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A Nonlinear Model Predictive Control Strategy for Glucose Control in People with Type 1 Diabetes

Dimitri Boiroux, John Bagterp Jørgensen

Abstract: In this paper, we evaluate the closed-loop performance of a control algorithm for the treatment of type 1 diabetes (T1D) identified from prior continuous glucose monitor (CGM) data. The control algorithm is based on nonlinear model predictive control (NMPC). At each iteration, we solve an optimal control problem (OCP) using a sequential quadratic programming algorithm with multiple shooting and sensitivity computation. The control algorithm uses a physiological model of T1D to predict future blood glucose (BG) concentrations. The T1D physiological model takes into account the dynamics between subcutaneously administered insulin and blood glucose, the contribution of meal absorption and the lag and noise of CGM measurements. The model parameters have been identified using prior data. Numerical simulations on 10 patients show that the NMPC algorithm is safe and is able to optimize the insulin delivery in patients with T1D.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Type 1 diabetes (T1D) is an autoimmune disease causing the destruction of the insulin-producing β-cells of the pancreas. People with T1D rely on exogenously administered insulin to regulate their blood glucose (BG) concentration. Usual insulin therapy consists of a combination of basal insulin and insulin boluses. Basal insulin compensates for endogenous glucose production from the liver, whereas boluses are administered at mealtimes to mitigate post-prandial glucose excursions. Currently, the decision on the amounts of insulin to administer is made by the patient him/herself.

The artificial pancreas (AP) refers to closed-loop of BG concentration for T1D, and has the potential to partially or fully automate the insulin therapy for people with T1D. Current AP prototypes comprise a CGM, a control algorithm and an insulin pump. The CGM provides frequent interstitial glucose measurements (at least every 5 minutes, but more frequent measurements are also possible). The estimator computes the state estimates and predictions through an extended Kalman filter (EKF) and identifies the parameters of the T1D model using maximum likelihood. The detector detects faulty CGM measurements, eg. drifts, as well as meal time and size by using a specific algorithm for meal estimation (Turksoy et al. (2016); Mahmoudi et al. (2016, 2017); Samadi et al. (2018)). The MPC algorithm uses the model and states provided by the Kalman filter and meal information to predict and optimize future insulin injections. Smart bolus calculators may be used to compute prandial insulin boluses (Marchetti et al. (2008); Schmidt et al. (2012); Boiroux et al. (2015, 2017)). A continuous subcutaneous insulin infusion (CSII) pump implements the suggested basal and/or boluses using the subcutaneous (sc.) route. Fig. 1 illustrates the AP.

Model predictive control (MPC) is a model-based control technology. At each iteration, the control algorithm optimizes the predicted outcome of a given system by solving an optimal control problem (OCP). Nonlinear model predictive control (NMPC) algorithms have already shown promising closed-loop performance in the case where full state information is available (Boiroux et al. (2010a)). Nonlinear filters such as the extended and unscented Kalman filters can estimate the meal size and track the insulin sensitivity (Boiroux et al. (2015)). The NMPC-based approach has the advantage to incorporate the physiological model of the patient, the constraints on insulin injections, the insulin on board, the effects of CHO absorption, the physiological lags and delays in an intuitive, unified and straightforward manner.

In this paper, we present and evaluate the closed-loop performance of a NMPC-based control algorithm for T1D with parameters identified from prior data. The physiological T1D is formulated as a stochastic model in continuous time with discrete-time measurements. We assess the performance of our control algorithm on a virtual population of 10 patients with T1D.

This paper is structured as follows. Section 2 presents the identifiable physiological model of T1D and the identified parameters for 10 virtual patients. Section 3 presents the continuous-discrete extended Kalman filter. In Section 4, we briefly state the OCP used in our control algorithm. In Section 5, we discuss the formulation of the objective
function. Section 6 illustrates the closed-loop performance of our control algorithm on a population of 10 patients. Section 7 summarizes the main contribution of this paper.

2. PHYSIOLOGICAL MODEL OF GLUCOSE-INSULIN DYNAMICS

In this section, we present a minimal physiological model derived from the model by Kanderian et al. (2009). This model describes the glucose-insulin dynamics, the meal absorption, and the lag and noise from CGMs. Fig. 2 illustrates the MVP model. The CGM noise model has been developed by Facchinetti et al. (2014). We add diffusion terms to reformulate the MVP model as a stochastic model in the form

\[ dx(t) = f(t, x(t), u(t), d(t), \theta)dt + \sigma(\theta)dw(t), \]

\[ y_k = g(x_k) + v_k, \]

in which \( x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n_x \) is a vector containing the states variables, and \( y_k \in \mathbb{R}^n_y \) is a vector containing the output variables measured at discrete times. \( u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n_u \) is a vector containing the manipulated inputs, and \( d(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n_d \) is a vector containing the uncontrolled disturbances. \( \{w(t), t \geq 0\} \) is a standard Wiener process, i.e. \( dw(t) \sim N(0, Idt) \). \( \theta \in \mathbb{R}^n_\theta \) is a vector containing the parameters to be estimated. The matrix \( \sigma(\theta) \) is time-invariant and assumed to be diagonal. The measurement noise, \( v_k \), is independently normally distributed, \( v_k \sim N_{iid}(0, R(\theta)) \). Also, we assume that the initial state, \( x_0 \), is normally distributed with a known mean and covariance, \( x_0 \sim N(x_{0-1}(\theta), F_{0-1}(\theta)) \).

2.1 Insulin Absorption Subsystem

The insulin absorption subsystem is given by the following two-compartment model

\[ dI_{SC} = k_1 \left( \frac{u(t)}{C_I} - I_{SC}(t) \right)dt + \sigma_1 dw_1, \]

\[ dI_P = k_2 (I_{SC}(t) - I_P(t))dt + \sigma_2 dw_2, \]

where \( I_{SC}(t) \) [mU/L/min] is the subcutaneous insulin concentration, and \( I_P(t) \) [mU/L] is the plasma insulin concentration. \( u(t) \) [mU/min] is the insulin infusion rate, \( C_I \) [L/min] is the clearance rate.

2.2 Insulin-Glucose Dynamics

The effect of insulin on blood glucose is described by the following SDEs

\[ dI_{EFF} = (-p_2 I_{EFF}(t) + p_2 S_I I_P(t))dt + \sigma_3 dw_3, \]

\[ dG = (-I_{EFF}(t) + GEGP)G(t) + EGP + R_A(t)dt + \sigma_4 dw_4. \]

\( I_{EFF}(t) \) [min\(^{-1}\)] is the effect of insulin. \( S_I \) [mL/mU] reflects the insulin sensitivity. The glucose concentration \( G(t) \) [mg/dL] is also affected by the endogenous glucose production \( (EGP) \) [mg/dL/min] and the rate of appearance contribution from the meals, \( R_A(t) \) [mg/dL/min].

2.3 CHO Absorption Model

We use the two-compartment model introduced by Hovorka et al. Hovorka et al. (2004) to describe the carbohydrates (CHO) absorption from meals and conversion to glucose. The model describes the effect of orally ingested carbohydrates on the rate of appearance of glucose \( R_A(t) \) [mg/dL/min] in the blood stream. The CHO absorption model is

\[ dD_1 = \left( \frac{d(t) - D_1(t)}{\tau_G} \right)dt + \sigma_5 dw_5, \]

\[ dD_2 = \left( \frac{D_1(t) - D_2(t)}{\tau_G} \right)dt + \sigma_6 dw_6, \]

\[ R_A(t) = D_2(t) \frac{k_m}{V_G}. \]

\( d(t) \) [mg/min] is the meal intake. \( k_m \) [min] is the inverse of the meal absorption time constant and \( V_G \) [dL\(^{-1}\)] is the glucose distribution volume.

2.4 CGM Model

We use here the CGM model from Facchinetti et al. (2014). This model represents the glucose transport from plasma to interstitial tissues and the sensor noise. The equation describing glucose transport is

\[ dG_I = \frac{1}{\tau_{G,1}} (G(t) - G_I(t)) dt + \sigma_7 dw_7. \]
where the time constant $\tau_{G,l}$ is 6.7 min. The sensor noise is represented by the sum of the two following autoregressive processes

$$c_{c,k} = 1.23 cc_{c,k-1} - 0.3995 cc_{c,k-2} + w_{cc,k},$$

$$\dot{v}_k = 1.013 \dot{v}_{k-1} - 0.2135 \dot{v}_{k-2} + w_k,$$

in which $w_{cc,k} \sim N(0,11.3 \text{ mg}^2/\text{dL}^2)$ and $w_k \sim N(0,14.45 \text{ mg}^2/\text{dL}^2)$. Thus, the discrete noise-corrupted value returned by the glucose sensor and used in (1b) at the time $t_k$ is

$$y_k = G_1(t_k) + cc_k + \dot{v}_k.$$

2.5 Model identification

The terms related to time constants, $k_1$, $k_2$ and $p_2$, as well as the glucose effectiveness at zero insulin, GEZI, are highly uncertain. Therefore, based on our previous work and these observations in Boiroux et al. (2016), we suggest the following simplifications: (i) We use only one term to describe the inverse of the time constants, $k_1$, $k_2$ and $p_2$, (ii) we fix the insulin clearance rate, $C_I$, because it cannot be distinguished from the insulin sensitivity within only CGM measurements are available, (iii) we set $GEZI = 0$ and (iv) we only identify the diffusion term related to blood glucose concentration, $\sigma_d$.

We identify the model parameters in our model using maximum likelihood combined with the continuous-discrete extended Kalman filter described in the next section (Kristensen et al. (2004)). The full details regarding the model identification are provided in Boiroux et al. (2018). Table 1 provides a summary of the identified model parameters for the 10 virtual patients. Fig. 3 shows the BG concentration and CGM measurements, the insulin concentration and the 10 virtual patients. Fig. 3 shows the BG concentration and CGM measurements, the insulin concentration and the 10 virtual patients.

3. CONTINUOUS-DISCRETE EXTENDED KALMAN FILTER

The CDEKF is used for state estimation of continuous-discrete grey-box models (Jazwinski (1970); Nørgaard et al. (2000)). In this paper, we use the CDEKF for model identification and in the control algorithm. The filtering in the CDEKF describes the steps used to compute the filtered state, $\hat{x}_{k|k}$, and the corresponding covariance, $P_{k|k}$. The filter step assumes availability of the one-step predictions, $\hat{x}_{k|k-1}$ and $P_{k|k-1}$.

The predictive filter gain is computed by

$$R_{e,k} = C_k P_{k|k-1} C_k^T + R,$$

$$K_k = P_{k|k-1} C_k^T R_{e,k}^{-1},$$

and the innovation is obtained by

$$e_k = y_k - C_k \hat{x}_{k|k-1},$$

where

$$C_k = \partial g/\partial x(\hat{x}_{k|k-1}).$$

This provides a linearization of the output function $g$ evaluated at $\hat{x}_{k|k-1}$.

The filtered state, $\hat{x}_{k|k}$, and its covariance $P_{k|k}$ are given by

$$\hat{x}_{k|k} = \hat{x}_{k|k-1} + K_k e_k,$$

$$P_{k|k} = P_{k|k-1} - K_k R_{e,k} K_k^T.$$

The predicted mean-covariance pair of the state estimate, $\hat{x}_{k+1|k} = \hat{x}_k(t_{k+1})$ and $P_{k+1|k} = F_k(t_{k+1})$, is computed as the solution to the system of coupled ordinary differential equations (Jørgensen and Jørgensen (2007))

$$\frac{dx_k(t)}{dt} = f(t, x_k(t), u_k),$$

$$\frac{dp_k(t)}{dt} = A_k(t) P_k(t) + P_k(t) A_k(t)^T + \sigma\sigma^T,$$

with

$$A_k(t) = A(t, x_k(t), u_k),$$

The initial conditions for (9a)-(9b) are

$$\hat{x}_k(t_k) = x_{k|k},$$

$$P_k(t_k) = P_{k|k}.$$

4. OPTIMAL CONTROL PROBLEM

We assume a zero-order hold parametrization of the input vector, $u(t)$ and the disturbance vector, $d(t)$. At each iteration, the NMPC algorithm will have to solve an optimal control problem in the form

$$\min_{\{x_{k+1}, u_{k}\in\mathbb{R}^N\}} \phi = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} G_k(x_k, u_k, d_k) + h(x_N)$$

s.t. $b_k := F_k(x_k, u_k, d_k) - x_{k+1} = 0,$

$x(t_0) = x_0,$

$u_{\min} \leq u_k \leq u_{\max}.$

The function describing the state dynamics is

$$F_k(x_k, u_k, d_k) = \{x(t_{k+1}) : \dot{x}(t) = f(x(t), u_k, d_k), x(t_k) = x_k\},$$

The discrete time stage cost is

$$G_k(x_k, u_k, d_k) = \left\{ \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} g(x(t), u_k, d_k) \, dt : \dot{x}(t) = f(x(t), u_k, d_k), x(t_k) = x_k \right\}.$$
for the numerical integration of the state dynamics, the objective function and for computation of the sensitivities of the objective function and the constraints. The initial state, $x_0$, is estimated by the CDEKF.

4.1 SQP algorithm

We define the parameter vector, $p$, as

$$p = [u'_1, x'_1, u'_2, x'_2, \ldots, x'_{N-1}, u'_{N-1}, x'_{N}]' .$$

We compute the residuals as

$$b(p) = b(p, x_0, d) = \begin{bmatrix} F_0(x_0, u_0, d_0) - x_1 \\ F_1(x_1, u_1, d_1) - x_2 \\ \vdots \\ F_{N-1}(x_{N-1}, u_{N-1}, d_{N-1}) - x_N \end{bmatrix} .$$

Using these notations, we reformulate the discrete-time OCP (12) as a constrained optimization problem in the standard SQP form

$$\min_p \phi(p) = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} G_k(x_k, u_k, d) + h(x_N) ,$$

s.t. \begin{align*}
    b(p) = 0, \\
    c(p) \geq 0, \\
    u_{\text{min}} \leq u_k \leq u_{\text{max}}
\end{align*}

in which $c(p)$ corresponds to the bound constraints.

5. OBJECTIVE FUNCTION

In this section, we present and discuss the choice of the objective function. The objective function, $\phi$, is a function of the BG concentration, $z(t)$, and the variations in insulin infusion rates, $\Delta u_k$. It is

$$\phi = \int_{t_0}^{t_f} \rho_z(z(t))dt + \rho_{\Delta u}(\Delta u_k) .$$

The BG penalty function penalizes the deviation of the predicted BG concentration, $z(t)$, to a given setpoint, $\bar{z}$.

The quadratic glucose penalty function are defined as

$$\rho_z(z) = \frac{1}{2}(z - \bar{z})^2 ,$$
$$\rho_{z_{\text{min}}}(z) = \frac{1}{2}(\min\{z - z_{\text{min}}, 0\})^2 ,$$
$$\rho_{z_{\text{max}}}(z) = \frac{1}{2}(\max\{z - z_{\text{max}}, 0\})^2 ,$$

where $\bar{z}$ is the desired glucose target, $z_{\text{min}}$ and $z_{\text{max}}$ are thresholds for hypoglycemia (BG<70 mg/dL) and hyperglycemia (BG>180 mg/dL), respectively. The resulting penalty function is

$$\rho_z(z) = \alpha_{\bar{z}} \rho_z(z) + \alpha_{z_{\text{min}}} \rho_{z_{\text{min}}}(z) + \alpha_{z_{\text{max}}} \rho_{z_{\text{max}}}(z) ,$$

in which $\alpha_{\bar{z}}$, $\alpha_{z_{\text{min}}}$ and $\alpha_{z_{\text{max}}}$ are weights. Since hypoglycemia is much more undesirable than hyperglycemia and postprandial hyperglycemia is unavoidable, we set high penalties for BG concentrations below 4 mmol/L and we do not set any additional penalty on hyperglycemic BG concentrations, i.e. $\alpha_{z_{\text{max}}}$ = 0. Fig. 4 illustrates the asymmetrical cost function.

It is possible to normalize the weight on the $\ell_2$ penalty for $\Delta u$ by setting the following scaling

$$\rho_{\Delta u}(\Delta u) = \frac{1}{2} \alpha_{\Delta u} T_s \Delta u^2 ,$$

in which $T_s$ is the sampling time, such that the tuning of the controller remains identical regardless of the sampling time.

6. RESULTS

In this section, we evaluate the closed-loop performance of our NMPC-based control algorithm using numerical simulations of a stochastic model. To simulate the intra-patient variability, we consider a SDE version of the T1D model in the form of (1). The model for simulation is derived from the model and the parameter distribution developed by (Hovorka et al., 2002). We use the Euler-Maruyama method to solve the SDE system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient</th>
<th>$k_1, k_2, p_2$ (min$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$S_f$ (mL/mU/min)</th>
<th>$EGF_P$ (mg/dL/min)</th>
<th>$1/V_G$ (dL$^{-1}$) (min$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$k_m$ (mg/dL/min)</th>
<th>$\sigma_{x_{\text{f}}}$ (mg/dL/min)</th>
<th>$k_1/k_m$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.0017</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.0082</td>
<td>0.0226</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.0011</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.0014</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.0019</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.0059</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.0024</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.0018</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.0020</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.0016</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.0011</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.0036</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.0044</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.0008</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.0039</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.0013</td>
<td>0.958</td>
<td>0.0074</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
method for numerical integration, see eg. Higham (2001). The patients have the following meals: a 75g CHO breakfast at 6:00, a 100g CHO lunch at 12:00 and a 75g CHO dinner at 18:00. The meals are announced to the controller at mealtimes only. We set $u_{\text{min}} = 0$ to allow insulin suspension and we set the maximal insulin infusion rate, $u_{\text{max}}$, to a large value such that it is not limiting the performance of the control algorithm. Fig. 5 shows the BG concentration traces and the insulin infusion rates for the 10 virtual patients. The variability between the patients becomes large after meals, depending on the sc. insulin and meal absorption time constants. The insulin profile shows a bolus-like impulse followed by a suspension of insulin delivery for all patients, sometimes referred to as a super-bolus. Clinical studies have shown that using a super-bolus strategy tightens the regulation of BG concentration and reduces the occurrence of postprandial hypoglycemia (Rossetti et al. (2012); Boronat et al. (2015)).

Fig. 6 depicts the control variability grid analysis (CVGA) plot for the 10 patients. Only one patient had a mild hypoglycemic event before breakfast. The large postprandial glucose excursions are mainly caused by the large meal sizes and the ratio between time-to-peak of meal absorption and time-to-peak of insulin absorption (Boiroux et al. (2010b); El Fathi et al. (2018)).

7. CONCLUSION

In this paper we developed an NMPC-based control algorithm. Parameter identification is used to handle inter-patient variability and to adjust for long-term metabolic variations. We numerically evaluated the performance of our control algorithm. The results suggest that the estimation of model parameters involved in NMPC algorithms using CGM data is promising for the design of an AP. Currently, the slow insulin dynamics compared to CHO absorption dynamics limit the performance of the AP. Personalized diet in complement to control algorithms could further improve glucose regulation by reducing postprandial peaks.
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