An adaptive switched control approach to heterogeneous platooning with inter-vehicle communication losses

Abou Harfouch, Youssef; Yuan, Shuai; Baldi, Simone

DOI
10.1109/TCNS.2017.2718359

Publication date
2017

Document Version
Accepted author manuscript

Published in
IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems

Accepted Author Manuscript. Link to published article (IEEE): https://doi.org/10.1109/TCNS.2017.2718359

An Adaptive Switched Control Approach to Heterogeneous Platooning with Inter-Vehicle Communication Losses

Youssef Abou Harfouch, Shuai Yuan, and Simone Baldi

***Abstract*—The advances in distributed inter-vehicle communication networks have stimulated a fruitful line of research in Cooperative Adaptive Cruise Control (CACC). In CACC, individual vehicles, grouped into platoons, must automatically adjust their own speed using on-board sensors and communication with the preceding vehicle so as to maintain a safe inter-vehicle distance. However, a crucial limitation of the state-of-the-art of this control scheme is that the string stability of the platoon can be proven only when the vehicles in the platoon have identical driveline dynamics and perfect engine performance (homogeneous platoon), and possibly an ideal communication channel. This work proposes a novel CACC strategy that overcomes the homogeneity assumption and that is able to adapt its action and achieve string stability even for uncertain heterogeneous platoons. Furthermore, in order to handle the inevitable communication losses, we formulate an extended average dwell-time framework and design an adaptive switched control strategy which activates an augmented CACC or an augmented Adaptive Cruise Control strategy depending on communication reliability. Stability is proven analytically and simulations are conducted to validate the theoretical analysis.**

***Index Terms*—Cooperative adaptive cruise control, switched control, heterogeneous platoon, adaptive control, networked control systems.**

I. Introduction

AUTOMATED driving is an active area of research striving to increase road safety, manage traffic congestion, and reduce vehicles' emissions by introducing automation into road traffic [1]. Platooning is an automated driving method in which vehicles are grouped into platoons, where the speed of each vehicle (except eventually the speed of the leading vehicle) is automatically adjusted so as to maintain a safe inter-vehicle distance [2]. The most celebrated technology to enable platooning is Cooperative Adaptive Cruise Control (CACC), an extension of Adaptive Cruise Control (ACC) [3] where platooning is enabled by inter-vehicle communication in addition to on-board sensors. CACC systems have overcome ACC systems in view of their better string stability properties [4]: string stability implies that disturbances which are introduced into a traffic flow by braking and accelerating vehicles are not amplified in the upstream direction. In fact, while string stability in ACC strategies cannot be guaranteed for inter-vehicle time gaps smaller than 1 second [5], CACC was shown to guarantee string stability for time gaps significantly smaller than 1 second [6]. This directly leads to improved road throughput [7], reduced aerodynamic drag, and reduced fuel consumption [8] over ACC systems.

Despite this potential, state-of-the-art studies and demonstrations of CACC crucially rely on the assumption of vehicle-independent driveline dynamics (homogeneous platoon): under this assumption, a one-vehicle look-ahead cooperative adaptive cruise controller was synthesized in [6], by using a performance oriented approach to define string stability. An adaptive bidirectional platoon-control method was derived in [9] which utilized a coupled sliding mode controller to enhance the string stability characteristics of the bidirectional platoon topology. A longitudinal controller based on a constant spacing policy was developed in [10], showing that string stability can be achieved by broadcasting the leading vehicle's acceleration and velocity to all vehicles in the platoon. In [11], a linear controller was augmented by a model predictive control strategy to maintain the platoon's stability while integrating safety and physical constraints. In addition, for a platoon composed of identical agents with different controllers, [12] assessed the performance and challenges, in terms of string stability, of unidirectional and asymmetric bidirectional control strategies.

Communication is an important ingredient of CACC systems: the work [13] reviews the practical challenges of CACC and highlights the importance of robust wireless communication. From here a series of studies aiming at addressing the effect of non-ideal communication on CACC performance: in order to account for network delays and packet losses caused by the wireless network, an H_∞ controller was synthesized in [14], guaranteeing string stability criteria and robustness for some small parametric uncertainty. The authors in [15] derived a controller that integrates inter-vehicle communication over different realistic network conditions which models time delays, packet losses, and interferences. Random packet dropouts were modeled as independent Bernoulli processes in [16] in order to derive a scheduling algorithm and design a controller for vehicular platoons with inter-vehicle network capacity limitation that guarantees string stability and zero steady state spacing errors.

All the aforementioned works rely on the crucial platoon's homogeneity assumption. However, in practice, having a homogeneous platoon is not feasible: there will always be some heterogeneity among the vehicles in the platoon

The authors are with the Delft Center for Systems and Control, Delft University of Technology, Mekelweg 2, 2628 CD Delft, The Netherlands. E-mail: youssef.harfoush1@gmail.com, (s.yuan-1, s.baldi)@tudelft.nl.

The research leading to these results has been partially funded by the European Commission FP7-ICT-2013.3.4, Advanced computing, embedded and control systems, under contract #611538 (LOCAL4GLOBAL) and by the China Scholarship Council (CSC), File No.20146160098

(e.g. different driveline dynamics, parametric and networked-induced uncertainties). A study conducted in [17] assessed the causes for heterogeneity of vehicles in a platoon and their effects on string stability. A distributed adaptive sliding mode controller for a heterogeneous vehicle platoon was derived in [18] to guarantee string stability and adaptive compensation of disturbances based on constant spacing policy. While addressing heterogeneous platoons to some extent, the aforementioned work neglects the effect of wireless communication, as pointed out by [13].

The brief overview of the state-of-the-art reveals the need to develop CACC with new functionalities, that can handle platoons of heterogeneous vehicles, and guarantee string stability while adapting to changing conditions and unreliable communication. The main contribution of this paper is to address for the first time the problem of CACC for heterogeneous platoons with unreliable communication. The heterogeneity of the platoon is represented by different (and uncertain) time constants for the driveline dynamics and possibly different (and uncertain) engine performance coefficients. Using a Model Reference Adaptive Control (MRAC) augmentation method, we prove analytically the asymptotic convergence of the heterogeneous platoon to an appropriately defined string stable reference platoon. Furthermore, inter-vehicle communication losses, which are modeled via an extended average dwell-time framework, are handled by switching the control strategy of the vehicle at issue to a string stable ACC strategy with a different reference model. For this adaptive switching control scheme, stability with bounded state tracking error is proven under realistic switching conditions that match the Packet Error Rate of the two most widely adopted vehicular wireless communication standards, namely IEEE 802.11p/wireless access in vehicular environment (WAVE) and long-term evolution (LTE) [19],[20].

The paper is organized as follows. In Section II, the system structure of a heterogeneous vehicle platoon with engine performance losses is presented. Section III presents a MRAC augmentation of a CACC strategy to stabilize the platoon. Moreover, Section IV presents an adaptive switched control strategy to stabilize the platoon in the heterogeneous scenario with engine performances losses while coping with inter-vehicle communication losses. Simulation results of the two controllers are presented in Section V along with some concluding remarks in Section VI.

Notation: The notation used in this paper is as follows: $\mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{N}$, and $\mathbb{N}^+$ represent the set of real numbers, natural numbers, and positive natural numbers, respectively. The notation $P = P^T > 0$ indicates a symmetric positive definite matrix P, where the superscript T represents the transpose of a matrix. The notation $\|\cdot\|$ represents the Euclidean norm. The identity matrix of dimension n is denoted by $I_{n\times n}$. The notation $\sup|\cdot|$ represents the least upper bound of a function.

II. System Structure

Consider a heterogeneous platoon with M vehicles. Fig. 1 shows the platoon where v_i represents the velocity (m/s) of vehicle i, and d_i the distance (m) between vehicle i and its preceding vehicle $i-1$. This distance is measured using a radar mounted on the front bumper of each vehicle. Furthermore, each vehicle in the platoon can communicate with its preceding vehicle via wireless communication. The main goal of every vehicle in the platoon, except the leading vehicle, is to maintain a desired distance $d_{\mathrm{r},i}$ between itself and its preceding vehicle. Define the set $S_M = \{i \in \mathbb{N} |\ 1 \le i \le M\}$ with the index $i = 0$ reserved for the platoon's leader (leading vehicle). A constant time headway (CTH) spacing policy will be adopted to regulate the spacing between the vehicles [21]. The CTH is implemented by defining the desired distance as:



Fig. 1. CACC-equiped heterogeneous vehicle platoon [6]

$$d_{\mathrm{r},i}(t) = r_i + h_i v_i(t)\ ,\ i \in S_M \tag{1}$$

where r_i is the standstill distance (m) and h_i the time headway (s) (or time gap). It is now possible to define the spacing error (m) of the i^{th} vehicle as:

$$\begin{aligned} e_i(t) &= d_i(t) - d_{\mathrm{r},i}(t) \\ &= (q_{i-1}(t) - q_i(t) - L_i) - (r_i + h_i v_i(t)) \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

with q_i and L_i representing the rear-bumper position (m) and length (m) of vehicle i, respectively.

A desired behavior of the platoon is instantiated when the effect of disturbances (e.g. emergency braking) introduced along the platoon is attenuated as they propagate in the upstream direction [6]. Such behavior is denoted with the term string stability. A standard definition of string stability considered in this work is given as follows.

Definition 1 : (String stability [6]) Let the acceleration of vehicle i be denoted with $a_i(t)$. Then a platoon is considered string stable if,

$$\sup_{\omega} |\Gamma_i(j\omega)| = \sup_{\omega} \left| \frac{a_i(j\omega)}{a_{i-1}(j\omega)} \right| \le 1,\ \ 1 \le i \le M \tag{3}$$

where, $a_i(s)$ is the Laplace transform of the acceleration $a_i(t)$ of vehicle i.

The control objective is to regulate e_i to zero for all $i \in S_M$, while ensuring the string stability of the platoon. The following model is used to represent the vehicles' dynamics in the platoon

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{e}_i \\ \dot{v}_i \\ \dot{a}_i \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & -h_i \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{\tau_i} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} e_i \\ v_i \\ a_i \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} v_{i-1} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \frac{\Lambda_i}{\tau_i} \end{pmatrix} u_i \tag{4}$$

where a_i and u_i are respectively the acceleration (m/s^2) and control input (m/s^2) of vehicle i. Moreover, τ_i represents each vehicle's unknown driveline time constant (s) and Λ_i represents the engine's performance: for the nominal performance we

have $\Lambda_i = 1$, while performance might decrease below 1 due to wear or wind gusts, or increase above 1 due to wind in the tail; Λ_i can also be affected by the slope of the road. Model (4) was proposed in [6] for the special case of $\Lambda_i = 1$, $\forall i \in S_M$. The leading vehicle's model is defined as:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{e_0} \\ \dot{v_0} \\ \dot{a_0} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{\tau_0} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} e_0 \\ v_0 \\ a_0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \frac{1}{\tau_0} \end{pmatrix} u_0. \tag{5}$$

Note that, under the assumption of a homogeneous platoon with perfect engine performance, we have $\tau_i = \tau_0$ and $\Lambda_i = 1$, $\forall i \in S_M$. In this work, we remove the homogeneous assumption by considering that $\forall i \in S_M$, τ_i can be represented as the sum of two terms:

$$\tau_i = \tau_0 + \Delta\tau_i \tag{6}$$

where τ_0 is a known constant representing the driveline dynamics of the leading vehicle and $\Delta\tau_i$ is an unknown constant deviation of the driveline dynamics of vehicle i from τ_0. In fact, $\Delta\tau_i$ acts as an unknown parametric uncertainty. In addition, we remove the perfect engine performance assumption by considering Λ_i as an unknown input uncertainty. Substituting (6) into the third differential equation of (4) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_i \dot{a}_i &= -a_i + \Lambda_i u_i \\ \dot{a}_i &= -\frac{1}{\tau_0} a_i + \frac{1}{\tau_0} \Lambda_i^* [u_i + \Omega_i^* \phi_i] \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where $\Lambda_i^* = \frac{\Lambda_i \tau_0}{\tau_i}$, $\Omega_i^* = -\frac{\Delta\tau_i}{\Lambda_i \tau_0}$, and $\phi_i = -a_i$.

Substituting (7) in (4), the vehicle model in a heterogeneous platoon with engine performance loss under spacing policy (1) can be defined as the following uncertain linear-time invariant system $\forall i \in S_M$

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} \dot{e_i} \\ \dot{v_i} \\ \dot{a_i} \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & -h_i \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{\tau_0} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} e_i \\ v_i \\ a_i \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} v_{i-1} \\ &\quad + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \frac{1}{\tau_0} \end{pmatrix} \Lambda_i^* [u_i + \Omega_i^* \phi_i]. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

We can now formulate the control objective for the heterogeneous platoon as follows:

Problem 1: (Adaptive heterogeneous platooning) Design an adaptive control input $u_i(t)$, $\forall i \in S_M$, such that the heterogeneous platoon described by (5) and (8) asymptotically tracks the behavior of a string stable platoon for any possible vehicles' parametric uncertainty under ideal communication between all consecutive vehicles.

III. Adaptive heterogeneous platooning

In order to design the control input, Section III-A presents string stable reference dynamics for the vehicles in the platoon, and Section III-B defines a stabilizing $u_i(t)$ through a MRAC augmentation approach.

A. CACC reference model

Under the baseline conditions of identical vehicles, perfect engine performance, and no communication losses between any consecutive vehicles, [6] derived, using a CACC strategy, a controller and spacing policy which proved to guarantee the string stability of the platoon. The time headway constant of the spacing policy (1) is set as $h_i = h^C$, $\forall i \in S_M$, where the superscript C indicates that communication is maintained between the vehicle and its preceding one. Moreover, the CACC baseline controller is defined as:

$$h^C \dot{u}^C_{bl,i} = -u^C_{bl,i} + K^C_p e_i + K^C_d \dot{e}_i + u^C_{bl,i-1} \ , \ i \in S_M \tag{9}$$

where K^C_p and K^C_d are the design parameters of the controller. Without loss of generality here and in the following all initial conditions of controllers are set to zero. The initial condition of (9) is set to zero: $u^C_{bl,i}(0) = 0$, $\forall i \in S_M$. In addition, the leading vehicle control input is defined as:

$$h_0 \dot{u}_0 = -u_0 + u_r \tag{10}$$

where u_r is the platoon's input representing the desired acceleration (m/s^2) of the leading vehicle, and h_0 a positive design parameter denoting the nominal time headway. The initial condition of (10) is set to zero: $u_0(0) = 0$. The cooperative aspect of (9) resides in $u^C_{bl,i-1}$, which is received over the wireless communication link between vehicle i and $i-1$.

We can now define the reference dynamics for (8) as: the dynamics of system (8) with $\Omega_i^* = 0$, $\Lambda_i^* = 1$, and control input $u_{i,m} = u^C_{bl,i}$. The reference model can be therefore described by:

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} \dot{e}_{i,m} \\ \dot{v}_{i,m} \\ \dot{a}_{i,m} \\ \dot{u}_{i,m} \end{pmatrix} &= \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & -h^C & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{\tau_0} & \frac{1}{\tau_0} \\ \frac{K^C_p}{h^C} & -\frac{K^C_d}{h^C} & -K^C_d & -\frac{1}{h^C} \end{pmatrix}}_{A^C_m} \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} e_{i,m} \\ v_{i,m} \\ a_{i,m} \\ u_{i,m} \end{pmatrix}}_{x_{i,m}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ \frac{K^C_d}{h^C} & \frac{1}{h^C} \end{pmatrix}}_{B^C_w} \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} v_{i-1} \\ u^C_{bl,i-1} \end{pmatrix}}_{w_i}, \ \forall i \in S_M \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where $x_{i,m}$ and w_i are vehicle i's reference state vector and exogenous input vector, respectively. Consequently, (11) is of the following form:

$$\dot{x}_{i,m} = A^C_m x_{i,m} + B^C_w w_i, \ \forall i \in S_M. \tag{12}$$

Furthermore, using (10), the leading vehicle's model becomes

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{e}_0 \\ \dot{v}_0 \\ \dot{a}_0 \\ \dot{u}_0 \end{pmatrix} = \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{\tau_0} & \frac{1}{\tau_0} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{h_0} \end{pmatrix}}_{A_r} \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} e_0 \\ v_0 \\ a_0 \\ u_0 \end{pmatrix}}_{x_0} + \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \frac{1}{h_0} \end{pmatrix}}_{B_r} u_r. \tag{13}$$

Reference model (12) has been proven in [6] to be asymptotically stable around the equilibrium point

$$x_{i,m,eq} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \bar{v}_0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^T \text{ for } x_0 = x_{i,m,eq} \text{ and } u_r = 0 \tag{14}$$

where $\bar{v}_0$ is a constant velocity, provided that the following Routh-Hurwitz conditions are satisfied

$$h^C > 0,\ \ K_p^C, K_d^C > 0,\ \ K_d^C > \tau_0 K_p^C. \tag{15}$$

To assess the string stability of the reference platoon dynamics, it is found that

$$\Gamma_i(s) = \frac{1}{h^C s + 1},\ \ \forall i \in S_M \tag{16}$$

Therefore, we can conclude that (16) satisfies the string stability condition (3) of Definition 1 for any choice of $h^C > 0$, and thus the defined reference platoon dynamics (12) are string stable.

B. MRAC augmentation of a baseline controller

In this Section, reference model (12) will be used to design the control input $u_i(t)$ such that the uncertain platoon's dynamics described by (5) and (8) converge to string stable dynamics. With this scope in mind, we will augment a baseline controller with an adaptive term, using a similar architecture as proposed in [22]. To include the adaptive augmentation, the input $u_i(t)$ is split, $\forall i \in S_M$, into two different inputs:

$$u_i(t) = u_{bl,i}(t) + u_{ad,i}(t) \tag{17}$$

where $u_{bl,i}$ and $u_{ad,i}$ are the baseline controller and the adaptive augmentation controller (to be constructed), respectively.

First, define the control input of the leading vehicle $u_0(t)$ as in (10). Moreover, define $u_{bl,i}(t) = u_{bl,i}^C(t)$. Substituting (17) into (8), we get the uncertain vehicle model

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i = A_m^C x_i + B_w^C w_i + B_u \Lambda_i^* \big[& u_{ad,i} \\ & + \Theta_i^{*T} \Phi_i \big],\ \forall i \in S_M \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where $x_i = \begin{pmatrix} e_i & v_i & a_i & u_{bl,i} \end{pmatrix}^T$, and the matrices A_m^C and B_w^C are known and defined in (12), and $B_u = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\tau_0} & 0 \end{pmatrix}^T$.

The uncertain ideal parameter vector is defined as $\Theta_i^* = \begin{pmatrix} K_{u,i}^* & \Omega_i^* \end{pmatrix}^T$ where $K_{u,i}^* = 1 - \Lambda_i^{*-1}$. The regressor vector is defined as $\Phi_i = \begin{pmatrix} u_{bl,i} & \phi_i \end{pmatrix}^T$. Therefore, the heterogeneous platoon with engine performance loss and control input (17) can be defined as system (13)-(18).

Furthermore, taking (12) as the vehicle reference model, the adaptive control input is defined as

$$u_{ad,i} = -\Theta_i^T \Phi_i \tag{19}$$

where Θ_i is the estimate of Θ_i^*. Define the state tracking error as

$$\tilde{x}_i = x_i - x_{i,m},\ \forall i \in S_M. \tag{20}$$

Replacing (19) in (18) and subtracting (12) results in the following state tracking error dynamics

$$\dot{\tilde{x}}_i = A_m^C \tilde{x}_i - B_u \Lambda_i^* \tilde{\Theta}_i^T \Phi_i \tag{21}$$

where $\tilde{\Theta}_i = \Theta_i - \Theta_i^*$.

Since A_m^C is stable, there exists a unique symmetric positive define matrix $P_m = P_m^T > 0$ such that

$$(A_m^C)^T P_m + P_m A_m^C + Q_m = 0$$



Fig. 2. Networked switched control system

where $Q_m = Q_m^T > 0$ is a designed matrix. Define the adaptive law

$$\dot{\Theta}_i = \Gamma_\Theta \Phi_i \tilde{x}_i^T P_m B_u \tag{22}$$

with $\Gamma_\Theta = \Gamma_\Theta^T > 0$ being the adaptive gain. Then the following stability and convergence results can be stated.

Theorem 1: Consider the heterogeneous platoon model (8) with reference model (12). Then, the adaptive input (19) with adaptive law (22) makes the platoon's dynamics asymptotically converge to string stable dynamics. Consequently,

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} [x_i(t) - x_{i,m}(t)] = 0,\ \forall i \in S_M$$

and

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \|\Theta_i^T(t)\Phi_i(t)\| = 0,\ \forall i \in S_M.$$

Proof: See Appendix A. ■

The results of Theorem 1 hold under the assumption of ideal continuous communication between the vehicles in the platoon. However, communication losses are always present in practice and coping with them is the subject of the next section.

IV. Adaptive Switched Heterogeneous Platooning

One way of handling the unavoidable communication losses is by switching between CACC and ACC depending on the network's state at each single communication link. This networked switched control system is outlined in Fig. 2. In this aim, an adaptive switched control method is presented for the scenario with joint heterogeneous dynamics and inter-vehicle communication losses. Note that ACC does not require inter-vehicle communication, but as a drawback it requires to increase the time gap in order to guarantee string stability [6]. So, the switched control system also takes into account that a different spacing policy might be active in the CACC case (indicated with h^C) and in the ACC case (indicated with h^L), where the superscript L stands for communication loss. The adaptive switched controller is based on a Mode-Dependent Average Dwell Time (MDADT) which is used to characterize the network switching behavior as a consequence of communication losses.

Definition 2 (Mode-Dependent Average Dwell Time [23]): For a switched system with S subsystems, a switching signal $\sigma(\cdot)$, taking values in $\{1,2,3,...,S\} = \mathscr{M}$, and for $s \geq t \geq 0$ and $k \in \mathscr{M}$, let $N_{\sigma k}(t,s)$ denote the number of times subsystem k is activated in the interval $[t,s)$, and let $T_k(t,s)$ be the total time subsystem k is active in the interval $[t,s)$. The switching

signal $\sigma(\cdot)$ is said to have a MDADT τ_{ak} if there exist positive numbers N_{0k}, called mode-dependent chatter bounds, and τ_{ak} such that:

$$N_{\sigma k}(t,s) \leq N_{0k} + \frac{T_k(t,s)}{\tau_{ak}}, \ \forall s \geq t \geq 0. \tag{23}$$

Furthermore, in the presence of switching losses, the following notion of stability must be introduced.

Definition 3 (Global uniform ultimate boundedness [24]): A signal $\phi(t)$ is said to be globally uniformly ultimately bounded (GUUB) with ultimate bound if there exists a positive constant b, and for arbitrarily large $a \geq 0$, there is a time instant $T = T(a,b)$, where b and T are independent of t_0, such that

$$\|\phi(t_0)\| \leq a \Rightarrow \|\phi(t)\| \leq b, \ \forall\, t \geq t_0 + T. \tag{24}$$

By extension, we say that a system is GUUB when its trajectories are GUUB.

A. Mixed CACC-ACC reference model

In order to design the switched adaptive control input, we present in this section mixed CACC-ACC string stable dynamics which serve as reference dynamics of the vehicles in the platoon. Let S_M^L be the subset of S_M containing the indices of the vehicles that lose communication with their preceding vehicle. In addition, let S_M^C be the subset of S_M containing the indices of the vehicles with maintained communication with their preceding vehicle. In the presence of inter-vehicle communication losses, reference dynamics (12) fail in general to guarantee the string stability of the platoon since, $u_{bl,i-1}^C$ is now no longer present for measurement $\forall i \in S_M^L$, and (3) might be violated. In this case, the time headway constant of the spacing policy (1) is set as $h_i = h^L$, $\forall i \in S_M^L$, with h^L to be determined in order to recover string stability. To do so, we define a new ACC baseline controller as follows

$$h^L \dot{u}_{bl,i}^L = -u_{bl,i}^L + K_p^L e_i + K_d^L \dot{e}_i, \ \forall i \in S_M^L \tag{25}$$

where K_p^L and K_d^L are the design parameters of the controller. The initial condition of (25) is set to zero: $u_{bl,i}^C(0) = 0$, $\forall i \in S_M^L$. Similar to the CACC case, the ACC reference model is defined as system (8) with $\Omega_i^* = 0$, $\Lambda_i^* = 1$, and control input $u_{i,m} = u_{bl,i}^L$. Therefore, the reference model can be described by

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{e}_{i,m} \\ \dot{v}_{i,m} \\ \dot{a}_{i,m} \\ \dot{u}_{i,m} \end{pmatrix} = \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & -h^L & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{\tau_0} & \frac{1}{\tau_0} \\ \frac{K_p^L}{h^L} & -\frac{K_d^L}{h^L} & -K_d^L & -\frac{1}{h^L} \end{pmatrix}}_{A_m^L} \begin{pmatrix} e_{i,m} \\ v_{i,m} \\ a_{i,m} \\ u_{i,m} \end{pmatrix} + \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ \frac{K_d^L}{h^L} & 0 \end{pmatrix}}_{B_w^L} \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} v_{i-1} \\ u_{bl,i-1}^C \end{pmatrix}}_{w_i}, \ \forall i \in S_M^L \tag{26}$$

which is of the form

$$\dot{x}_{i,m} = A_m^L x_{i,m} + B_w^L w_i, \ \forall i \in S_M^L \tag{27}$$

The asymptotic stability of the reference model (27) around equilibrium point (14) can be guaranteed by deriving conditions on K_p^L and K_d^L through the Routh-Hurwitz stability criteria. These conditions were found to be the same as (15). String stability of (27) can be additionally guaranteed by deriving sufficient conditions on the gains of controller (25) using condition (3) of Definition 1; when vehicle i is operating under ACC ($i \in S_M^L$), $\Gamma_i(s)$ is

$$\Gamma_i(s) = \frac{K_p^L + K_d^L s}{(\tau_0 s^3 + s^2 + K_d^L s + K_p^L)(h^L s + 1)}, \ \forall i \in S_M^L. \tag{28}$$

It gives,

$$|\Gamma_i(j\omega)| = \frac{\sqrt{(K_d^L \omega)^2 + K_p^{L^2}}}{\sqrt{(h^L\omega)^2 + 1}\sqrt{(K_p^L - \omega^2)^2 + (K_d^L\omega - \tau_0\omega^3)^2}}. \tag{29}$$

For a defined h^L, $\sup_w |\Gamma_i| \leq 1$, $\forall i \in S_M^L$, is verified by choosing K_p^L and K_d^L such that, $\forall \omega > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}(h^L\tau_0)^2\omega^6 + ((h^L)^2 - 2K_d^L\tau_0(h^L)^2 + \tau_0^2)\omega^4 + (1 - 2K_p^L h^L \\ + (h^L K_d^L)^2 - 2K_d^L\tau_0)\omega^2 + ((h^L K_p^L)^2 - 2K_p^L) \geq 0.\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Therefore, for a homogeneous platoon with no engine performance loss, when a communication link is lost, one can switch, for that link, from a string stable CACC strategy designed via (20), to a string stable ACC strategy designed via (28).

The resulting string stable mixed CACC-ACC reference dynamics can be described by

$$\dot{x}_0 = A_r x_0 + B_r u_r \tag{31}$$

$$\dot{x}_{i,m} = A_m^C x_{i,m} + B_w^C w_i, \ \forall i \in S_M^C \tag{32}$$

$$\dot{x}_{i,m} = A_m^L x_{i,m} + B_w^L w_i, \ \forall i \in S_M^L. \tag{33}$$

B. Formulation and main result for platooning with inter-vehicle communication losses

In this section, reference models (32) and (33) will be used to design the piecewise continuous control input $u_i(t)$ such that the uncertain platoon's dynamics described by (5) and (8) track with a bounded error string stable dynamics even in the presence of communication losses.

We define a new switched control input as

$$u_i(t) = u_{bl,i}(t) + u_{ad,i}(t), \ \forall i \in S_M \tag{34}$$

where

$$u_{bl,i}(t) = \begin{cases} u_{bl,i}^C, \text{ when communication is present} \\ u_{bl,i}^L, \text{ when communication is lost} \end{cases} \tag{35}$$

In the presence of inter-vehicle communication losses, the following problem is defined:

Problem 2: (Adaptive switched heterogeneous platooning) Design the adaptive laws for (34) and the switching parameters τ_{ak} and N_{0k} as in (23) such that for any MDADT switching

signal satisfying (23) and in the presence of vehicles' parametric uncertainties, the heterogeneous platoon, described by (5) and (8), with communication losses tracks the behavior of a string stable platoon with GUUB error.

Remark 1: The reason for seeking GUUB stability (in place of asymptotic stability) is that asymptotic stability of switched systems with large uncertainties and average dwell time is a big open problem in control theory [25].

First, defining the control input of the leading vehicle $u_0(t)$ as in (10), results in a lead vehicle model as in (31). Then substituting (17) into (8), the uncertain switched linear system vehicle model as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}_i = A_{m,\sigma_i(t)}x_i + B_{w,\sigma_i(t)}w_i + B_u\Lambda_i^*\big[u_{ad,i} \\ + \Theta_i^{*T}\Phi_i\big],\ \forall i \in S_M,\ \sigma_i(t) \in \mathscr{M} := \{1,2\}\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

where $\sigma_i(\cdot)$ is the switching law of vehicle i (defined at the single link level), and $A_{m,\sigma_i(t)}$ and $B_{w,\sigma_i(t)}$ are time variant matrices taking values, depending on the activated subsystem, as the known matrices $A_{m,k}$ and $B_{w,k}$ respectively, defined in (32) and (33), with $k \in \mathscr{M}$ representing the two subsystems in our system. In fact, subsystem $k=1$ is activated by $\sigma_i(\cdot)$ when communication is maintained between vehicle i and its preceding one (when $i \in S_M^C$), and subsystem $k=2$ is activated by $\sigma_i(\cdot)$ otherwise (when $i \in S_M^L$).

Therefore, the heterogeneous platoon with engine performance loss under the control input $u_i(t) = u_{bl,i}(t) + u_{ad,i}(t)$ can be described by (31) and (36).

Furthermore, define the group of reference models representing the desired behavior of each subsystem as:

$$\dot{x}_{m,i}(t) = A_{m,\sigma_i(t)}x_{m,i}(t) + B_{w,\sigma_i(t)}w_i(t),\ \forall i \in S_M,\ \sigma_i(t) \in \mathscr{M} \tag{37}$$

where $x_{m,i} = \begin{pmatrix} e_{m,i} & v_{m,i} & a_{m,i} & u_{i,m}\end{pmatrix}^T$. Note that (37) is of the form (32) for $\sigma_i(t)=1$ (when $i \in S_M^C$) and (32) for $\sigma_i(t)=2$ (when $i \in S_M^L$).

The adaptive control input is defined as:

$$u_{ad,i}(t) = -\Theta_{i,\sigma_i(t)}^T\Phi_i \tag{38}$$

where $\Theta_{i,k}$ is the estimate of Θ_i^* of subsystem k. Moreover, the state tracking error is defined as in (20). Replacing (38) in (36) and subtracting (37) we obtain, $\forall i \in S_M$ and $\sigma_i(t) \in \mathscr{M} = \{1,2\}$, the following state tracking error dynamics

$$\dot{\tilde{x}}_i = A_{m,\sigma_i(t)}\tilde{x}_i - B_u\Lambda_i^*\tilde{\Theta}_{i,\sigma_i(t)}^T\Phi_i \tag{39}$$

where $\tilde{\Theta}_{i,k} = \Theta_{i,k} - \Theta_i^*$. Moreover, define (t_{k_l}, t_{k_l+1}) as the switch-in and switch-out instant pair of subsystem k, with $k \in \mathscr{M}$ and $l \in \mathbb{N}^+$.

Since $A_{m,k}$ is stable, there exist symmetric positive definite matrices $P_k = P_k^T > 0$ for every subsystem $k \in \{1,2\}$ such that

$$A_{m,k}^TP_k + P_kA_{m,k} + \gamma_kP_k \leq 0.$$

Define $\overline{\lambda}_k$ and $\underline{\lambda}_k$ as the maximum and the minimum eigenvalue of P_k respectively, and $\beta = \min_{k\in\mathscr{M}}\{\underline{\lambda}_k\}$. Furthermore, assume known upper and lower bounds for Θ^* such that $\Theta^* \in [\underline{\Theta}, \overline{\Theta}]$, and assume $\Lambda_i^* \geq 0$ with a known upper bound such that $0 \leq \Lambda_i^* \leq \overline{\Lambda}$.

Moreover, define the adaptive law for every $k \in \{1,2\}$ and $S_k = S_k^T > 0$ as

$$\dot{\Theta}_{i,k}^T(t) = S_k^TB_u^TP_k\tilde{x}_i(t)\Phi_i^T + F_{i,k}^T(t) \tag{40}$$

where $F_{i,k}(t)$ is a parameter projection term, defined in [26], that acts component-wise and guarantees the boundedness of the estimated parameters in $[\underline{\Theta}, \overline{\Theta}]$. In particular, $F_{i,k}$ is zero whenever the corresponding component of $\Theta_{i,k}$ is within the prescribed uncertainty bounds; otherwise, $F_{i,k}$ is set to guarantee that the corresponding time derivative of $\Theta_{i,k}$ is zero.

Furthermore, we define the switching law $\sigma_i(t)$ based on a MDADT strategy as follows

$$\tau_{ak} > \frac{1+\zeta}{\gamma_k}\ln(\mu_k) \tag{41}$$

with $\zeta > 0$ is a user-defined positive constant, and μ_k, $k \in \mathscr{M}$ defined as $\mu_1 = \frac{\overline{\lambda}_2}{\underline{\lambda}_1}$ and $\mu_2 = \frac{\overline{\lambda}_1}{\underline{\lambda}_2}$. The following stability and convergence results can be guaranteed by (40)-(41):

Theorem 2: Consider the heterogeneous platoon model (8) with reference models (32) and (33) in the CACC and ACC mode respectively. Then, the adaptive input (38) with adaptive laws (40) makes the error dynamics (39) GUUB, provided that the switching between CACC and ACC satisfies the MDADT (41). Furthermore, the following state tracking error upper bound is derived

$$\|\tilde{x}_i(t)\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{\beta}\exp\Big\{\sum_{k=1}^{2}N_{0k}\ln\mu_k\Big\}M\ ,\ \ \forall i \in S_M \tag{42}$$

where $M = \max_{k\in\mathscr{M}}\Big\{\|\tilde{x}_i(t_0)\|^2 + c_1 + c_2, \kappa\frac{(1+\zeta)}{\zeta}(c_1+c_2)\Big\}$, $c_k = \mathrm{tr}\big[(\overline{\Theta}-\underline{\Theta})S_k^{-1}(\overline{\Theta}-\underline{\Theta})^T\overline{\Lambda}\big] > 0$, and $\kappa = \max_{k\in\mathscr{M}}\{\mu_k\}$. Finally, the ultimate bound b on the norm of the state tracking error is found to be

$$b \in \left[0,\ \sqrt{\exp\left(\sum_{k=1}^{2}N_{0k}\ln\mu_k\right)\frac{\kappa\overline{B}}{\beta}}\right].$$

with

$$\overline{B} = (c_1+c_2)\frac{1+\zeta}{\zeta} > 0 \tag{43}$$

Proof: See Appendix B. ∎

Remark 2: The choice of ζ is based on the compromise between fast switching capabilities (41) (small ζ) and a small tracking error (42) upper bound (large ζ). Note that, as it is to be expected in any adaptive control setting [27], the error bounds are dependent on the size of the uncertainty set via c_1 and c_2.

Remark 3: Since reference models (37) were chosen to provide the desired string stable dynamics of the platoon under mixed network conditions as shown in Sections III-A and IV-A, then (40)-(41) guarantee that the heterogeneous platoon tracks, with a bounded tracking error, the behavior of a string stable platoon even in the presence of inter-vehicle communication losses.

Remark 4: The stability proof of Theorem 2 is based on two Lyapunov functions, one active when communication is present and one active when it is lost, cf. (46). Consequently,

when communication is always maintained, only one Lyapunov function in (46) is active, from which we recover the asymptotic stability result as in Theorem 1.

V. An Illustrative Example

To validate the different control strategies discussed earlier, we simulate in Matlab/Simulink [28] a heterogeneous platoon of 5+1 vehicles (including vehicle 0) with vehicles' engine performance loss. The platoon's characteristics are shown in Table I, and are motivated by nominal values found and validated in the literature as in [6] and [29].

TABLE I
Platoon parameters, M=5.

i	0	1	2	3	4	5
$\tau_i(s)$	0.1	0.5	0.7	0.3	0.7	0.9
Λ_i	-	0.5	0.7	0.75	0.7	0.7

In order to test the string stability of the heterogeneous platoon, the desired platoon acceleration $a_0(t)$, shown in Fig. 3, represents a stop-and-go scenario that undergoes a sudden disturbance at $t = 20$ s.

We define 3 experiments to showcase the performance and results of controllers (17) and (34)

- Experiment 1: (Perfect communication, no adaptation) Simulate the platoon under the control action of the CACC baseline controller (9) without adaptation.
- Experiment 2: (Perfect communication, adaptation) Simulate the platoon under the control action of the augmented adaptive CACC controller (17).
- Experiment 3: (Communication losses, adaptation) Simulate the platoon under the control action of the augmented adaptive switched controller (34) using TrueTime2.0 [30] to model a realistic wireless communication network (IEEE 802.11p/WAVE) with update frequency of 10 Hz.

In terms of spacing policies, ACC will operate with the standardized minimum time gap of $h^L = 1$ s. On the other hand, CACC was shown to guarantee string stability for any $h^C > 0$ provided (15) are verified. This motivates us to choose h^C as small as possible in order to guarantee maximum road throughput and fuel efficiency. However, [6] showed a compromise between a low value of h^C and the maximum allowed delay in the network for string stability. We choose a time gap of $h^C = 0.7$ s which provides robustness towards delays up to 0.3 s. The baseline controllers' gains are chosen (for all experiments), as $K_p^C = 0.2$ and $K_d^C = 0.7$ for $u_{bl,i}^C$, and $K_p^L = 2.5$ and $K_d^L = 2.3$ for $u_{bl,i}^L$ in order to respect both string stability conditions (15) and (30). For all experiments, the control input of the lead vehicle is defined by setting $h_0 = 0.7$ s. In experiment 2, we designed the adaptive term (19) by setting $\Gamma_\Theta = 80 I_{2\times 2}$ and $Q_m = 5 I_{4\times 4}$.

Furthermore, in order to design the adaptive input (38) for experiment 3, we need to quantify the loss of communication between vehicles which is represented as the switching signals $\sigma_i(t)$. In fact, for a velocity range of approximately $[0, 50]$ (m/s) and inter-vehicle distance range of approximately $[0, 40]$ (m), the Packet Error Rate between consecutive vehicles was measured in practice to be around 1% [20]. Therefore, since our operating conditions, characterized by the desired platoon acceleration and the headway constants, fall inside the previously defined intervals, and since the total experiment duration is 120 s, the expected average time of loss of communication can be calculated as 1% of 120 s for one inter-vehicle communication network. This results in an average total communication loss time of 1.2 s between consecutive vehicles during the total operating time of 120 s. Accounting for single packet loss and consecutive packet loss, we define the switching signals of the 5 vehicles, shown in Fig. 5 (Top), by the following MDADT characteristics $N_{01} = 2$, $N_{02} = 2$, $\tau_{a1} = 8.5$, and $\tau_{a2} = 0.7$, and a total communication loss time for one inter-vehicle communication link of 1.2 s.



Fig. 3. Desired platoon acceleration $a_0(t)$.

Therefore, to keep the platoon stable when switching back and forth between control strategies, we need to design the adaptive term (38) such that the switching conditions for stability (41) are satisfied $\forall k \in \mathscr{M}$. In fact, by setting $\gamma_1 = 0.60$, $\gamma_2 = 1.00$, and $S_1 = S_2 = 100$, the following MDADT conditions are necessary to guarantee the overall stability of the switched system: $\tau_{a1} > 8.01$ and $\tau_{a2} > 0.66$. Therefore, since both conditions are satisfied by the switching signal's MDADT characteristics, then the switching controller in able to indeed guarantee the overall stability of the switched system. From Fig. 4, it is clear that in Experiment 1, the CACC baseline controller (9) which guarantees the string stability of the platoon under the homogeneity and perfect engine assumptions, fails to maintain the platoon's stability when applied to the heterogeneous platoon. On the other hand, Fig. 4 also shows that, in Experiment 2, the augmented CACC controller (17), under the same platoon desired acceleration $a_0(t)$, succeeds in maintaining the string stability of the platoon even-though the platoon is composed of unknown non-identical vehicles that suffer from unknown engine performance loss.

Furthermore, Fig. 5 demonstrates the performance of the augmented adaptive switched controller (34) when communication loss is present in the platoon. We can see that controller (34) manages to maintain the string stability of the platoon while switching back and forth between control strategies to recover from the loss of communication throughout the platoon. We can see from Fig. 5 that when a vehicle loses communication with its preceding one, it switches to a spacing policy characterized by a larger time gap. This is illustrated by the fact that the vehicle reduces its speed, for some time,



Fig. 4. Velocities of vehicles 0-5: $v_i(t)$, $i \in \{0, S_5\}$ in Experiment 1 (Top) and Experiment 2 (Bottom).



Fig. 5. Experiment 3: Switching signals $\sigma_i(t)$ of vehicles 1-5: $\sigma_i(t)$, $i \in S_5$ (Top) and Velocities of vehicles 0-5: $v_i(t)$, $i \in \{0, S_5\}$ (Bottom).



Fig. 6. Norm of the state tracking error of vehicles 1-5: $\|\tilde{x}_i(t)\|$, $i \in S_5$ in Experiment 2 (Top) and Experiment 3 (Bottom).

in order to enlarge its inter-vehicle time gap and subsequently increases it speed again to match the platoon's speed. In turn, its following vehicles reduce their speeds in order to maintain their respective desired inter-vehicle spacing.

In terms of the norm of the state tracking error, Fig. 6 shows that when communication is always maintained, controller (17) regulates asymptotically the error to 0. Moreover, Experiment 3 shows that, under the action of controller (34), the platoon's dynamics track, with a bounded state tracking error, the dynamics of a string stable platoon even when communication loss is present in the system.

VI. Conclusions

A novel adaptive switched control strategy to stabilize a platoon with non-identical vehicle dynamics, engine performance losses, and communication losses has been considered. The proposed control scheme comprises a switched baseline controller (string stable under the homogeneous platoon with perfect engine performance assumption) augmented with a switched adaptive term (to compensate for heterogeneous dynamics and engine performance losses). The derivation of the string stable reference models and augmented switched controllers have been provided and their stability and string stability properties were analytically studied. When the switching respects a required mode-dependent average dwell time, the closed-loop switched system is stable and signal boundedness is guaranteed. Numerical results have demonstrated the string stability of the heterogeneous platoon with engine performance losses under the designed control strategy.

Appendix A
Proof of Theorem 1

Define a radially unbounded quadratic Lyapunov candidate function as:

$$V_i(t) = \tilde{x}_i^T P_m \tilde{x}_i + \mathrm{tr}(\tilde{\Theta}_i \Gamma_\Theta^{-1} \tilde{\Theta}_i \Lambda_i^*).$$

Taking the time derivative of $V_i(t)$ and substituting the error dynamics into (21) results in:

$$\dot{V}_i(t) = -\tilde{x}_i^T Q_m \tilde{x}_i - 2\tilde{x}_i^T P_m B_u \Lambda_i^* \tilde{\Theta}_i \Phi_i + 2\mathrm{tr}(\tilde{\Theta}_i \Gamma_\Theta^{-1} \dot{\Theta}_i \Lambda_i^*).$$

When calculating the time derivative we have used the fact that the extra input from system $i-1$ in (11) to reference model i is canceled by the last term in (9). In such a way we can proceed showing that this interconnection does not destroy stability. Using the identity $a^T b = \mathrm{tr}(ba^T)$ results in:

$$\dot{V}_i(t) = -\tilde{x}_i^T Q_m \tilde{x}_i + 2\mathrm{tr}(\tilde{\Theta}_i^T \{\Gamma_\Theta^{-1} \dot{\Theta}_i - \Phi_i \tilde{x}_i^T P_m B_u\} \Lambda_i^*). \quad (44)$$

Choosing the adaptive law as in (22) reduces (44) to:

$$\dot{V}_i(t) = -\tilde{x}_i^T Q_m \tilde{x}_i \leq 0 \quad (45)$$

which proves the uniform ultimate boundedness of $(\tilde{x}_i, \tilde{\Theta}_i)$. Furthermore, it can be concluded from (45) that $\tilde{x}_i \in L_2$. In addition, since $w_i(t)$ is bounded, then $x_{i,m} \in L_\infty$ and consequently, $x_i \in L_\infty$ and $u_{bl,i} \in L_\infty$. Moreover, since Θ_i^* is constant then the estimated value is also bounded, $\tilde{\Theta}_i \in L_\infty$. Since $(x_i, u_{bl,i}) \in L_\infty$ and the components of the regressor vector Φ_i are locally Lipschitz continuous, then the regressor's components are bounded. Therefore, $u_i \in L_\infty$ and $\dot{x}_i \in L_\infty$. Hence, $\dot{\tilde{x}}_i \in L_\infty$, which implies that $\ddot{V}_i \in L_\infty$. Thus, $\dot{V}_i$ is a uniformly continuous function of time. In addition, since V_i has a lower bound, $\dot{V}_i \leq 0$, and $\dot{V}_i$ is uniformly continuous, then by Barbalat's Lemma, V_i tends to a limit, while its derivative tends to zero. Hence, the tracking error $\tilde{x}_i$ tends asymptotically to zero as $t \to \infty$. Furthermore, since V_i is radially unbounded, then $\tilde{x}_i$ globally asymptotically tends to zero as $t \to \infty$. This means that the tracking error dynamics are globally asymptotically stable. From (21), it can be deduced that $\ddot{\tilde{x}}_i \in L_\infty$ which indicates that

$\dot{\tilde{x}}_i$ is uniformly continuous. Moreover, since $\tilde{x}_i \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$ then using Barbalat's lemma, $\lim_{t\to\infty} \|\dot{\tilde{x}}_i\| = 0$. Which leads to:

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \|\tilde{\Theta}_i^T \Phi_i\| = 0 \ , \ \forall i \in S_M.$$

This proves that for any bounded w_i, the closed-loop system globally asymptotically tracks the reference model as $t \to \infty$. This completes the proof.

Appendix B
Proof of Theorem 2

The stability proof is based on two Lyapunov functions, one active when communication is present and one active when it is lost. An appropriate MDADT will be constructed in such a way that switching among the Lyapunov functions guarantees GUUB. Define the following Lyapunov function:

$$V_i(t) = \tilde{x}_i^T(t) P_{\sigma_i(t)} \tilde{x}_i(t) + \sum_{k=1}^{2} \mathrm{tr}(\tilde{\Theta}_{i,k}(t) S_k^{-1} \tilde{\Theta}_{i,k}^T(t) \Lambda_i^*), \ \forall i \in S_M. \tag{46}$$

Using the switched adaptive law (40), the derivative of $V_i(t)$ with respect to time between two consecutive discontinuities (i.e. $t \in [t_l, t_{l+1})$) is

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{V}_i(t) &= \tilde{x}_i^T(t)(A_{m\sigma_i(t_{l+1}^-)}^T P_{\sigma_i(t_{l+1}^-)} + P_{\sigma_i(t_{l+1}^-)} A_{m\sigma_i(t_{l+1}^-)}) \tilde{x}_i(t) \\
&\quad + 2\mathrm{tr}[\tilde{\Theta}_{i,\sigma_i(t_{l+1}^-)} S^{-1}_{\sigma_i(t_{l+1}^-)} F^T_{i,\sigma_i(t_{l+1}^-)} \Lambda_i^*] \\
&\leq -\gamma_{\sigma_i(t_{l+1}^-)} \tilde{x}_i^T(t) P_{\sigma_i(t_{l+1}^-)} \tilde{x}_i(t) \\
&\quad + 2\mathrm{tr}[\tilde{\Theta}_{i,\sigma_i(t_{l+1}^-)} S^{-1}_{\sigma_i(t_{l+1}^-)} F^T_{i,\sigma_i(t_{l+1}^-)} \Lambda_i^*].
\end{aligned}$$

In fact the following two inequalities hold [26]

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{\Theta}_{i,\sigma_i(t_{l+1}^-)} S^{-1}_{\sigma_i(t_{l+1}^-)} F^T_{i,\sigma_i(t_{l+1}^-)} \Lambda_i^* \leq 0 \\
&\sum_{k=1}^{2} \mathrm{tr}(\tilde{\Theta}_{i,k}(t) S_k^{-1} \tilde{\Theta}_{i,k}^T(t) \Lambda_i^*) \leq c_1 + c_2
\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

where $c_k = \mathrm{tr}\big[(\overline{\Theta} - \underline{\Theta}) S_k^{-1} (\overline{\Theta} - \underline{\Theta})^T \overline{\Lambda}\big]$ is a finite positive constant. This results in, for any $\zeta > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{V}_i(t) &\leq -\gamma_{\sigma_i(t_{l+1}^-)} \tilde{x}_i^T(t) P_{\sigma_i(t_{l+1}^-)} \tilde{x}_i(t) \\
&\quad + \gamma_{\sigma_i(t_{l+1}^-)}(c_1 + c_2) - \gamma_{\sigma_i(t_{l+1}^-)}(c_1 + c_2) \\
&\leq -\frac{\gamma_{\sigma_i(t_{l+1}^-)}}{1+\zeta} V_i(t) + \frac{\gamma_{\sigma_i(t_{l+1}^-)}}{1+\zeta} \left[(1+\zeta)(c_1+c_2) - \zeta V_i(t)\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

Let us define a finite positive constant

$$\overline{B} = \frac{1+\zeta}{\zeta}(c_1 + c_2). \tag{49}$$

Then, using (48) and (49) we can conclude that, between two consecutive discontinuities, $V_i(t)$ is

- decreasing at an exponential rate when $V_i(t) > \overline{B}$ since $\dot{V}_i(t) \leq -\frac{\gamma_{\sigma_i(t_{l+1}^-)}}{1+\zeta} V_i(t)$
- non increasing when $V_i(t) \leq \overline{B}$ since $\dot{V}_i(t) \leq 0$

The next step is to assess the behavior of $V_i(t)$ at the discontinuous instants. We consider subsystem $\sigma_i(t_{l+1}^-)$ is active when $t \in [t_l, t_{l+1})$ and subsystem $\sigma_i(t_{l+1})$ is active when $t \in [t_{l+1}, t_{l+2})$. Therefore, before switching we have

$$\begin{aligned}
V_i(t_{l+1}^-) &= \tilde{x}_i^T(t_{l+1}^-) P_{\sigma_i(t_{l+1}^-)} \tilde{x}_i(t_{l+1}^-) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{2} \mathrm{tr}(\tilde{\Theta}_{i,k}(t_{l+1}^-) S_k^{-1} \tilde{\Theta}_{i,k}^T(t_{l+1}^-) \Lambda_i^*)
\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

and after switching we have

$$\begin{aligned}
V_i(t_{l+1}) &= \tilde{x}_i^T(t_{l+1}) P_{\sigma_i(t_{l+1})} \tilde{x}_i(t_{l+1}) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{2} \mathrm{tr}(\tilde{\Theta}_{i,k}(t_{l+1}) S_k^{-1} \tilde{\Theta}_{i,k}^T(t_{l+1}) \Lambda_i^*).
\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

Since the tracking error $\tilde{x}_i(\cdot)$ and the parameter estimation error $\tilde{\Theta}_{i,k}(\cdot)$ are continuous, we have $\tilde{x}_i(t_{l+1}^-) = \tilde{x}_i(t_{l+1})$ and $\tilde{\Theta}_{i,k}(t_{l+1}^-) = \tilde{\Theta}_{i,k}(t_{l+1})$. Furthermore, we have the following properties:

- $\tilde{x}_i^T(t) P_{\sigma_i(t_{l+1})} \tilde{x}_i(t) \leq \overline{\lambda}_{\sigma_i(t_{l+1})} \tilde{x}_i^T(t) \tilde{x}_i(t)$
- $\tilde{x}_i^T(t) P_{\sigma_i(t_{l+1}^-)} \tilde{x}_i(t) \geq \underline{\lambda}_{\sigma_i(t_{l+1}^-)} \tilde{x}_i^T(t) \tilde{x}_i(t)$

where the first property is valid since we only have 2 subsystems and we know in advance to which subsystem we are switching to. Consequently, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
V_i(t_{l+1}) - V_i(t_{l+1}^-) &= \tilde{x}_i^T(t)(P_{\sigma_i(t_{l+1})} - P_{\sigma_i(t_{l+1}^-)}) \tilde{x}_i(t) \\
V_i(t_{l+1}) - V_i(t_{l+1}^-) &\leq \Big(\frac{\overline{\lambda}_{\sigma_i(t_{l+1})}}{\underline{\lambda}_{\sigma_i(t_{l+1}^-)}} - 1\Big) V_i(t_{l+1}^-) \\
V_i(t_{l+1}) &\leq \mu_{\sigma_i(t_{l+1})} V_i(t_{l+1}^-)
\end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

where $\mu_{\sigma_i(t_{l+1})} = \overline{\lambda}_{\sigma_i(t_{l+1})} / \underline{\lambda}_{\sigma_i(t_{l+1}^-)}$. The next step is to analyze the overall behavior of $V_i(t)$. Considering the initial condition, we have two cases: *a)* $V_i(t_0) > \overline{B}$ and *b)* $V_i(t_0) \leq \overline{B}$.

Case a) $V_i(t_0) > \overline{B}$. Since $V_i(t)$ is decreasing at an exponential rate between two consecutive discontinuities, there exists a finite time instant $t_0 + T_1$ such that $V_i(t_0 + T_1) \leq \overline{B}$. Denote the number of intervals that subsystem k, $k \in \mathscr{M}$, is active by N_{1k}. Therefore, it follows from (48) and (52) that, for $t \in [t_0, \ t_0 + T_1)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
V_i(t) &\leq \prod_{k=1}^{2} \mu_k^{N_{1k}} \exp\left\{ -\sum_{k=1}^{2} \sum_{j=1}^{N_{1k}} (t_{k_j+1} - t_{k_j}) \frac{\gamma_k}{1+\zeta} \right\} V_i(t_0) \\
&= \exp\left(\sum_{k=1}^{2} N_{1k} \ln \mu_k \right) \exp\left(-\sum_{k=1}^{2} T_k \frac{\gamma_k}{1+\zeta} \right) V_i(t_0) \\
&\leq \exp\left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{2} \left[\left(N_{0k} + \frac{T_k}{\tau_{ak}} \right) \ln \mu_k - T_k \frac{\gamma_k}{1+\zeta} \right] \right\} V_i(t_0) \\
&\leq \exp\left(\sum_{k=1}^{2} N_{0k} \ln \mu_k \right) \exp\left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{2} \left(\frac{\ln \mu_k}{\tau_{ak}} - \frac{\gamma_k}{1+\zeta} \right) T_k \right\} V_i(t_0)
\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

where T_k is the total time when subsystem k is active for $t \in [t_0, \ t_0 + T_1)$. By substituting MDADT in (41) to (53), $V_i(t)$ can be attracted into the interval $[0, \overline{B}]$ with sufficiently big $T_1 > 0$. To study the value of $V_i(t_0 + T_1)$, we consider the special case: when $t = t_0 + T_1$, a switching is activated. Then, the interval $[0, \overline{B}]$ becomes $[0, \kappa \overline{B}]$, where the coefficient $\kappa := \max_{k \in \mathscr{M}} \mu_k$ is introduced by (52). Next, it is possible that

$V_i(t)$ will diverge far away from the interval $[0, \kappa\overline{B}]$ due to fast switches when $t > t_0 + T_1$. By recursively performing the analysis above, we notice that it is possible that fast switches happen intermittently over the whole time horizon, which can only guarantee that the Lyapunov function enters and then exceeds the bound $\kappa\overline{B}$ intermittently over the whole time horizon. The worse scenario is that fast switches characterized by N_{0k} are initialized when the Lyapunov function exceeds the bound $\kappa\overline{B}$. This implies that only the following ultimate bound of the Lyapunov function can be guaranteed:

$$b_{\mathrm{V}} = \exp\left(\sum_{k=1}^{2} N_{0k} \ln \mu_k\right) \kappa\overline{B}. \tag{54}$$

Case b) $V_i(t_0) \leq \overline{B}$. The Lyapunov function is non-decreasing at the beginning, and it might exceed the bound $\overline{B}$. Therefore, with a similar analysis as in *case a)*, the same ultimate bound b_{V} of the Lyapunov function can be guaranteed as in (54). Hence, it can be concluded that the switched system (36) is GUUB according to (54). Furthermore, using (53), we can easily obtain an upper bound on $V_i(t)$ with a switching law based on MDADT (41) as follows, $\forall t \geq t_0$,

$$V_i(t) \leq \exp\left(\sum_{k=1}^{2} N_{0k} \ln \mu_k\right) \max\left\{V_i(t_0),\ \kappa\overline{B}\right\}. \tag{55}$$

Since $V_i(t) \geq \beta \|\tilde{x}_i(t)\|^2$, it follows, $\forall t \geq t_0$,

$$\|\tilde{x}_i(t)\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{\beta}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{2} N_{0k} \ln \mu_k\right) \max\left\{V_i(t_0),\ \kappa\overline{B}\right\}.$$

Furthermore, using (54), an ultimate bound of the tracking error is obtained as follows:

$$b \in \left[0,\ \sqrt{\exp\left(\sum_{k=1}^{2} N_{0k} \ln \mu_k\right) \frac{\kappa\overline{B}}{\beta}}\right].$$

This completes the proof.

REFERENCES

[1] M. di Bernardo, A. Salvi, and S. Santini, "Distributed consensus strategy for platooning of vehicles in the presence of time-varying heterogeneous communication delays," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 102–112, 2015.

[2] G. Guo and W. Yue, "Autonomous platoon control allowing range-limited sensors," *IEEE Transactions on vehicular technology*, vol. 61, no. 7, pp. 2901–2912, 2012.

[3] G. Marsden, M. McDonald, and M. Brackstone, "Towards an understanding of adaptive cruise control," *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 33–51, 2001.

[4] D. Jia, K. Lu, J. Wang, X. Zhang, and X. Shen, "A survey on platoon-based vehicular cyber-physical systems," *IEEE Communications Surveys Tutorials*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 263–284, 2016.

[5] "Adaptive Cruise Control Systems: Performance Requirements And Test Procedures," *Standard BS ISO 15622*, 2010.

[6] J. Ploeg, N. Van De Wouw, and H. Nijmeijer, "L_p string stability of cascaded systems: Application to vehicle platooning," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 786–793, 2014.

[7] B. Van Arem, C. J. Van Driel, and R. Visser, "The impact of cooperative adaptive cruise control on traffic-flow characteristics," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 429–436, 2006.

[8] S. E. Shladover, "Automated vehicles for highway operations (automated highway systems)," *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part I: Journal of Systems and Control Engineering*, vol. 219, no. 1, pp. 53–75, 2005.

[9] J.-W. Kwon and D. Chwa, "Adaptive bidirectional platoon control using a coupled sliding mode control method," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 15, no. 5, pp. 2040–2048, 2014.

[10] M. H. M. Ariffin, M. A. A. Rahman, and H. Zamzuri, "Effect of leader information broadcasted throughout vehicle platoon in a constant spacing policy," in *2015 IEEE International Symposium on Robotics and Intelligent Sensors (IRIS)*, Tokyo, Japan, December 2015, pp. 132–137.

[11] R. Kianfar, P. Falcone, and J. Fredriksson, "A control matching model predictive control approach to string stable vehicle platooning," *Control Engineering Practice*, vol. 45, pp. 163–173, 2015.

[12] D. Martinec, I. Herman, and M. Sebek, "On the necessity of symmetric positional coupling for string stability," *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, 2016.

[13] K. C. Dey, L. Yan, X. Wang, Y. Wang, H. Shen, M. Chowdhury, L. Yu, C. Qiu, and V. Soundararaj, "A review of communication, driver characteristics, and controls aspects of cooperative adaptive cruise control (CACC)," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 17, pp. 491–509, 2016.

[14] G. Guo and W. Yue, "Hierarchical platoon control with heterogeneous information feedback," *IET control theory & applications*, vol. 5, no. 15, pp. 1766–1781, 2011.

[15] S. Santini, A. Salvi, A. S. Valente, A. Pescape, M. Segatayz, and R. L. Cignoz, "A consensus-based approach for platooning with inter-vehicular communications," in *IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*, Kowloon, Hong Kong, April 2015, pp. 1158–1166.

[16] G. Guo and S. Wen, "Communication scheduling and control of a platoon of vehicles in vanets," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 17, no. 6, pp. 1551–1563, 2016.

[17] C. Wang and H. Nijmeijer, "String stable heterogeneous vehicle platoon using cooperative adaptive cruise control," in *IEEE 18th International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, Canary Islands, Spain, September 2015, pp. 1977–1982.

[18] X. Guo, J. Wang, F. Liao, and R. S. H. Teo, "String stability of heterogeneous leader-following vehicle platoons based on constant spacing policy," in *IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, Gothenburg, Sweden, June 2016, pp. 761–766.

[19] Z. H. Mir and F. Filali, "LTE and IEEE 802.11 p for vehicular networking: a performance evaluation," *EURASIP Journal on Wireless Communications and Networking*, no. 1, p. 1, 2014.

[20] K. Karlsson, C. Bergenhem, and E. Hedin, "Field measurements of IEEE 802.11p communication in NLOS environments for a platooning application," in *Vehicular Technology Conference (VTC Fall)*, Qubec City, Canada, September 2012, pp. 1–5.

[21] R. Rajamani and C. Zhu, "Semi-autonomous adaptive cruise control systems," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicle Technology*, vol. 51, pp. 1186–1192, 2002.

[22] E. Lavretsky and K. A. Wise, *Robust Adaptive Control*. London: Springer, 2013.

[23] X. Zhao, L. Zhang, P. Shi, and M. Liu, "Stability and stabilization of switched linear systems with mode-dependent average dwell time," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 57, no. 7, pp. 1809–1815, 2012.

[24] D. Liberzon, *Switching in Systems and Control*. Boston: Birkhauser, 2003.

[25] C. Wu and J. Zhao, "H_∞ adaptive tracking control for switched systems based on an average dwell-time method," *International Journal of Systems Science*, vol. 46, no. 14, pp. 2547–2559, 2015.

[26] Q. Sang and G. Tao, "Adaptive control of piecewise linear systems: the state tracking case," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 57, pp. 522–528, 2012.

[27] G. Tao, *Adaptive control design and analysis*. John Wiley & Sons, 2003, vol. 37.

[28] MATLAB, *version 8.5.1 (R2015a)*. Natick, Massachusetts: The MathWorks Inc., 2015.

[29] B. H. Tongue and Y.-T. Yang, "Platoon collision dynamics and emergency maneuvering ii: Platoon simulations for small disturbances," *California Partners for Advanced Transit and Highways (PATH)*, 1994.

[30] A. Cervin, D. Henriksson, and M. Ohlin, "Truetime 2.0–reference manual," 2009.