MILLA BALDO CEOLIN AWARD

Optimal Control tools to minimize dispersion in turbulent flows

Chiara Calascibetta

Dept. Physics & INFN, University of Rome Tor Vergata

calascibetta@roma2.infn.it

WOMEN IN THEORETICAL PHYSICS

National Award Milla Baldo Ceolin 2021

21 OCTOBER 2022

L. Biferale (Uni. and INFN Tor Vergata, IT),
F. Borra (LPENS, CNRS Paris, FR), **A. Celani** (ICTP, IT),
M. Cencini (CNR and INFN Tor Vergata, IT).

TOR VERGATA UNIVERSITY OF ROME

INFN Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare

European Research Council
Established by the European Commission
Supporting top researchers from anywhere in the world

Turbulent flows



https://svs.gsfc.nasa.gov/3827

*How to exploit **coherent structures**?*

*How to avoid (or exploit) **intense fluctuations** when navigating inside the flow?*

*Which is the best **limited-control** to navigate in such complex flows?*

Theoretical interests:



Engineering applications:



C. Calascibetta, L. Biferale, F. Borra, A. Celani, M. Cencini, **Optimal Control tools to minimize dispersion in turbulent flows**, (*in preparation* 2022).

2 AGENTS



Goal: **minimize** the **separation/capture** in a finite time horizon

Problem setup

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{X}}_t^{(1)} = \boldsymbol{v}(\mathbf{X}_t^{(1)}, t) \\ \dot{\mathbf{X}}_t^{(2)} = \boldsymbol{v}(\mathbf{X}_t^{(2)}, t) + \mathbf{U}(t) \\ \mathbf{U}(t) = V_s \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t) \end{cases} \longrightarrow \mathbf{U}(t) = ?$$

$$\boxed{\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t) = (\cos[\theta_t], \sin[\theta_t])}$$

Tools:
(1) Heuristic policies
(2) Optimal Control (OC) theory
(3) Reinforcement Learning (RL)

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{X}}_t^{(1)} = \boldsymbol{v}(\mathbf{X}_t^{(1)}, t) \\ \dot{\mathbf{X}}_t^{(2)} = \boldsymbol{v}(\mathbf{X}_t^{(2)}, t) + \mathbf{U}(t) \\ \mathbf{U}(t) = V_s \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t) \end{cases}$$

$$\mathbf{U}(t) = ?$$

$$\begin{cases} \boldsymbol{R}_t = \mathbf{X}_t^{(2)} - \mathbf{X}_t^{(1)} \\ L = \text{ characteristic scale of the flow} \end{cases}$$

(1) (semi) Heuristic policies

Trivial Policy: constantly chooses the direction that points towards the moving target, $\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t) = -\hat{\boldsymbol{R}}_t$

Surfing Policy*:
- constant gradients for a time τ_s (free parameter);
- maximization of the searcher displacement along the $\boldsymbol{R}_t$ direction;
- good for slowly varying $\boldsymbol{R}_t$ (i.e. at large scales)

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t) = -\frac{\left[e^{(\tau_s - t)\nabla \boldsymbol{v}_{t_0}}\right]^{\mathrm{T}} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{R}}_{t_0}}{\left\|\left[e^{(\tau_s - t)\nabla \boldsymbol{v}_{t_0}}\right]^{\mathrm{T}} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{R}}_{t_0}\right\|}$$

Perturbative Policy:
- 0^{th} order OC with constant gradients for a time τ_p (free parameter) ;
- valid at small scales

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t) = -\frac{\left[e^{(\tau_p - t)\nabla \boldsymbol{v}_{t_0}}\right]^{\mathrm{T}} \cdot e^{(\nabla \boldsymbol{v})_{t_0}\tau_p} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{R}}_{t_0}}{\left\|\left[e^{(\tau_p - t)\nabla \boldsymbol{v}_{t_0}}\right]^{\mathrm{T}} \cdot e^{(\nabla \boldsymbol{v})_{t_0}\tau_p} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{R}}_{t_0}\right\|}$$

*Monthiller, Rémi, et al. **Surfing on Turbulence: A Strategy for Planktonic Navigation**. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* ***129**, 064502* (2022)

(2) **Optimal Control theory** – Pontryagin minimum principle

state variables *control variables*

Minimize $J = C_F\left(\mathbf{X}(t_f)\right) + \int_{t_0}^{t_f} dt\, \left[L(\mathbf{X}(t), \mathbf{U}(t), t)\right]$

performance index *Lagrangian function*

Imposing $\dot{\mathbf{X}}_t = \boldsymbol{f}(\mathbf{X}(t), \mathbf{U}(t), t)$

and other possible constraints,

e.g.: $\begin{cases} \mathbf{X}(t_f) = \mathbf{X}_\star\,, \quad \mathbf{X}(t_0) \le \mathbf{X}_\star\,, \\ \|\mathbf{U}(t)\|^2 = 1\,, \quad \|\mathbf{U}(t)\|^2 \le 1\,, \text{ exc.} \end{cases}$

- **Model based** and analytical tool
- Perfect knowledge required

$\|\boldsymbol{R}_{t_0}\| \sim \dfrac{V_s}{\lambda_{lyapunov}}$ border of controllability

In our case:

$\|\boldsymbol{R}^\star\| = \|\boldsymbol{R}_{t_0}\|/100$

capture's distance

Minimize $J = \|\boldsymbol{R}_{t_f}\|^2 + c \int_{t_0}^{t_f} dt\, \theta(\|\boldsymbol{R}_t\|^2 - \|\boldsymbol{R}^\star\|^2)$

Imposing $(*)$ and the control constraint $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t)\|^2 = 1$

$$(*) \begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{X}}_t^{(1)} = \boldsymbol{v}(\mathbf{X}_t^{(1)}, t) \\ \dot{\mathbf{X}}_t^{(2)} = \boldsymbol{v}(\mathbf{X}_t^{(2)}, t) + \mathbf{U}(t) \\ \mathbf{U}(t) = V_s \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t) \end{cases}$$

Minimize trajectories' separation

Minimize time of arrival at the desired distance

Optimal Control vs heuristic policies at **small scales**

Velocity field*

3D Direct Numerical Simulations $N = 1024^3$

NSEs: $$\begin{cases} \partial_t \boldsymbol{v} = -\nabla \mathrm{p} - (\boldsymbol{v}\cdot\nabla)\boldsymbol{v} + \nu\nabla^2\boldsymbol{v} + \mathbf{F}\,, \\ \nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{v} = 0 \end{cases}$$

$\downarrow$

homogeneous and isotropic forcing



DNS parameters

$$\eta_k = 0.0043$$

$$\tau_\eta = 0.023$$

$$Re \simeq 17000$$

(1) LINEAR REGIME $\|\boldsymbol{R}_{t_0}\| < \eta_k$

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{X}}_t^{(1)} = \boldsymbol{v}(\mathbf{X}_t^{(1)}, t) \\ \dot{\mathbf{X}}_t^{(2)} = \boldsymbol{v}(\mathbf{X}_t^{(2)}, t) + \mathbf{U}(t) \\ \mathbf{U}(t) = V_s\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t) \end{cases}$$

$$\boldsymbol{v}(\mathbf{X}_t^{(2)}, t) \simeq \boldsymbol{v}(\mathbf{X}_t^{(1)}, t) + \nabla\boldsymbol{v}_t\boldsymbol{R}_t$$

$$\boxed{\dot{\boldsymbol{R}}_t = \nabla\boldsymbol{v}_t\boldsymbol{R}_t + \mathbf{U}(t)}$$

*Buzzicotti et al. **Lagrangian statistics for Navier–Stokes turbulence under Fourier-mode reduction: fractal and homogeneous decimations.** *New J. Phys., 18 (11)* (2016), *p. 113047*

Optimal Control vs heuristic policies in linear regime

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{R}}_t = \nabla \boldsymbol{v}_t \boldsymbol{R}_t + \mathbf{U}(t)$$

$T_c =$ **Capture** time: (time of arrival at the desired distance)



PRELIMINARY UNPUBLISHED

PDF of normalized capture time



pros & cons

Optimal Control

- \+ It is optimized
- \- It is model based and needs perfect information from the environment
- \- It is sensitive to variation of the initial condition
- \- It is difficult to consider a decision time in the control variable

Heuristic policies

- \- They are not optimized
- \+ They need only partial information
- \+ They are stable wrt variation of the initial condition
- \+ They work also with a discrete decision time

Next step: Reinforcement Learning

- \+ It is optimized
- \+ It is model free
- \+ It needs partial information
- \- It is data-hungry

European Research Council
Established by the European Commission
Supporting top researchers from anywhere in the world

Conclusions



Open questions:

1. How to control a multi-agent system to minimize turbulent dispersion in realistic geophysical flows (beyond the linear regime) ?
2. Can we identify the key degrees-of-freedom to control the agents' trajectories (key flow structures)?
3. Are the agents able to collaborate with each-other during the navigation?

Tools:

- We can use RL to control autonomous swimmers in a realistic way (i.e., with a limited knowledge of the underlying flow - only local or instantaneous features);
- We can use OC as a benchmark to test the RL solutions.

Smart two-way feedback



http://stilton.tnw.utwente.nl/people/stevensr/afid.html



https://argo.ucsd.edu/

Backup slides

Particles dispersion in complex flows

Lagrangian approach

$$\dot{\mathbf{X}} = \boldsymbol{v}(\mathbf{X}_t, t)$$

Eq. of motion of a tracer

Trajectories separation:

$$\delta R_t = \|\mathbf{X}_t^2 - \mathbf{X}_t^1\|$$





(1) Dispersion at small scales

$$\boxed{\delta R_t \sim \delta R_0 \, e^{\lambda t}}$$

Lagrangian Chaos

$$\lambda = \lim_{t\to\infty} \lim_{\delta R_0 \to 0} \frac{1}{t} ln \frac{\delta R_t}{\delta R_0}$$

Lyapunov exponent

(2) Dispersion at intermediate scales

(Inertial range)

$$\boxed{\langle (\delta R_t)^2 \rangle \sim t^3}$$

non-differentiable
velocity field

If $Re \to \infty$ Fully Developed Turbulence
Richardson's Dispersion

(3) Dispersion at large scales

Advection
+
molecular diffusion

$$\boxed{\langle (\delta R_t)^2 \rangle \sim D^E t}$$

effective diffusion

Control Theory





Tools:
Optimal Control (**OC**) theory
Reinforcement Learning (**RL**)
Heuristic policies

Optimal Control vs heuristic policies at **small scales**

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{R}}_t = \nabla \boldsymbol{v}_t \boldsymbol{R}_t + \mathbf{U}(t)$$

$T_c =$ **Capture** time: (time of arriving at the desired distance)




Initial conditions
Target
Trivial policy
Surfing policy
Perturbative policy
Optimal Control
R_z
R_y
R_x
Initial conditions
Target
Trivial policy
Surfing policy
Perturbative policy
Optimal Control
R_z
R_y
R_x
Initial conditions
Target
Trivial policy
Surfing policy
Perturbative policy
Optimal Control
R_z
R_y
R_x
Initial conditions
Target
Trivial policy
Surfing policy
Perturbative policy
Optimal Control
R_z
R_y
R_x

C. Calascibetta, L. Biferale, F. Borra, A. Celani, M. Cencini, **Optimal Control tools to minimize dispersion in chaotic flows**, (*in preparation*).

2 AGENTS



Goal: **minimize** the **separation** in a finite time horizon

Problem setup

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{X}}_t^{(1)} = \boldsymbol{v}(\mathbf{X}_t^{(1)}, t) \\ \dot{\mathbf{X}}_t^{(2)} = \boldsymbol{v}(\mathbf{X}_t^{(2)}, t) + \mathbf{U}(t) \\ \mathbf{U}(t) = V_s \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t) \end{cases} \longrightarrow \mathbf{U}(t) = ?$$

$$\boxed{\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t) = (\cos[\theta_t], \sin[\theta_t])}$$

MAIN POINT: Different approaches for different range of scales:

$$\begin{cases} \boldsymbol{R}_t = \mathbf{X}_t^{(2)} - \mathbf{X}_t^{(1)} \\ L = \text{Characteristic scale of the flow} \end{cases}$$

$||\boldsymbol{R}_t|| \ll L$ Small scales

$||\boldsymbol{R}_t|| \gg L$ Large scales

Tools:
(1) **Heuristic policies**
(2) Optimal Control (**OC**) theory
(3) Reinforcement Learning (**RL**)

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{X}}_t^{(1)} = \boldsymbol{v}(\mathbf{X}_t^{(1)}, t) \\ \dot{\mathbf{X}}_t^{(2)} = \boldsymbol{v}(\mathbf{X}_t^{(2)}, t) + \mathbf{U}(t) \\ \mathbf{U}(t) = V_s \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t) \end{cases}$$

$$\mathbf{U}(t) = ?$$

$$\begin{cases} \boldsymbol{R}_t = \mathbf{X}_t^{(2)} - \mathbf{X}_t^{(1)} \\ L = \text{ characteristic scale of the flow} \end{cases}$$

(1) (semi) Heuristic policies

Trivial Policy: constantly chooses the direction that points towards the moving target

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t) = -\hat{\boldsymbol{R}}_t$$

Surfing policy*: valid at large scales, i.e., $\|\boldsymbol{R}_t\| \gg L$. Based on a free parameter τ_s .

Perturbative policy: valid at small scales, i.e., $\|\boldsymbol{R}_t\| \ll L$. Based on a free parameter τ_p .

*Monthiller, Rémi, et al. **Surfing on Turbulence: A Strategy for Planktonic Navigation**. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* ***129***, *064502* (2022)

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{X}}_t^{(1)} = \boldsymbol{v}(\mathbf{X}_t^{(1)}, t) \\ \boxed{\dot{\mathbf{X}}_t^{(2)} = \boldsymbol{v}(\mathbf{X}_t^{(2)}, t) + \mathbf{U}(t)} \\ \mathbf{U}(t) = V_s \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t) \end{cases}$$

$$\mathbf{U}(t) = ?$$

$$\begin{cases} \boldsymbol{R}_t = \mathbf{X}_t^{(2)} - \mathbf{X}_t^{(1)} \\ L = \text{ characteristic scale of the flow} \end{cases}$$

(1) (semi) Heuristic policies

Surfing policy* - derivation

- Approximate linearly the underlying flow, $\boldsymbol{v}(\mathbf{X}_t^{(2)}, t)$ for $t_0 < t < \tau_s$; *(Assuming constant gradients for a time τ_s)*

$$\dot{\mathbf{X}}_t^{(2)} = \boldsymbol{v}_{t_0} + (\nabla \boldsymbol{v})_{t_0} \cdot \left(\mathbf{X}_t^{(2)} - \mathbf{X}_{t_0}^{(2)}\right) + \left(\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{v}}{\partial t}\right)_{t_0} (t - t_0) + \mathbf{U}(t) \, ,$$

- Find $\mathbf{U}(t)$ such that $-(\mathbf{X}_{\tau_s}^{(2)} - \mathbf{X}_{t_0}^{(2)}) \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{R}}_{t_0}$ is maximum;

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t) = -\frac{\left[e^{(\tau_s - t)\nabla \boldsymbol{v}_{t_0}}\right]^{\mathrm{T}} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{R}}_{t_0}}{\left\| \left[e^{(\tau_s - t)\nabla \boldsymbol{v}_{t_0}}\right]^{\mathrm{T}} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{R}}_{t_0} \right\|}$$

(Assuming constant the direction $\hat{\boldsymbol{R}}_t$ for a time τ_s)

$$\downarrow$$

$$\|\boldsymbol{R}_t\| \gg L$$

- Numerically optimize the free parameter τ_s.

*Monthiller, Rémi, et al. **Surfing on Turbulence: A Strategy for Planktonic Navigation**. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* ***129**, 064502* (2022)

$$\begin{cases} \boxed{\begin{aligned}\dot{\mathbf{X}}_t^{(1)} &= \boldsymbol{v}(\mathbf{X}_t^{(1)}, t) \\ \dot{\mathbf{X}}_t^{(2)} &= \boldsymbol{v}(\mathbf{X}_t^{(2)}, t) + \mathbf{U}(t)\end{aligned}} \\ \mathbf{U}(t) = V_s \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t) \end{cases}$$

$$\mathbf{U}(t) = ?$$

$$\begin{cases} \boldsymbol{R}_t = \mathbf{X}_t^{(2)} - \mathbf{X}_t^{(1)} \\ L = \text{ characteristic scale of the flow} \end{cases}$$

(1) (semi) Heuristic policies

Perturbative policy - derivation

- Consider linearity between the two agents, i.e., $\boldsymbol{v}(\mathbf{X}_t^{(2)}, t) \simeq \boldsymbol{v}(\mathbf{X}_t^{(1)}, t) + \nabla \boldsymbol{v}_t \boldsymbol{R}_t \,,$ $\longrightarrow \|\boldsymbol{R}_t\| \ll L$

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{R}}_t = \nabla \boldsymbol{v}_t \boldsymbol{R}_t + \mathbf{U}(t) \rightarrow \boldsymbol{R}_{\tau_p} = \underbrace{e^{[(\nabla \boldsymbol{v})_{t_0} \tau_p]} \boldsymbol{R}_{t_0}} + V_s \int_{t_0}^{\tau_p} dt\, e^{[(\nabla \boldsymbol{v})_{t_0} (\tau_p - t)]} \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t) \,;$$

(Assuming constant gradients for a time τ_p)

- Find $\mathbf{U}(t)$ such that $\boldsymbol{R}_{\tau_p} \cdot \boldsymbol{R}_{\tau_p}^{free}$ is minimum;

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t) = - \frac{\left[e^{(\tau_p - t) \nabla \boldsymbol{v}_{t_0}}\right]^{\mathrm{T}} \cdot e^{(\nabla \boldsymbol{v})_{t_0} \tau_p} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{R}}_{t_0}}{\left\| \left[e^{(\tau_p - t) \nabla \boldsymbol{v}_{t_0}}\right]^{\mathrm{T}} \cdot e^{(\nabla \boldsymbol{v})_{t_0} \tau_p} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{R}}_{t_0} \right\|}$$

- Numerically optimize the free parameter τ_p.

Surfing policy* - derivation

$$\dot{\mathbf{X}}_t^{(2)} = \boldsymbol{v}_{t_0} + (\nabla \boldsymbol{v})_{t_0} \cdot (\mathbf{X}_t^{(2)} - \mathbf{X}_{t_0}^{(2)}) + \left(\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{v}}{\partial t}\right)_{t_0} (t - t_0) + V_s \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t)$$

$$\boxed{\begin{aligned}\mathbf{X}_{\tau_s}^{(2)} = &\mathbf{X}_{t_0}^{(2)} + \left[e^{\tau_s (\nabla \boldsymbol{v})_{t_0}} - \mathbb{I}\right] \cdot (\nabla \boldsymbol{v}_{t_0})^{-1} \cdot \left[\boldsymbol{v}_{t_0} + (\nabla \boldsymbol{v}_{t_0})^{-1} \cdot \left(\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{v}}{\partial t}\right)_{t_0}\right] - \\ &- \tau_s (\nabla \boldsymbol{v}_{t_0})^{-1} \cdot \left(\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{v}}{\partial t}\right)_{t_0} + V_s \int_{t_0}^{\tau_s} dt\, e^{(\tau_s - t)\nabla \boldsymbol{v}_{t_0}} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t)\end{aligned}}$$

find $\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t)$ such as $-(\mathbf{X}_{\tau_s}^{(2)} - \mathbf{X}_{t_0}^{(2)}) \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{R}}_{t_0}$ is maximum,

means find $\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t)$ such that $- \int_{t_0}^{\tau_s} dt \underbrace{\left[e^{(\tau_s - t)\nabla \boldsymbol{v}_{t_0}} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t) \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{R}}_{t_0}\right]}_{-[e^{(\tau_s - t)\nabla \boldsymbol{v}_{t_0}}]^{\mathrm{T}} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{R}}_{t_0} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t)}$ is maximum (i.e. by maximizing the integrand).

$\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t)$ must be collinear to $-[e^{(\tau_s - t)\nabla \boldsymbol{v}_{t_0}}]^{\mathrm{T}} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{R}}_{t_0}$ $\longrightarrow$

$$\boxed{\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t) = - \frac{\left[e^{(\tau_s - t)\nabla \boldsymbol{v}_{t_0}}\right]^{\mathrm{T}} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{R}}_{t_0}}{\left\| \left[e^{(\tau_s - t)\nabla \boldsymbol{v}_{t_0}}\right]^{\mathrm{T}} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{R}}_{t_0} \right\|}}$$

*Monthiller, Rémi, et al. **Surfing on Turbulence: A Strategy for Planktonic Navigation**. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* ***129***, *064502* (2022)

(2) **Optimal Control theory** – Pontryagin minimum principle

state variables *control variables*

Minimize $J = C_F\big(\mathbf{X}(t_f)\big) + \int_{t_0}^{t_f} dt\,[L(\mathbf{X}(t), \mathbf{U}(t), t)]$

performance index *Lagrangian function*

Imposing $\dot{\mathbf{X}}_t = \boldsymbol{f}(\mathbf{X}(t), \mathbf{U}(t), t)$

and other possible constraints,

e.g.: $\begin{cases} \mathbf{X}(t_f) = \mathbf{X}_\star\,, \quad \mathbf{X}(t_0) \le \mathbf{X}_\star\,, \\ \|\mathbf{U}(t)\|^2 = 1\,, \quad \|\mathbf{U}(t)\|^2 \le 1\,, \; exc. \end{cases}$

Observe that this is a **constrained** minimization

Lagrangian multipliers

$$\tilde{J} = C_F\big(\mathbf{X}(t_f)\big) + \int_{t_0}^{t_f} dt\,[L(\mathbf{X}(t), \mathbf{U}(t), t) + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\mathrm{T}}\cdot(\boldsymbol{f} - \dot{\mathbf{X}}) + \ldots]$$
$$+\mu(t)(1 - \|\mathbf{U}(t)\|^2)$$

We impose minimum in $\mathbf{X}(\cdot)$, $\mathbf{U}(\cdot)$, $\boldsymbol{\lambda}(\cdot)$, i.e., $d\tilde{J} \le 0$:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\delta \tilde{J}}{\delta \mathbf{X}(t)} = 0 \implies \dot{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = -\boldsymbol{\partial}_{\mathbf{X}} L - (\boldsymbol{\partial}_{\mathbf{X}} f)^{\mathrm{T}} \boldsymbol{\lambda}(t)\,, \\ \frac{\delta \tilde{J}}{\delta \mathbf{X}(t_f)} = 0 \implies \boldsymbol{\lambda}(t_f) = \boldsymbol{\partial}_{\mathbf{X}} C_F\big(\mathbf{X}(t_f)\big)\,, \\ \frac{\delta \tilde{J}}{\delta \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{X},t)} = 0 \implies \mathbf{U}(\mathbf{X}, t) = \frac{\boldsymbol{\partial}_{\mathbf{U}} L + (\boldsymbol{\partial}_{\mathbf{U}} \boldsymbol{f})^{\mathrm{T}} \boldsymbol{\lambda}(t)}{2\mu(t)}\,. \end{cases}$$

*computationally heavy

It requires iterative searching with backward and forward integration such as to identify the optimal control

*Lenhart, S., & Workman, J.T. (2007). Optimal Control Applied to Biological Models (1st ed.). Chapman and Hall/CRC.

(2) Optimal Control theory to **minimize Lagrangian particles dispersion** in turbulent flows

state variables *control variables*

Minimize $J = C_F(\mathbf{X}(t_f)) + \int_{t_0}^{t_f} dt\, [L(\mathbf{X}(t), \mathbf{U}(t), t)]$

performance index

Imposing $\dot{\mathbf{X}}_t = \boldsymbol{f}(\mathbf{X}(t), \mathbf{U}(t), t)$

and other possible constraints,

e.g.: $\begin{cases} \mathbf{X}(t_f) = \mathbf{X}_\star\,, \quad \mathbf{X}(t_0) \le \mathbf{X}_\star\,, \\ \|\mathbf{U}(t)\|^2 = 1\,, \quad \|\mathbf{U}(t)\|^2 \le 1\,, \text{ exc.} \end{cases}$

In our case:

$$(*) \begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{X}}_t^{(1)} = \boldsymbol{v}(\mathbf{X}_t^{(1)}, t) \\ \dot{\mathbf{X}}_t^{(2)} = \boldsymbol{v}(\mathbf{X}_t^{(2)}, t) + \mathbf{U}(t) \\ \mathbf{U}(t) = V_s \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t) \end{cases}$$

$\|\boldsymbol{R}^\star\| = \|\boldsymbol{R}_{t_0}\|/100$

capture's distance

Minimize $J = \|\boldsymbol{R}_{t_f}\|^2 + c \int_{t_0}^{t_f} dt\, \theta(\|\boldsymbol{R}_t\|^2 - \|\boldsymbol{R}^\star\|^2)$

Imposing $(*)$ and the control constraint $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t)\|^2 = 1$

We impose minimu

$\|\boldsymbol{R}_{t_0}\| \sim \dfrac{V_s}{\lambda_{lyapunov}}$ border of controllability

Minimize trajectories' separation

Minimize time of arrival at the desired distance

(2) **Optimal Control theory** – Pontryagin minimum principle

state variables *control variables*

Minimize $J = C_F(\mathbf{X}(t_f)) + \int_{t_0}^{t_f} dt\, [L(\mathbf{X}(t), \mathbf{U}(t), t)]$

performance index *Lagrangian function*

Imposing $\dot{\mathbf{X}}_t = \boldsymbol{f}(\mathbf{X}(t), \mathbf{U}(t), t)$

and other possible constraints,

e.g.: $\begin{cases} \mathbf{X}(t_f) = \mathbf{X}_\star\,, \quad \mathbf{X}(t_0) \le \mathbf{X}_\star\,, \\ \|\mathbf{U}(t)\|^2 = 1\,, \quad \|\mathbf{U}(t)\|^2 \le 1\,, \text{ exc.} \end{cases}$

- **Model based** and analytical tool
- Perfect knowledge required

$\|\boldsymbol{R}_{t_0}\| \sim \dfrac{V_s}{\lambda_{lyapunov}}$ border of controllability

In our case:

$\|\boldsymbol{R}^\star\| = \|\boldsymbol{R}_{t_0}\|/100$

capture's distance

Minimize $J = \|\boldsymbol{R}_{t_f}\|^2 + c\int_{t_0}^{t_f} dt\, \theta(\|\boldsymbol{R}_t\|^2 - \|\boldsymbol{R}^\star\|^2)$

Imposing $(*)$ and the control constraint $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t)\|^2 = 1$

$$(*)\begin{cases} \dot{\boldsymbol{R}}_t = \nabla \boldsymbol{v}_t \boldsymbol{R}_t + \mathbf{U}(t)\,, \\ \mathbf{U}(t) = V_S \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t)\,. \end{cases}$$

LINEAR REGIME

Optimal Control theory to **minimize Lagrangian particles dispersion** in turbulent flows

Constrained performance index:

$$\tilde{J} = \|\boldsymbol{R}_{t_f}|^2 + \int_{t_0}^{t_f} dt\, \{c[\theta(\|\boldsymbol{R}_t\|^2 - \|\boldsymbol{R}^\star\|^2)] + \underbrace{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)[\nabla \boldsymbol{v}_t \boldsymbol{R}_t + V_s \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t) - \dot{\boldsymbol{R}}] + \mu(t)(1 - \|\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t)\|^2)\}}_{\text{Constrained minimization problem}}$$

Integrating by parts,

$$\tilde{J} = \|\boldsymbol{R}_{t_f}\|^2 - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\mathrm{T}}(t_f)\boldsymbol{R}_{t_f} + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\mathrm{T}}(t_0)\boldsymbol{R}_{t_0} + \int_{t_0}^{t_f} dt\, [H(\boldsymbol{R}_t, \boldsymbol{\lambda}(t), \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t), \mu(t), t) + \dot{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{\mathrm{T}} \boldsymbol{R}_t]\,,$$

$$H(\boldsymbol{R}_t, \boldsymbol{\lambda}(t), \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t), \mu(t), t) = c[\theta(\|\boldsymbol{R}_t\|^2 - \|\boldsymbol{R}^\star\|^2)] + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)[\nabla \boldsymbol{v}_t \boldsymbol{R}_t + V_s \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t)] + \mu(t)(1 - \|\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t)\|^2).$$ *Hamiltonian function*

Consider variation in $\tilde{J}$:

$$\delta \tilde{J} = \Big[\big(2\boldsymbol{R}_t - \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)\big)\delta \boldsymbol{R}\Big]_{t=t_f} + \Big[\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)\delta \boldsymbol{R}\Big]_{t=t_0} + \int_{t_0}^{t_f} dt \left\{\left[\frac{\partial H}{\partial \boldsymbol{R}} + \dot{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{\mathrm{T}}\right]\delta \boldsymbol{R} + \frac{\partial H}{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}}\delta \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}\right\}$$

Euler-Lagrange equations:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial \boldsymbol{R}} = -2c\, \boldsymbol{R}_t \delta(\|\boldsymbol{R}_t\|^2 - \|\boldsymbol{R}^\star\|^2) - (\nabla \boldsymbol{v}_t)^{\mathrm{T}} \boldsymbol{\lambda}(t)\,, \\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}(t_f) = 2\boldsymbol{R}_{t_f}\,, \\ \frac{\partial H}{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}} = 0 \implies \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t) = \frac{V_s \boldsymbol{\lambda}(t)}{2\mu(t)} = -\frac{\boldsymbol{\lambda}(t)}{\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}(t)\|}\,. \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\boldsymbol{R}}_t = \nabla \boldsymbol{v}_t \boldsymbol{R}_t + \mathbf{U}(t)\,, \\ \boldsymbol{R}_{t_0} = \text{ given}\,, \\ \mathbf{U}(t) = V_S \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t)\,. \end{cases}$$

A. E. Bryson and Y. Ho, **Applied optimal control: optimization, estimation and control** (New York: Routledge, 1975).

Optimal Control theory to **minimize Lagrangian particles dispersion** in turbulent flows

Euler-Lagrange equations:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial \boldsymbol{R}} = -2c\, \boldsymbol{R}_t \delta(\|\boldsymbol{R}_t\|^2 - \|\boldsymbol{R}^\star\|^2) - (\nabla \boldsymbol{v}_t)^{\mathrm{T}} \boldsymbol{\lambda}(t)\,, \\ \boldsymbol{\lambda}(t_f) = 2\boldsymbol{R}_{t_f}\,, \\ \frac{\partial H}{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}} = 0 \implies \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t) = \frac{V_s \boldsymbol{\lambda}(t)}{2\mu(t)} = -\frac{\boldsymbol{\lambda}(t)}{\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}(t)\|}\,. \end{cases}$$

backward integration

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\boldsymbol{R}}_t = \nabla \boldsymbol{v}_t \boldsymbol{R}_t + \mathbf{U}(t)\,, \\ \boldsymbol{R}_{t_0} = \text{ given}\,, \\ \mathbf{U}(t) = V_S \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t)\,. \end{cases}$$

Forward integration

computationally heavy

It requires iterative searching with backward and forward integration such as to identify the optimal control



Lenhart, S., & Workman, J.T. (2007). **Optimal Control Applied to Biological Models** (1st ed.). Chapman and Hall/CRC.

Optimal Control vs heuristic policies at **small scales**

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{R}}_t = \boldsymbol{\nabla v}_t \boldsymbol{R}_t + \mathbf{U}(t)$$

Failures (no capture):



Optimal Control vs heuristic policies in linear regime

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{R}}_t = \nabla \boldsymbol{v}_t \boldsymbol{R}_t + \mathbf{U}(t)$$

$T_c =$ **Capture** time: (time of arrival at the desired distance)



PRELIMINARY UNPUBLISHED

PDF of normalized capture time



Heuristic policies in a 2d stochastic flow (linear and non-linear regime)

Heuristic policies in a 2d stochastic flow

Dispersion of a bunch of particles



$$\boldsymbol{v}(x, y, t) = \left(\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial y}, -\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x}\right)$$

$$\psi(\boldsymbol{x}, t) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{k} \in \mathscr{K}} \left(A(\boldsymbol{k}, t)e^{i(\boldsymbol{k}\cdot\boldsymbol{x})} + \text{c.c.}\right)$$

Dove $\mathscr{K} = \{(k_s,0), (\pm k_s, k_s), (0,k_s)\}$

Velocity field

- $A(\boldsymbol{k}, t)$ generated by an **Ornstein-Uhlenbeck** process
- $u_{rms} = 1$ (typical velocity)
- $L = \dfrac{2\pi}{k_s} = 1$ (characteristic scale)



$$\lambda > 0$$

The Lagrangian dynamics is chaotic

Heuristic policies in a 2d stochastic flow

Performance at small scales $\|R_{t_0}\| \ll L$





- The surfing policy performs bad at small scales.
- The perturbative policy performs well at small scales, $\exists\ best\ \tau_p \neq 0$.

There is a way to perform better than the Trivial Policy

Heuristic policies in a 2d stochastic flow

Performance at large scales $\|R_{t_0}\| \gg L$





- The surfing policy performs well at large scales, $\exists\ best\ \tau_s \neq 0$.
- The perturbative policy performs well at large scales, $\exists\ best\ \tau_p \neq 0$.

There is a way to perform better than the Trivial Policy

Heuristic vs OC
Double gyre flow (2d)
(linear regime)

Optimal Control vs heuristic policies at **small scales**

Linear regime

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{X}}_t^1 = \boldsymbol{v}(\mathbf{X}_t^1) \\ \dot{\mathbf{X}}_t^2 = \boldsymbol{v}(\mathbf{X}_t^2) + \mathbf{U}(t) \\ \mathbf{U}(t) = V_s\, \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}(t) \end{cases}$$

$$\boldsymbol{v}(\mathbf{X}_t^2) \simeq \boldsymbol{v}(\mathbf{X}_t^1) + \nabla \boldsymbol{v}_t \boldsymbol{R}_t$$

$$\boxed{\dot{\boldsymbol{R}}_t = \nabla \boldsymbol{v}_t \boldsymbol{R}_t + \mathbf{U}(t)}$$

Velocity field (double gyre flow*)

$$f(x,t) = a(t)x^2 + b(t)x$$

$$\phi(x,y,t) = A\sin(\pi f(x,t))\sin(\pi y),$$

$$a(t) = \epsilon \sin(\omega t)$$

$$b(t) = 1 - 2\epsilon \sin(\omega t).$$



*Krishna K, Song Z, Brunton SL. 2022 **Finite-horizon, energy-efficient trajectories in unsteady flows**. *Proc. R. Soc. A* **478**: 20210255.

Optimal Control vs heuristic policies in linear regime

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{R}}_t = \boldsymbol{\nabla v}_t \boldsymbol{R}_t + \mathbf{U}(t)$$







T_c = **Capture** time: (time of arrival at the desired distance)

$\boxed{\text{OW}}$ = Average of the Okubo Weiss parameter $\begin{cases} < 0 \text{ vorticity dominated} \\ > 0 \text{ strain dominated} \end{cases}$

PDF of normalized capture time



$$\dot{\boldsymbol{R}}_t = \boldsymbol{\nabla v}_t \boldsymbol{R}_t + \mathbf{U}(t)$$

Optimal Control vs heuristic policies at **small scales**

$T_c =$ **Capture** time: (time of arriving at the desired distance)



$OW > 0$

$OW \simeq 0$

$OW < 0$

Optimal Control vs heuristic policies at **small scales**

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{R}}_t = \boldsymbol{\nabla v}_t \boldsymbol{R}_t + \mathbf{U}(t)$$

Failures (no capture):



Trajectories examples

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{R}}_t = \boldsymbol{\nabla v}_t \boldsymbol{R}_t + \mathbf{U}(t)$$

OC vs Trivial Policy



OC vs Surfing



OC vs Perturbative



Policies' stability

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{R}}_t = \boldsymbol{\nabla v}_t \boldsymbol{R}_t + \mathbf{U}(t)$$

Perturbation of the initial condition



PDF (only capture episodes)