Improving Control Stability for a Robot Arm Packaging System Using Fuzzy Optimization

Zhimin Lu, Shouquan Gao, Wei Wu, Hongli Deng*, Wencan Li, Weiwei Zhang, Mengling Huang
Longyan Tobacco Industry Co., Ltd.,
No. 1299 Shengfeng Rd, Xinluo District, Longyan 364021, China
*1012240592@qq.com; gsq22572@fjtic.cn; ww23017@fjtic.cn; *dhl23399@fjtic.cn; lwc22355@fjtic.cn; zww22404@fjtic.cn; hml23122@fjtic.cn*

***Abstract*—This work addresses the issue of insufficient control stability in the robotic arm feeding system on the packaging production line by proposing an adaptive algorithm based on the fuzzy-optimized proportional-integral-derivative (PID) controller. By establishing the Denavit-Hartenberg (D-H) kinematic model of the robotic arm and combining the MATLAB Robot Toolbox with the SIMULINK simulation platform, a fuzzy controller was designed with amplitude deviation and deviation rate as inputs to dynamically adjust the PID parameters. Hardware integration was achieved based on the Mitsubishi FX2N series programmable logic controller (PLC). Simulation results show that the adjustment time of the fuzzy PID control is 0.45 s, which is reduced by 25 % compared to the traditional PID (i.e., 0.6 s), with the overshoot reduced from 6 % to 0 % and the steady-state error stabilized at 0 mm. Through 10 sets of actual picking experiments, it was verified that the average time error under fuzzy PID control is 0.37 s with a standard deviation of 0.23 s, which is a reduction of 55.4 % and 85.6 % compared to traditional PID and direct start-up, respectively, which significantly improves the stability and efficiency of the robotic arm feeding system. This study proves that fuzzy PID, through dynamic parameter optimization and disturbance compensation, can effectively address the control response delay and error accumulation of the robotic arm under non-ideal operating conditions, providing a high-precision and high-robustness solution for industrial packaging automation.**

***Index Terms*—Industrial control; Fuzzy control; PID controller; Experimental test.**

I. INTRODUCTION

The stability operation of the tobacco packaging production line directly influences production efficiency, cost control, product quality, and sustainable development. Currently, the technological development of the cigarette packaging still faces many challenges. Many traditional devices rely on manual operation and fail to integrate advanced automation technologies efficiently, leading to instability in the production process, wasted time and resources, and a negative impact on overall production efficiency. In addition, the intelligence level of the current controller in the packaging production line is very low, reducing the overall collaborative efficiency of the production line. Therefore, there is an urgent need for automation innovation in the cigarette packaging process, especially to improve intelligence and digitalization.

Introducing intelligent control technology will enable flexible production in response to market demand. Through these technological innovations, not only can production efficiency be improved and labor costs reduced, but product quality and the sustainability of the production line can also be effectively enhanced. Fuzzy theory is regarded as the most practical artificial intelligence (AI) in industry to improve control performance [1]. Existing studies have demonstrated that fuzzy optimization can be used for industrial applications to improve the production control performance. However, very limited work has been reported on the tobacco packaging production line using the fuzzy-based control strategy. Based on the existing studies, it is reasonable to introduce the fuzzy method into the robotic arm feeding system of the tobacco packaging production line to enhance the system control stability to improve the production quality and efficiency.

This paper addresses the design of a robotic arm to achieve automatic cigarette grabbing and packing. A fuzzy PID controller is proposed to improve the control stability of the robotic arm feeding system. By establishing the robotic arm motion model, the motion process of the arm is analysed. Based on the functional requirements for cigarette feeding, both simulation analysis and experimental evaluation have been carried out. The results demonstrate high control stability of the robotic arm feeding process.

The rest of this work is organized as follows. Section II describes the related work. Section III establishes the robotic arm motion model. Section IV proposes the fuzzy PID controller and analyses the simulation control results. Section V performs the experimental evaluation, and Section VI draws the conclusions.

II. RELATED WORK

The stability operation of the tobacco packaging production line directly influences production efficiency, cost control, product quality, and sustainable development. Currently, PID control is the mainstream technique in real-world applications. However, the PID parameters are fixed during the PID control process, which cannot adapt to the changes in production line operation due to external interference and noise [2].

Fuzzy logic is capable of tuning the PID parameters in a real-time manner. Wang *et al.* [3] implemented continuous

Manuscript received 2 February, 2026; accepted 2 April, 2026.

adjustment of cotton picking speed, conveyor belt speed, and fan speed of the robotic arm based on fuzzy PID control theory. Ren, Yang, and Meng [4] designed a fuzzy adaptive PID control system for the packaging machine weighing system and performed the entire control process with the PLC hardware, making the weighing process more accurate and responsive. Alavandar and Nigam [5] applied fuzzy PID controllers for visual servo control, enhancing the precision and flexibility of robots in performing grasping and manipulation tasks in dynamic environments. Cen *et al.* [6] achieved precise target positioning and control of the robotic arm using proximal policy optimization with a fuzzy PID controller. Srivastava *et al.* [7] demonstrated strong robustness and adaptability by applying fuzzy neural control to robotic arm control, especially in dealing with dynamic changes and uncertainties. Yang, Zhang, Xu, and Yan [8] applied the Takagi-Sugeno (T-S) fuzzy model to robotic arm control, ensuring asymptotic stability of the closed-loop control system and optimizing the transient performance of the robotic arm. Jiang, Wang, Zhang, and Yang [9] demonstrated that robotic arms controlled by a fuzzy neural network (FNN) controller exhibit fast response, small overshoot, and minimal oscillation. Armendariz, Parra-Vega, García-Rodríguez, and Rosales [10] used a PID controller with constant feedback gain, ensuring system dissipation through carefully designed damping injection, and guaranteed semi-global exponential convergence using the Lyapunov stability theory, resulting in more precise robotic arm motion. Chhabra, Mohan, Rani, and Singh [11] proposed a nonlinear fuzzy PD-I controller based on fractional order calculus, providing more precise and stable control for robotic arms. Adar, Tiryaki, and Kozan [12] proposed a novel control strategy based on a fuzzy PD + I controller for the trajectory tracking control of a six-degree-of-freedom PUMA robotic arm, making the controller more concise and efficient. Raković *et al.* [13] focused on fuzzy logic controllers to control the brushless DC motor of a hand drive with underactuated fingers, ensuring precise control. Alizadeh, Samaei, Estakhri, Momeni, and Beheshti [14] proposed an innovative super-twisting fast non-singular terminal sliding mode control strategy, specifically addressing trajectory control problem of a three-degree-of-freedom robotic arm, significantly improving the trajectory tracking accuracy and system response performance.

It can be concluded that fuzzy logic is a perfect match to the PID controller in practical applications. However, very limited work has been reported on the tobacco packaging production line using the fuzzy-based control strategy. It is reasonable to explore the fuzzy PID control on the packaging production line.

III. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE ROBOTIC ARM MODEL

A. D-H Transformation

The present robotic arm is illustrated in Fig. 1. The robotic arm model is analysed using the D-H method. The D-H method describes the spatial relationship between two adjacent links by establishing the coordinate systems on each axis and using a 4×4 homogeneous transformation matrix. The D-H transformation is established based on the physical diagram of the robotic arm, as shown in Fig. 2. The parameters for each link of the robotic arm can be determined using the following four parameters, where the first two parameters describe the relationship between two adjacent link axes, while the other two describe the relationship between two adjacent links.

1. Link twist angle: the angle at which the link axis *i*-1 rotates around the common perpendicular to reach the link axis *i*.
2. Link length: the distance along the common perpendicular from the link axis *i*-1 to the link axis *i*.
3. Link rotation angle: the angle at which link *i*-1 rotates around the link axis *i* to reach link *i*.
4. Link offset: the distance along the common axis from the link *i*-1 to the link *i*.



Fig. 1. Physical diagram of the robotic arm.




Fig. 2. Reference diagram of the D-H coordinate system.

B. Robot Arm Model

Generally, the spatial position transformation of the robotic

arm links involves compound transformations, often requiring coordinate composite transformations to determine the transformation laws and, consequently, the motion form of the robotic arm in space. When the origin and direction of coordinate system *A* differ from those of coordinate system *B*, the transformation from coordinate system *A* to *B* is called a composite transformation. The mathematical expression for the transformation of point *P* from *A* to *B* is

$$^{A}P = R^{B}P + {}^{A}P_{B}. \tag{1}$$

Starting from the base of the robotic arm and performing the coordinate transformations to the end effector, each transformation is designated as *A*. The transformation matrices should be sequentially as follows

$$^{0}_{T}T = {}^{0}_{1}T\,{}^{1}_{2}T\,{}^{2}_{3}T\cdots{}^{n-1}_{n}T = A_1A_2A_3\cdots A_n. \tag{2}$$

The formula to calculate the transformation matrix **T** is

$$\begin{aligned}{}^{i-1}_{i}T = A_i &= \mathrm{Rot}(z,\theta_i)\,\mathrm{Trans}(0,0,\mathrm{d}_i)\,\mathrm{Trans}(\mathrm{l}_i,0,0)\,\mathrm{Rot}(\mathrm{x},\alpha_i) = \\ &= \begin{bmatrix}\cos\theta_i & -\sin\theta_i & 0 & 0\\ \sin\theta_i & \cos\theta_i & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}1 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 1 & d_i\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}1 & 0 & 0 & d_i\\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}1 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & \cos\theta_i & -\sin\theta_i & 0\\ 0 & \sin\theta_i & \cos\theta_i & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1\end{bmatrix} = \\ &= \begin{bmatrix}\cos\theta_i & -\sin\theta_i\cos\alpha_i & \sin\theta_i\sin\alpha_i & l_i\cos\theta_i\\ \sin\theta_i & \cos\theta_i\cos\alpha_i & -\cos\theta_i\sin\alpha_i & l_i\sin\theta_i\\ 0 & \sin\alpha_i & \cos\alpha_i & d_i\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1\end{bmatrix}.\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

The robotic arm model is established using the Robot Toolbox in MATLAB, as shown in Fig. 3, and the data in Table I describe the trajectory of the robotic arm when picking up the cigarette sticks from the cigarette sorting mechanism to the cigarette box. The model is built using the Denavit-Hartenberg (D-H) parameter table and the link function by taking into account the link angles, link rotation angles, link lengths, link twists, and link types.

The expression for the link function is

$$L(i) = LinK\left(\left[\theta_i, d_i, \beta_i, \alpha_i\right], \text{'standard'}\right), \tag{4}$$

where *i* presents the link number, θ denotes the link rotation angle, *d* denotes the link offset, α_i denotes the link twist angle, β_i denotes the link length, and the standard function is adopted.




Fig. 3. Robotic arm model.

TABLE I. ROBOT D-H PARAMETER TABLE.

Number of links	Link twist angle (α_i)	Link rotation angle (θ_i)	Link length (β_i)	Link offset (d_i)	Rotation angle range/degree
1	-90	θ_1	175	495	$-90 \le \theta_1 \le 180$
2	0	θ_2	1095	0	$-90 \le \theta_2 \le 150$
3	-90	θ_3	175	0	$-180 \le \theta_3 \le 75$
4	90	θ_4	0	1270	$-400 \leqslant \theta_4 \leqslant 400$
5	90	θ_5	0	0	$-125 \le \theta_5 \le 120$
6	0	θ_6	0	135	$-400 \le \theta_6 \le 400$

IV. FUZZY PID CONTROL FOR ROBOT ARM

A. Controller Design

The control stability of the robot arm when grasping the production is related to the frequency and amplitude of the robotic vibration. When the vibration frequency is high, the amplitude of the robotic arm is large, resulting in stronger vibrational impacts that affect the stability and continuity of the robot grasping process. The traditional PID controller can adjust the control deviation to stabilize the system; however, fixed PID parameters and slow control response make it difficult to achieve stable control of the grasping amplitude for robotic arms. To resolve this issue, a fuzzy PID controller is designed, as shown in Fig. 4. In the controller, an amplitude sensor collects the amplitude value δ to compare with the control reference *u*; the obtained deviation *e* and its change rate *ec* between the measured value and the reference value are used as the input variables for the fuzzy inference module. Through fuzzy inference, the values of the PID parameters *Kp*, *Ki*, and *Kd* are adaptively optimized during the control process. Therefore, the fuzzy inference for the robotic arm is a single-variable control system with two inputs and three outputs.




Fig. 4. Fuzzy PID Controller design.

The fuzzy inference module is established using the

MATLAB Fuzzy Logic Toolbox. The Mamdani inference is employed with the centroid method for solving the fuzzy inference, the minimum method is used for the fuzzy rules, and the maximum method is adopted for the fuzzy rule composition.

The number of fuzzy subsets determines the control accuracy; a large number of subsets will produce a higher control accuracy but will require more computational resources. Based on the computational feasibility and practical experience, it is generally recommended to use 3 to 10 levels of the subsets. Considering the actual response speed and computational load of the robotic arm, the input and output variables of the controller are divided into 7 levels. The fuzzy sets for the input parameters *e* and *ec*, as well as the output parameters *Kp*, *Ki*, and *Kd*, are defined as {B, M, S, O, D, E, F}, representing {Negative Large, Negative Medium, Negative Small, Zero, Positive Small, Positive Medium, Positive Large}. The domains of the input parameters *e* and *ec* are quantified into the standard universe as the same as [-6, -4, -2, 0, 2, 4, 6], with their membership functions being triangular, as shown in Fig. 5(a). The domains of the output parameters *Kp*, *Ki*, and *Kd* are set the same as [-3, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, 3], with their membership functions being triangular, S-shaped, and Z-shaped, respectively, as shown in Fig. 5(b).

When the deviation *e* is large, a larger proportional coefficient and a smaller differential coefficient are selected. At the same time, to prevent integral saturation and avoid large overshoot in the control system response, the integral term is set to 0. When the deviation *e* and the change rate of the deviation *ec* are moderate, none of the proportional, differential, and integral parameters should be too large. The integral term should be set to a smaller value, while the proportional and differential terms should be set at moderate values to ensure a good response speed for the control system. When the deviation *e* is small, to ensure good steady-state performance of the control system, the proportional and integral coefficients should be increased. At the same time, to prevent oscillation around the setpoint and considering the system anti-interference ability, a medium-sized differential coefficient is chosen. Based on these fuzzy rules, the rule table for the designed fuzzy inference is set as shown in Table II.




Fig. 5. Membership functions of the inputs: (a) Membership functions of the input parameter *e*; (b) Membership functions of the input parameter *ec*.

TABLE II. FUZZY CONTROL RULES.

e	*ec*						
	B	**M**	**S**	**O**	**D**	**E**	**F**
B	F/B/D	F/B/D	E/M/B	M/D/B	D/S/B	O/O/M	O/O/D
M	F/B/D	F/B/S	E/M/B	D/S/M	D/S/M	O/O/S	S/O/O
S	E/B/O	E/M/S	E/M/S	D/S/O	O/O/S	S/D/S	M/D/O
O	E/S/O	E/S/S	D/S/S	O/O/S	S/D/M	M/E/S	S/E/O
D	D/M/O	D/S/O	O/O/O	O/D/S	S/D/O	M/E/O	B/F/O
E	D/O/F	O/O/S	S/D/S	M/D/M	M/E/D	B/F/D	B/F/F
F	O/O/F	O/O/E	S/D/M	M/D/M	B/E/D	B/F/D	B/F/F

When the input variable *x* is fuzzified and mapped to the fuzzy quantity *X*, the output fuzzy quantity can be obtained according to the approximate inference composition rules as

$$U = XR = (XR_1) \cup (XR_2) \cdots (XR_{n-1}) \cup (XR_n), \qquad (5)$$

where *R* denotes the fuzzy rules. Since the fuzzy quantity *X* may not activate every fuzzy rule, zero terms may appear in the operation of (XR_j) (where j = 1, 2, ..., n, with n as the rule total number). The "OR" operation in (5) will eliminate the zero terms.




Fig. 6. The design fuzzy PID simulation model in SIMULINK.

Therefore, the actual fuzzy output quantity is


$$\begin{cases} K_p = k_{p0} + k_0 \{e, ec\}_p, \\ K_i = k_{i0} + k_1 \{e, ec\}_i, \\ K_d = k_{d0} + k_2 \{e, ec\}_d, \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where k_{p0}, k_{i0}, and k_{d0} are the initial values of the PID parameters and k_0, k_1, and k_2 and are the quantization factors of the fuzzy output parameters.


A. Simulation Model Based on SIMULINK

A fuzzy PID control simulation model is established using the SIMULINK module in MATLAB, as shown in Fig. 6. The control outputs of the traditional PID and the fuzzy PID are displayed on the same oscilloscope in the simulation model for comparison purpose.


A fuzzy inference system (FIS) for the robotic arm is established using the Fuzzy Logic Toolbox in MATLAB. The relationship between the input quantities of the fuzzy control rules and the output variables is shown in Fig. 7.



(a)



(b)



(c)

Fig. 7. Three-dimensional (3D) view of the fuzzy rules: (a) Observation chart of *Kp* in the fuzzy PID; (b) Observation chart of *Ki* in the fuzzy PID; (c) Observation chart of *Kd* in the fuzzy PID.

After quantifying the fuzzy inputs *e* and *ec*, they pass through the saturation block, which quantizes all input values to the fuzzy domain. Then, fuzzy inference is carried out based on fuzzy rules to generate the optimized PID parameters. Lastly, the PID controller will update its PID parameters to enhance its control performance.

V. Simulation and Experimental Evaluation

A. Simulation Analysis

In the traditional PID control simulation model, the trial-and-error method is used, which is based on manual parameter tuning. By continuously adjusting the PID parameters and observing the system response, the optimal PID parameters are gradually approached. The core idea is to repeatedly experiment to find the parameter values that allow the system response to meet the expected performance criteria such as expected overshoot, settling time, and steady-state error.

In the simulation analysis, the sampling time is set to 0.1 s, the simulation time is set to 2 s, and the stable value is set to 1 mm. The PID parameters adjusted using the trial-and-error method for the traditional PID control are 0.6, 77, and 0.12.

For the fuzzy PID controller, the fuzzy domain for the deviation *e* is chosen as [-0.06, 0.06], and for the deviation rate *ec* is chosen as [-0.03, 0.03]. The quantization factor for the deviation *e* in the fuzzy domain is 100, and for the deviation rate *ec* is 20; the quantization factor for *Kp* is 0.05, for *Ki* is 1.5, and for *Kd* is 0.05. The simulation results are shown in Fig. 8.




Fig. 8. Robot arm control simulation results.

In Fig. 8, it can be observed that the traditional PID control has a higher overshoot than the fuzzy PID control. The fuzzy PID control has a shorter adjustment time and only requires a slight adjustment to reach control stability. On the other hand, the traditional PID control has a longer adjustment period and exhibits larger fluctuations when reaching steady state. This is because the PID parameters are fixed for the traditional PID controller while real-time adjusting for the fuzzy PID controller. As a result, fuzzy PID control can produce better control performance by using different but proper PID parameters during the control process.




Fig. 9. Disturbance simulation results.

To further compare the control performance of the two controllers, the simulation time is set to 2 s, and at 1.5 s an external disturbance is applied to test the controller anti-interference performance. The simulation results are shown in Fig. 9.

From Fig. 9, it can be observed that due to extra interference, the amplitude curve shows significant fluctuations. After the disturbance occurs, both controllers can adjust according to the level of interference. The adjustment times for the PID controller and the fuzzy PID controller in response to the disturbance are 0.62 s and 0.46 s, respectively. From the adjustment times, it can be seen that the fuzzy PID controller can quickly compensate for the disturbance, allowing the amplitude to stabilize more rapidly.

B. Experimental Evaluation

To evaluate the actual control performance of the fuzzy control method, a tobacco packaging platform in Longyan Tobacco Industry Co., Ltd. is used to carry out the experiment test. The packaging platform is illustrated in Fig. 10, which consists of two robotic arms, four work slots, one controller box with PLC, and a product transmission line. Packaging boxes will be continuously placed on work slots during the packaging process. The robot arms are controlled by the fuzzy controller to correctly and stably grasp the products to the packaging boxes.




Fig. 10. The tobacco packaging platform.

Figure 11 shows an image of the packaging platform, where the main parameters of the robotic arm (model: ABB IRB4600-40/2.55) are as follows: 6 axes, 40 kg payload, 2550 mm working range, 0.13 mm–0.46 mm of repeatability, standard IP67 protection level, and 435 kg weight.

The robotic arm control system uses the Mitsubishi FX2N series PLC. The main parameters of the PLC (model: Siemens CPU 1511-1 PN) are as follows: working memory capable of storing 150 KB of code and 1 MB of data, 60 ns bit execution time, transmission protocol TCP/IP, and firmware version V2.9.

When using the PLC to program the fuzzy control algorithm, the resolution setting value for the PLC analog input module is 1 V. The fuzzy domain of the error e is [-0.06, 0.06], and the fuzzy domain of the error change rate ec is [-0.03, 0.03]. Based on the resolution of the analog input module, the domains of e and ec can be quantized in the PLC as [-12, 12] and [-6, 6], respectively. In PLC programming, the CMP (Compare) instruction is used to implement the level quantization of the input value. The sampling time is set to 0.1 s, and the action direction is set to the positive direction.



Fig. 11. An image of the packaging platform.

The experimental results for the robot arm control response are listed in Table III.

TABLE III. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS.

Response parameters	Control Method	
	PID control	Fuzzy PID control
Adjustment time (s)	0.6	0.45
Overshoot amount	6 %	0
Steady-state error (mm)	0	0

As shown in Table III, the traditional PID controller reaches a settling time of about 0.6 s, with an overshoot of 6 %. The fuzzy PID controller reaches a steady state in about 0.45 s, with the adjustment time being approximately one-quarter shorter than the traditional PID, resulting in a faster and smoother system response without any overshoot yet.

The experimental results indicate that the traditional PID control has a higher overshoot compared to the fuzzy PID control. The fuzzy PID control responds faster than the traditional PID, with a shorter adjustment time and only a slight adjustment when stability is reached. In contrast, traditional PID control has a longer adjustment time and greater fluctuations when reaching steady state. Furthermore, during speed regulation, the fuzzy PID algorithm responds more quickly. Therefore, it can be concluded that fuzzy PID control is more effective for robotic arm control.

C. Packaging Experiment Analysis

According to the actual tobacco packaging requirements, the expected time to complete one picking task is 8 s. An experimental analysis of the packaging process is conducted. The timing starts when the robotic arm restarts after picking the previous row of tobacco, and stops when the robotic arm completes the 10^{th} row of tobacco. The idea time is 80 s, and the error between the idea time and the actual time is calculated. Figure 12 describes the robot arm packaging process using three completed grasps with fuzzy control. As can be seen in Fig. 12, the robot arm is able to stably and accurately complete the grasping action to pack the products

into the packaging box. A video of the robot arm packaging process is provided in the supplement material.




Fig. 12. Robot arm packaging process: (a) First completed grasp; (b) Second completed grasp; (c) Third completed grasp.

After conducting 10 test runs, the statistical errors are shown in Fig. 13. As shown in Fig. 13, when the robotic arm is started directly without a controller, there is a significant error in the picking time. With the traditional PID control, the time error is significantly reduced, while the fuzzy PID control further reduces the error. Table IV compares the statistical errors between different control methods. As can be seen, the fuzzy PID control produces the smallest errors, indicating significant improvement in the control stability.




Fig. 13. Grasping time error in the experimental tests.

TABLE IV. ERROR STATISTICS TABLE.

Control Method	Mean error	Standard deviation	Maximum error	Minimum error
No controller	2.57 s	0.76 s	5.1 s	0.6 s
PID controller	0.83 s	0.34 s	2.4 s	0.1 s
Fuzzy PID controller	0.37 s	0.23 s	0.7 s	0.1 s

VI. CONCLUSIONS

This study puts forward a fuzzy PID control method for the robot arm control in the tobacco industrial packaging system. Simulation and experiments have demonstrated great improvement in control stability when comparing the fuzzy PID controller with the traditional PID controller. Considering that the industrial packaging system currently uses the traditional PID controller, the proposed fuzzy PID has been embedded into the PLC of the industrial packaging system to replace the traditional PID controller to enhance the product packaging control performance. The main conclusions are drawn as follows.

1. The simulation results verified that the designed fuzzy PID controller exhibits a faster response speed compared to the traditional PID controller.
2. The fuzzy PID control algorithm was implemented through the design of the program and the development of the PLC. The speed control effect in the experiments verified the feasibility of the fuzzy PID algorithm.
3. In the experiments, the mean error of the fuzzy PID is shortened by more than 50 % over the traditional PID controller, demonstrating higher control stability and accuracy.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

[1] B. Y. Suprapto, S. Dwijayanti, and D. Amri, "Development of a position control system for wheeled humanoid robot movement using the swerve drive method based on fuzzy logic type-2", *Elektronika ir Elektrotechnika*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 4–13, 2024. DOI: 10.5755/j02.eie.35912.

[2] L. Zhang, M. Kang, X. Liu, and Z. Li, "Position control for automatic assembly equipment using a new hybrid fuzzy controller", *Elektronika ir Elektrotechnika*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 15–22, 2024. DOI: 10.5755/j02.eie.37166.

[3] Y. Wang *et al.*, "Grey prediction Fuzzy PID control method for volume flow in cotton picker", *Journal of Agricultural Mechanization Research*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 6–11, 2020.

[4] S. Ren, C. Yang, and X. Meng, "Research on weighing control system of fully automatic bagging packaging machine based on PLC", *Packaging Engineering*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 162–168, 2019.

[5] S. Alavandar and M. J. Nigam, "Fuzzy PD+I control of a six DOF robot manipulator", *Industrial Robot*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 125–132, 2008. DOI: 10.1108/01439910810854610.

[6] Y. Cen *et al.*, "Digital twin-empowered robotic arm control: An integrated PPO and fuzzy PID approach", *Mathematics*, vol. 13, no. 2, p. 216, 2025. DOI: 10.3390/math13020216.

[7] S. Srivastava *et al.*, "A comparative study of PID and neuro-fuzzy based control schemes for a 6-DoF robotic arm", *Journal of Intelligent & Fuzzy Systems: Applications in Engineering and Technology*, vol. 35, no. 5, pp. 5317–5327, 2018. DOI: 10.3233/JIFS-169814.

[8] W. Yang, W. Zhang, D. Xu, and W. Yan, "Fuzzy model predictive control for 2-DOF robotic arms", *Assembly Automation*, vol. 38, no. 5, pp. 568–575, 2018. DOI: 10.1108/AA-11-2017-162.

[9] X. Jiang, Z. Wang, C. Zhang, and L. Yang, "Fuzzy neural network control of the rehabilitation robotic arm driven by pneumatic muscles", *Industrial Robot*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 36–43, 2015. DOI: 10.1108/IR-07-2014-0374.

[10] J. Armendariz, V. Parra-Vega, R. García-Rodríguez, and S. Rosales, "Neuro-fuzzy self-tuning of PID control for semiglobal exponential tracking of robot arms", *Applied Soft Computing*, vol. 25, pp. 139–148, 2014. DOI: 10.1016/j.asoc.2014.08.037.

[11] H. Chhabra, V. Mohan, A. Rani, and V. Singh, "Robust nonlinear fractional order fuzzy PD plus fuzzy I controller applied to robotic manipulator", *Neural Computing and Applications*, vol. 32, pp. 2055–2079, 2020. DOI: 10.1007/s00521-019-04074-3.

[12] N. G. Adar, A. E. Tiryaki, and R. Kozan, "Real time visual servoing of a 6-DOF robotic arm using fuzzy-PID controller", *Acta Physica*

Polonica A, vol. 128, no. 2-B, pp. 1–4, 2015. DOI: 10.12693/APhysPolA.128.B-348.

[13] M. Raković *et al.*, "Fuzzy position-velocity control of underactuated finger of FTN robot hand", *Journal of Intelligent & Fuzzy Systems: Applications in Engineering and Technology*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 2723–2736, 2018. DOI: 10.3233/JIFS-17879.

[14] M. Alizadeh, M. H. Samaei, M. V. Estakhri, H. Momeni, and M. TH Beheshti, "Robust trajectory tracking of a 3-DOF robotic arm using a Super-Twisting Fast finite-time Non-singular Terminal Sliding Mode Control in the presence of perturbations", *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part I: Journal of Systems and Control Engineering*, vol. 238, no. 7, 2024. DOI: 10.1177/09596518241229741.



This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 (CC BY 4.0) license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).