

Co-Optimization of Adaptive Cruise Control and Hybrid Electric Vehicle Energy Management via Model Predictive Mixed Integer Control

Qitao Li¹, Changfu Gong¹, Yuan Lin¹

1. Shien-Ming Wu School of Intelligent Engineering, South China University of Technology, Guangzhou 511442, P. R. China
E-mail: yuanlin@scut.edu.cn

Abstract: In this paper, a model predictive mixed integer control method for BYD Qin Plus DM-i (Dual Model intelligent) plug-in hybrid electric vehicle (PHEV) is proposed for co-optimization to reduce fuel consumption during car following. First, the adaptive cruise control (ACC) model for energy-saving driving is established. Then, a control-oriented energy management strategy (EMS) model considering the clutch engagement and disengagement is constructed. Finally, the co-optimization structure by integrating ACC model and EMS model is created and is converted to the mixed integer nonlinear programming (MINLP). The results show that this modeling method can be applied to EMS based on the model predictive control (MPC) framework and verify that co-optimization can achieve a 5.1% reduction in fuel consumption compared to sequential optimization with the guarantee of ACC performance.

Key Words: Co-optimization, Energy Management, Adaptive Cruise Control, Model Predictive Control

1 Introduction

In 2021, China's permeability of new energy vehicle market increase to 13.4% rapidly[1]. As one of the most popular new energy vehicles, PHEVs are focused by current paper in ACC condition[2].

ACC is the most widely used advanced driving assistance system (ADAS) and the common velocity planning method. Through smoothing the velocity profile, ACC reduces the fuel consumption, improves vehicle comfortability and safety[3]. To further reduce fuel consumption, Li et al. presented an ecological adaptive cruise controller (ECO-ACC) with a two-level framework for a PHEV, which could maintain a proper distance from the preceding vehicle[4].

The main reasons for PHEVs can be energy-saving are regenerative braking, engine stopping and operating in high-efficiency area. PHEVs combine the advantages of electric vehicles (EVs) and hybrid electric vehicles (HEVs), which have the capability of pure electric driving[5]. Li et al. illustrated the outstanding energy saving of DM-i by simulation and experiment[6]. BYD Qin Plus DM-i has the forced charge sustaining mode, which allows battery state of charge (SOC) to be maintained around the set value in order to ensure the acceleration performance and to cope with situations where external power grid is not available. Currently, there is lack of literature modeling the control-oriented models for BYD Qin Plus DM-i using optimization-based method.

The purpose of EMS for HEVs or PHEVs is to minimize energy consumption by deciding the speed and torque between the engine and the motor. There are three main categories to EMS: rule-based, optimization-based, and learning-based. Rule-based methods specify the torque of the engine and motor according to SOC and torque demand[7]. Optimization-based energy management includes global optimization strategies such as dynamic programming (DP), Pontryagin's minimum principle (PMP), and the local optimization strategies such as MPC[8]. Reinforcement learning (RL) can achieve fuel consumption close to DP[9].

The optimization structure composed of velocity planning and EMS can be classified into two categories: sequential optimization and co-optimization. Sequential optimization optimizes velocity planning and energy management separately. The optimal velocity or acceleration command is obtained by the upper controller, which is input into the lower EMS controller to minimize energy consumption. Due to the real-time performance and the simplicity of modeling and solving, large numbers of studies focus on it. The upper and lower controllers could be applied to the same or different solutions, such as convex optimization, alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM)[10], DP and deep reinforcement learning (DRL)[11]. These solutions can be connected in series as different sequential optimizations, which lead to different fuel consumption and calculation time. However, the upper controller gives the desire speed or acceleration in advance, which limits the EMS optimization space.

Co-optimization optimizes velocity planning and energy management as an integration. Due to a wider feasible region, the better optimal solution can be found to achieve lower fuel consumption in co-optimization. Co-optimization achieves reduction in total energy consumption compared to sequential optimization[12]. In some traffic scenarios, such as velocity limit[10] or traffic light constraints[13], the global optimal results of co-optimization are solved by DP, which can be used as a benchmark for comparison with other methods. However, ACC requires short sampling time and accurate acceleration command. The high-dimensional and high-precision grids make DP to solve the co-optimization of ACC and EMS difficult. In other words, it is a challenge to solve the global optimal results of co-optimization based on ACC and EMS in drive cycle. Using MPC framework to solve the co-optimization problem is one of the most common methods[14–16]. MPC can effectively deal with multi-objective optimization problems with constraints, which has been widely used in ACC and EMS. The short prediction horizon can reduce the computation burden and enable the co-optimization problem to be solved. Based on this, we use the MPC framework to achieve both co-optimization and sequential optimization.

The main contributions and innovative points of this paper

include three aspects:

- A modeling method for BYD Qin Plus DM-i is proposed, which includes the engine, motor, generator model, etc.
- Considering the engagement and disengagement of clutch, the EMS problem is converted to MINLP.
- By comparing with sequential optimization, the comfort, energy saving and computational burden of co-optimization are tested.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 introduces the modeling of ACC model. Section 3 details the DM-i system. Section 4 presents the structures of sequential optimization and co-optimization based on MPC. Section 5 details the simulation and analyses the optimization result. Section 6 concludes the paper and prospects future work.

2 Adaptive Cruise Control Model

ACC model can be described as[17]

$$\dot{s} = v_r \quad (1)$$

$$\dot{v}_r = a_p - a_h \quad (2)$$

where s is the actual distance between the preceding vehicle and the host vehicle, $v_r = v_p - v_h$ is the relative velocity, v_h and v_p are the velocity of the host vehicle and the preceding vehicle, a_h and a_p are the acceleration of the host vehicle and the preceding vehicle.

The optimal distance area is written as

$$s_{opt,min} = 5.2 + 0.7v_h + 0.0705v_h^2 \quad (3)$$

$$s_{opt,max} = 6.8 + 0.8v_h + 0.0745v_h^2 \quad (4)$$

where $s_{opt,min}$ and $s_{opt,max}$ are the minimum and the maximum of optimal distance[12]. The optimal distance area gives the host vehicle a more flexible time headway to avoid aggressive following, which helps to reduce fuel consumption. Maintaining the small time headway could lead the host vehicle to follow the preceding vehicle in a more aggressive way, which causes drastic acceleration and more fuel consumption[18].

The distance error is defined as

$$e = \begin{cases} s_{opt,min} - s, & \text{if } s < s_{opt,min} \\ 0, & \text{if } s_{opt,min} \leq s \leq s_{opt,max} \\ s - s_{opt,max}, & \text{if } s > s_{opt,max} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

When the actual distance s locates in the optimal distance area, the value of e will be zero.

Jerk is defined as the rate of change in a_h , which is relative to the driving comfort of the host vehicle.

$$\dot{a}_h = \Delta a_h \quad (6)$$

3 DM-i Model

The simulation model of BYD Qin Plus DM-i is shown in Fig. 1. This series-parallel PHEV has an engine, a motor, a generator, a battery and a clutch. The vehicle parameters are listed in Table 1.

3.1 Vehicle Dynamics

According to the longitudinal dynamic model of the vehicle, wheel rolling resistance torque T_w is written as

$$T_w = [ma_h + 0.5C_d\rho Av_h^2 + \mu mg\cos(\theta) + mgsin(\theta)]r \quad (7)$$




Fig. 1: Powertrain configuration of the BYD Qin Plus DM-i.

Table 1: Parameters of BYD Qin Plus DM-i

Parameter	Value
Vehicle mass m	1500kg
Vehicle cross section area A	2.36m ²
Wheel radius r	0.315m
Rolling resistance coefficient μ	0.01
Air density ρ	1.1985
Air drag coefficient C_d	2.8

In Eqn. 7, m is the vehicle mass, C_d is the air drag coefficient, A is the vehicle cross section area, μ is rolling resistance coefficient, g is the gravity constant, and θ is the road grade. In this paper, the road grade θ is considered as 0. There is no rolling resistance when velocity is zero.

The wheel speed is written as

$$w_{wheel} = \frac{v_h}{r} \quad (8)$$

where r is wheel radius.

3.2 Engine Model

The engine speed is written as

$$w_e = w_{wheel}i_3i_d i_c + w_e(1 - i_c) \quad (9)$$

where w_e is the engine speed, i_3 is the transmission ratio of gear 3 and gear 2, i_d is gear ratio of the final drive, $i_c \in \{0, 1\}$ is the clutch engagement/disengagement command (0 corresponding to disengagement, 1 to engagement). When the clutch is disengaged, w_{wheel} will not be directly driven by the engine.

The fuel consumption per second \dot{m}_f can be expressed as a piecewise function. The unit of fuel consumption rate b_e is g/(kWh). When engine torque T_e is larger than 0, a quadratic function of w_e and T_e is used to approximate \dot{m}_f .

$$\dot{m}_f = b_e w_e T_e \begin{cases} f_f(w, T_e), & \text{if } T_e > 0 \\ 0, & \text{if } T_e = 0 \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

Considering that BYD Qin Plus is a series-parallel PHEV, operation points of engine is unnecessary to distribute in the whole engine map. In order to improve fuel economy, operation points of engine are constrained in high-efficiency area. The engine speed w_e and engine torque T_e are both set to semi-continuous variables shown in Eqns. 11 and 12. The engine could either be off or work in high-efficiency area.

$$w_e = 0 \cup w_{e,min} \leq w_e \leq w_{e,max} \quad (11)$$

$$T_e = 0 \cup T_{e,min} \leq T_e \leq T_{e,max} \quad (12)$$

3.3 Motor Model

The motor speed and motor torque are written as

$$w_m = w_{wheel} i_m i_d \quad (13)$$

$$T_m = \frac{T_w - T_3 i_3 i_d \eta_t i_c}{i_m i_d \eta_t} \quad (14)$$

where i_m is the transmission ratio of gear 1 and gear 2, T_3 is torque transmitted by gear 3, η_t is the mechanical efficiency of gears. Eqn. 14 illustrates that when the clutch is disengaged, the gear 3 will not transmit the torque from the engine, and the motor provides the torque for the wheels only.

The motor efficiency is defined as follows.

$$\eta_m = \begin{cases} f_1(w_m, |T_m|), & \text{if } w_{m,min} \leq w_m < w_{m1} \\ f_2(w_m, |T_m|), & \text{if } w_{m1} \leq w_m \leq w_{m2} \\ f_3(w_m, |T_m|), & \text{if } w_{m2} < w_m \leq w_{m,max} \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

To improve the fitting accuracy, η_m is defined as the piecewise function. $|T_m|$ is the absolute value of T_m . f_1 , f_2 and f_3 are the binary quadratic functions of w_m and $|T_m|$.

3.4 Generator Model

The generator speed and generator torque are written as follows.

$$w_g = \frac{w_e}{i_g} \quad (16)$$

$$T_g = (T_e - \frac{T_3 i_c}{\eta_t}) i_g \eta_t \quad (17)$$

In Eqn. 18, the generator efficiency η_g is defined as a binary quadratic function of w_g and $|T_g|$. When the clutch is engaged ($i_c = 1$), The engine torque T_e could be distributed to Gear 3 and generator. When the clutch is disengaged ($i_c = 0$), the engine torque T_e would be distributed to generator only. Considering the high speed transmitted by the engine to the generator, only a segment of function is needed for fitting.

$$\eta_g = f_g(w_g, |T_g|) \quad (18)$$

3.5 Battery Model

The battery power P_b is composed of motor power and generator power as follows.

$$P_b = T_m w_m \eta_m^{sgn(-T_m)} - T_g w_g \eta_g \quad (19)$$

The rate of change in SOC is represented by

$$\dot{SOC} = -\frac{V_{oc} - \sqrt{V_{oc}^2 - 4R_b P_b}}{2R_b Q_{max}} \quad (20)$$

where Q_{max} is the battery capacity, V_{oc} is the open circuit voltage and R_b is the internal resistance. V_{oc} and R_b are both considered as the quadratic functions of SOC .

$$V_{oc} = b_1 SOC^2 + b_2 SOC + b_3 \quad (21)$$

$$R_b = c_1 SOC^2 + c_2 SOC + c_3 \quad (22)$$

where b_1 , b_2 , b_3 , c_1 , c_2 and c_3 are coefficients.

4 Optimization Problem Formulation

The optimization problems are analyzed in MPC framework. The time step is set as 0.1s. Considering the calculation burden and control performance, the predictive horizon of MPC is set as 0.8s. In addition, we assume that the host vehicle can obtain the perfect information of the preceding vehicle's future velocity in every predictive horizon.

4.1 Sequential Optimization

The sequential optimization is used to evaluate co-optimization, which is shown in Fig. 2. In this method, the upper-level ACC controller outputs the acceleration demand, which is given to lower-level EMS controller to optimize the acceleration demand, engine demand and the clutch engagement/disengagement demand. These two controllers are both based on MPC.




Fig. 2: Sequential optimization structure

In ACC problem, the system states x_{acc} and control input u_{acc} are defined as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} x_{acc} &= [s, v_r]^T \\ u_{acc} &= [a_h] \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

For the purpose of safety and comfortability, a_h and v_h is constrained in a range.

$$\Phi_{acc} = \begin{pmatrix} a_{min} \leq a_h \leq a_{max} \\ v_{min} \leq v_h \leq v_{max} \end{pmatrix} \quad (24)$$

The ACC cost function is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \min J_{acc} &= \int_0^{t_f} \left(\frac{e}{e_{nmax}} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{v_r}{v_{r,nmax}} \right)^2 \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{a_h}{a_{min}} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{j_h}{j_{nmax}} \right)^2 dt \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where e_{nmax} , $v_{r,nmax}$ and j_{nmax} are the nominal maximum distance error, relative velocity and jerk, respectively. a_{min} is the lower bound of acceleration.

In EMS problem, the system states x_{ems} and control input u_{ems} are defined as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} x_{ems} &= [SOC] \\ u_{ems} &= [T_e, w_e, T_m, i_c]^T \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

The constraints are defined as follows.

$$\Phi_{ems} = \begin{pmatrix} w_e = 0 \cup w_{e,min} \leq w_e \leq w_{e,max} \\ T_e = 0 \cup T_{e,min} \leq T_e \leq T_{e,max} \\ w_{m,min} \leq w_m \leq w_{m,max} \\ T_{m,min} \leq T_m \leq T_{m,max} \\ SOC_{min} \leq SOC \leq SOC_{max} \\ i_c \in \{0, 1\} \end{pmatrix} \quad (27)$$

The EMS cost function is defined as

$$\min J_{ems} = \int_0^{t_f} \dot{m}_f + \lambda \left(\frac{SOC - SOC_{ref}}{SOC_{max} - SOC_{min}} \right)^2 dt \quad (28)$$

where SOC_{ref} is the constant reference of SOC , λ is the cost coefficient, SOC_{min} and SOC_{max} are the minimum and maximum value of SOC . The nonlinear constraints and the integer variables constitute the MINLP.

4.2 Co-optimization

As shown in Fig. 3, the co-optimization controller optimizes the ACC problem and EMS problem simultaneously.




Fig. 3: Co-optimization structure

In this problem, the system states x_{co} and control input u_{co} are defined in Eqn. 29.

$$\begin{aligned} x_{co} &= [s, v_r, SOC]^T \\ u_{co} &= [a_h, T_e, w_e, T_m, i_c]^T \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

The constraints are the combination of Φ_{acc} and Φ_{ems} .

$$\Phi_{co} = [\Phi_{acc}, \Phi_{ems}]^T \quad (30)$$

The cost function of co-optimization is defined as follows.

$$\min J_{co} = \int_0^{t_f} J_{acc} + J_{ems} dt \quad (31)$$

Due to the increase of variables and constraints and the complexity of the cost function, co-optimization is a much larger and more complex MINLP than sequential optimization.

5 Simulation

In this section, the preceding vehicle follows the drive cycles. Worldwide harmonized light-duty vehicles test cycles (WLTC) is used in simulation. The initial value of SOC is set as 0.6, which assumes that the host vehicle is in forced charge sustaining mode. The optimization problems are solved by Gurobi 10.0 using branch-and-cut method. All the simulations are conducted on a desktop computer with a 12-core Intel i7 CPU and 32GB RAM.

5.1 ACC Performance Comparison

Fig. 4 shows the ACC performance of sequential optimization and co-optimization. Both two methods can follow the velocity of the preceding vehicle and maintain the appropriate distance. In most cases, the acceleration and jerk of host vehicle are smoother than that of the preceding vehicle, which means that the host vehicle has the better driving comfort and energy saving. In sequential optimization, the jerks are in a range of $\pm 2m/s^3$, which is much less than those in co-optimization. The higher jerk will reduce the driving comfort, which is the tradeoff with fuel reduction.

5.2 EMS Performance Comparison

The operation points of engine and motor are exhibited in Fig. 5. The green line is engine optimal operating points (OPP) line.

A majority of engine operation points can be optimized in high-efficiency area. Due to the engine torque constraints, most of the engine operation points distribute in the area where T_e is larger than 57 Nm and b_e is less than 230g/(kwh). Compare




Fig. 4: The ACC performance of sequential optimization and co-optimization

with sequential optimization, co-optimization distributes more operation points in the area of engine map with 210g/(kwh) and the area near OPP. For these two methods, most of the operation points of motor distribute in area of motor map with efficiency over than 90%.

Fig. 6 shows the clutch engagement/disengagement demand. Based on co-optimization, the clutch engagement and disengagement frequencies are lower than that of sequential op-




Fig. 5: Operation points of engine and motor

tization. The clutch disengages at the velocity less than 17m/s, which signifies that the host vehicle is in the series mode. The engine drives the wheels directly when the host

vehicle drives at high velocity with parallel mode.




Fig. 6: Clutch engagement/disengagement demand

Fig. 7 shows the trend of SOC and fuel consumption. Co-optimization could always maintain lower fuel consumption. When the host vehicle drives at high velocity, the *SOC* curve of these two methods are significantly different. It demonstrates the different energy distribution between these two optimization methods. The area where the fuel consumption is horizontal demonstrates that the host vehicle is driven in pure electric mode.




Fig. 7: SOC and fuel consumption

Table. 2 shows the comparisons of energy saving between these two methods. The final *SOC* of co-optimization is 0.5914, which is only about 0.1% lower than sequential optimization. However, the fuel consumption of co-optimization is 5.1% less than sequential optimization. After converting the mass of fuel consumption to the consumption per hun-

dred kilometers, the fuel consumption of the two methods are 3.736L/(100 km) and 3.545L/(100 km). In other words, co-optimization has better fuel economy than sequential optimization.

Table 2: Comparison of fuel consumption and final SOC

Method	Fuel consumption	Final SOC
Sequential optimization	0.8692kg (0%)	0.5920 (0%)
Co-optimization	0.8248kg (-5.1%)	0.5914 (-0.1%)

5.3 Simulation Time Comparison

Table. 3 shows the simulation time of these two methods. Due to the increase in numbers of state and control variables, it takes more time to compute the co-optimization problem, which is nearly 30 times more than that of sequential optimization. If co-optimization is applied to hardware-in-the-loop test or real vehicle experiment, it is dependent on high performance computers to ensure the real-time performance.

Table 3: Simulation time

Method	Average simulation time per time step
Sequential optimization	0.17s (0%)
Co-optimization	5.26s (2994%)

6 Conclusion

This paper presents the control-oriented EMS model of BYD Qin Plus DM-i and applies it to the co-optimization of ACC and EMS based on MPC framework. Though slightly less comfortable than sequential optimization, co-optimization shows excellent performance in EMS and saving 5.1% of fuel consumption compared to sequential optimization. However, the simulation time gap between co-optimization and sequential optimization is significant, which hinders the practical deployment.

For the future work, learning-based method will be applied to co-optimization for the purpose of reducing online computation time. The results of this paper can also be used as a benchmark for the comparison of learning-based method to co-optimization.

References

- [1] Q. Zhang, S. Tian, and X. Lin, Recent Advances and Applications of AI-Based Mathematical Modeling in Predictive Control of Hybrid Electric Vehicle Energy Management in China, *Electronics*, 12(2): 445, 2023.
- [2] C. Yang, M. Wang, W. Wang, et al., An efficient vehicle-following predictive energy management strategy for PHEV based on improved sequential quadratic programming algorithm, *Energy*, 219: 119595, 2021.
- [3] D. Chen, M. Huang, AG. Stefanopoulou, et al., Sequential optimization of velocity and charge depletion in a plug-in hybrid electric vehicle, in *14th International Symposium on Advanced Vehicle Control*, 2018.
- [4] G. Li, and D. Grges, Ecological adaptive cruise control and energy management strategy for hybrid electric vehicles based on heuristic dynamic programming, *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 20(9): 3526–3535, 2018.
- [5] Y. Lin, J. McPhee, and NL. Azad, Co-Optimization of On-Ramp Merging and Plug-In Hybrid Electric Vehicle Power Split Using Deep Reinforcement Learning, *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, 71(7): 6958–6968, 2022.
- [6] S. Li, P. Wang, D. Zeng, et al., Multi-System Coupling DMi Hybrid Vehicle Modeling and Its Performance Analysis Based on Simulation, *World Electric Vehicle Journal*, 12(4): 215, 2021.
- [7] H. Banvait, S. Anwar, and Y. Chen, A rule-based energy management strategy for plug-in hybrid electric vehicle (PHEV), in *2009 American control conference (ACC)*, 2009: 3938–3943.
- [8] N. Robuschi, M. Salazar, N. Viscera, et al., Minimum-fuel energy management of a hybrid electric vehicle via iterative linear programming, *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, 69(12): 14575–14587, 2020.
- [9] R. Lian, J. Peng, Y. Wu, et al., Rule-interposing deep reinforcement learning based energy management strategy for power-split hybrid electric vehicle, *Energy*, 197: 117297, 2020.
- [10] B. Liu, C. Sun, B. Wang, et al., Bi-level convex optimization of eco-driving for connected Fuel Cell Hybrid Electric Vehicles through signalized intersections, *Energy*, 252: 123956, 2022.
- [11] X. Tang, J. Chen, T. Liu, et al., Research on Deep Reinforcement Learning-based Intelligent Car-following Control and Energy Management Strategy for Hybrid Electric Vehicles, *Journal of Mechanical Engineering*, 57(22): 237–246, 2021.
- [12] L. Li, X. Wang, and J. Song, Fuel consumption optimization for smart hybrid electric vehicle during a car-following process, *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing*, 87: 17–29, 2017.
- [13] Y. Liu, Z. Huang, J. Li, et al., Cooperative optimization of velocity planning and energy management for connected plug-in hybrid electric vehicles, *Applied Mathematical Modelling*, 95: 715–733, 2021.
- [14] D. Chen, Y. Kim, M. Huang, et al., An iterative and hierarchical approach to co-optimizing the velocity profile and power-split of plug-in hybrid electric vehicles, in *2020 American Control Conference (ACC)*, 2020: 3059–3064.
- [15] D. Chen, Y. Kim, and E. Hyeon, Receding-Horizon Safe co-Optimization of the Velocity and Power-Split of Plug-in Hybrid Electric Vehicles With Imperfect Prediction, in *2021 American Control Conference (ACC)*, 2021: 1848–1854.
- [16] D. Chen, M. Huang, A. Stefanopoulou, et al., Co-optimization of velocity and charge-depletion for plug-in hybrid electric vehicles: Accounting for acceleration and jerk constraints, *Journal of Dynamic Systems, Measurement, and Control*, 144(1), 2022.
- [17] Y. Sun, X. Wang, L. Li, et al., Modelling and control for economy-oriented car-following problem of hybrid electric vehicle, *IET Intelligent Transport Systems*, 13(5): 825–833, 2019.
- [18] N. Prakash, AG. Stefanopoulou, AJ. Moskalik, et al., Use of the hypothetical lead (hl) vehicle trace: A new method for evaluating fuel consumption in automated driving, in *2016 American Control Conference (ACC)*, 2016: 3486–3491.