

## Office of Naval Research

Contract N0014-67-6-0097-0004 NR-375-732

## SIMULTANEOUS MULTIPLE PARAMETER ADJUSTMENT IN

ADAPTIVE SYSTEMS USING A SINGLE PERTURBATION SIGNAL

By

Kumpati S. Narendra and Theodore S. Baker

April 15, 1967

**Control Theory** 

Dunham Laboratory Technical Report CT-11

DEPARTMENT OF ENGINEERING AND APPLIED SCIENCE

AUN 30 1957

# YALE UNIVERSITY

Almenica a cici Y

#### Office of Naval Research

Contract N0014-67-A-0097-0004

NR - 375 - 732

## SIMULTANEOUS MULTIPLE PARAMETER ADJUSTMENT IN ADAPTIVE SYSTEMS USING A SINGLE PERTURBATION SIGNAL

by

Kumpati S. Narendra and Theodore S. Baker

## April 15, 1967

The research reported in this document was sponsored in part by support extended to Yale University by the U.S. Office of Naval Research. Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government.

Technical Report No, CT-11

Dunham Laboratory

Yale University

New Haven, Connecticut

#### Summary<sup>+</sup>

A gradient method is presented for adjusting the parameters of a system to optimize a performance criterion. The partial derivatives of the performance index with respect to the adjustable parameters are obtained as real time signals, using a single perturbation signal for a system with unknown structure, but favorable topology.

CT-11

Computer simulations are included to indicate the feasibility of the approach.

The adaptive control method using a single perturbation signal, as proposed here, has many features in commom with the well-known parameter perturbation scheme.

<sup>+</sup> This paper will be presented at the Sixth Symposium on Adaptive Processes at the National Electronics Conference, Chicago, Illinois, October, 1967.

ï

#### INTRODUCTION

1 n 🔒

A new perturbation method is presented in this paper for the simultaneous adjustmen<sup>1</sup> by the gradient method of multiple parameters in adaptive control systems. The significant advantage of this method is that only one perturbation signal is needed to generate the gradient of a performance criterion which is a function of all of the adjustable parameters. This results in a considerable saving in time and equipment over the conventional perturbation methods which use a separate perturbation for each parameter adjustment. At present the method has only been shown to work for systems with a favorable topology, where the adjustable gain parameters feed into a common summing junction that is linked with the system input by a single subsystem, as shown in Figure 1. This is not, however, necessarily overly restrictive since a controller with adjustable parameters often can be constructed with this structure even though the plant itself may not have a structure suitable for this perturbation method.

The single perturbation signal method is an outgrowth of the model methods of gradient generation [1, 2]. It was shown previously [2] that in a truly adaptive situation, where much of the structure of the system is unknown and a model cannot be constructed, that the system could be used as its own model by feeding back the appropriate error signal, attenuated and delayed beyond the autocorrelation time of the system signals. In this paper the idea of using the system as its own model is extended further by the demonstration that a multiplicative perturbation signal, which is uncorrelated with the major system signals, can be used in place of the time delay. Furthermore, it is shown that [3, 4] exhibit significant features in common with the method presented here.

First it is shown that a single perturbation signal can generate the signals necessary for the correlation technique construction of the gradient of the performance index in parameter space. Then this method is compared with the model method and the conventional perturbation methods. Next the design and stability of the adaptive loop is discussed and finally computer simulations which demonstrate the feasibility of the method are presented.

#### PERTURBATION METHOD

A performance criterion often used in adaptive procedures is the minimization of  $\frac{1}{e^2}$ , where the bar denotes a statistical ensemble average, or a time average over a finite or infinite time interval. If k is an adjustable parameter, then the quantity required for the steepest descent adjustment of k is the gradient component

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial k} \left[ e^{2}(t) \right] = \frac{\partial}{\partial k} \left[ e^{2}(t) \right] = 2 e(t) \frac{\partial e(t)}{\partial k}$$

The adaptive loop is an implementation of this correlation process. The error signal is multiplied by the partial derivative and the product is integrated and multiplied by a loop gain constant  $\beta$ . The resulting signal is subtracted from the gain k. The error e(t) usually is available as an actual signal so that the gradient component for any particular k can be obtained by correlation of e(t) and  $\frac{\partial e(t)}{\partial k}$ , if this partial derivative also can be generated as a real time signal. Even if a more general performance index, J = F(e(t), t), is used, the crucial part in determining the gradient is obtaining  $\frac{\partial e(t)}{\partial k}$  as a signal.

It is shown now that if the system has several adjustable gain parameters  $k_i$ , (i = 1, ..., m), then the partial derivatives  $\frac{3e(t)}{3k_i}$  each appear at the inputs to the respective gains  $k_i$ . These desired signals are imbedded within the normal system signals at these points and must be extracted for se in the adaptive loops.

The convolution integral representations of the signals e(t), x(t), and  $y_i(t)$  in the linear time invariant system shown in Figure 1 are

$$e(t) = \int_{0}^{\infty} H(s) e(t-s) ds = H*x$$

$$y_{i}(t) = h_{i}*x \qquad (1)$$

$$x(t) = u + g*(\sum_{i=1}^{m} k_{i} y_{i} + c_{\rho} e),$$

$$i=1$$

where H is the impulse response between the input summer output and the error output and  $h_i$  is the impulse response between the input summer output and the input to the gain  $k_i$ , with the output of every  $k_i$  open-circuited and with c f(t) = 0. Also, g(t) is the impulse response of the subsystem between the gain summer and the input summer.

The partial derivatives of each of these signals with respect to any one of the adjustable gains  $k_i$  is calculated from (1) as

$$\frac{\partial e}{\partial k_{j}} = H^{*} \frac{\partial x}{\partial k_{j}}$$

$$\frac{\partial Y}{\partial k_{j}} = h_{i}^{*} \frac{\partial x}{\partial k_{j}}$$
(2)

$$\frac{\partial x}{\partial k_j} = g * \left( \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} k_i - \frac{\partial y_i}{\partial k_j} + y_j + \varepsilon_p - \frac{\partial e}{\partial k_j} \right) .$$

ار این ۱۹۳۵ است. ۱۹۰۱ - ۱۹۹۹ میلاد میلاد میلاد ۱۹۰۱ - میلود ۲۰ Since each impulse response corresponds to a linear time invariant system any sequence of convolutions can be permuted, for zero initial conditions. Therefore, equations (2) can be combined to yield

$$\frac{\partial e}{\partial k_j} = (g \star \Sigma \quad k_i h_i) \star \frac{\partial e}{\partial k_j} + (g \star H) \star y_j + \varepsilon g \star H \star (\rho \quad \frac{\partial e}{\partial k_j}) . (3)$$

$$i=1$$

If the magnitude of the perturbation signal,  $\epsilon_{\rho}(t)$ , is small compared with the magnitudes of the system signals, then the last term in (3) is small compared with the other terms.

Therefore, if a system were modeled by the integral equation representation

$$z_{j} = (g * \Sigma k_{h}) * z_{j} + (g * H) * y_{j},$$

$$i = 1$$

$$(4)$$

then  $z_j$  would be the desired partial derivative  $\frac{\partial e}{\partial k_j}$ . It is shown now that (4) is an approximate representation for a portion of the signal  $y_j(t)$ , and that this portion can be extracted for use in generating the gradient of  $e^2(t)$ .

Equations (1) can be combined to yield

$$y_{j} = (g * \Sigma k_{i}h_{j}) * y_{j} + \varepsilon g * h_{j} * \rho (H * x) + h_{j} * u .$$
(5)  
i=1 (5)

Let  $y_j = y_j + y_j^*$  and  $x = x_0 + x^*$ , where  $y_{j,0}$  and  $x_0$  are the signals developed when  $p_p(t) = 0$ . Then (5) becomes

If  $\varepsilon \rho(t)$  is small, then x'(t) is much smaller than  $x_0(t)$  and the last term in (6) can be ignored, which yields

$$y'_{j} = (g * \sum_{i=1}^{m} k_{i}h_{i}) * y'_{j} + \epsilon g * h_{j} * \rho (H * x_{0}).$$
(7)

If  $\rho(t)$  is slowly varying compared with the impulse response times of  $h_{i}$  and H then  $\rho(t)$  can be shifted within the sequence of convolutions in the last term of (7) to yield  $(g*H)* \epsilon \rho y_{j,0}$ . Therefore, (7) becomes identical to (4) except that the driving function in (7) is  $\epsilon \rho(t)y_{j,0}(t)$ , whereas the driving function in (4) is  $y_{j}(t)|_{0} = 0 = y_{j,0}(t)$ . Because

 $\rho(t)$  is slowly varying the output of the system represented by (7) is approximately equal to the output of the system represented by (4) multiplied by

$$\varepsilon_{\rho}(t), i.e., y_{j}^{*} z_{\varepsilon_{\rho}}(t) z_{j}(t), \text{ or}$$

$$y_{j}(t) = y_{j,0}(t) + \varepsilon_{\rho}(t) \frac{\partial e(t)}{\partial k_{j}} . \qquad (8)$$

A heuristic demonstration that  $\frac{2\omega}{k_j}$  exists within the signal  $y_j$  is afforded by the model method. The system is shown with a model and without the perturbation signal, in Figure 2. The system equations are the same as (1), with  $\varepsilon = 0$ , and these can be combined to yield

$$\frac{\partial \Theta}{\partial k_{j}} = (g * \Sigma k_{i}h_{i}) * \frac{\partial \Theta}{\partial k_{j}} + (g * H) * y_{j}$$
(9)

which is the same as (3) with  $\epsilon \rho$  (t) = 0.

The model equations are

$$f = H^{*}w$$

$$z_{i} = h_{i}^{*}w$$

$$w = g^{*}(\sum_{i=1}^{m} k_{i}z_{i}^{*} + e),$$
(10)

which can be combined with (1) to yield

$$z = (g * \Sigma k_{i}h_{j}) * z_{j} + (g * H) * y_{j}.$$
(11)  

$$i = 1$$

For zero initial conditions (9) and (11) gener the same signal, so that  $z_j = \frac{\partial e}{\partial k_j}$ .

Now if e(t) is multiplied by a low frequency perturbation signal  $e \rho(t)$ before insertion into the model, it is claimed that the new signals in the model will be approximately equal to the respective old signals, each multiplied by  $e \rho(t)$ . Secondly it is claimed that the perturbation signal is not large enough to disturb the system significantly, and the system can be used as its own model.

### ADAPTIVE SCHEME

As in most adaptive methods using the gradient technique, the basic idea in the present scheme is to construct the gradient of the performance index  $e^2(t)$  with respect to the control parameters, and then adjust these parameters in the direction of the negative gradient. In the model method the partial derivatives are generated directly as real time signals and  $\frac{\partial e}{\partial k_i}^2$  is obtained by multiplying e(t) and  $\frac{\partial e(t)}{\partial k_i}$  and integrating the product. The adaptive loop for the i<sup>th</sup> gain is implemented as

$$k_{i}(t) = k_{i}(0) - \beta \int e(s) \frac{\partial e(s)}{\partial k_{i}} ds$$
, so that

the integration for the continuous adjustment of  $k_i$  is combined with the integration for the averaging of  $e^2(t)$ .

In the present scheme  $\frac{\partial e(t)}{\partial k_i}$  is imbedded in the signal  $y_i(t)$ , (8).

The extraction of the partial derivative and the correlation with e(t) is incorporated within one integration as

$$k_{i}(t) = k_{i}(0) - \beta e_{\rho} y_{i} = k_{i}(0) - \beta e_{\rho} \frac{\partial e}{\partial k_{i}}$$
, (12)

where  $\beta' = \beta \epsilon \rho^2$ . The simplification in (12) follows from (8) and the assumption that  $\rho(t)$  is uncorrelated with the system signals and has zero mean.

In the usual parameter perturbation schemes for adaptive systems [3, 4]each gain  $k_i$  is perturbed by a signal  $\rho(t)$  and the partial derivatives  $\frac{\partial \Theta}{\partial k_i}$  all are imbedded in the perturbed error signal. It is commonly assumed that  $\Theta^2 = e^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sigma_i \rho_i - \frac{\partial \Theta^2}{\partial k_i} + n(t)$ , where  $e^*$  is the perturbed

error, e is the unperturbed error, and n(t) is noise. The gradient is then extracted by correlation as

$$e^{\star^2 \rho_j} = \rho_{ij} e^{2} + \frac{m}{i=1} e_{i\rho_i \rho_j} \frac{\partial e^2}{\partial k_i} = e_j e_j \frac{2}{\partial k_j} e^{2}$$

where the  $\rho_{i}$  have zero mean and are uncorrelated with each other. This extraction and correlation, however, can be formulated in the manner of the perturbation scheme of this paper, too. Thus

#### ADAPTIVE PARAMETERS AND STABILITY

The four adaptive parameters of a system using this new perturbation method are (i) the perturbation frequency,  $\omega$ , (or period, T), (ii) the gain of the perturbation loop,  $\varepsilon$ , (iii) the gain of the adaptive loop,  $\beta$ , and (iv) the bandwidth of the adaptive loop. The parameter  $\varepsilon$  is adjusted so that the perturbed system does not differ markedly from the unperturbed system and the first term in the Taylor expansions are adequate for approximation purposes. Too small a value of  $\varepsilon$ , however, requires a long averaging time. If only a single integrator is used in the adaptive loop, then  $\beta$  determines the gain and bandwidth of the adaptive loop. If  $\beta$  is increased, then the speed of adaptation is increased but the effect of noise (due to averaging  $\rho(t) e(t) y_i(t)$  over a short time) results in larger excursions of the parameters from their optimum values, as discussed below.

The choice of the perturbation frequency  $\omega$  is decided by considerations of stability and accuracy. Generally, upper and lower bounds,  $\omega_1$  and  $\omega_0$ , respectively, can be found. If  $\omega$  is greater than  $\omega_1$  then the approximations made while deriving the gradient signal are no longer valid. If  $\omega$  is less than  $\omega_0$  then a large phase lag may be introduced in the loop, which causes instability. Slow perturbations involve longer averaging times which are equivalent to longer time delays in the feedback loop.

At the present time no general method exists for analyzing adaptive systems involving significant adaptive loop and system intercoupling. Therefore, for purposes of analysis the adaptive loop gain  $\beta$  which controls the speed of adaptation is assumed small. With this simplifying assumption a stability

- 8 -

analysis of the system using the error perturbation described in this paper, is carried out exactly as in the case of a parametar perturbation system.

Using the method suggested by Eveleigh [3] , if the index of performance can be expressed as

$$\overline{e^2(t)} = a_1(k - k_0)^2 + a_2$$

for a single adjustable parameter k, then

 $\frac{\partial_e^2(t)}{\partial k} = 2a_1(k - k_0), \text{ where } a_1 \text{ and } a_2 \text{ are constants and}$ k<sub>0</sub> is the optimal value of k.

The signal used to adjust the parameter k is obtained by multiplying the two signals,  $y(t) = y_0(t) + \varepsilon_p(t) - \frac{\partial e(t)}{\partial k}$ , (8), and p(t) e(t). If the product of these two signals is integrated over a sufficiently large time interval, then the first term  $\theta(t) = \int_{f}^{t} y_0(t) \rho(t) e(t) dt$  becomes negligible because  $\rho(t)$  is uncorrelated with the input or other system signals. The second term is

$$\int \frac{e}{2} \rho(t) \frac{\partial e^2(t)}{\partial k} dt z = e \gamma a_1 [[k-k_0]],$$

where  $\int_{\rho}^{0} \rho^{2}(t) dt = \gamma$ , the variance of the independent random o

perturbation signal.

If  $\beta$  is the gain of the feedback loop, the rate of change of the parameter k is given by

 $k = -\beta \epsilon \gamma a_1 (k - k_0) = -\alpha (k - k_0)$ , where  $\alpha = \epsilon \beta \gamma$ . It is seen that in the ideal case the parameter k varies exponentially to reach the final value  $k_0$ . In practice, however, the averaging time is not sufficiently large to reduce  $\theta(t)$  to zero and this term acts as an added forcing function so that,

$$k + \alpha k = \alpha k_0 + \theta(t),$$

and the final value of  $k(\,t\,\,)$  oscillates about the optimal value  $\,k_{\rm O}^{}$  .

In the multiple parameter case the same argument is used for each of the adjustable parameters  $k_1$ ,  $k_2$  ---,  $k_n$ . If  $e^2(t)$  in the parameter space is represented by

$$\frac{T}{e^{2}(t)} = \left[\underline{k} - \underline{k}_{0}\right] \qquad P \left[\underline{k} - \underline{k}_{0}\right] + \underline{a}$$

where k is the parameter vector,  $\underline{a}$  is a constant vector and P is a positive definite matrix, then the simplified adaptive loop is described by the vector equation

$$\dot{\mathbf{k}} = -\beta \varepsilon_{Y} P \left[ \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}_{o} \right] + \underline{\theta}(\mathbf{t}) ,$$

where  $\underline{\theta}(t)$  is obtained by the finite time averaging of  $\int_{\rho}^{t} (t) e(t) \underline{y}_{0}(t) dt$ . In the ideal case  $\underline{k}(t)$  approaches  $\underline{k}_{0}$  exponentially. If  $\underline{\theta}(t)$  is nonzero, the final value of  $\underline{k}(t)$  oscillates in the vicinity of  $\underline{k}_{0}$ .

#### COMPUTER SIMULATIONS

Systems modeled by difference equations have been simulated on the 7094/7090 digital computer at Yale University to illustrate the single perturbation signal method of adaptation. The error function in each case is the difference between the output of the system and the output of a reference system which is fed by the same input. In order to demonstrate the feasibility of the method the reference system and the actual system are given the same structure so that the actual system can "identify" the reference exactly, in the absence of noise. Examples are presented for two and three adjustable parameters with sinusoidal and white noise perturbation signals, and with additive white noise.

The adaptive scheme used for adjusting parameters A, B, and C is shown in Figure 3a. The adjustable parameter system has a pulse transfer function  $\frac{z^3}{z^3 + Az^2 + Bz + C}$ , and the reference system has a pulse transfer function  $\frac{z^3}{z^3 - 0.1z^2 + 0.2z - 0.25}$ . In examples 1 and 3 the parameter C is fixed at -0.25, and the region in the (A, B) parameter space where the system is asymptotically stable is shown in Figure 3b.

The input to all systems in the following examples is a white noise signal with uniform distribution between -0.5 and +0.5. This input is a sequence of random numbers (generated by a computer program) whose statistical properties have been verified by direct computer calculation. Furthermore, both the same random number sequence at the input and the same initial settings of the adjustable parameters (zero) have been used throughout to provide a basis

for comparison among the different situations.

In all of these examples the performance index for implementing the adaptation is the continuous adjustment of the parameters with the instantaneous integral of the square error. The performance index for evaluating the adaptive scheme, however, is more meaningful as the mean square error. A theoretical mean square error criterion is most easily used in calculations if the integration interval is infinite. Therefore, one index reported in all of these results is the mean square error at any time t ,

mse<sub>1</sub> = 
$$\frac{1}{t} \int_{0}^{t} e^{2}(s) ds = \frac{1}{t} \int_{1}^{t} e^{2}(i) ds$$

As time increases, the values of this index approach those for an infinite time average, but even for large integration intervals this index depends significantly on the initial state of the system. Therefore, a second index reported in all of these results is the square error averaged over only the previous 150 units of time, at any time t ,

mse<sub>2</sub> = 
$$\frac{1}{150}$$
  $\frac{t}{\int} e^{2}(s) ds = \frac{1}{150}$   $\Sigma e^{2}(t-i)$ .  
t-150  $i=0$ 

Since 150 units of time is much larger than the impulse response time of the reference system, (which is approximately 5 units of time), or than the correlation times of any signals used here, the index mse<sub>2</sub> is a good measure of the closeness of any set of parameters to their optimum value, for large time.

#### EXAMPLE 1 :

In this example the perturbation is a sinusoid of unit amplitude and period, T. For a specific setting of the adaptive parameters, the time responses of the adjustable parameters A and B are shown by the solid curves in Figure 4b. After 2000 units of time A and B have reached the values -0.1 and +0.2, respectively and the system is indistinguishable from the reference. This is corroborated by the reduction of  $mse_2$  from  $5 \times 10^{-3}$  to  $5 \times 10^{-7}$ , as shown by the solid curves in Figure 4c. After 5000 units of time  $mse_2$  is zero within the accuracy of the computer.

It has been observed in other test runs that the adjustable parameters approach their optimum values for wide ranges of  $\beta$  and  $\epsilon$  and for periods of the sinusoidal perturbations ranging between 10 and 60 units of time (which is large compared with the impulse response time of 5 units for the reference system ).

If additive white noise is inserted at the system output, then the adaptation is slower and subject to more fluctuations, as shown by the dotted curves in Figures 4b, c. Nonetheless, the system adapts nearly as well as is possible, as shown by the eventual approach of mse<sub>2</sub> to the experimentally determined value for a system with parameters <u>fixed</u> identically to those of the reference system.

#### EXAMPLE 2 :

For the same setting of  $\beta$  and  $\epsilon$ , but with the sinusoidal perturbation at twice the frequency of that in Example 1, all three parameters, A, B, and C adjust near to their optimum values within 3000 units of time, as shown by the dotted curves in Figures 5b, c. During the next two thousand units of time, however, there are drastic fluctuations. For these settings of  $\beta$  and T, but with  $\epsilon$  reduced, the system adapts at almost the same speed and no

- 13 -

instability occurs, as shown by the solid curves in Figures 5b, c .

This stable case with three parameters corroborates the claim that multiple parameters can be adjusted simultaneously with a single perturbation signal. The fluctuating case also supports this contention but emphasizes the dependence of the scheme on the settings of the adaptive parameters. The most likely explanation for the instability with larger  $\varepsilon$  is that this increase in the perturbation signal disturbs the system sufficiently so that an incorrect gradient is generated in the vicinity of the optimum settings. Thus the adaptive system hunts around the optimum settings.

#### EXAMPLE 3 :

Despite the emphasis on low frequency perturbation signals it is shown in Figures 6, 7 that the system parameters adjust along the gradient even if the perturbation signal is broad band noise. It is seen by comparing Figure 6 with Figure 4, for two adjustable parameters, and Figure 7 with Figure 5, for three adjustable parameters, that the adaptation is much slower and less accurate for the white noise perturbation than for the low frequency sinusoid. Yet the fact that the perturbation noise is uncorrelated with the input noise permits the adaptive loop to utilize the low frequency content of the perturbation signal in the extraction and correlation process (12), for producing the gradient. As expected the values of  $\beta$  and  $\varepsilon$  must be increased to compensate for the lose of high frequency perturbation signal energy.

Work is in progress to determine experimentally and analytically the behavior of these systems for other sets of initial conditions and for wider ranges of the adaptive parameters.

#### - 14 -

#### CONCLUSION

To the best of the authors' knowledge this is the first demonstration of an adaptive scheme for adjusting many parameters simultaneously with one perturbation signal, without the necessity of using a model or an equivalent system identification scheme. The method is limited at present to situations where the adjustable gain parameters feed into a common summing junction, but this limitation is not overly restrictive in the design of a controller. It is expected that the method can be extended to certain time-varying and nonlinear situations.

#### REFERENCES

- K. S. Narendra and L. E. McBride, Jr., "Multiparameter Self-Optimizing Systems Using Correlation Techniques," <u>IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control</u>, <u>AC-9</u>, 31-38, January 1964.
- K. S. Narendra, M. A. L. Thathachar, and T. S. Baker, "Adaptive Control Using Time Delay and Correlation," Proceeding of the Third Annual Allerton Conference, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, 1965, pp. 130-143.
- V. W. Eveleigh, "General Stability Analysis of Sinusoidal Perturbation Extrema Searching Adaptive System," Proceedings of the Second International Conference, IFAC, <u>Automatic and Remote Control</u>, 1963, pp. 472-481.
- 4. R. J. McGrath and V. C. Rideout, "A Simulator Study of a Two-Parameter Adaptive Control System," <u>IRE Trans</u>, on <u>Automatic Control</u>, <u>AC-6</u>, 35-42, February 1961.



FIGURE 1. Single Perturbation Signal Scheme for Gradient Generation



FIGURE 2. Model Method Scheme for Gradient Generation



-17-



T

Adaptive Scheme



FIGURE 3b. Stability Region in (A,B) Parameter Space



No.

Figure 4c. Mean Square Errors



( Two Adjustable Parameters )



1

13.5





FIGURE 5. Adaptation with Single Sinusoidal Porturbation Signal (Three Adjustable Parameters)



ρ(t): White Noise, Uniform Distribution, ±0.5





( Two Adjustable Parameters )

 $\beta = 0.4$ ,  $\varepsilon = 0.4$ 

 $\rho$  (t): White Noise, Uniform Distribution, ±0.5



FIGURE 7a. Adaptive Parameters



# FIGURE 7. Adaptation with White Noise Porturbation Signal (Three Adjustable Parameters )

.

#### Basic Distribution List

Office of Naval Research, Code 427 Department of the Navy Nashington, D. C. 20360 Director Office of Naval Research Branch Office . 495 Summer Street Boston, Massachusetts 02210

Commanding Officer Office of Naval Research Box 39, Navy No. 100 F.P.O. New York, New York 09510 Director, Navel Research Laboratory (6) Technical Information Officer Washington, D. C. 20369 Attn: Ceda 2000

Defense Documentation Center (20) Camoron Station Alexandria, Virginia 22314

#### Report Mailing List

Chief of Naval Operations Department of the Navy Washington, D.C. 20350 Attn: Code 427, Dr. A. Shostak

Systems Engineering Group Deputy for Systems Engineering Directorate of Technical Publications and Specifications (SEPRR) Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 45433

Stanford Electronics Laboratory Stanford University Stanford, California 94305 Attn: Document Library Applied Electronics Laboratory

Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn Graduate Center Library Route 110 Farmingdale, L.I., New York 11735

M.I.T. Research Laboratory of Electronics Document office, Building 26, Room 327 Cambridge, Mass. 02139

M.I.T. Lincoln Laboratory P.O. Box 73 Lexington, Mass. Attn: Library A-082

Research Materials Information Center Oak Ridge National Laboratory P.O. Hox X Oak Ridge, Tennossee 37831

Gordon McKay Library Pierce Hall Harvard University Cambridge, Mass. 02138

Electronics Research Laboratory University of California Berkeloy, California 94720 Hq. AFCRL (CRXL) L.G. Hanscom Field Bedford, Mass. 01731

Sandia Corporation ORG. 1425 Sandia Base Alburquerque, New Mexico 87115 Attn: Technical Library

Engineering Division Case Institute of Technology Cleveland, Ohio 44106 Attn: H.R. Nara, Associate Director

The University of New Mexico Department of Electrical Engineering Alburquerque, New Mexico, 87106

M.I.T. Engineering Library Building 10, Room 550 Cambridge, Mass. 02139

Bell Telephone Laboratories Murray Hill, New Jorsey 07971

Institute of Science and Tochnology The University of Michigan P.O. Box 618 Ann Arbor, Michigan 48107

Coordinated Science Laboratory University of Illinois Urbana, Illinois 61803

Electronics Sciences Laboratory University of Southern California Los Angeles, California 90007 National Aeronautics and Space Administration Langley Research Center Langley Station Hampton, Virginia 23365 Attn: Mrs. Elizabeth Gilman, Librarian, Mail stop 185

Professor Y.H. Ku Moore School of Electrical Engineering University of Pennsylvania Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

The Rand Corporation 1700 Main Street Santa Monica, California 90406

Professor M. Athans Electrical Engineering Department M.I.T. Cambridge, Mass. 02139

Professor R.E. Kronauer Pierco Hall Harvard University Cambridge Mass. 02139

Professor J.P. Cruz Department of Electrical Engineering University of Illinois Urbana, Illinois 61801

Professor N. DoClaris System Theory Group Electrical Engineering Department Cornell University Ithaca, New York

Professor M.E. Van Valkenburg Department of Electrical Engineering Princeton University Princeton, New Jersey National Aeronautics and Space Administration Electronics Research Center Cambridge, Mass. 02139

Professor E.I. Jury Electrical Engineering Department University of California Berkeley, California 94720

Dr. George Zames National Aeronautics & Space Administration Electronics Research Center Cambridge, Mass. 02139

Professor H.H. Rosenbrock The University of Manchester Institute of Technology and Science P.O. Box No. 88 Sackvillo Street, Manchester, Great Britain.

Professor A.E. Bryson Jr. Pierco Hall Harvard University Cambridge, Mass. 02139

Professor P. Kokotovic Coordinated Science Laboratory University of Illinois Urbana, Illinois 61801

Professor L. Zadon Dopartment of Electrical Engineering University of California Berkeloy, California 94720

Professor M.D. Srinath Electrical Engineering Department Indian Institute of Science Bangalore, India.