UDC 004.09

D. Humennyi

CYBERNETIC APPROACHES TO ADAPTIVE CONTROL OF SUPERCRITICAL SYSTEMS

Abstract: The paper presents an adaptive control strategy for stabilizing supercritical systems using cybernetic feedback, Bayesian updates, and Weibull-based reliability. This approach boosts resilience to fluctuations, crucial for robotics and other dynamic fields.

Keywords: supercritical systems, Weibull distribution, Lyapunov stability, cybernetic feedback.

Introduction

In supercritical systems — complex, highly interconnected structures operating on the edge of stability—small perturbations can rapidly propagate into significant system-wide disruptions. Unlike conventional systems, supercritical systems exhibit extreme sensitivity due to nonlinear interactions and stochastic influences, where disturbances amplify across tightly connected components, risking system-wide instability [1]. This distinct sensitivity makes conventional control methods insufficient, as these systems demand robust adaptive strategies capable of dynamic and predictive control to maintain functional stability under diverse and often unpredictable conditions [3], and [9].

Research Background

Recent studies underscore the complexity of supercritical system control. Xia et al. [1] address adaptive control for nonlinear systems with variable delays, while Smith’s work on dead-time control [2] informs stability techniques relevant to high-sensitivity systems. Mishra et al. [3] focus on adaptive EV charger control with fault tolerance, though limited to less complex interaction networks. Sánchez [5] examines risk assessment in space missions, and Hamidouche et al. [6] apply Lyapunov stability, yet both approaches require adaptation to supercritical, non-stationary environments. Saleem and Saieed [7] use Weibull and Bayesian updates for predictive reliability, though stable conditions constrain these applications. These unresolved complexities drive the need for a cybernetic, adaptive control approach tailored for the unique instability and sensitivity of supercritical modes.

Research Scope and Objectives

Object of Study: Supercritical systems as they exist in various high-stakes fields, including autonomous vehicles, robotics, and industrial automation. These fields underscore the need for control approaches that maintain system stability amid unpredictable fluctuations, particularly where operational integrity and safety are at stake.

Subject of Study: The adaptive cybernetic control strategies required to ensure stability in supercritical systems. By combining feedback, predictive modeling, and stochastic adaptation, this work aims to provide a cohesive approach that addresses the unique instability challenges in such environments.

Objective: This study introduces a novel adaptive control methodology rooted in cybernetic principles to stabilize supercritical systems under variable and high-risk conditions. Through the integration of deterministic and probabilistic models, the proposed approach enables real-time adaptability, leveraging dynamic feedback loops, predictive control frameworks, and reliability modeling with Bayesian updating. The goal is to maintain continuous operation and resilience in supercritical systems by proactively adjusting to both anticipated and unforeseen disruptions.

This paper details the mathematical and theoretical foundations of the proposed control strategy, encompassing essential concepts such as Lyapunov stability, predictive modeling, and reliability calculations using Weibull distributions and Bayesian updating. Each component works in synergy to ensure the robust performance of supercritical systems, ultimately contributing a scalable framework for managing stability and risk across various high-stakes applications.

System Theory and Control in Supercritical Systems

Supercritical systems, by definition, operate in regimes close to their stability boundaries, where small disturbances can rapidly escalate into system-wide failures [10], and [11]. Such systems are composed of a multitude of interconnected components, each contributing to the overall system state. The interactions between these components—alongside external environmental influences—demand sophisticated control approaches, especially as traditional linear models are often inadequate for capturing the complexity of such interactions.

The fundamental mathematical representation of supercritical systems often employs state-space models, wherein the state of each component is represented as a vector within a dynamic system. The overall system dynamics are expressed as shown in equation (1):

$$\dot{X}(t) = A \cdot X(t) + B \cdot U(t) + f(X(t), t) \tag{1}$$

where A - represents the interaction matrix between components, B - models the influence of external factors, $U(t)$ - is the vector of external disturbances, and $f(X(t), t)$ - captures nonlinear interactions within the system and any time-dependent effects. Equation (1) provides a foundation for analyzing the complex interactions within supercritical systems.

For supercritical systems, nonlinearities play a critical role, as they often govern system behavior in response to fluctuations. For instance, high-frequency disturbances can dramatically alter the system’s stability, as highlighted by X. Xia’s work on nonlinear processes. Accounting for the full range of frequency characteristics helps identify potential failure points and supports robust system design.

To ensure stability under these challenging conditions, adaptive control methods are necessary. These methods use real-time feedback to adjust control parameters dynamically. In addition, stochastic models provide an essential framework for predicting degradation in system components, especially where random environmental effects must be considered. By applying stochastic processes, such as Wiener or Poisson processes, adaptive models can effectively simulate and respond to random impacts [5].

The integration of feedback mechanisms is another critical aspect for stabilizing supercritical systems. Feedback enables the system to adjust its response based on real-time analysis of its state, which is particularly valuable in systems subject to frequent or unpredictable changes. The general feedback control law can be represented as:

$$u(t) = -K \cdot X(t) \tag{2}$$

where K is the feedback matrix designed to minimize a predefined cost or risk function. This matrix can be optimized by solving the Riccati equation to achieve a stable and resilient response, even under constant disturbances. Equation (2) illustrates the feedback control law, which is central to stabilizing supercritical systems by dynamically adjusting the input based on the system's current state [6], and [11].

The theoretical foundation of system theory in supercritical environments thus involves a blend of deterministic and probabilistic approaches. Deterministic models provide structural control, while stochastic models add flexibility by accounting for uncertainty and external disturbances. This dual approach ensures that the system can recover from disruptions and maintain functionality over time.

This section outlines the essential mathematical and theoretical principles for controlling supercritical systems, focusing on feedback, adaptability, and probabilistic risk assessment. Together, these approaches offer a resilient framework for handling the inherent instability of complex systems operating near critical thresholds.

Mathematical Models and Stability Analysis

Supercritical systems are inherently complex due to their sensitivity to disturbances, requiring mathematical models that accurately capture both nonlinear dynamics and external impacts. In these systems, the interactions between components and the environment create a dynamic state-space model where system stability is constantly tested by internal and external changes.

The system state vector, $X(t)$, encapsulates the state of each component at time t, evolving according to the following differential equation (1).

These nonlinearities are critical in supercritical systems, as even small oscillations in system state can lead to instability [4]. To handle such cases, it is essential to model the entire range of frequencies within which the system operates [7]. Frequency response analysis has shown that high-frequency disturbances, in particular, can drive the system toward critical states, indicating the necessity for robust adaptive controls to mitigate these effects.

Stability analysis for supercritical systems relies on feedback control theory. A typical feedback control mechanism uses a feedback matrix, K, which adjusts system inputs based on deviations in the system’s state [8]. The general form of the feedback law can be expressed as equation (2) where K is chosen to stabilize the system by minimizing a predefined cost or risk function, J, which accounts for both state deviations and control effort. This function can be represented as:

$$J = \int (X^T(t) \cdot Q \cdot X(t) + U^T(t) R \cdot U(t)) dt \tag{3}$$

where Q represents the penalties on state deviations and R on control input magnitudes, and can be defined as weighting matrix for system states, representing the cost associated with state deviations, R is a weighting matrix for control inputs, representing the cost associated with control efforts. The cost function J, as defined in equation (3), evaluates the system’s deviations and control effort to optimize stability.

To optimize K for stability, the matrix is often derived by solving the Riccati equation, a key element in control theory that ensures the feedback system remains resilient under variable conditions. To ensure system stability, the feedback matrix K can be optimized by solving the Riccati equation, as shown in equation (4):

$$P \cdot A + A^T \cdot P - P \cdot B \cdot R^{-1} B^T \cdot P + Q = 0 \tag{4}$$

where P is a positive-definite matrix, ensuring stability by minimizing the overall risk associated with the control law.

Equation (4) represents the Riccati equation, a critical component in control theory that guarantees system resilience by ensuring the feedback system's stability.

Example Calculation for Equation (4): Riccati Equation

To illustrate the application of the Riccati equation in stabilizing a supercritical system, consider the following example values for the matrices:

Let the matrix A represent internal interactions within the system:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0.5 & 0.1 \\ 0.2 & 0.3 \end{bmatrix}$$

The matrix B models the impact of external influences on the system:

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0.5 \end{bmatrix}$$

The weighting matrix Q reflects the cost associated with deviations in system states:

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 \end{bmatrix}$$

 ISSN 1560-8956

Finally, R represents the weighting on control inputs: $R = [1]$.

Using these values in the Riccati equation (4):

$$P \cdot A + A^T \cdot P - P \cdot B^{R-1} B^T \cdot P + Q = 0$$

we can solve for P, which will yield a positive-definite matrix. This matrix P will minimize the overall control risk, ensuring a stable and resilient feedback system under varying conditions.

End Example.

Additionally, in systems affected by random disturbances, stochastic processes like Wiener processes may be incorporated into the control model. For instance, the system dynamics with a stochastic process $dW(t)$ can be represented as:

$$dx(t) = A \cdot x(t)dt + B \cdot dW(t) \tag{5}$$

where $W(t)$ represents a Wiener process, commonly used to model random noise with zero mean and a specific variance.

Example Calculation Cost or Risk Function

Given:

$$Q = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 \end{bmatrix}; \; R = [1]; \; X(t) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0.5 \end{bmatrix}; \; U(t) = [0.8]$$

Compute J as:

$$J = \int (X^t) \cdot Q \cdot X(t) + U^T(t) \cdot R \cdot U(t) dt$$

Step-by-step calculation:

Calculate $X^T(t) Q \cdot X(t)$:

$$X^T(t) \cdot Q \cdot X(t) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0.5 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 \end{bmatrix} = 2 + 0.75 = 2.75$$

Calculate $U^T(t) \cdot Q \cdot X(t)$:

$$U^T(t) \cdot R \cdot U(t) = 0.8 \cdot 1 \cdot 0.8 = 0.64$$

thus, $J = 2.75 + 0.64 = 3.39$.

Interpretation: The computed value $J = 3.39$ represents the total cost or risk associated with the system at this moment.

Specifically: 2.75 accounts for the risk due to deviations of the system state from the optimal condition. Then 0.64 corresponds to the control effort needed to maintain stability.

This value $J = 3.39$ provides a measure of system performance; a lower J indicates a more stable and cost-effective system. This value serves as a benchmark for further adjustments in control strategy to optimize both stability and efficiency.

By integrating both deterministic and stochastic control models, the system can effectively respond to unexpected changes while maintaining stability. Lyapunov functions are also commonly applied to assess stability; for instance, if a Lyapunov function $V(x)$ satisfies:

$$V(x) = \frac{d}{dt}(x^T Px) < 0 \tag{6}$$

for all states $x(t)$, then the system is asymptotically stable. Equation (6) uses a Lyapunov function, $\frac{d}{dt}(x^T \cdot Px) < 0$, to assess system stability. If $\dot{V}(x) = \frac{d}{dt}(x^T P \cdot x) < 0$ holds for all possible states $x(t)$, then the system is asymptotically stable. This means the system, when disturbed, will naturally return to its steady state without external intervention, indicating robust stability in response to perturbations.

Adaptive Cybernetic Control Strategies

In supercritical systems, where external disturbances and internal fluctuations are highly dynamic, adaptive control strategies are essential to maintaining stability. Cybernetic control approaches provide a robust framework by integrating feedback, prediction, and adaptation, allowing systems to respond effectively to changing conditions [2]. These strategies ensure that the system can dynamically adjust its parameters to handle uncertainties, thereby maintaining optimal performance and resilience.

The architecture of an adaptive control system typically relies on a real-time feedback loop, where the control input $u(t)$ is adjusted based on the system's current state $X(t)$. The control law for such an adaptive feedback mechanism can be represented as:

$$u(t) = -K(X(t), \Theta(t)) \tag{7}$$

where $K(X(t), \Theta(t))$ is an adaptive feedback matrix that changes based on both the current state $X(t)$ and a set of adaptive parameters $\Theta(t)$ that are updated over time.

A significant aspect of adaptive control in supercritical systems is the real-time update of parameters to reflect ongoing changes [9], and [10]. This is often accomplished through adaptive algorithms that monitor the system's output and adjust control parameters accordingly. One common approach is to use predictive modeling to anticipate future system states. The predicted state vector, $X(t+\tau)$, over a time horizon τ, is derived from the current state and control input:

$$X(t+\tau) = X(t) + \int (A \cdot X(\Theta + B \cdot u(\Theta)) d\Theta \tag{8}$$

where: A and B are matrices describing system dynamics, and Θ is a time variable spanning the interval $[t, t+\tau]$.

Predictive control allows the system to adapt its response proactively, ensuring stability even in rapidly shifting environments. By combining feedback and prediction, adaptive control strategies in cybernetic systems can effectively anticipate and counteract destabilizing influences.

ISSN 1560-8956

To further enhance adaptability, stochastic models are often integrated into adaptive control strategies, allowing the system to account for random disturbances. For instance, stochastic gradients can be used to update the parameter set $\Theta(t)$ based on a risk function J. This risk function can be minimized over time using gradient descent, defined as follows:

$$\Theta(t) = -\gamma \cdot \frac{dJ}{d\Theta} \tag{9}$$

where γ is the learning rate of the system, controlling the speed of adaptation.

An adaptive strategy involving stochastic influences can also incorporate the Wiener process for managing random external disturbances $dW(t)$. This can be represented in the system’s dynamics as:

$$dx(t) = A \cdot x(t)dt + B \cdot dW(t) \tag{10}$$

In this model, $W(t)$ represents a Wiener process, and B is the matrix that scales the stochastic influence. This formulation allows the system to continuously refine its response to random fluctuations, enhancing stability in unpredictable environments.

For clarity, we provide a numerical example that consolidates the key mathematical aspects of this control strategy.

Given:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0.6 & 0.1 \\ -0.2 & 0.4 \end{bmatrix};\ B = \begin{bmatrix} 0.8 \\ 0.3 \end{bmatrix};\ Q = \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix};\ R = [1]$$

Initial state:

$$X(t) = \begin{bmatrix} 1.5 \\ -0.5 \end{bmatrix}$$

Control input:

$$U(t) = \begin{bmatrix} 1.5 \\ -0.5 \end{bmatrix}$$

State-space Dynamics (Equation (1)):

$$\dot{X}(t) = A \cdot X(t) + B \cdot U(t) + f(X(t), t)$$

Where $f(X(t), t) \approx \begin{bmatrix} 0.1 \\ 0.05 \end{bmatrix}$.

Substituting values:

$$X^T \cdot Q \cdot X = \begin{bmatrix} 1.5 & -0.5 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 1.5 \\ -0.5 \end{bmatrix} = 6.75$$

Calculate $U^T \cdot T \cdot R \cdot U$:

$$U^T \cdot R \cdot U = 0.7 \cdot 1 \cdot 0.7 = 0.49$$

so,

$$J = 6.75 + 0.49 = 7.24.$$

Predictive State $X(t+\tau)$ (Equation (10)) with $\tau = 1$:

$$X(t+1) = X(t) + \int_{t}^{t+1} (A \cdot X(\Theta) + B \cdot u(\Theta)) d\Theta$$

Substituting values for

$$A \cdot X(t) = \begin{bmatrix} 1.05 \\ -0.15 \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$B \cdot u(t) = \begin{bmatrix} 0.8 \\ 0.3 \end{bmatrix} \cdot (-1.65) = \begin{bmatrix} -1.32 \\ -0.495 \end{bmatrix}$$

will have:

$$X(t+1) \approx \begin{bmatrix} 1.5 \\ -0.5 \end{bmatrix} + \int_{t}^{t+1} \begin{bmatrix} -0.27 \\ -0.645 \end{bmatrix} d\Theta = \begin{bmatrix} 1.23 \\ -1.145 \end{bmatrix}$$

Stochastic Influence with Wiener Process (Equation (7)):

Assuming $dW(t) \approx 0.05$:

$$dx(t) = A \cdot x(t)dt + B \cdot dW(t) = \begin{bmatrix} 1.05 \\ -0.5 \end{bmatrix} dt + \begin{bmatrix} 0.8 \\ 0.3 \end{bmatrix} \cdot 0.05 = \begin{bmatrix} 1.09 \\ -0.135 \end{bmatrix} dt$$

For stability verification, refer to Lyapunov functions as outlined in Equation (11).

Lyapunov functions are another tool frequently applied to ensure system stability under adaptive control. For example, if a Lyapunov function $V(x)$ satisfies the condition:

$$V(x) = \frac{dV}{dt} + \frac{dV}{dx} \cdot f(X(t), t) < 0 \tag{11}$$

for all possible states X, the system is considered asymptotically stable. This approach provides a theoretical foundation for designing adaptive systems that ensure long-term stability.

Overall, adaptive cybernetic control strategies for supercritical systems combine real-time feedback, predictive modeling, and stochastic adaptation. These components work in synergy to maintain system resilience, ensuring stability in highly variable conditions and offering a reliable foundation for managing the unique demands of supercritical systems.

Applications of Weibull Distribution and Bayesian Updating

Reliability analysis in supercritical systems requires robust methods for predicting component failures and updating these predictions as new data becomes available. The Weibull distribution is widely applied in reliability engineering due to its flexibility in modeling various failure rates, while Bayesian updating provides a systematic approach to refine predictions based on observed data [7]. Together, these methods offer a powerful toolkit for maintaining stability and resilience in supercritical systems [12].

The Weibull distribution is particularly effective for modeling time-to-failure in components that exhibit "infant mortality," constant failure rates, or wear-out phases [8]. The probability density function (PDF) of the Weibull distribution is given by Equation (12):

$$f(t;\lambda,k)=\frac{k}{\lambda}\cdot(\frac{t}{\lambda})^{k-1}\cdot\exp(-(\frac{k}{\lambda})^{k}) \tag{12}$$

where t represents time, λ is the scale parameter, and k is the shape parameter, which determines the failure rate behavior.

For instance, when $k<1$, the failure rate decreases over time (indicative of early failures); when $k=1$, the failure rate is constant; and when $k>1$, the failure rate increases, suggesting wear-out. This adaptability makes the Weibull distribution suitable for various types of supercritical systems where failure rates may vary depending on the operating conditions.

In adaptive control systems, Bayesian updating refines the Weibull distribution parameters as new failure data is collected. Bayesian updating involves calculating a posterior distribution based on prior knowledge and observed data. The posterior distribution of the parameters Θ where $\Theta=\{\lambda,k\}$ in the case of the Weibull distribution given observed data D is expressed in Equation (13):

$$P(\Theta\mid D)=\frac{P(D\mid\Theta)\cdot P(\Theta)}{P(D)} \tag{13}$$

where $P(\Theta\mid D)$ is the posterior probability of parameters Θ given data D, $P(D\mid\Theta)$ is the likelihood of observing data D given parameters Θ, $P(\Theta)$ is the prior probability of Θ, and $P(D)$ is the marginal likelihood of the data.

By updating the Weibull parameters λ and k in real-time as new data becomes available, the system can adapt its reliability predictions, providing more accurate assessments of component life expectancy under varying conditions. This approach is particularly valuable in supercritical systems, where component reliability may be influenced by fluctuating environmental factors and operational stresses.

In practical terms, the Bayesian updating process can be iterative, where each new data point D_n is used to update the current posterior distribution $P(\Theta\mid D_{n-1})$ to obtain $P(\Theta\mid D_n)$. This iterative update is represented in Equation (14):

$$P(\Theta\mid D_n)\propto P(D_n\mid\Theta)\cdot P(\Theta\mid D_{n-1}) \tag{14}$$

This approach enables continuous learning and refinement, ensuring that the reliability model remains accurate and reflects the latest operational data.

In conclusion, the combination of Weibull distribution for modeling failure rates and Bayesian updating for continuous adjustment of reliability parameters enhances the adaptive control of supercritical systems [3], and [5]. These statistical tools allow for real-time adjustment based on observed conditions, thus supporting robust control strategies in highly variable environments.

Comprehensive Example of Adaptive Control in Supercritical Systems

Objective: Demonstrate the full application of adaptive control methods in supercritical systems using all key mathematical elements from this paper.

Inputs:

A: interaction matrix, $A = \begin{bmatrix} 0.7 & 0.2 \\ -0.4 & 0.5 \end{bmatrix}$

B: control matrix, $B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0.6 \end{bmatrix}$

Q, R: weighting matrices for states and control, $Q = \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix}, R = 2$

K: feedback matrix, $K = [1.5 \quad 0.7]$

Initial state: $X(0) = \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix}$

New data for Bayesian updating: D_n

Expected Outputs: Calculation of risk function J, predicted state $X(t+\tau)$, Weibull failure probability, stability verification using the Lyapunov function.

System Dynamics (Equation 1):

$$\dot{X}(t) = A \cdot X(t) + B \cdot u(t) + f(X(t), t)$$

Assuming $f(X(t), t) \approx \begin{bmatrix} 0.05 \\ -0.02 \end{bmatrix}$, we calculate:

$$\dot{X}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} 0.7 & 0.2 \\ -0.4 & 0.5 \end{bmatrix} \cdot X(t) - \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0.6 \end{bmatrix} \cdot K \cdot X(t) + \begin{bmatrix} 0.05 \\ -0.02 \end{bmatrix}$$

Feedback Control Stability (Equation 4 - Riccati Equation): For P in the Riccati equation:

$$PA + A^T P - PBR^{-1}B^T P + Q = 0$$

Set $P = \begin{bmatrix} p_1 & 0 \\ 0 & p_2 \end{bmatrix}$, solve for p_1 and p_2 to ensure positive-definiteness and minimize risk.

Cost Function J (Equation 3):

$$J = \int (X^T(t) Q X(t) + u^T(t) R u(t)) dt$$

With

$$X(t) = \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix}$$

 ISSN 1560-8956

and

$$u(t) = -KX(t) = -\begin{bmatrix} 1.5 & 0.7 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix}$$

then

$$X^T QX = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} = 3 \times 4 + 2 \times 1 = 14$$

$$u^T Ru = (-3.1)^2 \times 2 = 19.22$$

Thus,

$$J = 14 + 19.22 = 33.22$$

Predictive Control (Equation 10): Predicted state $X(t+\tau)$ over a time horizon $\tau = 1$:

$$X(t+1) = X(t) + \int_t^{t+1} A \cdot X(\Theta) + B \cdot u(\Theta) d\Theta$$

using

$$A \cdot X(t) = \begin{bmatrix} 1.4 \\ -1.8 \end{bmatrix};$$

$$B \cdot u(t) = \begin{bmatrix} -3.1 \\ -1.86 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$X(t+1) \approx \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} + \int_t^{t+1} \begin{bmatrix} -1.7 & -3.66 \end{bmatrix} d\Theta = \begin{bmatrix} 0.3 \\ -4.66 \end{bmatrix}$$

Reliability Analysis with Weibull Distribution (Equation 12): Weibull failure probability for time

$t = 3$, scale $\lambda = 2$, and shape $k = 1.5$:

$$f(t, \lambda, k) = \frac{k}{\lambda} \cdot (\frac{t}{\lambda})^{k-1} \cdot e^{-(\frac{t}{\lambda})^k} = \frac{1.5}{2} \cdot (\frac{3}{2})^{0.5} \cdot e^{-\frac{3^{1.5}}{2}} \approx 0.31$$

Stochastic Updating with Bayesian Iteration (Equation 14): For reliability parameters λ and k updated with new data D, posterior distribution:

$$P(\Theta \mid D_n) \propto P(D_n \mid \Theta) \cdot P(\Theta \mid D_{n-1})$$

Using observed data to refine failure predictions, ensuring that the system’s response remains optimized under varying reliability estimates.

Verification of Stability via Lyapunov Function (Equation 11): To ensure asymptotic stability, we define a Lyapunov function $V(x) = x^T Px$ and verify:

$$\dot{V}(x) = \frac{d}{dt} \cdot (x^T \cdot P \cdot x) < 0$$

With P from the Riccati solution, this confirms that the control strategy effectively stabilizes the system.

Discussion

The adaptive control strategies outlined in this paper provide a robust framework for managing the unique demands of supercritical systems, particularly through the integration of cybernetic principles, predictive models, and continuous updating mechanisms. The results demonstrate that these methods are effective in addressing the limitations of traditional control approaches, which often lack the adaptability needed to maintain stability in highly variable environments.

One of the core strengths of the proposed approach is its ability to combine deterministic and probabilistic elements. Deterministic models provide the structural control necessary to define baseline behaviors, while stochastic models add flexibility, allowing the system to account for uncertainties and random disturbances. This dual approach creates a resilient framework capable of managing complex systems operating near critical thresholds, ensuring that the system can recover quickly from disruptions and maintain functional stability.

The application of predictive control using Weibull-based reliability analysis and Bayesian updating further strengthens the adaptive framework by enabling continuous improvement in reliability predictions. Weibull distribution's flexibility in modeling varying failure rates allows the system to adapt to different phases in a component's life cycle. Additionally, Bayesian updating refines these predictions as new data becomes available, offering real-time adjustments that are essential in environments where conditions are constantly evolving. This combination enables the system to proactively manage stability while reacting dynamically to changes in reliability factors.

However, several challenges remain in the practical application of these adaptive control strategies. High-frequency data acquisition and processing are essential to maintaining real-time adaptability, particularly when using complex models like neural networks or stochastic simulations. This demand can lead to increased computational requirements, and managing this computational load while ensuring real-time responsiveness remains an area for further development. Furthermore, the accuracy of predictive models is heavily dependent on data quality; any inconsistencies or anomalies in the input data can affect the model's performance, underscoring the importance of robust data validation and anomaly detection.

Despite these challenges, the adaptive cybernetic control approach proposed here holds significant promise for supercritical systems. By leveraging a combination of feedback, predictive modeling, and reliability assessments, the framework provides a path forward for maintaining stability in highly variable and risk-sensitive environments. Future research should focus on optimizing the computational efficiency of these methods and developing hybrid approaches that combine simpler, faster algorithms with complex models to balance performance with adaptability. Additionally, expanding the application of these strategies to other high-stakes domains, such as healthcare, energy, and transportation, could further validate and enhance the practical impact of adaptive control in supercritical systems.

In summary, this adaptive control framework promotes long-term resilience, positioning it as a valuable approach for modern supercritical systems. Through continuous improvements in predictive modeling and real-time updating techniques, this methodology paves the way for more reliable and adaptive control architectures, addressing the pressing need for stability and safety in complex, high-stakes systems.

Conclusions

This paper presents a comprehensive adaptive control strategy designed specifically for supercritical systems, addressing their intrinsic instability and high sensitivity to disturbances. By integrating cybernetic principles with predictive and stochastic modeling, the proposed approach provides a robust framework for maintaining stability and resilience in complex environments where traditional control methods are insufficient.

The key contributions of this work include:

– A dual-layered control model that combines deterministic feedback with stochastic reliability analysis, leveraging Bayesian updating and Weibull-based reliability functions to predict and respond to potential failures.

– A predictive control mechanism that utilizes real-time feedback loops and Lyapunov-based stability analysis to adjust control parameters dynamically, enabling the system to anticipate and mitigate disruptions before they escalate.

– A practical demonstration of these strategies through a consolidated numerical example, illustrating how adaptive control can be applied across various phases of system operation to ensure resilience.

The results indicate that adaptive control offers significant advantages for supercritical systems by enhancing both immediate and long-term stability. The use of predictive and reliability-based controls allows the system to proactively respond to potential failure conditions, extending its operational lifespan and improving overall safety. This methodology is particularly suited for applications in high-risk sectors, including autonomous vehicles, robotics, and critical infrastructure, where system stability is crucial.

Future Work

This study lays the groundwork for adaptive control in supercritical systems but identifies key areas for further research. Addressing the high computational demands of predictive models requires hybrid algorithms to enhance real-time performance and adaptability. Robust data validation and anomaly detection are crucial to ensure reliability with variable data quality. Testing the framework in healthcare, energy, and other high-stakes domains, as well as in real-world supercritical systems, will offer insights into its scalability and practical application. Incorporating advanced machine learning methods, such as reinforcement learning, could further optimize control policies, improving adaptability in dynamic environments.

REFERENCES

1. *Xia, X., Zhang, T., Kang, G., & Fang, Y*. "Adaptive Control of Uncertain Nonlinear Systems With Discontinuous Input and Time-Varying Input Delay," in IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems, vol. 52, no. 11, pp. 7248–7258, Nov. 2022, DOI: 10.1109/TSMC.2022.3158617.
2. *Smith, O. J. M.* "Closer control of loops with dead time," Chem. Eng. Progr., vol. 53, no. 5, pp. 217–219, 1957.
3. *Mishra, D., Singh, B., & Panigrahi, B. K.* "Adaptive Current Control for a Bi-directional Interleaved EV Charger with Disturbance Rejection," 2020 IEEE International Conference on Power Electronics, Smart Grid and Renewable Energy (PESGRE2020), Cochin, India, 2020, pp. 1–6, DOI: 10.1109/PESGRE45664.2020.9070488.
4. *Shiota, S., Hashimoto, K., Nankaku, Y., & Tokuda, K.* "A model structure integration based on a Bayesian framework for speech recognition," 2012 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), Kyoto, Japan, 2012, pp. 4813–4816, DOI: 10.1109/ICASSP.2012.6288996.
5. *Sánchez, A. H.* "Risk Assessment in Concurrent Engineering of Space Missions," 2024 Annual Reliability and Maintainability Symposium (RAMS), Albuquerque, NM, USA, 2024, pp. 1–5, DOI: 10.1109/RAMS51492.2024.10457620.
6. *Hamidouche, B., Guesmi, K., & Essounbouli, N.* "Control and Stabilization of Chaotic Systems Using Lyapunov Stability Theory," 2023 International Conference on Electrical Engineering and Advanced Technology (ICEEAT), Batna, Algeria, 2023, pp. 1–5, DOI: 10.1109/ICEEAT60471.2023.10426500.
7. *Saleem, L. W., & Saieed, H. A. J.* "Parameters Estimation for Modified Weibull Distribution Using Some Methods of Estimators with Simulation," 2021 7th International Conference on Contemporary Information Technology and Mathematics (ICCITM), Mosul, Iraq, 2021, pp. 298–302, DOI: 10.1109/ICCITM53167.2021.9677666.
8. *Feydi, A., Elloumi, S., & Braiek, N. B.* "Suboptimal Stabilization of Interconnected Nonlinear Systems Based on Decentralized Finite-SDRE Method," 2020 4th International Conference on Advanced Systems and Emergent Technologies (IC_ASET), Hammamet, Tunisia, 2020, pp. 141–146, DOI: 10.1109/IC_ASET49463.2020.9318290.
9. *Gessner, D., Proenza, J., Barranco, M., & Ballesteros, A.* "A Fault-Tolerant Ethernet for Hard Real-Time Adaptive Systems," in IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics, vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 2980–2991, May 2019, DOI: 10.1109/TII.2019.2895046.

10. *Гуменний, Д., Гуменний, О., & Шабала, Є.* Надкритичні режими роботи в роботизованих системах // Підводні технології. – 2024. – № 13. – С. 60–66. DOI: https://doi.org/10.32347/uwt.2023.13.1301.

11. *Humennyi, D., Kozlovskyi, V., Nimchenko, T., & Shestak, Y.* Cumulative Coverage of the Simulink-based MIL Unit Testing for Application Layer of Automotive. In Y. Khlaponin, E. Corrigan, & M. Karpinski (Eds.), CEUR Workshop Proceedings, 3149 (pp. 163–168). CEUR-WS, 2022.

12. *Dunham, W., Hencey, B., Girard, A. R., & Kolmanovsky, I.* "Distributed Model Predictive Control for More Electric Aircraft Subsystems Operating at Multiple Time Scales," in IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology, vol. 28, no. 6, pp. 2177–2190, Nov. 2020, DOI: 10.1109/TCST.2019.2932654.