Abstract—A pneumatic actuator has several advantages such as low heat generation, high weight power ratio, and low cost. However, it has several disadvantages such as time delays and nonlinearities. Because pressure and position feedback bandwidths are limited by the time delay problem, it is difficult to implement a pneumatic actuator for a scan stage. Therefore, this paper proposes a modified Smith predictor for it and implements for an experimental scan stage. The effectiveness of the proposed control system is validated by frequency and time domain experiments.

I. INTRODUCTION

High-precision stages are important machinery in the semiconductor and flat panel display manufacturing processes [1], [2]. To achieve the high integration and manufacturing cost reduction of electronic devices, faster and more precise positioning by larger stages are required. However, high speed positioning leads to increase in mass of the actuator. Therefore, this spurs on increase in the moving mass due to increase in the size of the stage. As a result, the heat generated by electromagnetic actuators is increased. Heat generation is a serious concern because it affects not only the proprieties of the mechanical system but also the proprieties of the actuation and measurement system [3], [4]. Another problem of increasing in the size and mass of the stage is a reduction in resonant frequency. Due to this problem, it is difficult to design a high bandwidth feedback controller. Hence, conventional scan stages face an inherent trade-offs between high throughput and high positioning accuracy [5].

To relax the trade-offs, a contactless dual stage structure which has a short stroke fine stage and a long stroke coarse stage is commonly used [6], [7]. This structure enables us to make a slightly lighter fine stage and reduce disturbance from the coarse stage. However, there is still limit to the reduction in the weight of the fine stage because the required maximum acceleration of the fine stage actuator is determined by the maximum acceleration of the setpoint trajectory. To deal with this problem, our group proposed the catapult stage [8], [9] which allows both contact and separation between the fine and coarse stages. The fine stage of the catapult stage is lighter and simpler compared to the conventional dual stage because the fine stage actuation is not necessary in the acceleration and deceleration region in the scanning motion.

This paper considers a lightweight and simple structure for a coarse stage by replacing its linear motor to a pneumatic actuator. By combination of a catapult stage structure for fine stage and a pneumatic actuator for a coarse stage, a new generation dual stage with low heat generation, lightweight,
and high response accuracy can be available. A pneumatic actuator has advantages compared to a linear motor: 1) low heat generation [4], 2) high weight power ratio [10], and 3) low cost [10]. Disadvantages are 1) the time delay [11] and 2) the nonlinearity dynamics [12], [13] due to air dynamics and servo valves. This paper focuses on the time delay problem which limits the feedback control bandwidth. Various methods have been studied for time delay problem: 1) Smith predictor [14] and its modifications [15], [16], 2) Internal Model Control (IMC) [17], and 3) communication disturbance observer [18]. This paper applies a modified Smith predictor to a trajectory tracking control problem.

Control methods for pneumatic actuators have been studied [19] including PID control [20], iterative leaning control [21], and sliding mode control [22]. Proposed control system of this paper has inner pressure feedback loops for each chamber with modified Smith predictors and an outer position feedback loop. The inner loops of this paper also have a pressure-derivative feedback stabilization by the jerk reference of the stage to improve the pressure tracking control performance.

II. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

Schematics and photographs of an experimental setup are shown in Fig. 1 and 2. This stage is designed as a miniaturized single axis (x) coarse stage actuated by a pneumatic cylinder. The coarse stage is supported by air pads to reduce friction. As illustrated in Fig. 3, the cylinder has two chambers. Each chamber has a pressure sensor, a high-pressure side poppet valve and an ambient side poppet valve. Supply air of the high-pressure side is 4 \times 10^5 \text{ Pa}. The position of the stage is measured by a linear encoder.

One of the problems of this pneumatic actuated stage is the time delay. Step response from the valve voltage reference in the chamber 1 to the measured pressure in the same chamber is shown in Fig. 4. There is a about 10 ms delay. This delay is not negligible to achieve high feedback bandwidths for the pressure and position feedback loops.

III. TIME DELAY COMPENSATION BY MODIFIED SMITH PREDICTOR

A. Smith predictor

This subsection introduces the Smith predictor [14]. This section assumes a plant with input delay \( P(s)e^{-\tau s} \). Without Smith predictor, the tracking control performance is

\[
y(s) = \frac{C(s)P(s)e^{-\tau s}}{1 + C(s)P(s)e^{-\tau s}}.
\]

The denominator of (1) has a delay element which deteriorates a feedback stability. With the Smith predictor shown in Fig. 5, the tracking control performance becomes

\[
y(s) = \frac{C(s)P(s)e^{-\tau s}}{r(s)} = \frac{C(s)P(s)e^{-\tau s}}{1 + C(s)P(s)}.
\]

when \( P_n(s) = P(s) \) and \( \tau_n = \tau \). Because the denominator of (2) does not have a delay element, the feedback controller \( C(s) \) can be designed as a system without delay.

B. Modified Smith predictor and its analysis

However, the Smith predictor cannot be used for an unstable system or an integrating system with a constant disturbance [16]. To deal with this problem, this paper proposes a modified Smith predictor with a high pass filter (HPF) illustrated in Fig. 6 for the integrating system. Fig. 6 has two tuning parameters: a cut off frequency of the HPF \( \omega_c \) and a gain \( K \).

Step responses and frequency characteristics are analyzed. Conditions of this analysis for the modified Smith predictor are as follows. Plant is defined as \( P(s) = \frac{1}{s}e^{-\tau s} \) which has an input delay \( \tau = 10 \text{ ms} \). A feedback controller \( C(s) \) is designed as PI controller. Gain is set to locate the closed loop poles at \(-20\text{Hz}\) without considering the delay. In this case, the feedback loop is unstable without the Smith or modified Smith predictor.

In Fig. 7–9, ‘Smith’ denotes the standard Smith predictor case shown in Fig. 5. The others denote methods with the modified Smith predictor.
IV. Modeling

The model of the pneumatic actuated stage is illustrated in Fig. 3. Block diagram of overall control system is shown in Fig. 10. Gas equation is expressed as

\[ P_i(t)V_i(t) = \dot{m}_f(t)RT_i \]  

where \( P_i, V_i, m_i, R, T_i \) denotes chamber pressure, chamber volume, mass of the gas, ideal gas constant, temperature for each chambers, respectively. Chamber temperature \( T_i \) is assumed as a constant. The subscript \( i \) represents the chamber number. By time differentiation of (3),

\[ \dot{P}_i(t)V_i(t) + P_i(t)V_i(t) = \dot{m}_f(t)RT_i \]  

is obtained. From (4), \( P_i \) is modeled as

\[ P_i(t) = -\frac{P_f(t)V_i(t) + \dot{m}_f(t)RT_i}{V_i(t)} \]  

A nonlinear model \( NL \) from valve commands \( u_{in}, u_{out} \) to \( \dot{m}_f \) shown in Fig. 10 is obtained by polynomial fitting of experimental data [12].

Equation of motion of the stage is

\[ f(t) = P_1(t)A - P_2(t)A = M\ddot{x}(t), \]  

where \( f, A, M, x \) denotes the force from the pneumatic cylinder, the size of the pressurized area, the mass, and the position of the stage, respectively.

V. Basic Control System

Basic control system of the pneumatic actuation stage is shown in Fig. 10. As an inner loop, a pressure feedback is implemented for each chamber. As an outer loop, a position feedback is implemented for stage position by using a linear encoder.

A. Position control

\( C_{fb}^p(s) \) is implemented as an outer loop position feedback controller. The relationship between the output of position feedback \( f^{ref} \) and the pressure commands \( P_1^{ref}, P_2^{ref} \) is

\[ P_1^{ref}(t) = P_{set} + \frac{f^{ref}(t)\dot{V}_i(t)}{2A}, \quad P_2^{ref}(t) = P_{set} - \frac{f^{ref}(t)\dot{V}_i(t)}{2A}. \]  

where \( P_{set} \) denotes the set pressure for each chamber. In this case, \( P_{set} \) is set as \( 2.0 \times 10^5 \) Pa. \( C_{fb}^p(s) \) is designed by a series connection of a PI controller, a phase lead filter, and notch filters.

B. Pressure control

Pressure feedback controllers \( C_{fb}^{P1}, C_{fb}^{P2} \) are designed as a series connection of a PI controller, a phase lead filter, and notch filters.

The reference of the derivative of the gas mass is obtained as follows:

\[ \dot{m}_f^{ref}(t) = \frac{\dot{P}_i^{ref}(t)V_i(t) + P_i(t)\dot{V}_i(t)}{RT_i}. \]
An inverse model \( NL^{-1} \) from \( \dot{m}_{\text{ref}}^{\text{in}} \) to \( u_{\text{ref}}^{\text{in}} \) is calculated by inverse of the polynomial obtained in subsection IV.

Feedforward commands \( P_{1,\text{ff}}^{\text{ref}}, P_{2,\text{ff}}^{\text{ref}} \) are obtained by differential of (6) and (7):

\[
P_{1,\text{ff}}^{\text{ref}}(t) = \frac{M\ddot{x}^{\text{ref}}(t)}{2A}, \quad P_{2,\text{ff}}^{\text{ref}}(t) = -\frac{M\ddot{x}^{\text{ref}}(t)}{2A}.
\]

VI. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

A. Pressure feedback

The case 1 and case 2 are performed by the block diagrams shown in Fig. 10 and Fig. 11, respectively. Pressure feedback control performance is shown in Fig. 12 and Tab. I. In case 1, \( C_{\text{fb}}^{P1}, C_{\text{fb}}^{P2} \) are designed to have about 35 degree phase margin without the modified Smith predictor. In case 2, \( C_{\text{fb}}^{P1}, C_{\text{fb}}^{P2} \) are redesigned to have about 35 degree phase margin with the modified Smith predictor. The parameters of the Modified Smith predictor are set as \( \tau_n = 10 \text{ ms}, K_1 = 0.3, K_2 = 0.4 \), and \( \varepsilon = 1 \times 2\pi \text{ rad/s} \).

Fig. 12 shows a frequency response from the force command for the pneumatic cylinder \( f^{\text{ref}} \) to estimated force generated by the pneumatic cylinder \( \hat{f} \). \( \frac{f^{\text{ref}}}{f^{\text{out}}(\omega)} \) is calculated by

\[
\frac{f^{\text{ref}}(\omega)}{f^{\text{out}}(\omega)} = \frac{P_1(\omega)\lambda - P_2(\omega)\lambda}{P_2(\omega)\lambda}.
\]

In Tab. I, the bandwidth is defined as -90 degree crossover of \( \frac{f^{\text{ref}}}{f^{\text{out}}(\omega)} \). From Fig. 12 and Tab. I, the pressure feedback bandwidth is improved from 9.4 Hz to 31 Hz regardless of similar phase margin.

B. Position feedback

Frequency response of the position feedback is shown in Fig. 13 and Tab. II. In the case 1, the phase margin of position feedback is 22 degree. In the case 2, the phase margin of position feedback is 53 degree because the inner loop pressure feedback is improved. In the case 3, the outer loop position feedback controller \( C_{\text{fb}}^{x} \) is redesigned. The position feedback bandwidth is improved from 5.3 Hz to 11 Hz although the gain and phase margins increase.

Time responses are shown in Fig. 14. In this experiment, a scan trajectory is given as a reference shown in Fig. 14(a). Tracking performances are depicted in Fig. 14(b), (c). In the case 3, the maximum tracking error is improved from 507.7
such as low heat generation, high weight power ratio, and low cost. On the other hand, it has disadvantages such as a time delay and a nonlinearity. Due to the time delay problem, it is difficult to implement the high bandwidth feedback controller.

The proposed control system has pressure feedback inner loops for each chamber and a position feedback outer loop. The nominal plant of the inner loop is an integrator. The standard Smith predictor can not be used in a system with an integrator. Therefore, this paper proposes a modified Smith predictor and implements to an experimental scan stage.

The proposed control system with the modified Smith predictor in the inner loops can achieve high bandwidths for inner loops and outer loop. Time response data indicate high position tracking performance.
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Fig. 14. Scan motion experimental results.

TABLE III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Case1</th>
<th>Case2</th>
<th>Case3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max error (Ch1, Pressure)</td>
<td>7.9 [kPa]</td>
<td>6.1 [kPa]</td>
<td>6.6 [kPa]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max error (Ch2, Pressure)</td>
<td>8.4 [kPa]</td>
<td>10.1 [kPa]</td>
<td>12.5 [kPa]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max error (Position)</td>
<td>507.7 [um]</td>
<td>417.8 [um]</td>
<td>135.3 [um]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>