

# Comparison of Dynamic Tomato Growth Models for Optimal Control in Greenhouses

Michael Fink\*

Chair of Automatic Control Engineering  
Technical University of Munich, Germany  
michael.fink@tum.de

Annalena Daniels\*

Chair of Automatic Control Engineering  
Technical University of Munich, Germany  
a.daniels@tum.de

Cheng Qian

Chair of Automatic Control Engineering  
Technical University of Munich, Germany  
cheng.qian@tum.de

Víctor Martínez Velásquez

Chair of Automatic Control Engineering  
Technical University of Munich, Germany  
victor.martinez@tum.de

Sahil Salotra

Chair of Automatic Control Engineering  
Technical University of Munich, Germany  
sahil.salotra@tum.de

Dirk Wollherr

Chair of Automatic Control Engineering  
Technical University of Munich, Germany  
dw@tum.de

**Abstract**—As global demand for efficiency in agriculture rises, there is a growing interest in high-precision farming practices. Particularly greenhouses play a critical role in ensuring a year-round supply of fresh produce. In order to maximize efficiency and productivity while minimizing resource use, mathematical techniques such as optimal control have been employed. However, selecting appropriate models for optimal control requires domain expertise. This study aims to compare three established tomato models for their suitability in an optimal control framework. Results show that all three models have similar yield predictions and accuracy, but only two models are currently applicable for optimal control due to implementation limitations. The two remaining models each have advantages in terms of economic yield and computation times, but the differences in optimal control strategies suggest that they require more accurate parameter identification and calibration tailored to greenhouses.

**Index Terms**—optimal control, greenhouse, tomato, vertical farm

## I. INTRODUCTION

With a growing world population, the agricultural sector is challenged to increase food production while minimizing the negative impact on the environment and preserving biodiversity [1]. In addition, the availability of agricultural land is decreasing due to factors including climate change and geopolitical conflicts, highlighting the need for higher production density. To achieve higher yields and quality while reducing cost and environmental impact, there is a growing trend towards high-precision controlled environment agriculture [2], of which greenhouses (GHs) are a crucial element. GHs are partially enclosed systems that regulate environmental variables like temperature, humidity and CO<sub>2</sub> concentration.

Despite their benefits for providing food all-year-round, GHs still face challenges due to their high energy and cost requirements, making them less profitable than arable farming during cropping seasons. Nonetheless, they offer significant

advantages for crops like tomatoes, which are difficult to transport and store for extended periods. Maximizing the potential yield of these crops while minimizing the economic and ecological costs can unlock the full potential of GH tomato production.

The optimization of GH management for enhanced crop productivity and reduced resource use and environmental impact requires the use of optimal control (OC). OC is a mathematical technique that aims at finding the best control strategy for a given system. It involves determining the optimal values of control variables over a specified time horizon that maximize or minimize a performance measure, subject to constraints. In the context of GH management, OC can be used to optimize environmental factors such as temperature, humidity, and lighting to enhance crop productivity while minimizing resource use and environmental impact [3]–[5].

OC requires accurate models of the GH building environment and the crop growth. Crop models can offer insights into how various factors influence crop growth and yield. Existing OC approaches [6], [7] use models customized for specific crops and problems, which necessitates extensive experimentation for each adaptation and limits their general applicability. In contrast, numerous models have been developed for the general description of plants in agriculture and biology. Among them are several tomato models developed in the last 30 years [3], [8]–[13], indicating the continuous interest of research and industry in more accurate models for various applications. However, control engineering requires a mathematically analytical description of models and most of these models were not designed for that use-case and are not given as a set of equations but as a defined combination of look-up tables. Hence, they are often implemented as a pure simulation black box model with no interfaces to the inside of the models, and the models themselves frequently include discontinuities, and only guarantee good performance within unknown boundaries. As a result, selecting a model that is accurate, computationally efficient, and appropriate for the use in OC remains a challenge.

Previous studies have used different approaches to select or synthesize crop models for control engineering, including

\*These authors contributed equally to this work.

© 2023 IEEE. This work was accepted for IEEE AGRETA2023. Personal use of this material is permitted. Permission from IEEE must be obtained for all other uses, in any current or future media, including reprinting/republishing this material for advertising or promotional purposes, creating new collective works, for resale or redistribution to servers or lists, or reuse of any copyrighted component of this work in other works.

a model comparison [14] of the *TomSim* [9] and reduced *TOMGRO* model [15] and combining components from existing models [16]–[18]. While previous studies have used a common model structure to combine model components into new models [18], we do not use this approach since the individual components lack modularity and explainability. Instead we compare existing models regarding their performance and applicability in OC. To the best of our knowledge, there is a lack of comparative studies on tomato crop models that include performance metrics regarding OC results, computational time, and applicability.

In this paper, we compare three established crop models. The *SIMPLE* crop model by Zhao et al. [19] is a simple but generic crop model that can be used for various crops. The reduced *TOMGRO* model by Jones et al. [15] is designed for tomatoes only, and agricultural scientists and farmers commonly use the tomato model of the *DSSAT* toolbox [20]. The comparison evaluated the model’s performance when applied to OC approaches in a GH environment. We addressed the remaining challenges that may impact the implementation of these models in real-world agricultural settings.

Our key contributions can be summarized as follows:

- Comparison of the accuracy of *SIMPLE*, reduced *TOMGRO*, and *DSSAT*, using a GH data set from the Autonomous GH Challenge in the Netherlands [21], [22].
- Comparison of the structure and applicability of these models in OC and re-formulation of two models as state-space models to be used in control theory. Combination of the models with a GH environment model.
- Incorporation of the GH-crop-model into an OC approach, and analysis of the results for their performance and meaning with recommendations for future users.

The paper is organized as follows. Sec. II provides an overview of the tomato models and the GH environment. In Sec. III, we introduce the OC approach. Sec. IV discusses the validation of the models and presents the comparison results. The ensuing Sec. V delves into the implications of our findings and explores the limitations of this study and future research directions. Finally, in Sec. VI, we conclude the paper.

## II. MODELS FOR THE GROWTH OF TOMATOES

Before a comparison can be conducted, an introduction to the three crop models and the GH model is given.

### A. *SIMPLE* Model

The parameters of the *SIMPLE* model [19] have been calibrated carefully using a large arable farming experimental data set for various crops. The model represents up to 14 crops, including tomatoes, and 22 cultivars with the modification of just 13 crop parameters, of which four are cultivar-specific and nine are species-specific. Although the model takes into account various factors like plant phenology, the impact of photosynthesis on growth, the influence of CO<sub>2</sub> concentration, drought stress, and radiation interception, it has some limitations, including the exclusion of vernalization effects and the

lack of nutrient dynamics. The state space-model for day  $i$  can be described as

$$\mathbf{x}_{s,i+1} = \mathbf{f}_s(\mathbf{x}_{s,i}, \mathbf{u}_{s,i}) \quad (1)$$

with the state of the *SIMPLE* model

$$\mathbf{x}_{s,i} = [m_{B,i} \quad \tau_i \quad I_{50B,i}]^T \quad (2)$$

where  $m_{B,i}$  is the tomato biomass in  $\frac{\text{kg}}{\text{m}^2}$ ,  $\tau_i$  is the cumulative temperature in °C d (temperature integrated over days) and  $I_{50B,i}$  is a value for the leaf senescence on day  $i$  in °C d [23]. The yield for the tomatoes is obtained with  $m_{\text{fruit}} = HI m_{B,N}$ , where  $HI$  is the harvest index ( $HI = 0.68$  for tomatoes) and  $m_{B,N}$  is the biomass of the plant on the last day.

Following the method employed in [23], we assume that the temperature remains constant throughout the day. However, we additionally treat the CO<sub>2</sub> concentration as a controllable variable. The input vector for this model for day  $i$  is

$$\mathbf{u}_{s,i} = [T_i \quad D_i \quad R_i \quad C_{CO_2,i}]^T \quad (3)$$

where  $T_i$  is the mean temperature in °C,  $D_i$  is the the relative level of drought between [0, 1],  $R_i$  is the solar radiation in  $\frac{\text{MJ}}{\text{m}^2\text{d}}$  and  $C_{CO_2,i}$  is the CO<sub>2</sub> concentration in ppm.

### B. *Reduced TOMGRO* Model

The reduced *TOMGRO* model [15] is a simplified version of the original, widely used *TOMGRO* model [8]. Compared to the original model, where the state dimension is 69, the reduced *TOMGRO* model contains a state with only a dimension of 5 and an input dimension of 3. This model was developed under GH conditions.

Similar to (1), we propose the reduced *TOMGRO* model describing the state of the next day  $i + 1$  as

$$\mathbf{x}_{t,i+1} = \mathbf{f}_t(\mathbf{x}_{t,i}, \mathbf{u}_{t,i}). \quad (4)$$

The state vector of this model for day  $i$  is given as

$$\mathbf{x}_{t,i} = [N_i \quad LAI_i \quad W_i \quad W_{f,i} \quad W_{m,i}]^T, \quad (5)$$

where  $N_i$  is the number of main stem nodes,  $LAI_i$  is the leaf area index in  $\frac{\text{m}^2}{\text{m}^2}$  (ratio of leaf area per ground area),  $W_i$  is the total plant weight in  $\frac{\text{kg}}{\text{m}^2}$ ,  $W_{f,i}$  is the fruit dry weight in  $\frac{\text{kg}}{\text{m}^2}$ , and  $W_{m,i}$  is the mature fruit dry weight in  $\frac{\text{kg}}{\text{m}^2}$ .

The input vector of this model for day  $i$  is given as

$$\mathbf{u}_{t,i} = [T_i \quad T_{d,i} \quad R_i \quad C_{CO_2,i}]^T, \quad (6)$$

where  $T_i$  is the average temperature of the whole day in °C,  $T_{d,i}$  is the average temperature of daytime in °C,  $R_i$  is the solar radiation on day  $i$  in  $\frac{\text{MJ}}{\text{m}^2\text{d}}$ ,  $C_{CO_2,i}$  is the concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> in ppm. From  $R_i$ , we obtain the photosynthetic photon flux density  $PPFD_i = R_i / 0.037 \frac{\text{MJ s}}{\mu\text{mol d}}$  for white light.

As the original model description contains piece-wise defined functions and is therefore not always differentiable, we use the smoothing function for maximum operators (cf. [23]), as well as a smoothing function for Heaviside step function

$H(x) \approx H_\epsilon(x) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\epsilon x}}$  to allow for gradient-based optimization approaches. For a big positive  $\epsilon$ , the smoothing function converges to the standard Heaviside step function.

### C. DSSAT

The *DSSAT* toolbox [20] contains widely used and well-established models in arable agriculture and has been used for decision support processes for a long time. For tomatoes it uses the *CROPGRO* model [13]. However, its implementation is only available as a complete Windows application. It requires manual file uploads, making it unsuitable for integration into OC processes. Therefore, we will use this model only as a well-established comparison.

### D. Greenhouse Model

The GH model described in [3] is employed for both the *SIMPLE* crop model [19] and the reduced *TOMGRO* model [15]. The GH model comprises the primary GH compartment, which is linked to three subsystems. These subsystems serve as the three control inputs for the GH, which are the heat supply through a heating pipe system, the supply of  $\text{CO}_2$ , and the window ventilation system for air flow. For a more comprehensive explanation of the GH structure, see [3].

The state-space equation for the GH model describes the state of the GH on an hourly basis and is given as

$$\mathbf{x}_{\text{gh},i+1} = \mathbf{f}_{\text{gh}}(\mathbf{x}_{\text{gh},i}, \mathbf{u}_{\text{gh},i}). \quad (7)$$

The state vector of the GH model is

$$\mathbf{x}_{\text{gh},i} = [T_{g,i} \quad T_{s,i} \quad T_{p,i} \quad C_{\text{CO}_2,i} \quad C_{\text{H}_2\text{O},i}]^T, \quad (8)$$

which are the greenhouse temperature  $T_{g,i}$  in  $^\circ\text{C}$ , soil temperature  $T_{s,i}$  in  $^\circ\text{C}$ , pipe temperature  $T_{p,i}$  in  $^\circ\text{C}$ ,  $\text{CO}_2$  concentration  $C_{\text{CO}_2,i}$  in ppm, and the water vapor concentration  $C_{\text{H}_2\text{O},i}$  in  $\frac{\text{kg}}{\text{m}^3}$  for the  $i^{\text{th}}$  hour. The three control inputs of the GH

$$\mathbf{u}_{\text{gh},i} = [u_{q,i}^{vp} \quad u_{v,i}^{Ap} \quad u_{\text{CO}_2,i}^{vp}]^T \quad (9)$$

are directly connected to the main GH compartment. The underlying systems of the control inputs are simplified. The heat and  $\text{CO}_2$  supply are expressed as a valve position  $u_{q,i}^{vp}$  and  $u_{\text{CO}_2,i}^{vp}$  which quantifies the supply, respectively. The ventilation system is expressed by the aperture of the windows from the windward and lee side of the greenhouse compartment. Both windows are considered for simplicity through one control input  $u_{v,i}^{Ap}$ .

Note that the the valve positions  $u_{q,i}^{vp}$  and  $u_{\text{CO}_2,i}^{vp}$  are between  $[0, 1]$ , where 0 indicates that there is no supply and the valve is closed. The control input  $u_{v,i}^{Ap}$  lies in the interval  $[0, 2]$  since we consider both the windward and lee side of the GH compartment. Furthermore, the GH compartment is subject to environmental influences as it is a partially open system. Thus, the overall dynamics of the GH model also include six parameters, which are summarized in the external disturbance vector

$$\mathbf{d}_{g,i} = [R_{\text{out},i} \quad T_{\text{out},i} \quad v_i \quad T_{\text{soil},i} \quad C_{\text{H}_2\text{O},\text{out},i} \quad C_{\text{CO}_2,\text{out},i}]^T. \quad (10)$$

with the solar radiation  $R_{\text{out},i}$  in  $\frac{\text{W}}{\text{m}^2}$ , the temperature outside the greenhouse  $T_{\text{out},i}$  in  $^\circ\text{C}$ , wind speed  $v_i$  in  $\frac{\text{m}}{\text{s}}$ , temperature of the subsoil  $T_{\text{soil},i}$  in  $^\circ\text{C}$ , the humidity  $C_{\text{H}_2\text{O},\text{out},i}$  in  $\frac{\text{kg}}{\text{m}^3}$  and concentration of  $\text{CO}_2$   $C_{\text{CO}_2,\text{out},i}$  in ppm outside the GH. Just

as with the crop models, smoothing functions are necessary to handle discontinuities. For example, an approximation of the absolute value is  $|x| \approx \sqrt{x^2 + \mu}$  where  $\mu$  is a small positive constant [24]. The derivative of the approximation exists for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ .

### E. Integration of the models

In a comparison of the OC results of the two harvesting models, the respective state-space model is used in combination with the GH model. Since the GH model operates on an hourly basis while the crop models are evaluated once a day, evaluating the combined model is not a simple task. Consequently, the crop model receives the mean value of the GH conditions as input, and the combined state vector comprises the state of the tomato model along with the hourly state of the greenhouse, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{x}_i = [\mathbf{x}_{s/t,i}^\top \quad \mathbf{x}_{\text{gh},24i}^\top \quad \mathbf{x}_{\text{gh},24i+1}^\top \quad \cdots \quad \mathbf{x}_{\text{gh},24i+23}^\top]^\top, \quad (11)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}_{s/t,i}$  is either the state resulting from the *SIMPLE* model  $\mathbf{x}_{s,i}$  or the state based on the *TOMGRO* model  $\mathbf{x}_{t,i}$ .

In order to account for and optimize the performance of the entire system comprising the tomato crop models within a greenhouse setting, we amalgamate them into a single model

$$\mathbf{x}_{i+1} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{u}_{\text{gh},i}), \quad (12)$$

where the components of  $\mathbf{x}_{i+1}$  are computed by

$$\mathbf{x}_{s/t,i+1} = \mathbf{f}_{s/t} \left( \mathbf{x}_{s/t,i}, \mathbf{g}_{s/t} \left( \frac{1}{24} \sum_{j=0}^{23} \mathbf{x}_{\text{gh},i+j} \right) \right) \quad (13)$$

$$\mathbf{x}_{\text{gh},i+j+1} = \mathbf{f}_{\text{gh}}(\mathbf{x}_{\text{gh},i+j}, \mathbf{u}_{\text{gh},i}) \quad \forall j \in [0, 23]. \quad (14)$$

and arranged in the same form as in (11). The function  $\mathbf{g}_{s/t}(\cdot)$  maps the mean states of the GH to the inputs for either the *SIMPLE* or the *TOMGRO* model. In the following section, the combined model (12) of tomato growth and GH is used in an optimal control problem (OCP).

## III. OPTIMAL CONTROL FOR PLANT GROWTH

In the following, the framework for the OC of plant growth is presented. The goal is to find a sequence of input values for the greenhouse (9) resulting in a maximum economic yield. The inputs of the greenhouse over the optimization period  $N$  is combined to the input sequence vector  $\mathbf{U} = [\mathbf{u}_{\text{gh},0}^\top, \mathbf{u}_{\text{gh},1}^\top, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{\text{gh},N-1}^\top]^\top$ .

The optimization selects one from all possible input sequences  $\mathbf{U}$  that minimizes the cost function

$$J(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{x}_N) = \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} l(\mathbf{u}_{\text{gh},i}) - V(\mathbf{x}_N), \quad (15)$$

while the input and state sequences are a solution to the system model (12) that consists of the greenhouse (7) and the tomato model, either the *SIMPLE* model (1) or the *TOMGRO* model (4). It is evaluated over a given growth period of  $N$  days. The cost function (15) represents the negative economic yield, thus the terminal cost is used with a negative sign, similar to [23]. The stage cost  $l(\mathbf{u}_{\text{gh},i})$  represents the

energy cost used for the growing process and is given as  $l(\mathbf{u}_{\text{gh},i}) = \mathbf{r}^\top \mathbf{u}_{\text{gh},i}$ , where  $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^3$  is a weight vector. The terminal cost  $V(\mathbf{x}_N)$  gives the yield at the harvest on day  $N$ . The price evolves linearly, leading to a linear cost term, i.e.  $V(\mathbf{x}_N) = \mathbf{q}^\top \mathbf{x}_N$ , with the weight  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ . The temperature, ventilation and  $\text{CO}_2$  can be controlled in a GH within lower and upper bounds. Therefore, we add constraints  $\mathbf{u}_{\text{gh},i} \in \mathcal{U}$  to the OCP, yielding

$$U^* = \underset{U}{\operatorname{argmin}} J(U, \mathbf{x}_N) \quad (16a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \mathbf{x}_{i+1} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{u}_{\text{gh},i}) \quad \forall i \in [0, N-1] \quad (16b)$$

$$\mathbf{u}_i \in \mathcal{U} \quad \forall i \in [0, N-1] \quad (16c)$$

$$\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{x}_{\text{init}}, \quad (16d)$$

where  $U^*$  is the sequence of optimal inputs of the GH. The states on day  $i = 0$  are given as initial states  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{init}}$ . The optimal input sequence  $U^*$  results in a state sequence that yields the smallest value of the cost function (15). The OCP is implemented in Python and solved with CasADi [25].

#### IV. COMPARISON OF THE CROP MODELS

After the definition of the models, we now compare these models regarding their structure and their validity compared to the *DSSAT* model and a GH data set. Additionally, we compare the findings of the OC study.

##### A. Structure

As already described in Sec. II-E, the two tomato models follow a similar state-space representation, which are integrated with the GH. Furthermore, their inputs, denoted as  $\mathbf{u}_{s,i}$  and  $\mathbf{u}_{t,i}$ , have a similar structure and contain variables such as daily average temperature, solar radiation, and  $\text{CO}_2$ . However, there are some differences between the two models in terms of inputs. For instance, the *SIMPLE* model includes an input for a drought factor  $D$ , which is set to 0 in a GH environment under the assumption that we guarantee sufficient water supply for each day. Another key difference is that *TOMGRO* follows a more complex model approach, e.g., it has a state with five elements (5), whereas the state of the *SIMPLE* model only considers three elements (1). While the *TOMGRO* model state is readily accessed and measurable through simple techniques such as counting stem nodes, assessing leaf area, and weighing different parts of the plant, the state of the *SIMPLE* model is not as easily observable. It requires expert knowledge along with analytical methods. Nonetheless, both models share a common state, the dry weight of the fruit ( $m_{\text{fruit}}$  for the *SIMPLE* model and  $W_f$  for the *TOMGRO* model), which is of interest in this study as it helps in obtaining the optimal yield. The results are given in fresh weight to compare it with experimental data.

##### B. Validation of Models

For the validation of both models, we use as real-world ground truth a data set consisting of GH climate data compiled from different experiments [22]. This data set, which we compare to both models, is generated from the experiments

of five different multi-disciplinary teams. As an example and for brevity, we only show the comparison for one set (The Automators team) for our validation. We use the environmental conditions of the experiment, including temperature, solar radiation, and  $\text{CO}_2$  concentration, for each day.

In Fig. 1, we observe that both models present a similar behavior for around 160 days of cultivation in comparison to the experimental data. However, the *TOMGRO* model fits the data better and yields about  $2 \frac{\text{kg}}{\text{m}^2}$  more biomass than the experimental data, while the *SIMPLE* model results in an underestimate of  $4 \frac{\text{kg}}{\text{m}^2}$ , under the same conditions.




Fig. 1. Comparison of the tomato fresh weight computed with the *SIMPLE* and *TOMGRO* model with experimental data.

Furthermore, we verify the accuracy of both models by subjecting them to validation in the *DSSAT* environment [20], which is widely used for crop growth modeling. For simulation of tomato growth and weather data, we utilize the *DSSAT* model. Fig. 2 illustrates that the *SIMPLE* and *TOMGRO* models produce nearly identical trajectories, whereas the *DSSAT* simulation behaves differently starting from day 60. However, all three models generate a similar yield of approximately  $13 \frac{\text{kg}}{\text{m}^2}$ .




Fig. 2. Comparison of the *SIMPLE* and *TOMGRO* with the *DSSAT* model.

Hence, the models demonstrate their ability to simulate real-life scenarios. In the following, the suitability of the models for use in OC is investigated to find optimal inputs for the greenhouse.

##### C. Comparing of Optimal Control Results

In this section, we present the results of applying the OC framework, as described in Section III, to the two crop models. The cost function (15) weights are chosen such that the cost represents the negative value of the economic yield, given that the fresh weight of the tomato is sold for  $2 \frac{\text{€}}{\text{kg}}$ . The cost for  $\text{CO}_2$  is assumed to be  $0.15 \frac{\text{€}}{\text{kg}}$ , while ventilation is considered to be neutral in terms of cost. Heating is assumed to cost  $0.02 \frac{\text{€}}{\text{kWh}}$ . The results include the optimal values of the crop model states, greenhouse states, and control inputs. Fig. 3 and

Fig. 4 show the optimal biomass evolution of the *SIMPLE* and *TOMGRO* model, respectively. Their optimal results can be found in Tab. I. Fig. 5 displays the OC inputs of the




Fig. 3. Optimized states of the *SIMPLE* model.




Fig. 4. Optimized states of the *TOMGRO* model.

greenhouse. The optimal value for  $u_{v,i}^{Ap}$  is 0 throughout for both crop models since ventilation leads to a decrease in the  $CO_2$  concentration. Therefore, for simplicity, ventilation is not additionally marked in the graph. We conclude that in the optimal solution, the greenhouse ventilation is not used, indicating that the optimization aims to maintain a stable environment throughout the cultivation period. The optimal values of  $u_q^{vp}$  and  $u_{CO_2}^{vp}$  of the greenhouse show similar results.

The optimal states of the greenhouse are shown in Fig. 6. We obtain similar results for both crop models, particularly for the  $T_s$ ,  $T_p$ , and  $C_{H_2O}$ . The optimized temperature  $T_g$  for the *SIMPLE* model is around  $27^\circ C$  during the cultivation period, which is close to the optimal temperature for this tomato variety ( $26^\circ C$ ) according to [19]. The optimal solution of  $C_{CO_2}$  concentration differs between the models, with the concentration resulting from the *SIMPLE* model saturating at




Fig. 5. Optimal inputs of the GH with the use of different tomato models in the optimization: Solid lines: *SIMPLE* model; Dashed lines: *TOMGRO* model.

700ppm, since further increase makes no difference in the simplified model.




Fig. 6. Optimal sequence of states of the GH: Solid lines: *SIMPLE* model; Dashed lines: *TOMGRO* model.




Fig. 7. Comparison of the optimized inputs applied on each model. OT: Inputs generated with OC based on *TOMGRO*, OS: Inputs generated with OC based on *SIMPLE*. I.e., OT-SIMPLE is the biomass predicted by the *SIMPLE* given the optimized inputs generated by the *TOMGRO*.

## V. DISCUSSION

Overall, all three models achieve similar yields under standard weather and GH conditions, even though only one of the models, the reduced *TOMGRO*, has initially been designed for GH applications. The existing *DSSAT* implementation rendered it inaccessible for immediate use in the current implementation of our OC approaches. The remaining two models have different structures and states, with *TOMGRO* being more intuitive to measure. All models share similar inputs, but *DSSAT* allows for more degrees of freedom, while *SIMPLE* allows for the least.

Based on the optimization results, the crop models have different sensitivities to environmental variables. We applied the OC trajectories of the GH to both models and found that while the resulting biomass depends on the chosen trajectory, the differences between the models are not substantial, even when the GH is optimized with the other model, shown in Fig. 7. Comparing to *DSSAT*, its prediction lies in between the other two models, leaving uncertainty as to which prediction is closer to reality. These findings emphasize the importance of thorough model calibration, as accurate validation does not

TABLE I  
OVERALL COMPARISON OF THE THREE TOMATO MODELS.

	Developed for GHs	Valid under GH conditions	Usable for OC	Optimal harvest in $\frac{\text{kg}}{\text{m}^2}$	Economic yield in $\frac{\text{€}}{\text{m}^2}$	Optimal harvest based on DSSAT in $\frac{\text{kg}}{\text{m}^2}$	Economic yield based on DSSAT in $\frac{\text{€}}{\text{m}^2}$	Computational cost in s
SIMPLE	✗	✓	✓	16.73	16.16	17.19	16.78	14
Reduced TOMGRO	✓	✓	✓	19.76	21.88	17.43	18.02	19
DSSAT	✗	✓	✗	-	-	-	-	-

necessarily lead to similar optimal GH environment trajectories for different crop models.

The results are presented in Table I, where it is shown that the *SIMPLE* model has a computation time 1.35 times faster than the *TOMGRO* model on a standard laptop, given an identical parallelized implementation in Python. This outcome holds noteworthy implications for closed-loop control systems that depend on updating constrained optimization using measured states. While the current GH model only permits hourly updates, adapting to a finer granularity would be advantageous for resource optimization, making the differences in computation time more consequential. Furthermore, the current configuration does not account for spatially distributed control approaches that consider spatial discrepancies in the GH and crop states, which would lead to a substantial increase in computational resource and real-time capability requirements. In order to compensate for the explained model parameter uncertainties and to enable a fair comparison, we compare the achievable harvest and yield using the *DSSAT* model predictions, using the inputs generated in the optimization with both *SIMPLE* and *TOMGRO* (see columns 6 and 7). Although both models achieve similar final biomass, the *TOMGRO* model produces slightly better economic yield (7 % higher). However, in a closed-loop regime, small model inaccuracies are less important due to constant feedback. In summary, both models have their strengths and weaknesses, but the *SIMPLE* model seems more attractive for closed-loop applications since it can be easily adapted to other crops. Nevertheless, obtaining the states poses difficulties that must be overcome to use the *SIMPLE* model in a closed-loop.

## VI. CONCLUSION

In this study, we compared three different models for the growth of a tomato plant, namely the *SIMPLE*, reduced *TOMGRO* and the *DSSAT* model. All crop models can achieve similar accurate yields under standard weather and GH conditions. While the *DSSAT* model turned out to be inaccessible for optimal control approaches, the remaining two models, *TOMGRO* and *SIMPLE*, were compared in a combination with the same GH model with respect to the usability in an OC approach. The optimization results revealed that the models have different sensitivities to environmental variables, emphasizing the importance of careful model calibration. The *SIMPLE* model had a faster computation time, making it more attractive for closed-loop control systems, but the *TOMGRO* model achieved an overall higher yield, leaving uncertainty about which model is closer to reality. Despite their strengths

and weaknesses, both models are relevant for closed-loop applications. The *SIMPLE* model is particularly useful due to its adaptability to other crops. However, challenges associated with obtaining states need to be overcome for the use in a closed-loop control system which will be left for future work.

## REFERENCES

- [1] T. Searchinger, R. Waite, C. Hanson, J. Ranganathan, P. Dumas, E. Matthews, and C. Klirs. Creating a sustainable food future: A menu of solutions to feed nearly 10 billion people by 2050. *WRI*, 2019.
- [2] R. Shamshiri, F. Kalantari, K.C. Ting, K.R. Thorp, I.A. Hameed, C. Weltzien, D. Ahmad, and Z.M. Shad. Advances in greenhouse automation and controlled environment agriculture: A transition to plant factories and urban agriculture. *Int. J. Agric. Biol. Eng.*, 11:1–22, 2018.
- [3] G. Van Straten, G. van Willigenburg, E. van Henten, and R. van Ooteghem. *Optimal control of greenhouse cultivation*. CRC press, 2010.
- [4] A. Ramírez-Arias, F. Rodríguez, J.L. Guzmán, and M. Berenguel. Multiobjective hierarchical control architecture for greenhouse crop growth. *Automatica*, 48(3):490–498, 2012.
- [5] D. Lin, L. Zhang, and X. Xia. Hierarchical model predictive control of venlo-type greenhouse climate for improving energy efficiency and reducing operating cost. *J. Clean. Prod.*, 264:121513, 2020.
- [6] Gerrit Van Straten. Optimal greenhouse cultivation control: Quo vadis? *IFAC Proc. Vol.*, 46(4):11–16, 2013.
- [7] N. Engler and M. Krarti. Review of energy efficiency in controlled environment agriculture. *Renew. Sust. Energ. Rev.*, 141:110786, 2021.
- [8] J.W. Jones, E. Dayan, L.H. Allen, H. Van Keulen, and H. Challa. A dynamic tomato growth and yield model (TOMGRO). *Trans. ASAE*, 34(2):663–667, 1991.
- [9] E. Heuvelink. Evaluation of a dynamic simulation model for tomato crop growth and development. *Annals of Botany*, 83(4):413–422, 1999.
- [10] I. Seginer, C. Gary, and M. Tchamitchian. Optimal temperature regimes for a greenhouse crop with a carbohydrate pool: A modelling study. *Scientia Horticulturae*, 60(1):55–80, 1994.
- [11] L.F.M. Marcelis, A. Elings, P.H.B. De Visser, and E. Heuvelink. Simulating growth and development of tomato crop. In *International Symposium on Tomato in the Tropics 821*, pages 101–110, 2008.
- [12] A. Martínez-Ruiz, I.L. López-Cruz, A. Ruiz-García, J. Pineda-Pineda, and J.V. Prado-Hernández. Hortsyst: A dynamic model to predict growth, nitrogen uptake, and transpiration of greenhouse tomatoes. *Chilean journal of agricultural research*, 2019.
- [13] K.J. Boote, M. R. Rybak, J.M.S. Scholberg, and J.W. Jones. Improving the cropgro-tomato model for predicting growth and yield response to temperature. *Hortscience*, 47:1038–1049, 2012.
- [14] A. Ramirez, F. Rodriguez, M. Berenguel, and E. Heuvelink. Calibration and validation of complex and simplified tomato growth models for control purposes in the southeast of Spain. In *Acta Hortic. 654*, pages 147–154, 2003.
- [15] J.W. Jones, A. Kenig, and C.E. Vallejos. Reduced state-variable tomato growth model. *Transactions of the ASAE*, 42(1):255, 1999.
- [16] F. Tap. *Economics-based optimal control of greenhouse tomato crop production*. PhD thesis, Wageningen University and Research, 2000.
- [17] R.J.C. Van Ooteghem. *Optimal control design for a solar greenhouse*. PhD thesis, Wageningen University and Research, 2007.
- [18] W.J.P. Kuijpers, M.J.G. van de Molengraft, S. van Mourik, A. van't Ooster, S. Hemming, and E.J. van Henten. Model selection with a common structure: Tomato crop growth models. *Biosystems Engineering*, 187:247–257, 2019.
- [19] C. Zhao, B. Liu, L. Xiao, G. Hoogenboom, K.J. Boote, B.T. Kassie, W. Pavan, V. Shelia, W.S. Kim, I.M. Hernandez-Ochoa, et al. A SIMPLE crop model. *Eur. J. Agron.*, 104:97–106, 2019.
- [20] J.W. Jones, G. Hoogenboom, C.H. Porter, K.J. Boote, W.D. Batchelor, L.A. Hunt, P.W. Wilkens, U. Singh, A.J. Gijsman, and J.T. Ritchie. The DSSAT cropping system model. *Eur. J. Agron.*, 18(3-4):235–265, 2003.
- [21] S. Hemming, F. de Zwart, A. Elings, A. Petropoulou, and I. Righini. Cherry tomato production in intelligent greenhouses—sensors and ai for control of climate, irrigation, crop yield, and quality. *Sensors*, 20(22):6430, 2020.
- [22] S. Hemming, H.F. de Zwart, A. Elings, A. Petropoulou, and I. Righini. *Autonomous greenhouse challenge, second edition* (2019), 2020.

- [23] A. Daniels, M. Fink, M. Leibold, and D. Wollherr. Optimal control for indoor vertical farms based on crop growth (accepted). *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, 2023.
- [24] C. Ramirez, R. Sanchez, V. Kreinovich, and M. Argaez.  $x_2 + \mu$  is the most computationally efficient smooth approximation to  $|x|$ : a proof. *Journal of Uncertain Systems*, 8, 2014.
- [25] J.A.E. Andersson, J. Gillis, G. Horn, J.B. Rawlings, and M. Diehl. CasADi – A software framework for nonlinear optimization and optimal control. *Math. Program. Comput.*, 11(1):1–36, 2019.