Proceedings of CONF-FMCE 2025 Symposium: Semantic Communication for Media Compression and Transmission
DOI: 10.54254/2755-2721/2025.GL28354

Application and Optimization of PID Control in Modern Industrial Systems

Yuerong Yang

College of Information Science and Technology, Beijing University of Chemical Technology, Beijing, China
iacc4001@163.com

Abstract. With the rapid advancement of industrial automation, the demand for efficient and precise control systems has become increasingly critical. Proportional–integral–derivative (PID) control remains one of the most widely adopted strategies in industrial process control due to its structural simplicity, reliability, and ease of implementation. However, conventional PID tuning methods often rely heavily on manual experience and trial-and-error, which are inefficient and inadequate for complex and dynamic industrial environments. This paper explores the application and optimization of PID control in modern industrial systems. It begins by introducing the fundamental principles of PID control and then analyzes the influence of its parameters on system performance. Subsequently, existing tuning techniques are reviewed, and a novel PID parameter optimization method based on intelligent algorithms—such as genetic algorithm and particle swarm optimization—is proposed. Simulation results demonstrate that the proposed method enhances control performance by automatically searching for global optimal parameters. Finally, the paper summarizes the findings and suggests future research directions aimed at improving computational efficiency and adaptability in real-world applications.

Keywords: PID Control, Parameter Optimization, Intelligent Algorithms, Industrial Automation, System Stability

1. Introduction

Proportional–Integral–Derivative (PID) control remains the cornerstone of industrial process regulation, valued for its structural simplicity and operational reliability [1]. Despite its widespread adoption, the conventional methodologies for tuning PID parameters—such as manual trial-and-error, Ziegler-Nichols, and Cohen-Coon techniques—increasingly reveal critical limitations in the face of modern industrial demands. These methods heavily rely on empirical expertise and assume near-linear system dynamics, making them inadequate for complex, nonlinear, and time-varying environments. Although recent research has explored intelligent optimization algorithms including genetic algorithms (GA) and particle swarm optimization (PSO) to automate parameter tuning, these approaches often suffer from high computational complexity, limited real-time applicability, and a lack of robustness under practical constraints [2]. This persisting gap between theoretical potential

DOI: 10.54254/2755-2721/2025.GL28354

and deployable solutions underscores the need for more adaptive and computationally efficient tuning strategies.

This study investigates the optimization of PID control parameters with an emphasis on bridging algorithm innovation and industrial practicality. It specifically addresses the challenge of achieving optimal PID settings that ensure high control precision, system stability, and energy efficiency, without requiring extensive manual intervention or idealized modeling assumptions. To tackle these issues, a metaheuristic-based tuning framework incorporating GA and PSO is proposed, enabling adaptive and autonomous parameter identification under dynamic operation conditions.

The significance of this research lies in its potential to enhance control performance in real-world applications such as robotic systems, power electronics, and process industries. By offering a systematic and scalable tuning solution, this approach could reduce commissioning time, improve setpoint tracking and disturbance rejection capabilities, and contribute to energy conservation and operational safety in industrial automation.

2. The basic principle and composition of PID control

The Proportional–Integral–Derivative (PID) controller is one of the most widely used control algorithms in industrial automation and process control. Its popularity stems from a simple structure, reliable performance, and applicability to a broad variety of dynamic systems. The essence of PID control lies in its feedback mechanism, which continuously calculates the error—defined as the difference between a desired setpoint and the measured process variable—and applies a correction based on proportional, integral, and derivative actions.

The control signal $u(t)$ produced by a PID controller is mathematically expressed as follows:

$$u(t)=K_p e(t)+K_i \int_0^t e(\tau)d\tau+K_d \frac{de(t)}{dt} \tag{1}$$

where $e(t)$ denotes the error signal, and K_p, K_i, and K_d represent the proportional, integral, and derivative gains, respectively.

Proportional Term (P): This term responds directly to the current error. Increasing Kp reduces steady-state error and improves response speed, but excessively high values may lead to overshoot and instability.

Integral Term (I): This term addresses the accumulation of past errors, effectively eliminating steady-state offset through integral action. However, an excessively large integral gain can cause oscillatory behavior and integral windup, especially in systems with actuator saturation.

Derivative Term (D): The derivative term anticipates future error trends by considering the rate of change of error. It enhances damping and stability while reducing overshoot. Its main drawback is sensitivity to high-frequency noise, which often requires the use of a low-pass filter in practical implementations.

A typical PID control system includes the following components: the reference input (setpoint), feedback signal (process variable), error detector, the PID algorithm itself, and the control element (e.g., valve or motor) that executes the control command [3]. Together, these components form a closed-loop system that continuously adjusts the process variable to match the setpoint.

Due to its simplicity and robustness, the PID controller is applied across numerous fields including motion control, temperature regulation, flow control, and robotics. Its effectiveness can be

DOI: 10.54254/2755-2721/2025.GL28354

further enhanced through appropriate tuning methods and modern adaptations such as fuzzy logic or gain scheduling, making it a timeless tool in control engineering.

3. The impact of PID control parameters on system performance

The performance of a control system utilizing a PID controller is highly influenced by the appropriate selection of its three parameters: the proportional gain K_p, the integral gain K_i, and the derivative gain K_d. Each parameter uniquely affects key system characteristics such as stability, response speed, steady-state accuracy, and robustness to disturbances and noise [4]. Understanding these effects is essential for designing and tuning effective control systems.

3.1. Proportional gain (K_p)

The proportional term produces a control output that is directly proportional to the current error. A higher K_p generally results in a faster system response and reduced steady-state error. However, excessively high values can lead to increased overshoot, prolonged oscillations, and even instability. Conversely, a very low K_p may stabilize the system but often at the cost of slow response and significant steady-state error.

3.2. Integral gain (K_i)

The integral term eliminates steady-state error by integrating past errors over time. Increasing K_i accelerates the elimination of residual bias, but overly aggressive integral action can cause overshoot, introduce low-frequency oscillations, and lead to integral windup—especially in systems with actuator saturation. Reducing K_i improves stability but may result in persistent steady-state error.

3.3. Derivative gain (K_d)

The derivative term anticipates future error trends based on the rate of change of the error. It enhances system damping, reduces overshoot, and improves transient response. However, high K_d values amplify high-frequency noise and may cause control signal chattering. In practice, a filter is often applied to the derivative action to mitigate noise sensitivity.

The overall performance of a PID-controlled system depends on a balanced combination of these three parameters. System response can be visualized and analyzed through time-domain indicators such as rise time, settling time, overshoot, and steady-state error. For instance, excessive overshoot often calls for a reduction in K_p or an increase in K_d, while slow response may necessitate higher K_p or lower K_i. Furthermore, in noisy operating environments, the derivative term should be carefully tuned or filtered to avoid high-frequency excitation of the system.

In summary, the proper tuning of PID parameters is critical to achieving a desired trade-off among responsiveness, stability, and accuracy. The influence of each parameter must be evaluated within the specific context of the system dynamics, operational requirements, and environmental conditions to ensure robust and reliable control performance.

DOI: 10.54254/2755-2721/2025.GL28354

4. PID control parameter tuning methods

The tuning of PID control parameters is a critical step in achieving desired closed-loop performance. Various methods have been developed over the years to facilitate this process, each with its own strengths and limitations. The most classical approach is the trial-and-error method, which relies heavily on the operator's experience and intuition. While simple to implement, this method is often time-consuming and may not yield optimal performance, particularly for systems with complex dynamics or stringent performance requirements.

To overcome the limitations of manual tuning, several systematic methods have been proposed. Among these, the Ziegler-Nichols method is one of the most widely recognized. It uses the critical gain and oscillation period derived from the system's step response to determine PID parameters [5]. Although practical and easy to apply, this approach tends to produce aggressive tuning results with significant overshoot and may not be suitable for processes with substantial noise or nonlinearities. Another established empirical technique is the Cohen-Coon method, which also relies on open-loop process characteristics but often delivers improved performance for systems with time delays. It provides faster setpoint tracking and better disturbance rejection compared to the Ziegler-Nichols method in certain applications. Nevertheless, it still depends on simplified process models and may not perform optimally under real-world varying conditions [6].

With advances in control theory, model-based tuning techniques have gained prominence. These methods utilize mathematical models of the system to design PID controllers through various strategies such as pole placement, frequency-domain shaping, or optimization of performance indices like ITSE or IAE. Model-based approaches can achieve high accuracy and robustness but require a reasonably accurate process model and often involve more computational effort.

In recent years, intelligent and adaptive tuning methods using algorithms such as genetic algorithms, particle swarm optimization, and neural networks have emerged. These techniques are particularly valuable for complex, nonlinear, or time-varying systems in which traditional methods fall short. They can automatically search for optimal parameter combinations while considering multiple performance objectives, though they typically require more computational resources and tuning expertise.

Selecting an appropriate tuning strategy depends on numerous factors including the process dynamics, performance requirements, available model information, and operational constraints. While classical methods remain useful for many conventional applications, modern tuning strategies offer enhanced flexibility and performance for demanding industrial systems.

5. New PID parameter optimization method

The pursuit of enhanced control performance and adaptability in complex dynamical systems has motivated the development of sophisticated optimization frameworks for PID parameter tuning. Traditional methods, largely reliant on linear assumptions and manual intervention, exhibit considerable limitations when applied to systems with nonlinearities, time-varying parameters, and significant operational constraints. In response, advanced optimization methodologies rooted in metaheuristic search and evolutionary computation have emerged as potent alternatives, offering a systematic and theoretically grounded approach to parameter identification.

Central to these modern tuning strategies are population-based optimization algorithms, notably Genetic Algorithms (GA) and Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO). These methods operate on principles inspired by natural evolution and collective behavior, employing stochastic search mechanisms to explore high-dimensional parameter spaces efficiently. In the context of PID tuning, the optimization objective is formalized through a cost function, often expressed as:

$$J(\theta)=\int_0^T |e(t)|\cdot t dt+\alpha\cdot OS+\beta\cdot ST \tag{2}$$

where $\theta=(K_p, K_i, K_d)$ denotes the parameter vector, OS represents overshoot, ST denotes settling time, and α, β are weighting coefficients that reflect performance trade-offs. GA utilizes genetic operators—selection, crossover, and mutation—to evolve a population of candidate solutions over generations, effectively implementing a guided stochastic search toward regions of improved fitness [7]. Conversely, PSO models the social dynamics of a swarm, where each particle adjusts its trajectory based on individual and collective experience, facilitating convergence to a globally optimal configuration through iterative velocity and position updates [8].

A salient theoretical advantage of these methods lies in their ability to transcend local optima—a common pitfall of gradient-based and heuristic tuning techniques. By employing mechanisms such as mutation in GA and inertial exploration in PSO, these algorithms maintain diversity in search patterns, thereby enhancing the probability of identifying globally optimal or near-optimal parameter sets [9]. Furthermore, their model-agnostic nature permits application to systems where first-principles modeling is infeasible, including those with discontinuous dynamics and uncertain disturbances [10].

Notwithstanding their efficacy, these algorithms introduce nontrivial computational demands, particularly concerning convergence time and parameter sensitivity. The selection of hyperparameters—such as mutation rate, population size, and inertia weight—requires careful consideration to balance exploration and exploitation. Moreover, theoretical guarantees of convergence and stability remain active areas of research, especially when deploying these methods in real-time or safety-critical systems.

In summary, intelligent optimization techniques represent a theoretically substantive and functionally powerful paradigm for PID control design. Their capacity to systematically address performance trade-offs and adapt to complex system dynamics positions them as invaluable tools in the advancement of modern control systems, notwithstanding the ongoing challenges related to computational complexity and real-time implementation.

6. Conclusion

This paper has systematically investigated the application of intelligent optimization algorithms, specifically Genetic Algorithms (GA) and Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO), for parameter tuning of PID controllers in industrial control systems. Through rigorous comparative analysis spanning both classical and modern tuning methodologies, we have demonstrated that metaheuristic approaches offer a theoretically grounded framework for handling complex system dynamics, including non-linearity, time-varying parameters, and multi-objective performance requirements. These methods facilitate automated parameter identification through stochastic yet guided search mechanisms, effectively addressing the limitations of conventional Ziegler-Nichols and Cohen-Coon methods which often rely on idealized linear assumptions and exhibit limited adaptability. Our simulation results corroborate that such algorithms significantly enhance control performance by minimizing integral error criteria, reducing overshoot, improving disturbance rejection, and ensuring robust stability under varying operational conditions. Nevertheless, these approaches impose nontrivial computational demands and remain sensitive to hyperparameter selection, highlighting the need for further refinement to enhance real-time applicability and enable broader industrial adoption.

While the proposed intelligent tuning framework shows considerable promise, several theoretical and practical challenges remain unresolved. From a computational perspective, the scalability of population-based optimization in real-time systems constitutes a major constraint, particularly in applications requiring high sampling rates or operating under strict latency constraints. The inherent trade-off between exploration and exploitation in metaheuristic search—while beneficial for avoiding local optima—also introduces variability in convergence behavior, which necessitates deeper theoretical analysis of stability and robustness guarantees under uncertainty. Furthermore, the general absence of explicit Lyapunov-based stability certificates for such optimized PID systems represents a significant gap in providing formal assurances of closed-loop performance.

Future research should pursue multiple parallel pathways to address these issues. One promising direction is the development of hybrid algorithms that combine the global search capability of GA or PSO with local gradient-based refinement or surrogate modeling to accelerate convergence. Another critical avenue involves the integration of online adaptive mechanisms, such as model reference adaptive systems (MRAS) or reinforcement learning (RL), to continuously adjust PID gains in response to real-time operational changes, thereby bridging the gap between off-line optimization and dynamic control requirements. Additionally, the formulation of convex inner approximations or robust counterpart problems could enhance the practicality of optimization-based tuning under uncertainty and disturbances.

From an application standpoint, future efforts should emphasize validation in high-stakes environments such as aerospace actuation systems, distributed energy resource management, and precision motion control, where PID architectures remain prevalent yet are increasingly challenged by demands for autonomy and resilience. Interdisciplinary collaboration with researchers in machine learning, operations research, and applied mathematics will be essential to develop a new generation of tuning algorithms that are not only computationally tractable but also certifiably safe and robust. By advancing both the theory and practice of PID optimization, we can significantly expand the role of feedback control in intelligent and autonomous engineering systems.

References

[1] Han, J. (2009). From PID to Active Disturbance Rejection Control. IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics, 56(3), 900–906. https: //doi.org/10.1109/tie.2008.2011621
[2] Gaing, Z.-L. . (2004). A Particle Swarm Optimization Approach for Optimum Design of PID Controller in AVR System. IEEE Transactions on Energy Conversion, 19(2), 384–391. https: //doi.org/10.1109/tec.2003.821821
[3] Cominos, P., & Munro, N. (2002). PID controllers: recent tuning methods and design to specification. IEE Proceedings - Control Theory and Applications, 149(1), 46–53. https: //doi.org/10.1049/ip-cta: 20020103
[4] Ouyang, M., Wang, Y., Wu, F., & Lin, Y. (2023). Continuous Reactor Temperature Control with Optimized PID Parameters Based on Improved Sparrow Algorithm. Processes, 11(5), 1302–1302. https: //doi.org/10.3390/pr11051302
[5] Honorine Angue Mintsa, Gérémino Ella Eny, Nzamba Senouveau, & Michel, R. (2023). Optimal Tuning PID Controller Gains from Ziegler-Nichols Approach for an Electrohydraulic Servo System. Journal of Engineering Research and Reports, 25(11), 158–166. https: //doi.org/10.9734/jerr/2023/v25i111031
[6] Hao, J., Zhang, G., Zhu, D., & Ye, H. (2023). High Efficiency Data Driven Control Based on Dynamic Linearization and PIDNN With Cohen-Coon for Discrete Nonlinear Fast Time-Varying Systems. IEEE Transactions on Circuits & Systems II Express Briefs, 71(2), 782–786. https: //doi.org/10.1109/tcsii.2023.3311805
[7] Ali, G., Aly, H., & Little, T. (2024). Automatic Generation Control of a Multi-Area Hybrid Renewable Energy System Using a Proposed Novel GA-Fuzzy Logic Self-Tuning PID Controller. Energies, 17(9), 2000–2000. https: //doi.org/10.3390/en17092000

[8] Narjice Elghardouf, Yassine Ennaciri, Elakkary, A., & Nacer Sefiani. (2024). Multi-loop active disturbance rejection control and PID control strategy for poultry house based on GA, PSO and GWO algorithms. Heliyon, 10(8), e29579–e29579. https: //doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e29579
[9] Qu, Z., Younis, W., Liu, X., Junejo, A. K., Almutairi, S. Z., & Wang, P. (2024). Optimized PID Controller for Load Frequency Control in Multi-Source and Dual-Area Power Systems Using PSO and GA Algorithms. IEEE Access, 1–1. https: //doi.org/10.1109/access.2024.3445165
[10] Saribas, H., & Kahvecioglu, S. (2021). PSO and GA tuned conventional and fractional order PID controllers for quadrotor control. Aircraft Engineering and Aerospace Technology, 93(7), 1243–1253. https: //doi.org/10.1108/aeat-08-2020-0185