\cdot)$ and $C(\cdot, \cdot)$ are truncated up to N steps [43]:

$$A(q) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-q)} \left(1 + \sum_{p=2}^{N_A} \frac{\Gamma(p-1+q)}{\Gamma(q)(p-1)!} \right), \quad (36)$$

$$B(q) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(2-q)} \left(1 + \sum_{p=1}^{N_B} \frac{\Gamma(p-1+q)}{\Gamma(q)(p-1)!} \right), \quad (37)$$

$$C(q, p) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(2-q)\Gamma(q-1)} \cdot \frac{\Gamma(p-1+q)}{(p-1)!}. \quad (38)$$

In such case, we can explicitly denote the first two coefficients by $A(\cdot, N_A)$ and $B(\cdot, N_B)$, where N_A and N_B are the upper bounds of the summations. For some significant works for numerical solutions, see [43–48].

It can be clearly seen that some equations must be solved forward while others backward. Therefore, in general, these type of problems cannot be solved using conventional numerical methods. One of the reliable numerical techniques

in solving such optimal control problems is the Forward-Backward Sweep Method (FBSM), based on the following five steps:

1. Guess the initial conditions for the controller $u(t)$ and save it. In our example, we have considered $\Delta t = 0.01$ and $u(t) = 5$.
2. Acquire and save states $x(t)$ in forward time, based on the given initial conditions of the states and the $u(t)$ stored in step one. We have considered $N_A = N_B = 10^9$ and limited p to 150 for calculating W_{pi} , which results in $x_1(1) \simeq 0.138$ and $x_2(1) \simeq 0.097$.
3. Obtain and save the co-states in backward, according to their final conditions. By using the backward path, the vector $V(t)$ can be obtained. For our considered initial time we obtain $V(0) \simeq 8.3$.
4. Update $u(t)$ with respect to states and co-states obtained from steps 2 and 3.
5. Check the variables values and their error rates. If the error is small enough, the obtained values are considered valid and the process is finished. Otherwise, jump and start from step 2.

Note that the presented method only applies to numerical solutions of problems in which the initial condition of $x(t)$ is constant and at the other times are free. For the considered problem, the error is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} error(t) = \sum_{j=1}^r \frac{1}{\Gamma(v_j)} (t_f - t)^{v_j-1} g_j(t, \mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{u}(t)) \\ + V_{\mathbf{x}}^T(t, \mathbf{x}(t)) \tilde{\mathbf{f}} + V_t(t, \mathbf{x}) \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

and

$$Error = \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\frac{t_f}{\Delta t}} error^2(n\Delta t) \right)^{(1/2)}. \quad (40)$$

By using the proposed method, the optimal cost of the system is $V(0, x(0)) \simeq 0.0053$, $x_1(1) \simeq 0.0667$, $x_2(1) \simeq 0.0970$ and $Error \simeq 1.06 \times 10^{-15}$. The state trajectories and the controller output signals are shown in Figures 1 and 2, respectively.

6 Concluding remarks

Based on fractional calculus theory, a generalized performance index has been defined for a typical optimal control problem in which the dynamical system is also of fractional order. We observed that the mentioned performance index has two important properties: backward compatibility to the integer order case and a natural weighting process. Besides these main features, one can include, under some mild assumptions, a derivative-type performance index in the proposed unified framework. Subsequently, based




Fig. 1. Optimal system states of problem (32)–(34), which converge to the equilibrium points.




Fig. 2. The optimal controller of the system (32)–(33) that minimizes the performance index (34).

on the optimality principle, we investigated a general optimal control problem with a vectorized order performance index. Thanks to the continuous time dynamic programming theory and the series expansions for fractional calculus proposed by [37] and further explored in [43], a fractional order version of the well-known Hamilton–Jacobi–Bellman (HJB) equation has been derived (Theorem 1). Finally, some discussions about the computational difficulties of the problems were presented, which can be considered as an important future line of research.

Acknowledgements

Razminia would like to thank Igor Podlubny and Ivo Petras for their encouragement and helpful discussions during his visit at Technical University of Kosice, Kosice, Slovak Republic. Torres was supported by FCT through CIDMA, project UID/MAT/04106/2013, and TOCCATA,

project PTDC/EEI-AUT/2933/2014, funded by FEDER and COMPETE 2020. The authors are very grateful to two anonymous referees for reading their paper carefully and for all the constructive remarks and suggestions.

References

- [1] Zou, S., Abdelkhalik, O., Robinett, R., Bacelli, G., and Wilson, D., 2017. “Optimal control of wave energy converters”. *Renewable Energy*, **103**, pp. 217–225.
- [2] Kolar, B., Rams, H., and Schlacher, K., 2017. “Time-optimal flatness based control of a gantry crane”. *Control Engineering Practice*, **60**, pp. 18–27.
- [3] Donkers, M., Schijndel, J. V., Heemels, W., and Willems, F., 2017. “Optimal control for integrated emission management in diesel engines”. *Control Engineering Practice*, **61**, pp. 206–216.
- [4] Titouche, S., Spiteri, P., Messine, F., and Aidene, M., 2015. “Optimal control of a large thermic process”. *Journal of Process Control*, **25**, pp. 50–58.
- [5] Rodrigues, F., Silva, C. J., Torres, D. F. M., and Maurer, H., 2018. “Optimal control of a delayed HIV model”. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B*, **23**(1), pp. 443–458. [arXiv:1708.06451](https://arxiv.org/abs/1708.06451)
- [6] Kilbas, A. A., Srivastava, H. M., and Trujillo, J. J., 2006. *Theory and applications of fractional differential equations*, Vol. 204 of *North-Holland Mathematics Studies*. Elsevier Science B.V., Amsterdam.
- [7] Podlubny, I., 1999. *Fractional differential equations*, Vol. 198 of *Mathematics in Science and Engineering*. Academic Press, Inc., San Diego, CA.
- [8] Monje, C. A., Chen, Y., Vinagre, B. M., Xue, D., and Feliu, V., 2010. *Fractional-order systems and controls*. Advances in Industrial Control. Springer, London.
- [9] Sabatier, J., Oustaloup, A., Garcia Iturricha, A., and Lanusse, P., 2002. “CRONE control: principles and extension to time-variant plants with asymptotically constant coefficients”. *Nonlinear Dynam.*, **29**(1-4), pp. 363–385.
- [10] Ibrir, S., and Bettayeb, M., 2015. “New sufficient conditions for observer-based control of fractional-order uncertain systems”. *Automatica J. IFAC*, **59**, pp. 216–223.
- [11] Razminia, A., and Torres, D. F. M., 2013. “Control of a novel chaotic fractional order system using a state feedback technique”. *Mechatronics*, **23**(7), pp. 755–763. [arXiv:1303.2358](https://arxiv.org/abs/1303.2358)
- [12] Shukla, M. K., and Sharma, B. B., 2017. “Stabilization of a class of fractional order chaotic systems via backstepping approach”. *Chaos Solitons Fractals*, **98**, pp. 56–62.
- [13] Razminia, K., Razminia, A., and Tenreiro Machado, J. A., 2014. “Analysis of diffusion process in fractured reservoirs using fractional derivative approach”. *Commun. Nonlinear Sci. Numer. Simul.*, **19**(9), pp. 3161–3170.
- [14] Razminia, K., Razminia, A., and Baleanu, D., 2015. “Investigation of the fractional diffusion equation based on generalized integral quadrature technique”. *Appl. Math. Model.*, **39**(1), pp. 86–98.
- [15] Jahanshahi, S., and Torres, D. F. M., 2017. “A simple accurate method for solving fractional variational and optimal control problems”. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, **174**(1), pp. 156–175. [arXiv:1601.06416](https://arxiv.org/abs/1601.06416)
- [16] Dabiri, A., Moghaddam, B. P., and Tenreiro Machado, J. A., 2018. “Optimal variable-order fractional PID controllers for dynamical systems”. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, **339**, pp. 40–48.
- [17] Baleanu, D., Jajarmi, A., Bonyah, E., and Hajipour, M., 2018. “New aspects of poor nutrition in the life cycle within the fractional calculus”. *Adv. Difference Equ.*, pp. Paper No. 230, 14.
- [18] Jajarmi, A., and Baleanu, D., 2018. “A new fractional analysis on the interaction of HIV with CD4+ T-cells”. *Chaos Solitons Fractals*, **113**, pp. 221–229.
- [19] Kumar, D., Singh, J., and Baleanu, D., 2018. “Modified Kawahara equation within a fractional derivative with non-singular kernel”. *Thermal Science*, **22**(2), pp. 789–796.
- [20] Kumar, D., Singh, J., and Baleanu, D., in press. “A new fractional model for convective straight fins with temperature-dependent thermal conductivity”. *Thermal Science*.
- [21] Kumar, D., Singh, J., Baleanu, D., and Sushila, 2018. “Analysis of regularized long-wave equation associated with a new fractional operator with Mittag-Leffler type kernel”. *Phys. A*, **492**, pp. 155–167.
- [22] Kumar, D., Singh, J., and Baleanu, D., 2018. “A new numerical algorithm for fractional Fitzhugh-Nagumo equation arising in transmission of nerve impulses”. *Nonlinear Dynam.*, **91**(1), pp. 307–317.
- [23] Kumar, D., Agarwal, R. P., and Singh, J., 2018. “A modified numerical scheme and convergence analysis for fractional model of Lienard’s equation”. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, **339**, pp. 405–413.
- [24] Ali, H. M., Lobo Pereira, F., and Gama, S. M. A., 2016. “A new approach to the Pontryagin maximum principle for nonlinear fractional optimal control problems”. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, **39**(13), pp. 3640–3649.
- [25] Agrawal, O. P., 2004. “A general formulation and solution scheme for fractional optimal control problems”. *Nonlinear Dynam.*, **38**(1-4), pp. 323–337.
- [26] Almeida, R., and Torres, D. F. M., 2009. “Calculus of variations with fractional derivatives and fractional integrals”. *Appl. Math. Lett.*, **22**(12), pp. 1816–1820. [arXiv:0907.1024](https://arxiv.org/abs/0907.1024)
- [27] Debbouche, A., Nieto, J. J., and Torres, D. F. M., 2017. “Optimal solutions to relaxation in multiple control problems of Sobolev type with nonlocal nonlinear fractional differential equations”. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, **174**(1), pp. 7–31. [arXiv:1504.05153](https://arxiv.org/abs/1504.05153)
- [28] Razminia, A., Majd, V. J., and Feyz Dizaji, A., 2012. “An extended formulation of calculus of variations for incommensurate fractional derivatives with fractional performance index”. *Nonlinear Dynam.*, **69**(3), pp. 1263–1284.

- [29] Odziejewicz, T., Malinowska, A. B., and Torres, D. F. M., 2012. “Generalized fractional calculus with applications to the calculus of variations”. *Comput. Math. Appl.*, **64**(10), pp. 3351–3366. [arXiv:1201.5747](https://arxiv.org/abs/1201.5747)
- [30] Razminia, A., Baleanu, D., and Majd, V. J., 2013. “Conditional optimization problems: fractional order case”. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, **156**(1), pp. 45–55.
- [31] Jajarmi, A., Hajipour, M., Mohammadzadeh, E., and Baleanu, D., 2018. “A new approach for the nonlinear fractional optimal control problems with external persistent disturbances”. *J. Franklin Inst.*, **355**(9), pp. 3938–3967.
- [32] Zaky, M. A., 2018. “A Legendre collocation method for distributed-order fractional optimal control problems”. *Nonlinear Dynamics*, **91**(4), pp. 2667–2681.
- [33] Dzielinski, A., and Czyronis, P. M., 2014. “Dynamic programming for fractional discrete-time systems”. *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, **47**(3), pp. 2003–2009.
- [34] Czyronis, P. M., 2014. “Dynamic programming problem for fractional discrete-time dynamic systems. Quadratic index of performance case”. *Circuits Systems Signal Process.*, **33**(7), pp. 2131–2149.
- [35] Kolokoltsov, V. N., and Veretennikova, M. A., 2014. “A fractional Hamilton Jacobi Bellman equation for scaled limits of controlled continuous time random walks”. *Commun. Appl. Ind. Math.*, **6**(1), pp. e–484, 18.
- [36] Li, C., and Deng, W., 2007. “Remarks on fractional derivatives”. *Appl. Math. Comput.*, **187**(2), pp. 777–784.
- [37] Atanackovic, T. M., and Stankovic, B., 2008. “On a numerical scheme for solving differential equations of fractional order”. *Mech. Res. Comm.*, **35**(7), pp. 429–438.
- [38] Kirk, D., 2004. *Optimal Control Theory: An Introduction*. Dover Publications.
- [39] El-Nabulsi, R. A., 2005. “A fractional action-like variational approach of some classical, quantum and geometrical dynamics”. *Int. J. Appl. Math.*, **17**(3), pp. 299–317.
- [40] El-Nabulsi, R. A., and Torres, D. F. M., 2007. “Necessary optimality conditions for fractional action-like integrals of variational calculus with Riemann-Liouville derivatives of order (α, β) ”. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, **30**(15), pp. 1931–1939. [arXiv:math-ph/0702099](https://arxiv.org/abs/math-ph/0702099)
- [41] EL-Nabulsi, A. R., 2009. “Fractional action-like variational problems in holonomic, non-holonomic and semi-holonomic constrained and dissipative dynamical systems”. *Chaos Solitons Fractals*, **42**(1), pp. 52–61.
- [42] Rakhshan, S. A., Effati, S., and Kamyad, A. V., 2018. “Solving a class of fractional optimal control problems by the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation”. *Journal of Vibration and Control*, **24**(9), pp. 1741–1756.
- [43] Almeida, R., Pooseh, S., and Torres, D. F. M., 2015. *Computational methods in the fractional calculus of variations*. Imperial College Press, London.
- [44] Yong, J., and Zhou, X. Y., 1999. *Stochastic controls*, Vol. 43 of *Applications of Mathematics (New York)*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- [45] Sun, M., 1993. “Domain decomposition algorithms for solving Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations”. *Numer. Funct. Anal. Optim.*, **14**(1-2), pp. 145–166.
- [46] Xu, H., Sun, Z., and Xie, S., 2011. “An iterative algorithm for solving a kind of discrete HJB equation with M -functions”. *Appl. Math. Lett.*, **24**(3), pp. 279–282.
- [47] Chen, G., and Chen, G., 2011. “A numerical algorithm based on a variational iterative approximation for the discrete Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation”. *Comput. Math. Appl.*, **61**(4), pp. 901–907.
- [48] Zhou, S., and Zhan, W., 2003. “A new domain decomposition method for an HJB equation”. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, **159**(1), pp. 195–204.