Development and Experimental Validation of a Real-Time Capable FPGA Based Gas-Exchange Model for Negative Valve Overlap

Journal Title
XX(X):1–15
©The Author(s) 2017
Reprints and permission:
sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/ToBeAssigned
www.sagepub.com/

David Gordon¹, Christian Wouters², Maximilian Wick³, Feihong Xia³, Bastian Lehrheuer⁴, Jakob Andert³, Charles R. Koch¹ and Stefan Pischinger⁴

Abstract

Homogeneous Charge Compression Ignition (HCCI) has the potential to significantly reduce NO_x emissions, while maintaining a high fuel efficiency. HCCI is characterized by compression induced autoignition of a lean homogeneous air-fuel mixture. Combustion timing is highly dependent on the in-cylinder state including pressure, temperature and trapped mass. To control HCCI combustion it is necessary to have an accurate representation of the gas exchange process. Currently, microprocessor based engine control units require that the gas exchange process is linearized around a desired operating point to simplify the model for real-time implementation. This reduces the models' ability to handle disturbances and limits the flexibility of the model. However, using a Field Programmable Gate Array (FPGA) a detailed simulation of the physical gas exchange process can be implemented in real-time. This paper outlines the process of converting physical governing equations to an offline 0D gas exchange model. The process used to convert this model to a FPGA capable model is described. This model is experimentally validated using a single cylinder research engine with electromagnetic valves to record real-time FPGA gas exchange results and comparing to the offline 0D physical model. The FPGA model is able to accurately calculate the cylinder temperature and cylinder mass at 0.1°CA intervals during the gas exchange process for a range of negative valve overlaps, boost conditions and engine speeds making the model useful for future real-time control applications.

Keywords

Field programmable gate array, homogeneous charge compression ignition, gasoline controlled autoignition, gas exchange model, 0D engine simulation

Introduction

Homogenous Charge Compression Ignition (HCCI), is a part-load combustion method, which is characterized by lean low-temperature combustion (LTC) with temperatures below the NO_x formation temperature of 2000 K. As a result, HCCI has the potential to significantly reduce NO_x emissions, while maintaining a high fuel efficiency, comparable with current stratified lean-burn combustion, with NO_x emissions reduced by up to 99%^{1,2,3,4}. Therefore, expensive exhaust aftertreatment systems can be reduced or simplified^{4,5,6}. Improved efficiency is also possible when using HCCI combustion due to the rapid global and spatial combustion in combination with reduced wall heat losses from the LTC. The potential of HCCI combustion has been proven in numerous research projects^{4,7,8,9,10,11}.

HCCI combustion is enabled by compression induced autoignition, which is highly dependent on the cylinder state after compression. The lack of a direct combustion timing control method like ignition timing in spark ignition (SI) engines or injection timing in traditional compression ignition (CI) engines is a major disadvantage, which has caused a strong research focus on control strategies. Temperature has a large impact on ignition timing and can be altered through intake air heating, increased compression

ratio or Exhaust Gas Recirculation (EGR)^{12,13,14}. Using two fuels with different ignition properties changes the chemical composition of the cylinder and has also shown potential for HCCI control^{15,16,17}.

Near the misfire limit, when using EGR as a means to provide the thermal energy required to achieve autoignition, a strong coupling between cycles can exist¹⁸. Consequently, the tendency for unstable combustion sequences increases, which proves to be problematic especially during engine transients and near the misfire limit. Current cycle-based control strategies only stabilize a small portion of the operation range, which is insufficient for practical engine deployment¹⁹. For the extension of the operation range

¹Dept. of Mechanical Engineering, University of Alberta

²Dept. of Mechanical Engineering, Eindhoven University of Technology

³Mechatronic Systems for Combustion Engines, RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, Germany

⁴Institute for Combustion Engines, RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, Germany

Corresponding author:

David Gordon, Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta T6G 2R3, Canada

Email: dgordon@ualberta.ca

use of external EGR and boosting were suggested²⁰. Unfortunately, these measures yield a reduced combustion stability, since the dependence of the combustion on boost pressure, EGR composition, and maximum pressure gradient vary widely during transient operation which can dilute the mixture lowering autoignition tendency. A stabilizing controller which works over a wide range of operating conditions is needed. Distinct cyclic variations, characterized by a spontaneous shift from stable to unstable operation, has been investigated in ^{21 22 23 24 25 26 4}.

To develop a deeper understanding of HCCI combustion, simulation models have been developed to predict the gas exchange and combustion processes. These include stochastic, multi-zone and physical models. Generally, detailed physical models are too computationally intensive for use in real-time engine applications and are linearized around a specific operating point^{27 28}. For their use in real-time applications it is necessary to relinearize the model for different operating points. A physics-based, 0D model is described in the first part of this paper and is useful for determining the in-cylinder state during the entire gas exchange process. This information is often desired for HCCI combustion controllers as an input.

For complex cylinder pressure analysis and control algorithms in real-time, the low latency and parallel computing architecture of Field Programmable Gate Array (FPGA) hardware is useful²⁹. FPGA hardware has successfully been used in experimental testing to provide closed loop control for the position of pneumatic valves³⁰. The calculation of heat release in real time has also been achieved in less than 0.02 CAD at 1200 rpm on an FPGA, which can be used for HCCI combustion control³¹. An FPGA controller has been used to control the amount of injected fuel to prevent an overshoot of IMEP resulting from unburned fuel from the previous cycle³² and it is proposed that a real-time calculation of exhaust gas fraction would improve the accuracy of the transferred fuel mass and allow for a better prediction of the fuel transferred from one cycle to the next. An FPGA has been used to calculate the real-time combustion metrics, CA50 and IMEP, which are then used for closed-loop control³³. A physical model would improve the results by removing feed-forward maps and allow for disturbance rejection. This is the focus of the second part of this paper, where the detailed physical gas exchange model is ported to FPGA hardware allowing for real-time calculation of in-cylinder temperature, pressure and trapped mass.

The procedure for the development and validation of a real-time capable FPGA based gas exchange model is described in this paper. This procedure can be broken into three stages of model development as depicted in Figure 1. The first step is the selection of a validated model based on physical governing equations. These equations are then used to develop a 0D physical gas exchange model created in Matlab Simulink, subsequently referred to as offline physical model which is used for offline calculation of the cylinder temperature, pressure and trapped mass. The offline physical model is compared to a standard commercial gas exchange

model as a simple validation. The offline physical model is used both as a reference for the real-time FPGA based model and in the development of the FPGA model. The third step is the hardware implementation and experimental validation of the FPGA model. The offline physical model must be adapted in this step for implementation on the FPGA hardware. The focus here will be on the development of a gas exchange model for use with internal combustion engines utilizing Negative Valve Overlap (NVO) to provide internal uncooled EGR, although a similar procedure can be followed for other FPGA algorithms. Each of the three steps will be explained in detail in the following sections.

Governing physical equations

The gas-exchange process using the mass and energy conservation laws is formulated in the offline physical model which is spatially lumped. This zero-dimensional approach indicates that the physical quantities are independent of location, making the process parameters dependent of time only. The change in crank angle φ is related to the time domain via $d\varphi = \omega dt$ where ω is the angular engine velocity.

Energy conservation

The energy conservation neglecting kinetic energy and latent heat of fuel evaporation is:

$$\frac{dU}{d\varphi} + \frac{dQ_b}{d\varphi} = \frac{dQ_w}{d\varphi} - p \frac{dV}{d\varphi} + \sum_i h_i \frac{dm_i}{d\varphi} \quad (1)$$

in which $dU/d\varphi$ is the internal energy change, $dQ_b/d\varphi$ the fuel energy release, $dQ_w/d\varphi$ the wall heat transfer, $p dV/d\varphi$ the internal work and $h_i dm_i/d\varphi$ the intake and exhaust enthalpy flows. Rewriting equation 1 to obtain an expression for the temperature gradient $dT/d\varphi$ results in:

$$\frac{dT}{d\varphi} = \frac{-\frac{dQ_b}{d\varphi} + \frac{dQ_w}{d\varphi} - p \frac{dV}{d\varphi} + \sum_i (h_i - u_i) \frac{dm_i}{d\varphi}}{m c_v} \quad (2)$$

Based upon the measured crank angle resolved cylinder pressure $p(\varphi)$, the heat release can be determined. It is defined that during the heat release, the transferred mass over the valves is zero. Additional simplifications can be made by neglecting the blow-by mass flow, assuming ideal gas state and constant gas composition $dR/d\varphi = 0$ and using the relations $R = c_p - c_v$ and $\gamma = c_p/c_v$. Using the specific heat ratio $\gamma(\varphi)$, the actual cylinder volume $V(\varphi)$ and the cylinder pressure $p(\varphi)$, all as a function of crank angle, the heat release term $dQ_b/d\varphi$ in equation 2 is modeled as:

$$\frac{dQ_b}{d\varphi} = -\frac{1}{\gamma - 1} V \frac{dp}{d\varphi} - \frac{\gamma}{\gamma - 1} p \frac{dV}{d\varphi} + \frac{dQ_w}{d\varphi} \quad (3)$$

The heat transfer $dQ_w/d\varphi$ of the combustion engine cylinder charge to the walls is comprised of convection and radiation³⁴. To simplify, the radiation part is incorporated into the convective heat transfer coefficient α which is a good approximation for gasoline engines³⁵. The wall heat transfer can be expressed as:

$$\frac{dQ_w}{d\varphi} = \alpha(\varphi) A(\varphi) (T_w - T_{gas}(\varphi)) \quad (4)$$

Figure 1. Example of process to create a FPGA based model from governing physical equations

To calculate the heat transfer, both the spatially averaged gas temperature in the cylinder $T_{gas}(\varphi)$ and wall temperature T_w are required. The wall temperature is assumed constant ($T_w = 465$ K) over an entire cycle with a dependency on engine load and speed, and the charge temperature can be obtained from the equation of state 1.

To calculate wall heat transfer coefficient, $\alpha(\varphi)$, three commonly used correlations are Woschni³⁶, Assanis³⁷ and Hohenberg³⁸. For HCCI combustion the Hohenberg correlation is recommended³⁹ and is:

$$\alpha(\varphi) = 130 V^{-0.06} p^{0.8} T^{-0.4} (\nu_{pis} + 1.4)^{0.8} \quad (5)$$

The piston speed ν_{pis} in equation 5 is calculated as function of crank angle $\nu_{pis}(\varphi)$ in the model.

The internal energy u of the burned gas can be obtained from multiple modeling approaches⁴⁰. A simplified approach where the internal energy is dependent on the gas temperature and air-fuel ratio is described in⁴¹. This approach was then extended by⁴² to also consider the pressure dependency. However, both approaches are only valid for the Diesel process and an air-fuel ratio of $\lambda \geq 1$ and where the composition of the gas is assumed constant.

The combustion chamber can also be treated as a mixture of individual species for which each of the species is considered an ideal gas⁴³. The model is then based on polynomial curve fits to the thermodynamic data for each species in the mixture. The specific heat $c_{p,i}$ is approximated by for each species i at temperature T as:

$$\frac{c_{p,i}}{R} = a_{i,1} + a_{i,2}T + a_{i,3}T^2 + a_{i,4}T^3 + a_{i,5}T^4 \quad (6)$$

where the coefficients $a_{i,j}$ can be obtained from tables. The enthalpy h of species i is then given by:

$$\frac{h_i}{R} = a_{i,1} + \frac{a_{i,2}}{2}T + \frac{a_{i,3}}{3}T^2 + \frac{a_{i,4}}{4}T^3 + \frac{a_{i,5}}{5}T^4 + \frac{a_{i,6}}{T} \quad (7)$$

The specific internal energy u of species i can now be obtained by:

$$u_i = h_i - RT \quad (8)$$

Using the species internal energies and their mass fractions χ , the internal energy of the mixture is:

$$u_{mix} = \sum_i \chi_i \cdot u_i \quad (9)$$

which, as opposed to the previously mentioned modeling approaches, can be applied for any C/H-ratio and a wider range of gases.

Mass conservation

The gas exchange process of the combustion chamber requires modelling of the intake and exhaust mass flows. The in-cylinder mass and composition at Intake Valve Closing (IVC) can be determined by using the mass flows and a mass balance. The theoretical (isentropic) one-dimensional stationary flow through a channel is defined as⁴⁴:

$$\frac{dm_{th}}{d\varphi} = A_s \rho_s \sqrt{\frac{2\gamma}{\gamma-1} RT_0 \left[1 - \left(\frac{p_1}{p_0} \right)^{\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma}} \right]} \quad (10)$$

in which ρ_s and A_s are the isentropic density and flow area, and p_0 and p_1 the pressure before and after valve respectively. Since the compression in a combustion engine is not isentropic and throttling losses occur this equation must be tuned. To tune the model an experimental flow measurement is required to measure the thermodynamical effect of the throttle losses. These losses are quantified by

the irreversible increase in entropy. To do this, the mass flow through the valve is normalized to the theoretical (isentropic) mass flow. This throttle loss is expressed as a discharge coefficient C_d , which is defined as the relation between the experimental and theoretical mass flow as:

$$C_d = \frac{\frac{dm_{exp}}{d\varphi}}{\frac{dm_{th}}{d\varphi}} \quad (11)$$

The intake and exhaust mass flows are then calculated by substituting equation 11 into equation 10, in which the indices 0 and 1 refer to before and after valve respectively:

$$\frac{dm}{d\varphi} = A_{th} C_d \rho_0 \sqrt{2RT_0} \sqrt{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1} \left(\left(\frac{p_1}{p_0} \right)^{\frac{2}{\gamma}} - \left(\frac{p_1}{p_0} \right)^{\frac{\gamma+1}{\gamma}} \right)} \quad (12)$$

An injector model is used to estimate the injected fuel mass m_f ³² as:

$$m_f = t_{inj} \alpha_f A \sqrt{2\rho_f \Delta p} \quad (13)$$

where t_{inj} is the injection duration, Δp is the pressure difference between the fuel rail and cylinder, ρ_f the fuel density and A the orifice area. The flow coefficient α_f is a function of t_{inj} to take the non-linear opening and closing behavior of the injector into account. The injector model was calibrated on a test bench by performing multiple measurements.

Offline physical gas exchange model creation

To obtain crank angle resolved information on the in-cylinder state during the gas exchange process, an offline physical 0D gas exchange model was created in Matlab Simulink as shown schematically in Figure 2. The model input is a set of discrete test bench data: the intake, exhaust and indicated cylinder pressure, crank angle position and intake and exhaust temperature as well as the measured valve lift.

Figure 2. Schematic overview of the offline 0D physical gas exchange model created in Simulink

In this calculation loop, the calculated instead of indicated

cylinder pressure is used. The motivation behind that is the unavoidable noise that is present in the indicated cylinder pressure, especially at valve closings. The mass flow calculation, equation 12, is extremely sensitive to pressure fluctuations, and shows unrealistic results when using the measured cylinder pressure signal. Using a calculated cylinder pressure also helps to compensate for sensor drift. During the combustion phase, -80→75°CA after Top Dead Center (aTDC), the calculated pressure is set equal to the measured in-cylinder pressure, since no combustion model is currently incorporated.

The offline physical model is based on equations 2 to 13 with simplifications described in the previous section. A calculation loop applies the temperature gradient in equation 2 to calculate the current temperature i.e. $T_i = T_{i-1} + \frac{dT}{d\varphi}$ and other values of interest such as EGR % and cylinder mass m_{cyl} during one sample period. First, the indicated cylinder pressure is referenced using a thermodynamic zero-point correction to the intake manifold pressure to determine the absolute cylinder pressure and to initialize the model. Initialization takes place only once every cycle during the expansion phase before Exhaust Valve Opening (EVO), the in-cylinder temperature is calculated using the ideal gas law.

After initialization the cylinder pressure is calculated from the cylinder temperature using the ideal gas law. This calculated cylinder pressure is combined with the measured manifold pressures to calculate cylinder mass using equation 12. This cylinder mass is then used in equation 2 to calculate the temperature gradient and subsequently the cylinder temperature. This calculation loop takes place during the gas exchange from before EVO at 75°CA aTDC to after IVC at 640°CA aTDC.

The calculated cylinder mass is used in the internal energy $u_i \frac{dm_i}{d\varphi}$ term in equation 2, and with the remaining four terms a temperature offset $\frac{dT}{d\varphi}$ is obtained to update the temperature of the next sample period. As a result, the calculated pressure, temperature and mass are delayed by one sample period. This delay is an important benefit of the model as it makes the model causal. This eliminates the need for a prediction in favor of rapid calculation.

The resolution of the model has an effect on the accuracy of the calculated parameters. In Figure 3, the cylinder mass has been modeled with four different resolutions. The model converges as the resolution increases from 5° to 0.1°CA which is the sample rate of the measured data. For this reason a resolution of 0.1°CA is used. For real-time implementation of a 0.1°CA model the computational speed of a FPGA is utilized in this work.

Model validation

An established commercial software, GT-Power®, which combines a 0D combustion calculation with a 1D gas exchange calculation was used as a reference model to validate the offline physical model^{10 24 7}. The same test bench data is used as input for both the offline physical and

Figure 3. Effect of increasing model crank angle resolution on modeled cylinder mass

reference models for comparison and validation. The areas of interest for HCCI are the NVO recompression phase and valve events for the mass flow calculation. The first validation step was to compare the calculated in-cylinder pressure to the reference model and measured pressure, as shown in Figure 4. The calculated in-cylinder pressure of the offline model matches the reference pressure trace quite well.

Figure 4. Validation of the modeled in-cylinder pressure with the reference model at 1500 rpm and 4.0 bar IMEP

The 1D gas exchange process in the reference model incorporates gas dynamics, which include the spatial and temporal expansion of pressure waves in the intake and exhaust runner volumes, and the calculation of friction losses and wall heat transfer⁴⁵. This inertia and spatial difference (sensor location) adds an additional phase shift effect to the pressure signals, therefore imposing a deviation in the mass flow calculation. To examine the impact of including the gas dynamics, the offline model was also simulated using intake and exhaust pressure traces that include the gas dynamics. These manifold pressure traces were extracted from the reference model. In Figure 5, the raw measured manifold pressures without compensation for the gas dynamics and the manifold pressure traces corrected

for gas dynamics have been shown. The gas dynamics appear to reduce the noise, as to be expected from the inertia of the exhaust and intake flow. Furthermore, the amplitude of the pressure fluctuations is increased in the pressure trace which considers gas dynamics.

Figure 5. Comparison of the intake and exhaust pressure traces with and without incorporation of the gas dynamics at 1500 rpm and 4.0 bar IMEP

The modeled in-cylinder temperature with and without consideration of gas dynamics, together with the reference temperature is shown in Figure 6. The modeled temperature matches the reference temperature, especially during the valve events where a small difference of 25 K is seen. During NVO recompression the temperature difference between the model and reference increases to 40 K. A larger deviation of close to 80 K can be observed shortly before IVO at the start of injection. The enthalpy of evaporation has not been modeled in the offline model, causing this small difference. The mass flow rate with gas dynamics included is visualized in Figure 7, where the offline model approximates the reference mass flow rate very well. The pulses in the exhaust mass flow rate show the same amplitude and no phase delay. The same can be observed during the intake mass flow. Both models consider the back-flow during valve events by using the properties of the cylinder mixture at cylinder or manifold conditions depending on flow direction.

Accumulation of the mass flow rates yields the cylinder mass, as shown in Figure 8. The offline model without gas dynamics deviates from the reference model during the exhaust phase, and fails to simulate the rebreathing short before IVC. At these points, the deviation increases to 21.4 mg or 11.3% which can be seen in the model difference plot in Figure 8. However, a slight offset during the valve events is of less significance. On the other hand, the offline model with gas dynamics matches the reference model during these events. Despite the differences in the offline model due to the lack of gas dynamics, the cylinder mass is close, within 3 mg or 0.8%, when the valves are closed. As a result, the offline model is able to calculate the in-cylinder mass sufficiently well without incorporation of gas dynamics.

An additional remark is that the mass at 90°CA aTDC

Figure 6. Validation of the modeled in-cylinder temperature with the reference model at 1500 rpm and 4.0 bar IMEP

Figure 7. Validation of the modeled mass flow with the reference model at 1500 rpm and 4.0 bar IMEP

and 630°CA aTDC are not identical. The cyclic- and pressure fluctuations result in imbalanced exhaust and intake mass flows. Since HCCI operation is unstable by nature differences in mass flow and trapped in-cylinder mass are expected. However, in the reference model each cycle is calculated by means of 200 iteration steps, until steady-state is reached. The output of one iteration step serves as input for the following one. The offline physical model does converge due to its causal nature, however, it does not incorporate this iterative process which could result in minor differences in cylinder mass for large cyclic fluctuations. Despite these differences, the trapped in-cylinder mass matches the reference mass sufficiently well.

Figure 8. Validation of the modeled in-cylinder mass with the reference model at 1500 rpm and 4.0 bar IMEP

Conversion to FPGA

Converting equations 2 to 5 of the offline physical Simulink model to an FPGA based model is the next step. To allow for operation of the above Simulink-based gas exchange model on the Xilinx® FPGA hardware the model must be adapted to use Xilinx® System Generator (XSG) library blocks. These blocks are specifically designed to simplify the development of an FPGA based model. The FPGA model creation consists of individually transferring each Simulink block from the offline physical model to its XSG equivalent while understanding the limitations of the FPGA hardware. Generally, the basic mathematical operations of addition, subtraction, multiplication and logical comparisons are resource efficient and can be easily implemented using existing XSG blocks. However, many standard Simulink library blocks used in the offline physical model must be replaced with basic arithmetic for implementation on FPGA. In this work, the following mathematical operations needed to be recreated to allow for the fixed-point arithmetic used in the FPGA: division, windowed averaging, integration, moving average filtering and edge detection. An example of this transition from Simulink to XSG blocks can be seen in Figure 1 and will be further explained in the following section.

FPGA hardware limitations

A FPGA consists of many gate arrays connected with re-configurable routing fabric containing switch points or routing blocks between the gate arrays. The various logic blocks can be used for simple combination logic (lookup tables) or may be flip-flops which allow for sequential logic^{46 31}. Also included on the FPGA board are random access memory (RAM) blocks distributed between the logic

blocks which provide an efficient method for data storage.

A limitation of using gate arrays is that fixed point arithmetic must be used. This forces the model designer to consider the binary precision at every calculation (scaling of all variables) and also limits the mathematical arithmetic that is possible. The offline physical model, discussed above, allows for estimating the range of values that will result from each operation. It is also important to consider the value or specifically the binary position, of any two values before a mathematical operation to ensure they are of similar size. This is to reduce calculation error due to a overflow or loss in precision due to truncation of the result. In the development of the gas exchange model due to the large magnitude difference in SI units for pressure, volume and temperature this problem occurs and scaling must be used. This however creates the additional step of checking the units after a calculation and possible unit correction before subsequent calculations. Figure 1 shows the signal sizes before and after each mathematical operation. To reduce the binary size of the signal the 'cast' block is used to truncate extra bits. This reduces the precision of the number but also reduces the resources that are required on the FPGA. Correctly setting the binary size is important in allocating the correct amount of resources to extremely sensitive calculations while saving resources by reducing the bit size for calculations that do not require it.

Figure 1 is also a good example of the limitation of FPGA arithmetic. Here the division is performed using a binary division algorithm which takes 65 samples and consumes significant FPGA resources when compared to addition, subtraction or multiplication. It also requires registers before the calculation to hold the incoming values constant during the calculation period. Another limitation of the binary division algorithm used is it requires an 32 bit signal with a binary point of 16, further strengthening the requirement to estimate the values which are divided when performing fixed point arithmetic.

Porting the model to the FPGA must take into account the limited number of gate arrays and RAM blocks. This requires that the model is kept as simple as possible to conserve available resources. A trade-off between gate array and RAM usage is often considered to determine if a complex calculation requiring many gates should be simplified to a 1D look-up table that requires more RAM. Specifically, the calculation of the piston speed, ν , required in equation 5, contains trigonometric functions which are difficult and resource intensive to implement using standard fixed point arithmetic. This was an example where a look-up table was used to conserve gate array resources.

FPGA delay consideration

One major difference between a standard microprocessor based model such as the offline physical model and the model ported to the FPGA is that the on FPGA each calculation takes a fixed amount of time. As many calculations are occurring in parallel on the FPGA this can cause signals to become delayed and misaligned if the time for the signal to pass through each logic element is ignored. The amount of delay is dependent on the complexity of the calculation

taking place, but at least one sample period (12.5 ns on the FPGA used in this study) occurs. This delay can be seen in Figure 1 where the mass signal must be delayed by three samples to match the delay caused by the multiplication of pressure and volume. This ensures that both signals being divided are correctly synchronized in time.

The individual delays of each operation on the FPGA can then be summed to determine the total calculation time. For the entire gas exchange process on the FPGA the calculation time is 282 samples or 3.5250 μ s. Therefore, with the current FPGA model running at 0.1°C/A an engine speed up to 4728 rpm is possible. If higher engine speeds are desired the calculations could be performed at a lower resolution. For example calculating at 0.2°C/A would double the maximum engine speed. The impact from the reduction in resolution is small as shown in Figure 3.

Model physics reduction

To port the offline physical model to the FPGA capable model, simplification of a portion of the physics used in the offline model is used. The three main changes were neglecting the heat release from possible combustion in the NVO recompression phase, not considering gas dynamics and a simplification of the NASA polynomials for the gas properties. The model simplifications for FPGA implementation have been summarized in Table 1

Consideration of combustion reactions during the NVO recompression phase is an important effect to incorporate if there is a misfire in the previous cycle. The heat release during the NVO phase $dQ_{NVO}/d\varphi$ has been modeled according to equation 3. In Figure 9, the effect of including the heat release $dQ_{NVO}/d\varphi$ on the in-cylinder pressure is visualized.

Figure 9. In-cylinder pressure during the NVO recompression phase. The offline physical model is able to accurately capture the heat release if combustion occurs and calculate the correct cylinder pressure.

As can be seen in Figure 9, the model without heat release fails to simulate the combustion, leading to a difference in peak pressure of 10 bar. However, the NVO combustion as shown in Figure 9 is an extreme scenario which occurred

Table 1. Included physical phenomenon in offline and FPGA models

Physical Process	Offline Model	FPGA Online Model
Energy conservation, eqn 2	Included	Included
Hohenberg wall heat model, eqn 5	Included	Included
Orifice flow, eqn 12	Included	Included
Heat release during recompression	Included	Neglected
Gas dynamics	GT-Power corrected manifold pressure	Neglected
Injected fuel mass, eqn 13	Included	Neglected
Ratio of specific heats, γ	NASA polynomials	2nd order polynomial simplification
Intake air properties	NASA polynomials	Assumed constant
Specific heat of cylinder gas	NASA polynomials	Temperature dependent look-up table
Enthalpy of cylinder contents	NASA polynomials	Temperature dependent look-up table

approximately once every 100 cycles at a very unstable operating point. The choice of neglecting the combustion during intermediate compression was made to simplify the model for FPGA implementation. Since combustion during recompression is not desired, and only occurs sporadically at extreme operating conditions, the simplification is acceptable.

As discussed in the offline model section, the inclusion of gas dynamics allows for a better match between the offline physical and reference models. However, the cylinder temperature and mass are very close between models and the inclusion of gas dynamics adds complexity to the FPGA model. Therefore, currently the gas dynamics are excluded from the FPGA model for simplicity and resource conservation.

The offline physical model calculates the gas properties using NASA polynomials using equation 6. To conserve resources and simplify the FPGA model the gas properties were simplified to either constant values or a temperature dependent look-up table. To determine if a look-up table was necessary rather than a constant value, the values calculated in the physical model were examined. Values that have little variation over the range that they are used were set as a constant. For example, the intake and exhaust manifold temperatures do not vary significantly over a single valve event and therefore it was sufficient to leave them as constants. As the temperature in the intake manifold remains constant so does the density, gas constant, and enthalpy of the charge entering the cylinder.

This simplification, however, can not be applied to the cylinder contents as the cylinder temperature changes over the exhaust event which changes the properties of the gas leaving the cylinder. Therefore, it was necessary to calculate the cylinder density, gas constant, and enthalpy using temperature dependent look-up tables.

The specific heat ratio, γ , is one gas property that has a significant impact on the calculated cylinder temperature. To get an acceptable value it was necessary to use the following second order polynomial⁴⁷:

$$\gamma = 1.338 - 6.0 * 10^{-5}T + 1 * 10^{-8}T^2 \quad (14)$$

in which T is the calculated cylinder temperature. Using this equation allowed for a good approximation of the specific heat ratio without the need for a detailed look-up table and is arithmetically simpler to implement than the fourth order NASA polynomials. Equation 14 provides a good balance of the required accuracy and FPGA resource conservation.

FPGA model error sources

The porting of the offline physical model to an FPGA capable model involves two main sources of error. They are the error resulting from switching to fixed point arithmetic over using floating point operations and the error caused by simplifying the physics in the model. Figure 10a shows the calculated constant volume specific heat capacity c_v at various temperatures. This figure shows the calculation using NASA polynomials and floating point arithmetic, simplified look-up table results using floating point arithmetic and finally the fixed point look-up table results. Here very little variation can be seen between the 3 calculation methods.

Figure 10b shows the difference between the 3 calculations. Here the simple floating point model matches the NASA polynomials, however, the transition to fixed point arithmetic causes an increase in the difference between calculations. Here the difference between FPGA model using the fixed point arithmetic and the NASA values used in the offline model are less than 1%. This value is acceptable as the model output changes very little for the additional resource cost of increasing binary size.

Offline FPGA simulation

For offline simulation of the FPGA model, these small sections of the existing offline physical model were individually converted over to XSG blocks. Then using the offline physical model as input for offline simulation of the FPGA model, small sections of the FPGA model can be optimized. The output of the FPGA model was then compared to the offline physical model results and adjustments to binary precision were made as necessary. Thus having a good offline physical model is essential to generate values that cannot be experimentally measured.

The problem with running an offline FPGA simulation is the simulation time of 720° crank angle taking over 21

Figure 10. Difference in constant volume specific heat capacity due to transition to FPGA capable model

hours compared to under 5 seconds for the same cycle using the offline physical model when the simulations are run on an Intel Core i7-6700K based PC. For comparison, the online FPGA the engine cycle can be run in 25.4 ms. This means that simulations must be carefully planned and results saved at intermediate calculations to troubleshoot after completion. The slow simulation is a consequence that each FPGA time step is simulated which is 12.5ns or 887 steps per 0.1°CA at an engine speed of 1500rpm used in this study.

After the small sections are individually tested in offline FPGA simulations they can be combined to build up the complete operation and then the complete model. As previously discussed the parallel processing of the FPGA presets a timing issue. When combining the small sections it is essential to ensure the correct accumulated delay of each model section. This is important so that values are updated at the same time and signals of different delay are not combined in future operations. After combining the smaller sections, another simulation is run and the results are compared to the offline physical model to check for errors caused by incompatible binary precision and timing problems.

Experimental setup

A Single Cylinder Research Engine (SCRE) outfitted with a fully variable Electro-Magnetic Valve Train (EMVT) is used to validate the online FPGA gas exchange model. The EMVT is controlled using the FPGA board which is part of

the engine control unit (ECU). The flexibility of the valve timing allows for engine operation with combustion chamber exhaust gas re-circulation through NVO. This allows for a wide operating range of HCCI combustion timings. The cylinder head used for the experiments is designed for optical investigations but no optical measurements were made. However, the sealing between the head and cylinder sleeve cause higher blow-by than a metal engine. The fuel injector is a piezoelectric outward-opening hollow cone injector that is controlled using the FPGA. The fuel used for all testing in this work is conventional European Research Octane Number (RON) 96 gasoline containing 10% ethanol. Engine geometry and testing conditions are listed in Table 2.

The four main inputs to the gas exchange model are cylinder, intake and exhaust manifold pressure, and crank position. The in-cylinder pressure is measured using a Kistler A6061B piezoelectric pressure transducer. The intake and exhaust manifold pressures are measured using Kistler 4045-A5 piezoresistive pressure transducers. Kistler charge amplifiers are used to output the measured pressure as a voltage. The position of the electromagnetic valves are measured using FEV conductive lift measurement sensors. While the position of the crank is measured using a hall effect encoder.

An FEV Combustion Analysis System (CAS) is used to record cylinder pressure at a 0.1° resolution for use in the offline detailed model. The pressure signals are simultaneously input to the FPGA board contained in the prototyping ECU. Details of the MicroAutoBox II (MABX) prototyping ECU are provided in Table 3.

Table 2. Single cylinder research engine parameters

Parameter	Value
Displacement volume	0.499 L
Stroke	90 mm
Bore	84 mm
Compression ratio	12:1
No. of valves (In/Ex)	2/2
Valve train	EMVT
Max. valve lift (In/Ex)	8 mm/8 mm
Valve angle (In/Ex)	$22.5^\circ/22.5^\circ$
Valve diameter (In/Ex)	32 mm/26 mm
Intake air pressure	1013 mbar
Exhaust pressure	1013 mbar
Oil and coolant temperature	90°C
Engine speed	1500 rpm
Fuel rail pressure	100 bar
Intake temperature	50°C

Resource utilization

As the hardware resources are limited for FPGA implementation it is important to consider the resource utilization for model development. These resources are broken into six main categories as presented in Table

Table 3. Rapid prototyping ECU Specifications

	Parameter	Specification
Processor	dSPACE® 1401	IBM PPC-750GL
	Speed	900 MHz
	Memory	16 MB main memory
I/O Board	dSPACE® 1513	
	Analog input	24 Parallel channels
	Resolution	16 bit
	Sampling frequency	1 Msps
	Analog input	32 Multiplexed channels
	Resolution	16 bit
	Sampling frequency	200 Ksps
	Analog output	12 Channels
	Digital input	40 Channels
	Digital output	40 Channels
FPGA	dSPACE® 1514	Xilinx® Kintex-7
	Flip-flops	407600
	Lookup table	203800
	Memory lookup table	64000
	Block RAM	445
	Digital signal processing	840
	I/O	478

3. The FPGA lookup tables resource usage from each of the main model sub-systems has been visualized in Figure 11. This figure is also useful in analyzing which model sub-system are utilizing resources. Here it can be seen that the gas exchange model is not using the most resources but the EMVT valve and injection control utilize a significant portion of the resources. In addition, there still remains free resources that can be used for future controllers.

The resource savings made available by using time division multiplexing (TDM) on the mass flow can be seen as large percentage in Figure 11 of the total resources used in the gas exchange model. The similarity of calculations between the intake and exhaust mass flows and the high calculation speed of the FPGA are combined to conserve resources. This is accomplished by switching the input values between intake and exhaust every sample (12.5 ns) and then passing that signal through the FPGA logic blocks to complete the mass flow calculation, then separating the two signals after the calculation as shown in Figure 12. This is only possible as the mass flow calculation on FPGA occurs much faster than the intake pressure changes at 0.1°C.A. This allows the same hardware on the FPGA to be used for the calculation of the both mass flows.

Figure 11. Lookup table resource utilization from current model sub-systems

Another benefit of utilizing FPGA hardware over standard microprocessor based engine controllers is the hardware requirements do not vary depending on the engine speed. Each mathematical operation on the FPGA hardware requires a fixed amount of time and utilizes specific resources. When the model is flashed to the FPGA the hardware resources are consumed and do not vary.

Results of online FPGA model

After verifying the offline FPGA simulation results were within 5% of the offline physical model, the FPGA model was compiled and flashed to the FPGA hardware for online testing and further tuning. The CAS system was set to output a timing pulse at the start of recording which was then recorded on both the MABX and CAS systems. This timing pulse was used to align the online FPGA model with the identical CAS cycle. Having the CAS data cycle synchronized with the FPGA data ensures that the offline physical model calculates the same cycle to have results that capture the cyclic variability present in HCCI combustion.

The FPGA results presented in this section were calculated on the FPGA board and recorded on the processor side of the ECU. The extraction of values to the processor side was limited to a sampling rate of 0.5ms to prevent overruns. However, it should be noted that the FPGA is still calculating at 12.5ns, and this fast sampling rate can be used for FPGA based controllers.

The calculation of cylinder pressure using the online FPGA model is compared to the measured and offline physical model calculated pressures in Figure 13. The cylinder pressure matches well over the entire engine cycle. During the NVO recompression there is a slight difference of cylinder pressure between the models and the measured pressure. The cause of this pressure difference is attributed to blow-by due to poor sealing between the optical cylinder head and the piston sleeve. This pressure loss is not included in the model and can be seen by the over-prediction of cylinder pressure during recompression. This error would be significantly lower for a metal engine and is not seen as a deficiency with the model.

Figure 12. Process of time division multiplexing

Figure 13. Comparison of measured in-cylinder pressure with calculated offline physical model and online FPGA models

The calculation of the temperature gradient presented in equation 2 is used for the calculation of the cylinder temperature from the previous time step. Therefore, it is important that the online FPGA model matches the offline physical model. Figure 14 shows that both models match with only a very slight offset during NVO recompression. This offset is attributed to simplifications in the wall heat loss calculation in the FPGA model.

Figure 14. Comparison of temperature gradient calculated with offline physical model and online FPGA model

As the temperature gradient closely matches the physical model, this leads to an accurate cylinder temperature calculation as shown in Figure 15. During the gas exchange process both models are very close. However, the temperatures calculated during the combustion phase show

some difference. As explained above, during the combustion phase the cylinder temperature is calculated using the ideal gas law and not the first law of thermodynamics as it is during the gas exchange process. Therefore, the FPGA model only needs to calculate a temperature during combustion to use as an initialization value. The causal nature of the model means that the initialization value does not need to be exact and this opportunity was used to conserve FPGA resources.

Figure 15. Comparison of temperature calculated with offline physical model and online FPGA model

Figure 16 shows the air mass flow rate calculated on both models using equation 12. The flow rates are very similar with the main difference being that the FPGA model appearing smoother due to the limited sampling rate of the ECU processor as described above. As the mass flows of the models are very similar both models calculate a similar cylinder mass as shown in Figure 17.

Model flexibility

A physics based model can handle a wide range of operating conditions compared to a linearized model. This means that variations in engine speed, boost pressure and NVO can be handled by the model without the need to linearize the model at many operating points i.e. engine mapping. This makes the physics based model capable of handling many operating points and also allows for disturbances to be accurately included in the calculation.

To test the models ability to handle various operating points, three sweeps were performed; boost pressure, NVO duration and engine speed. These changes represent control variables for HCCI combustion timing that could be encountered in practical engine operation. Boost pressure

Figure 16. Comparison of cylinder mass flow calculated with offline physical model and online FPGA model

Figure 17. Comparison of trapped cylinder mass calculated with offline physical model and online FPGA model

can be used to increase the operation range, however, not for cycle-by-cycle control²⁰. Since the SCRE is equipped with a fully variable EMVT, an NVO sweep can be achieved in various ways. In this study, the NVO was kept symmetric around the gas-exchange TDC. The EVO and IVC were fixed during this sweep while EVC and IVO were symmetrically varied, starting at the largest NVO. The third sweep was a variation of engine speed. Autoignition requires time for the chemical reactions to occur and increased engine speed reduces the time the cylinder contents spend at increased temperature and pressure. Variations in engine speed are also expected in practical implementations of HCCI combustion so it is important that the model is able to handle this change in boundary conditions. The chosen operating points of these three sweeps are presented in Table 4.

To compare the offline and FPGA model at the various operating points, the fresh air ratio was derived from the continuous mass calculation. This is the ratio of the fresh air entering the combustion chamber during the intake event to the total cylinder mass defined as:

$$\text{Fresh Air Ratio} = \frac{m_{\text{fresh air}}}{m_{\text{total}}} = \frac{m_{\text{IVC}} - m_{\text{IVO}}}{m_{\text{IVC}}} \quad (15)$$

The fresh air ratio for a variety of NVO durations for 50 cycles is shown in Figure 18. Here the FPGA model is able to follow the trend of the offline physical model capturing the cyclic variance in the fresh air ratio which has an effect on HCCI combustion timing. As both models are physics based, they both capture the change in NVO duration.

To obtain a measure for the FPGA model accuracy, a relative error is defined as the percentual difference between FPGA and offline models of the fresh air ratio. Figure 19 shows the relative error for each cycle as well as the mean error and standard deviation, σ , over the 200 cycles for a specific measurement point. As can be concluded from the figure, the relative error for all 200 cycles remains below 4% in this measurement point. These values along with the maximum error over all 200 cycles for all 12 measurements have been listed in Table 4. As can be seen, the mean error fluctuates around zero for all measurements showing that there is not a bias in the model to over or under predict the fresh air ratio when compared to the offline physical model. The standard deviation σ , which gives information on the amount of variation of the individual points in the entire measurement, reaches a maximum of 1.70% during all three sweeps. This indicates that the relative errors are close to the mean, and that the FPGA model works well over a variety of operating points. A maximum error of 4.40% over all 12 measurements indicates that the FPGA model achieves a good match to the offline physical model.

Table 4. Difference in calculated fresh air ratio between FPGA and offline physical models for variation in engine speed, NVO and boost pressure. *Italics*: manipulated variable for each sweep

RPM [1/min]	NVO [°CA]	Boost [mbar]	IMEP [bar]	Mean Error [%]	Std σ Error [%]	Max Error [%]
1000	170	1013	2.94	-0.19	0.53	2.71
1250	170	1013	2.92	-0.22	0.59	3.13
1500	170	1013	2.64	-0.23	1.41	3.73
1700	170	1013	2.57	-0.34	1.43	2.31
1500	<i>197</i>	1013	2.04	-0.28	1.34	3.54
1500	<i>170</i>	1013	2.64	-0.23	1.41	3.73
1500	<i>150</i>	1013	2.77	-0.42	1.70	3.42
1500	<i>130</i>	1013	3.26	-0.35	1.27	2.30
1500	164	<i>967</i>	2.19	-0.20	1.24	4.05
1500	164	<i>1110</i>	2.63	-0.081	1.02	3.50
1500	164	<i>1200</i>	2.63	+0.16	1.22	4.40
1500	164	<i>1300</i>	2.79	-0.004	1.24	3.50

Conclusions and future work

The FGPA gas exchange model presented in this paper is real-time capable and has been experimentally validated to the physically based 0D offline Simulink and reference GT-Power® models. This validation has not only shown that the FPGA model matches the offline physical model at the desired operating point, but also for a wide range of operating points. Since the model is physical based, a

Figure 18. Fresh air ratio comparison for various NVO durations. Note that with increasing fresh air ratio the IMEP increases

Figure 19. Percent difference in fresh air ratio between models for NVO duration of 170°C

range of operating conditions can be accurately simulated without the need for parameterizing look-up tables that have been used in previous real-time gas exchange models. The physical basis of the model allows for more detailed physics to be added where needed to improve the accuracy of the model output. The process of converting governing physical equations to a real-time capable FPGA model has been demonstrated and can be applied to a variety of systems where rapid calculations are required.

The benefit of using FPGA hardware for implementation of the gas exchange process, is that the cylinder state is calculated after only 0.1°C. This offers the potential to implement new HCCI control strategies that require current cylinder state. These control strategies rely on real-time cylinder mass, temperature and residual gas fraction to implement in-cycle feedback controllers to extend the HCCI operation range and increase combustion stability. In-cycle water injection using the current cylinder state to control combustion timing is one application where the presented FPGA model can be used and is the subject of our future work.

Acknowledgements

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: This work was performed in preparation of the research group 2401, funded by DFG (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft) and with Natural Sciences Research Council of Canada Grant 2016-04646. Partial funding from Future Energy Systems at the University of Alberta is also gratefully acknowledged.

References

1. H. Breitbach, A. Waltner, T. Landefeld, and C. Schwarz, "Lean-burn stratified combustion at gasoline engines," *MTZ Worldwide*, vol. 74, no. 5, pp. 10–16, 2013.
2. P. Langen, T. Melcher, S. Missy, C. Schwarz und E. Schünemann, "Neue BMW Sechs- und Vierzylinder-Ottomotoren mit High Precision Injection und Schichtbrennverfahren," in *28. Internationales Wiener Motorensymposium 2007*.
3. A. Waltner, P. Lückert, U. Schaupp, E. Rau, R. Kemmler, and R. Weller, "Die Zukunftstechnologie des Ottomotors: strahlgeführte Direkteinspritzung mit Piezo- Injektor," in *27. Internationales Wiener Motorensymposium 2006*, pp. 24–43.
4. H. Zhao, *HCCI and CAI engines for the automotive industry*. Woodhead Publishing in mechanical engineering, Boca Raton FL and Cambridge, England: CRC Press and Woodhead Pub.,

- 2007.
5. P. Guibert, C. Morin, and S. Mokhtari, "Verbrennungssteuerung durch Selbstzündung," *MTZ - Motortechnische Zeitschrift*, vol. 65, no. 2, pp. 122–130, 2004.
6. C. Stan and P. Guibert, "Verbrennungssteuerung durch Selbstzündung," *MTZ - Motortechnische Zeitschrift*, vol. 65, no. 1, pp. 56–62, 2004.
7. A. Brassat, *Betriebsstrategien der kontrollierten Selbstzündung am aufgeladenen direkteinspritzenden Ottomotor*. Dissertation, RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, 07.10.2013.
8. C. Bücker, *Betriebsstrategien zur kontrollierten Selbstzündung in Ottomotoren*. Dissertation, RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, 2008.
9. A. Kulzer, W. Fischer, R. Karrelmeyer, C. Sauer, T. Wintrich, and K. Benninger, "Kontrollierte Selbstzündung beim Ottomotor CO₂ Einsparpotenziale," *MTZ - Motortechnische Zeitschrift*, vol. 70, no. 1, pp. 50–57, 2009.
10. D. Seebach, *Untersuchung der kontrollierten Selbstzündung an einem direkteinspritzenden Ottomotor und Modellierung des transienten Verhaltens*. Dissertation, RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, 22.10.2010.
11. K. Ebrahimi, *Model Based Control of Combustion Timing and Load in HCCI Engines*. Dissertation, University of Alberta, 2016.
12. R. K. Maurya and A. K. Agarwal, "Experimental study of combustion and emission characteristics of ethanol fuelled port injected homogeneous charge compression ignition (HCCI) combustion engine," *Applied Energy*, vol. 88, no. 4, pp. 1169–1180, 2011.
13. G. Haraldsson, P. Tunestl, B. Johansson, and J. Hyvnen, "HCCI combustion phasing with closed-loop combustion control using variable compression ratio in a multi cylinder engine," *SAE Technical Papers 2003-01-1830*, 2003.
14. L. Manofsky, J. Vavra, D. Assanis, and A. Babajimopoulos, "Bridging the gap between HCCI and SI: Spark-assisted compression ignition," *SAE Technical Papers 2011-01-1179*, 2011.
15. C. E. Slepicka, *Iterative Learning Control for Fuel Robust HCCI*. MSc thesis, University of Alberta, 2016.
16. P. Kirchen, M. Shahbakhti, and C. R. Koch, "A skeletal kinetic mechanism for PRF combustion in HCCI engines," *Combustion science and technology*, vol. 179, no. 6, pp. 1059–1083, 2007.
17. S. L. Kokjohn, R. M. Hanson, D. A. Splitter, and R. D. Reitz, "Experiments and modeling of dual-fuel HCCI and PCCI combustion using in-cylinder fuel blending," *SAE International Journal of Engines 2009-01-2647*, vol. 2, pp. 24–39, nov 2009.
18. A. Ghazimirsaid and C. R. Koch, "Controlling cyclic combustion timing variations using a symbol-statistics predictive approach in an HCCI engine," *Applied energy*, vol. 92, pp. 133–146, 2012.
19. S. Saxena and I. D. Bedoya, "Fundamental phenomena affecting low temperature combustion and HCCI engines, high load limits and strategies for extending these limits," *Progress in Energy and Combustion Science*, vol. 39, no. 5, pp. 457–488, 2013.
20. B. Lehrheuer, B. Morcinkowski, S. Pischinger, and M. Nijs, "Low temperature gasoline combustion – potential, challenges, process modeling and control," in *Active Flow and Combustion Control 2014* (R. King, ed.), vol. 127 of *Notes on numerical fluid mechanics and multidisciplinary design*, pp. 163–179, Cham: Springer, 2015.
21. J. Andert, *Modellbasierte Echtzeioptimierung der ottomotorischen Selbstzündung*. Dissertation, RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, 05.06.2012.
22. E. Hellstrom, J. Larimore, S. Jade, A. G. Stefanopoulou, and L. Jiang, "Reducing cyclic variability while regulating combustion phasing in a four-cylinder HCCI engine," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 1190–1197, 2014.
23. J. Larimore, *Experimental Analysis and Control of Recompression Homogeneous Charge Compression Ignition Combustion at the High Cyclic Variability Limit*. Dissertation, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 2014.
24. B. Morcinkowski, *Simulative Analyse von zyklischen Schwankungen der kontrollierten ottomotorischen Selbstzündung*. Dissertation, RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, 2015.
25. A. Vaughan, *Adaptive Machine Learning for Modeling and Control of Non-Stationary, Near Chaotic Combustion in Real-Time*. Dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA, 2015.
26. A. Vaughan and S. V. Bohac, "A cycle-to-cycle method to predict hcci combustion phasing," in *ASME 2013 Internal Combustion Engine Division Fall Technical Conference*, pp. V001T03A026–V001T03A026, American Society of Mechanical Engineers, 2013.
27. K. Ebrahimi and C. Koch, "Model predictive control for combustion timing and load control in HCCI engines," in *SAE Technical Paper 2015-01-0822*, SAE International, 04 2015.
28. S. Choi, M. Ki, and K. Min, "Development of an on-line model to predict the in-cylinder residual gas fraction by using the measured intake/exhaust and cylinder pressures," *International Journal of Automotive Technology*, vol. 11, no. 6, pp. 773–781, 2010.
29. J. Pfluger, J. Andert, H. Ross, and F. Mertens, "Rapid control prototyping for cylinder pressure indication," *MTZ Worldwide*, vol. 73, no. 11, pp. 38–42, 2012.
30. S. Trajkovic, A. Milosavljevic, P. Tunestl, and B. Johansson, "FPGA controlled pneumatic variable valve actuation," in *SAE 2006 World Congress & Exhibition*, SAE International, apr 2006.
31. C. Wilhelmsson, P. Tunestl, and B. Johansson, "FPGA based engine feedback control algorithms," in *FISITA 2006 World Automotive Congress*, JSAE, 2006.
32. M. Wick, B. Lehrheuer, T. Albin, J. Andert, and S. Pischinger, "Decoupling of consecutive gasoline controlled auto-ignition combustion cycles by field programmable gate array based real-time cylinder pressure analysis," *International Journal of Engine Research*, April 2017.
33. J. K. Arora and M. Shahbakhti, "Real-time closed-loop control of a light-duty RCCI engine during transient operations," in *SAE Technical Paper 2017-01-0767*, SAE International, 03 2017.
34. G. P. Merker, C. Schwarz, and R. Teichmann, "Grundlagen Verbrennungsmotoren," *Simulation der Gemischbildung, Verbrennung, Schadstoffbildung und Aufladung*, vol. 4, 2009.
35. R. Pischinger, M. Klell, and T. Sams, *Thermodynamik der Verbrennungskraftmaschine*. Springer-Verlag, 2009.
36. G. Woschni, "A universally applicable equation for the instantaneous heat transfer coefficient in the internal combustion engine," tech. rep., SAE Technical paper 670931, 1967.

37. J. Chang, O. Güralp, Z. Filipi, D. N. Assanis, T.-W. Kuo, P. Najt, and R. Rask, "New heat transfer correlation for an hcci engine derived from measurements of instantaneous surface heat flux," tech. rep., SAE Technical paper, 2004.
38. G. Hohenberg, *Experimentelle Erfassung der Wandwärme von Kolbenmotoren*. PhD thesis, Universität Graz, 1980.
39. H. Soyhan, H. Yasar, H. Walmsley, B. Head, G. Kalghatgi, and C. Sorousbay, "Evaluation of heat transfer correlations for hcci engine modeling," *Applied Thermal Engineering*, vol. 29, no. 2-3, pp. 541–549, 2009.
40. P. D. I. G. Wachtmeister, *Motordynamik und Brennverfahren*. 2012.
41. E. Justi, "Die Dissoziation," in *Spezifische Wärme Enthalpie, Entropie und Dissoziation technischer Gase*, pp. 123–141, Springer, 1938.
42. F. Zacharias, *Analytische Darstellung der thermodynamischen Eigenschaften von Verbrennungsgasen*. 1966.
43. J. B. Heywood et al., *Internal combustion engine fundamentals*, vol. 930. Mcgraw-hill New York, 1988.
44. R. Van Basshuysen and F. Schäfer, *Handbuch Verbrennungsmotor: Grundlagen, Komponenten, Systeme, Perspektiven*. Springer-Verlag, 2014.
45. A. Kronich, *Methodik zur Entwicklung eines vollvariablen Ventiltriebes*. PhD thesis, Technische Universität Kaiserslautern, 2006.
46. S. Hauck and A. DeHon, *Reconfigurable computing: the theory and practice of FPGA-based computation*, vol. 1. Morgan Kaufmann, 2010.
47. D. Jung and D. Assanis, "Multi-zone DI diesel spray combustion model for cycle simulation studies of engine performance and emissions," *SAE Technical Papers*, 2001.