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Abstract: Several works have proposed longitudinal control strategies enabling a vehicle to operate adaptive cruise control and collision avoidance functions. However, no integration with lateral control has been proposed in the current state of the art, which motivates the developments of this work. This paper presents an integrated control strategy for adaptive cruise control with auto-steering for highway driving. An appropriate logic-based control strategy is used to create synergies and safe interaction between longitudinal and lateral controllers to obtain both lateral stability and advanced adaptive cruise control functionalities. In particular, an index is proposed to evaluate lateral motion of the vehicle based on previously published experimental studies on human driving. In order to handle unstable lateral motion of the vehicle, the desired acceleration is determined based on physical limitation in braking with cornering situations. Simulation results show that the proposed integrated controller satisfies the performance in terms of autonomous driving, path tracking and collision avoidance for various driving situations.

1 Introduction

An advanced driver assistance systems is a vehicle control system that uses environment sensors (e.g. radar, laser, vision, GPS) to improve driving comfort and traffic safety by assisting the driver in recognizing and reacting to potentially dangerous traffic situations [1]. To improve handling performance and active safety of vehicles, a considerable number of advanced driver assistance systems for vehicle lateral dynamics and longitudinal collision-safety have been developed and utilized commercially over the last two decades. For example, Cruise Control (CC), Adaptive Cruise Control (ACC), Collision Avoidance (CA) have been extensively researched [2]. However, the vast majority of systems proposed in literature [3–7] is focused on longitudinal control with minimal or no focus on lateral control. As a result, the major drawback of commercially available longitudinal control systems is the limited performance in cornering situations [8].

Since the vehicle longitudinal and lateral motions are naturally coupled, it is recognized that the integration of longitudinal and lateral control, also referred to as Integrated Vehicle Dynamics Control (IVDC) [9, 10], presents some challenges due to the co-existence of several control subsystems that can cause increased complexity and conflicts of control objectives and actions. Although the definition of IVDC is still under discussion, its attributes are evident, i.e. it needs to coordinate two or more subsystems systematically according to control objectives and actions [11]. The lack of integrated lateral and longitudinal control might lead in the worst case to conflicting actions, so that the resulting performance might be worse than the performance of longitudinal-only or lateral-only control [2]. Moreover, coordinated control of the actuators is necessary to obtain both lateral stability and safe clearance of autonomous driving vehicle, and also to avoid rear-end collisions in severe driving situations.

In literature, it has been proposed to use the vehicle body side-slip angle and yaw moment respectively to sense the lateral motion of the vehicle and to ensure the lateral stability by controlling these terms [2, 5]. To support integration, most researchers tend to adopt a multi-layer control structure in charge of the coordination and distribution of subsystems [4]. However, note that no specific integration logic (e.g. threshold values for the desired yaw moment and the error in slip angle) has been suggested so far. Furthermore, human factor issues have been widely acknowledged to play a key role in IVDC effectiveness [12]: the design of IVDC based on human driving behaviour encourages better driver acceptance [13] and increases safety [14]. However, to the best of the authors’ knowledge, there exists no experimental study on human driving concerning the desired yaw moment and the error in slip angle.

In this paper, a novel IVDC is proposed that creates safe interaction between longitudinal and lateral controllers. The proposed IVDC aims to avoid rear-end collision and unstable lateral motion of the vehicle. In particular, in severe driving situations, the proposed control strategy is designed based on longitudinal and lateral indices for driving situations to coordinate the braking and steering actuators. Since the vehicle slip angle is not directly measurable by sensors, we propose a novel lateral index based on previously published experimental studies on human driving concerning lateral acceleration levels. We focus on highway driving scenarios. Note that this approach does not require differential braking, thus allowing the use of a two-wheeled vehicle model (bicycle model) which is typically adopted in ACC applications for low computational complexity and real-time control. Simulations are conducted in Matlab/Simulink by using a set of highway traffic scenarios which are likely to occur in reality. Simulation results show that the proposed integrated controller satisfies the performance in terms of autonomous driving and collision avoidance.

The paper is structured as follows: Section 1 introduces vehicle dynamics and the longitudinal controller design, while the lateral controller is discussed in Section 2. Section 4 describes the integrated control structure. Simulations are conducted in Section 5 and conclusions are presented in Section 6. All units in the equations are understood to be SI units (so velocities are in m s\(^{-1}\) and angles are in rad).

2 Longitudinal control design

The longitudinal control strategy adopted in this work is presented together with some basics on vehicle dynamics, which will be used for control purposes.

2.1 Vehicle Dynamics

We consider a 3-Degree of Freedom vehicle model, accounting for the two displacements on the plane (longitudinal, indicated with subscript \(x\), and lateral, indicated with subscript \(y\)) and the rotation around an axis normal to the plane (yaw rotation). Assuming that the vehicle
travels at constant speed and that the turning radius is much larger than the vehicle’s track width, the two-wheeled vehicle model [15], can be written as

\begin{align}
m_x &= m v_y \psi + \cos \delta F_{x,f} + F_{x,r} - \sin \delta F_{y,f} - F_e \quad (1) \\
m_y &= -m v_x \psi + \cos \delta F_{y,f} + F_{y,r} + \sin \delta F_{x,f} \quad (2) \\
I_\psi &= l_f \cos \delta F_{y,f} - l_r F_{y,r} + l_f \sin \delta F_{x,f} \quad (3)
\end{align}

where \( F_{x,f} \) and \( F_{y,f} \) are the longitudinal and lateral tire forces for front wheels, \( F_{x,r} \) and \( F_{y,r} \) are the longitudinal and lateral tire forces for rear wheels, \( \delta \) is the front wheel steering angles, \( F_e \) includes lumped external forces (aerodynamic drag force, rolling resistance force and gravitational resistance force due to road slope), \( l_f \) and \( l_r \) are respectively the distance from the vehicle Centre of Gravity (CoG) to the front and the rear wheel axle of the vehicle, \( m \) is the total mass of the vehicle, \( v_x \) and \( v_y \) are longitudinal and lateral velocity of the host (ACC-equipped) vehicle, \( a_x \) and \( a_y \) are the longitudinal and lateral acceleration of the host vehicle, \( I_\psi \) is the mass moment of inertia with respect to a vertical axis, \( \psi \) and \( \psi \) are yaw angle and yaw rate of the host vehicle. We use the well-known Pacejka formula [16] for longitudinal tire forces

\[ \mu(s_i) = D_P \sin(C_P \arctan(B_P s_i - E_P (B_P s_i - \arctan(B_P s_i)))) \]

\[ F_{x,i} = \mu(s_i) F_{z,i} \quad (4) \]

where the subscript \( i = f, r \) denotes the front and rear wheel respectively, \( s_i \) are the longitudinal wheel-slip ratios, \( \mu(\cdot) \) is the slip ratio dependent friction coefficient, \( B_P, C_P, D_P, E_P \) are the coefficients depending on the road surface, \( F_{x,i} \) are the normal forces exerting on the wheels. For the purpose of this study, we concentrate on the dry tarmac (asphalt).

The lateral tire forces are assumed to be linear functions of slip angles \( \alpha_i \) and cornering stiffness \( C_{y,i} \). [17]

\[ F_{y,i} = 2C_{y,i} \alpha_i, \quad (5) \]

As commonly assumed in literature, we consider that longitudinal and lateral tire forces are limited physically by the adhesion limit between tire and road defined by Kamm circle [18, Sect. 13.8]

\[ \sqrt{F_{y,i}^2 + F_{x,i}^2} \leq \mu F_{z,i}. \quad (6) \]

### 2.2 Longitudinal control modes

The longitudinal controller, aiming at maintaining the longitudinal motion of the vehicle, consists of an upper-level and a low-level controller, as shown in Fig. 1a. The upper-level controller computes the desired acceleration required to attain the desired spacing or velocity. The computed acceleration command is transmitted to the low-level controller that calculates the corresponding actuation commands (throttle and brake). Here we elaborate more on the upper-level controller, while for the low-level controller, the interested reader is referred to the classic approaches presented in [4, 7].

The upper-level longitudinal control scheme is the one typically adopted in the literature [19] and consisting of four modes (CC, ACC, ACC+CA and CA), as depicted in Fig. 1b. In this work the CC mode implements a proportional-derivative control [15]

\[ e_v = v_x - v_{set} \]

\[ a_{x,M0} = K_v e_v + K_d \frac{\text{de}_v}{\text{dt}} \quad (7) \]

where \( v_{set} \) is the velocity of the host vehicle set by the driver. The first term in (7) represents the proportional action and the second term is the derivative action. Since an ideal derivative is not causal, the implementation of the PD controller (7) will include an additional

---

**Algorithm 1: Longitudinal Mode Determination**

1. if \( d > \bar{d} \) then
2. use \( a_{x,M0} \)
3. else if \( d \leq \bar{d} \) and \( \kappa \geq \pi \) and \( \text{TTC}^{-1} \leq \overline{T} \) then
4. use \( a_{x,M1} \)
5. else if \( d \leq \bar{d} \) and \( \kappa \geq \pi \) or \( \text{TTC}^{-1} > \overline{T} \) then
6. use \( a_{x,M2} \)
7. else if \( d \leq \bar{d} \) and \( \kappa \leq \pi \) or \( \text{TTC}^{-1} \geq \overline{T} \) then
8. use \( a_{x,M3} \)
9. end if

In Algorithm 1, \( \overline{T} \) is a design parameter (with \( \overline{T} \geq d_{des}, \) e.g. \( \overline{T} = 1.5d_{des} \)) indicating the maximum error distance beyond which CC is switched off. Note that if \( d \) should be selected by taking into account the distance beyond which the radar cannot detect any target vehicle (typically around 200 m): if \( d \) is larger than the maximum radar operating range, by definition \( d \) is not available and we operate in CC mode. The parameters \( d_0 \) and \( d_w \) in (11) are the braking-critical
and warning-critical distances, defined as
\[ d_b = \frac{v_b^2 - (v_x - v_{rel})^2}{2\mu g} \]
\[ d_w = \frac{v_w^2 - (v_x - v_{rel})^2}{2\mu g} + v_{rel}\tau_h \]  \hspace{1cm} (12)
and derived from the kinematics of two vehicles that brake to a full stop [6]: \( \tau_h \) is the typical human response delay. Finally, \( \zeta, \pi, \overline{T}, \overline{T} \) are user defined thresholds. Note that no integration of the longitudinal control (7)-(10) with lateral control has been proposed in the current state of the art, which motivates the development presented in the next subsection.

2.3 Vehicle Stability Control

Together with CC, ACC, ACC+CA, and CA, an additional Vehicle Stability Control (VSC) mode is designed with the aim to improve vehicle lateral motion and keep the vehicle on the desired path (e.g. the test circuits in Fig. 2b). This is done by calculating a desired longitudinal acceleration \( a_{x,des} \) from physical limitation in braking with cornering situation

\[ a_{x, VSC} = -\sqrt{(\mu mg)^2 - (\sum F_y)^2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (13)
The rationale behind (13) is the following: substitute in (6) the longitudinal forces with \( ma_{x,des} \) and the normal forces with \( \mu mg \), so as to obtain the deceleration (13). In this way, the constraint on longitudinal acceleration is tightened by using the Kamml inequality (6). Note that \( F_y \) in (13) must be either estimated [20, 21], or it can be even measured by using recently developed technology like smart tires [22] or load sensing bearings [23].

The next steps will be then to design a steering angle control (which will be done in Sect. 3) and to design a safe interaction between the longitudinal accelerations (7)-(10), (13) and the steering angle control (which will be done in Sect. 4).

3 Lateral control design

Lateral control involves the steering of the vehicle, so as to maintain the host vehicle in the centre of the lane: in this work, lane keeping is modeled as a path tracking problem.

3.1 Linearized Model

By adopting the classical two-degree of freedom model, the lateral position error \( y_e \) is defined as the lateral distance between the CoG and the centre-line of the desired path (see Fig. 2a). Yaw angle error is denoted with \( \varepsilon \) and defined as the difference between the yaw angle of the vehicle \( \psi \) and the desired yaw angle as dictated by the desired path \( \psi_d \). The rate of changes of the lateral position error and the yaw angle error are defined as [17]
\[ \dot{y}_e = v_x + v_z\varepsilon, \hspace{1cm} \dot{\varepsilon} = \psi - \psi_d \]  \hspace{1cm} (14)
\[ \dot{\psi}_d = \frac{v_x}{\rho} \]  \hspace{1cm} (15)
where \( \rho \) denotes the radius of curvature of the desired path (see Fig. 2b for two examples). Assuming that the lateral tire force is linearly related to the side slip angle by the cornering stiffness as in (5), the tire side-slip angles can be rewritten as
\[ F_{y,f} = C_{y,f}\alpha_f, \hspace{1cm} F_{y,r} = C_{y,r}\alpha_r. \]  \hspace{1cm} (16)

\[ \alpha_f = \delta - \left( \frac{v_y + l_f\dot{\psi}}{v_x} \right), \hspace{1cm} \alpha_r = -\left( \frac{v_y - l_r\dot{\psi}}{v_x} \right). \]  \hspace{1cm} (17)
The lateral tire forces can be expressed by substituting (14) and (15) into (5)
\[ F_{y,f} = 2C_{y,f}\left[ \delta - \left( \frac{v_y + l_f\dot{\psi}}{v_x} \right) + \varepsilon - \frac{l_f}{v_x}\psi_d \right] \]  \hspace{1cm} (18)
\[ F_{y,r} = 2C_{y,r}\left[ -\left( \frac{v_y - l_r\dot{\psi}}{v_x} \right) + \varepsilon + \frac{l_r}{v_x}\psi_d \right]. \]  \hspace{1cm} (19)

The dynamic behavior of the steering actuator is approximated by a first-order lag element [24]
\[ \tau_s\dot{\delta} + \delta = \delta_{des} \]  \hspace{1cm} (20)
where \( \tau_s \) denotes the dynamic time constant and \( \delta_{des} \) the desired wheel steering angle. Finally, lateral dynamic equations are obtained by substituting (20), (18) and (19) into (2) and (3).
\[ X_y = A_yX_y + B_yy_y + \Gamma y_y \]
\[ \chi_y = \left[ y_r \dot{y}_r \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \delta \right]^T \]  \hspace{1cm} (21)
with matrices
\[ A_y = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & a_{y,1} & -a_{y,1} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & a_{y,2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & a_{y,3} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\tau_s \end{bmatrix} \]
\[ B_y = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\
0 \\
0 \\
0 \end{bmatrix} \]
\[ \Gamma_y = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \]
\[ a_{y,1} = -2(C_{y,f} + C_{y,r}) \frac{m}{I_z} \]
\[ a_{y,2} = 2(-l_fC_{y,f} + l_tC_{y,r}) \frac{m}{I_z} \]
\[ a_{y,3} = 2(-l_fC_{y,f} + l_tC_{y,r}) \frac{I_z}{I_z} \]
\[ a_{y,4} = -2l_f^2C_{y,f} + l_f^2C_{y,r} \frac{I_z}{I_z} \]
\[ a_{y,5} = 2C_{y,f} \frac{m}{I_z} \]
\[ a_{y,6} = 2l_fC_{y,f} \frac{I_z}{I_z} \]
\[ w_{y,1} = -\frac{v_y^2}{\rho} + \frac{v_y}{v_x}\dot{\psi}_d \]
\[ w_{y,2} = \frac{a_{y,4}}{v_x}\psi_d - \dot{\psi}_d \]  \hspace{1cm} (23)
where the disturbance term \( w_y \) is defined from road information \((\rho, \dot{\psi}_d, \psi_d)\). Note that, in contrast with [17], one extra state \( \delta \) appears in (21). The extra state comes from the steering dynamics (18) so that the control exploits the information about the actuation authority.

Fig. 2: Vehicle movement in reference frame
(a) Yaw and lateral error. (b) Test circuits (with different radius of curvature \( \rho \))
3.2 Steering Controller

Following a similar approach as in [17], an optimal finite preview control method is used to develop a steering controller. The intention is to eliminate lateral and yaw angle error through a combination of feedback and feed-forward control. The feedback control input of the steering controller for path-tracking is computed using lateral position error and yaw angle error. The feed-forward control input is computed using the road information within the preview distance.

The steering control input is computed to minimize the performance index [17]

\[
J_y(x_y, \lambda, t) = \int_0^\infty \left( \frac{1}{2} x_y^T Q_y x_y + \frac{1}{2} \delta_{des}^T R_y \delta_{des} + \ldots \right) \lambda^T (A_y x_y + B_y \delta_{des} + \Gamma_y w_y - \dot{x}_y) dt
\]

where \( R_y \) is a positive scalar and \( Q_y \) a positive semidefinite matrix defined as follows

\[
Q_y = \begin{bmatrix}
Q_{y_0} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & Q_{y_r} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & Q_z & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & Q_z & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & Q_\delta
\end{bmatrix}
\]

As a result, the steering control input is computed as

\[
\delta_{des}(t) = -K_y x_y(t) + M(t)
\]

where the Lagrangian multiplier \( \lambda \) is calculated as in [25] using the form

\[
\lambda(t) = P_y(t) x_y(t) + H(t)
\]

with \( P_y(t) \) is the solution of Riccati equation and \( H(t) \) satisfies

\[
H = -A_c^T H - P_y \Gamma_y w_y, \quad A_c = A_y - B_y R_y^{-1} B_y^T P_y.
\]

Consider a preview time \( T_p \), which is a function of \( v_x \) and \( \rho \), obtained from experiments on human factors [26]. By using the road information between time \( t \) and \( t + T_p \), (26) becomes

\[
H(t, T_p) = \int_{t}^{t+T_p} (e^{-A_c^T (t-\tau)} P_y(\tau) \Gamma_y w_y(\tau)) d\tau
\]

and thus, the steering control input is used to minimize the cost function where \( K_y \) is the optimal feedback gain, \( M(t) \) is the finite preview control term, which are given as

\[
K_y = -R_y^{-1} B_y^T P_y, \quad M(t) = -R_y^{-1} B_y^T H(t, T_p).
\]

4 Integrated Control Design

In this section, previously designed longitudinal and lateral controllers are integrated into a novel Integrated Vehicle Dynamics Control (IVDC), shown in Fig. 3.

The proposed integration scheme consists of two main functionalities, namely determination of desired and comfort speed, and index-based control. In addition, the commands are delivered to the throttle, brake and steering actuators by the low-level controller.

4.1 Desired and comfort speed determination

The determination of comfort speed is essential so that the lateral acceleration of the host vehicle does not exceed a critical value: in fact, for high lateral accelerations, vehicle model goes non-linear and controlling the vehicle becomes more difficult.

\[
\text{Fig. 3: Scheme of multi-layer integrated vehicle dynamics control system}
\]

Therefore, based on human comfort experiments published in [27], the absolute value of lateral acceleration is limited via velocity-dependent constraints as

\[
|a_{y,des}(v_x)| = a_{y,0} \left( 1 - \frac{v_x}{v_{max}} \right), \quad 0 \leq v_x \leq v_{max}
\]

\[
v_{comfort} = \sqrt{\rho|a_{y,des}(v_x)|}
\]

where \( a_{y,0} \) is the acceptable lateral acceleration in highways (also called medium comfort-level lateral acceleration), \( a_{y,des} \) is the desired lateral acceleration of the host vehicle, \( v_{comfort} \) is the desired velocity of the host vehicle in the terms of comfort in curve, \( g \) is the gravitational acceleration, \( v_{max} \) is the maximum speed of the host vehicle. Note that (29) decreases linearly and monotonically for higher velocities.

The desired velocity of the host vehicle \( v_{des} \) results in

\[
v_{set} \leq v_{limit} = \sqrt{\rho g \mu}
\]

\[
v_{des} = \min \{ v_{set}, v_{comfort} \}
\]

where (31) is a requirement for the user, being \( v_{set} \) as in (7), and \( v_{limit} \) the maximum allowable velocity in curve beyond which the vehicle is driven away from the curve. The rationale behind (29)-(32) is the following: experimental studies on human driving show that drivers tend to have lower lateral acceleration values at higher speeds: so, a velocity-dependent lateral comfort constraint is designed in view of human comfort. The absolute value of desired lateral acceleration is determined in (29); then, \( v_{comfort} \) is calculated in (30) based on the radius of curve and \( a_{y,des} \). The vehicle is not allowed to reach higher speed than \( v_{limit} \) in (31) due to centripetal force, where \( v_{limit} \) determines a constraint on the user-set velocity as in (32).

4.2 Index-based control plane

A task of the decision layer is to determine which one of five control modes (CC, ACC, ACC+CA, CA, or VSC) to activate.

The activation of the five modes is based on an appropriately designed index plane that uses longitudinal and lateral indices. Fig. 4a shows the proposed index-plane. The index-plane consists of a "Normal Driving Mode", an "Integrated Safety Mode I", and an "Integrated Safety Mode II". Integrated safety modes are used to avoid collision and unstable lateral motion of the vehicle.

Similar to [2], the longitudinal index \( I_{long} \) is determined by using a warning index and an inverse TTC

\[
I_{long} = f_1(\kappa) + f_2(\text{TTC}^{-1})
\]

where \( f_1(\cdot) \) is a positive piecewise linear function of the warning index \( \kappa \) and \( f_2(\cdot) \) is a positive piecewise linear function of the inverse
time to collision. The combination of the two functions gives rise to the piecewise linear function represented in Fig. 4b. In this work, we propose a novel lateral index $I_{lat}$

$$a_y,\text{max}(v_x) = \mu g \left( 1 - \frac{v_x}{v_{\text{max}}} \right), \quad I_{lat} = \frac{|a_y|}{a_y,\text{max}(v_x)} \quad (34)$$

where $a_y$ is the lateral acceleration of the host vehicle and $a_y,\text{max}$ is the velocity-dependent maximum value of lateral acceleration. The proposed lateral index is based on experimental studies on human driving [27], which showed that values above $a_y,\text{max}$ definitely cause discomfort for human driving and also complicate the control of a vehicle. Note that $a_y,\text{max}$ decrease linearly as the velocity increases. The index $I_{lat}$ is represented in Fig. 4c.

Summarizing (cf. Algorithm 2):
- In "Normal Driving Mode", which covers CC, ACC, and ACC + CA, the desired longitudinal acceleration $a_x,\text{des}$ is determined as $a_x,\text{M0}$ (7), $a_x,\text{M1}$ (8), or $a_x,\text{M2}$ (9), depending on the active longitudinal mode;
- In "Integrated Safety Mode I", which covers CA, the desired longitudinal acceleration $a_x,\text{des}$ is determined as $a_x,\text{M1}$ (10);
- In "Integrated Safety Mode II", the VSC mode with acceleration (13) has priority over all the other modes, i.e. the desired longitudinal acceleration is $a_x,\text{des} = a_x,\text{VSC}$. Note that this extra mode provides a safe interaction between longitudinal acceleration and steering angle control, as demonstrated in the evaluation section.
- Finally, the desired steering angle $\delta_{\text{des}}$ is determined (no matter which mode is active) by using (25).

Algorithm 2 Integrated Mode Determination

1. if $I_{\text{long}} < 1$ and $I_{\text{lat}} < 1$ then
2. Normal Driving Mode is active
3. else if $I_{\text{long}} \geq 1$ and $I_{\text{lat}} < 1$ then
4. Integrated Safety Mode I is active
5. else if $I_{\text{lat}} \geq 1$ then
6. Integrated Safety Mode II is active
7. end if

Remark. The objective of proposed index-based integration is to satisfy both longitudinal safety and lateral stability. If the longitudinal index exceeds unit, the danger of collision is high; if the lateral index exceeds unit, the danger of unstable lateral motion is high. Notice that in the "Integrated Safety Mode I", the longitudinal safety control has priority to avoid rear-end collision; while in the "Integrated Safety Mode II", the lateral stability control has priority to improve vehicle lateral motion.

4.3 Low-level control

Based on the desired longitudinal acceleration and steering angle, the low-level control manipulates throttle, brake and steering actuators. The steering angle obtained from (25) is transmitted directly to the steering actuator; the throttle/brake actuator input depends on the low-level controller as in [4, 7].

5 Evaluation

For the evaluation of the designed integrated control system, several test scenarios are determined for various traffic situations, including the decentralized scenario in which the integrated control system is not present. We focus on highway driving scenarios. The performance specifications (steady-state errors) are defined as follows:

- for longitudinal control we consider (Table 1a): the steady-state value of $e_x$, i.e. the steady-state distance error between the desired distance and the actual distance; the steady-state value of $v_{rel}$, i.e. the steady-state relative velocity between target and host vehicle;
- for lateral control we consider (Table 1b): the steady-state value of $y_x$, i.e. the steady-state lateral position error; the steady-state value of $\varepsilon$, i.e. the steady-state yaw angle error.

The term steady-state indicates a value that is reached, after some transient, on a straight road or on a path with constant curvature.

With the exception of scenario 3, all simulations run with headway time of 1.5s. For all simulations, the proposed controller is activated after 1s from the beginning of the simulation, in order to start from a non-trivial initial state and allow the internal states of the vehicle model and of the low-level controller to reach a meaningful working point. Simulations are conducted on MATLAB/Simulink [28]. Relevant parameters can be found in Tables 2, 3 and 4. For more complete simulations, the interested reader is referred to the demonstration video [29], conducted on the vehicle simulator Dynacar [30].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Spec.</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>e_x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>v_{rel}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test Scenario 1: Integrated Safety I

This test scenario is dedicated to examine longitudinal safety control performance in case of possible rear-end collision. The host and target vehicle drive on a test circuit consisting of a 30 m straight line
Fig. 5: Results for scenario 1:
(a) Velocity, mode, lateral accelerations (b) Distance, lateral position, yaw angle error.

Fig. 6: Results for scenario 2:
(a) Velocity, mode, lateral accelerations (b) Distance, lateral position, yaw angle error.

and a curve with 580 m radius (cf. Fig. 2b). The target vehicle starts to decelerate at 3 s during cornering. The integrated control system recognizes the target vehicle as dangerous based on the warning index and the inverse TTC, and severe braking is applied in order to avoid collision with the target vehicle. After 20 s, the target vehicle starts to accelerate fast, and since the acceleration of the host vehicle is limited for passenger comfort, the system enables the CC mode. Integrated and longitudinal control modes shown in Fig. 5a indicate that longitudinal safety control to avoid rear-end collision has priority in the current driving situation. Despite the priority of longitudinal control, Fig. 5b reveals that lateral stability is maintained since lateral position and yaw angle errors are kept small during the whole simulation.

Test Scenario 2: Integrated Safety II

This test scenario investigates lateral safety control when the host and target vehicle run on a test circuit consisting of a 30 m straight line and a curve with 220 m radius (cf. Fig. 2b). The scenario has been constructed in such a way that an external force of magnitude 7125 N is applied laterally to the centre of gravity of the vehicle between 3 s to 4 s, i.e. simulating another vehicle bumping sidewards. As a consequence of this disturbance, the lateral index exceeds 1 (possible unstable lateral motion) and Integrated Safety II mode is triggered as displayed in Fig. 6a. The braking and steering inputs are simultaneously applied to the vehicle to track the desired path while maintaining lateral stability. It can be observed that, except for the time interval in which the vehicle is subject to the disturbance, lateral
Test Scenario 3: Integrated Safety I with decreased headway time

This scenario runs on the same track and with the same target vehicle as scenario 1, but with a smaller headway time of 0.8s (almost half of the default headway time). The purpose is to check the reliability of the proposed scheme in safety-critical situations. Remind that the typical headway time for ACC systems is somewhere between 1 and 2 seconds, and that smaller headway can be achieved only via cooperative adaptive cruise control implementations. As a result, a headway time of 0.8s might be beyond the design limit of most ACC systems [31]. Similar to scenario 1, Fig. 7a and Fig. 7b indicate that severe braking is applied in order to avoid collision with the target vehicle. The collision is avoided, after which the CC mode is enabled, as in scenario 1.

Test Scenario 4: No Integrated Safety II, Lateral Control isolated from Longitudinal Control

In this scenario, the effect of decentralized (not integrated) vehicle dynamics control is examined. Without integrated safety, the longitudinal and lateral control are decentralized. The track is the same as in
scenario 2. Similarly, the same external force of magnitude 7125 N is applied laterally to the centre of gravity of the vehicle between 3 s to 6 s, i.e., simulating another vehicle bumping sideways. However, due to lack of any integration, the Integrated Safety II mode is not triggered, as displayed in Fig. 8a. As a result, the VSC mode is not activated, and it can be seen that lateral acceleration is much larger than in scenario 2 (approximately 2 times larger, cf. Fig. 6a and Fig. 8a): also lateral displacement and yaw angle error are almost twice as large as in scenario 2 (cf. Fig. 6b and Fig. 8b). It can be observed that without the integrated controller, excessive oversteering occurs and the values of lateral acceleration far exceeds the discomfort level [27]. In realistic situation, these conditions are potentially hazardous: the vehicle could end up being outside its own lane, and when roll dynamics [18] is taken into account, the risk of rollover is heightened.

6 Conclusions
An integrated control system has been proposed by appropriately interconnecting longitudinal and lateral controllers. It consists of an index-based decision plane to create synergy and safe interaction between longitudinal and lateral controllers to ensure better overall performance. Simulations have been conducted in order to investigate the performance of the proposed IVDC system in various driving situations. From the simulations, it has been shown that the proposed system achieves lateral stability and prevents the vehicle to vehicle collision. In particular, the integrated controller which coordinates both longitudinal and lateral motions augments the safety of vehicle in severe driving situation.

Future work will include real-time implementation of integrated controller and experimental verification, integration of a function for friction coefficient estimation, integration of advanced algorithms for driving manoeuvres such overtaking or lane change, and Cooperative ACC systems with vehicle-to-vehicle communication.
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## Appendix

### Table 2 Vehicle Parameter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle mass</td>
<td>(m)</td>
<td>[kg]</td>
<td>(1.425 \times 10^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle maximum speed</td>
<td>(v_{\text{max}})</td>
<td>[m s(^{-1})]</td>
<td>(71.111 \times 10^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacejka model coefficients</td>
<td>(B_p, C_p, D_p, E_p)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.000 \times 10^9), (1.900 \times 10^8), (1.000 \times 10^6), (9.700 \times 10^{-1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front wheel axle-CoG distance</td>
<td>(l_f)</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>(1.240 \times 10^0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear wheel axle-CoG distance</td>
<td>(l_r)</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>(1.460 \times 10^0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height of CoG</td>
<td>(h)</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>(6.000 \times 10^{-1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical axis moment of inertia</td>
<td>(I_z)</td>
<td>[kg m(^2)]</td>
<td>(2.745 \times 10^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering actuator constant</td>
<td>(\tau_\delta)</td>
<td>[s]</td>
<td>(2.000 \times 10^{-1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friction coefficient</td>
<td>(\mu)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(9.000 \times 10^{-1})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornering stiffness</td>
<td>(C_{y,f}, C_{y,r})</td>
<td>[rad(^{-1})]</td>
<td>(3.463 \times 10^4), (2.941 \times 10^4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3 Longitudinal Controller Parameter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standstill distance</td>
<td>(d_0)</td>
<td>[m]</td>
<td>(7.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desired headway distance time</td>
<td>(t_{h,w})</td>
<td>[s]</td>
<td>(1.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal control weight</td>
<td>(Q_x)</td>
<td></td>
<td>diag(1, 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal control weight</td>
<td>(R_x)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(32.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response delay</td>
<td>(\tau_h)</td>
<td>[s]</td>
<td>(0.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning index upper threshold</td>
<td>(\kappa)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning index lower threshold</td>
<td>(\kappa)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverse TTC upper threshold</td>
<td>(T)</td>
<td>[s]</td>
<td>(1.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverse TTC lower threshold</td>
<td>(T)</td>
<td>[s]</td>
<td>(0.49)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4 Lateral Controller Parameter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium comfort lateral acceleration</td>
<td>(a_{y,0})</td>
<td>[m s(^{-2})]</td>
<td>(3.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum lateral acceleration</td>
<td>(a_{y,\text{max}})</td>
<td>[m s(^{-2})]</td>
<td>(7.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral control weight</td>
<td>(Q_y)</td>
<td></td>
<td>diag(0, 1, 0, 1, 0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral control weight</td>
<td>(R_y)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>