

## **An Overview of Automated Vehicle Platooning Strategies**

**M Sabbir Salek, M.S., Salek\***

Glenn Department of Civil Engineering, Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29634, USA, msalek@clemson.edu

**Mugdha Basu Thakur, M.B., Thakur**

Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Automotive Engineering, Clemson University, Greenville, SC 29607, USA,  
mbasuth@clemson.edu

**Pardha Sai Krishna Ala, P.S.K., Ala**

Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Automotive Engineering, Clemson University, Greenville, SC 29607, USA,  
pala@clemson.edu

**Mashrur Chowdhury, M., Chowdhury**

Professor, Glenn Department of Civil Engineering, Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29634, USA, mac@clemson.edu

**Matthias Schmid, M., Schmid**

Assistant Professor, Department of Automotive Engineering, Clemson University, Greenville, SC 29607, USA,  
schmidm@clemson.edu

**Pamela Murray-Tuite, P., Murray-Tuite**

Professor, Glenn Department of Civil Engineering, Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29634, USA,  
pmmurra@clemson.edu

**Sakib Mahmud Khan, S.M., Khan**

Glenn Department of Civil Engineering, Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29634, USA, sakibkhan@mitre.org

**Venkat Krovi, V., Krovi**

Professor, Department of Automotive Engineering, Clemson University, Greenville, SC 29607, USA,  
vkrovi@clemson.edu

Automated vehicle (AV) platooning has the potential to improve the safety, operational, and energy efficiency of surface transportation systems by limiting or eliminating human involvement in the driving tasks. The theoretical validity of the AV platooning strategies has been established and practical applications are being tested under real-world conditions. The emergence of sensors, communication, and control strategies has resulted in rapid and constant evolution of AV platooning strategies. In this paper, we review the state-of-the-art knowledge in AV platooning using a five-component platooning framework, which includes vehicle model, information-receiving process, information flow topology, spacing policy, and controller and discuss the advantages and limitations of the components. Based on the discussion about existing strategies and associated limitations, potential future research directions are presented.

**Additional Keywords and Phrases:** Vehicle platoon, Platoon control, Autonomous vehicle.

---

\* Corresponding author.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Platooning is a formation strategy in which a group of vehicles achieves and/or maintains a desired formation while navigating a route. Platooning offers considerable benefits in terms of improving roadway capacity and fuel economy [9,94]. These benefits could be further enhanced when platooning is performed by a group of automated vehicles (AVs) compared to platooning of a group of human-driven vehicles due to the variable and longer reaction time of human drivers. Eliminating human involvement in the platoon operation, AV platooning could reduce human factor-related safety as well as operational and energy deficiencies of roadway traffic movements.

AVs have in-built sensors, such as cameras, radio detection and ranging (radar) sensors, ultrasonic sensors, and light detection and ranging (lidar) sensors, that are used to collect surrounding information. In-vehicle computing units process the collected information to perceive the driving environment, and compute platooning parameters. For AV platooning, these suites of sensors and computing units also assist in collecting and processing motion information of neighboring vehicles, such as inter-vehicle distance, heading, and speed of the preceding and following vehicles. This information is then utilized by a platooning controller to compute the required control inputs for a subject vehicle to help achieve and/or maintain a desired formation. The efficacies of AV platooning are related to the formation geometry, operational algorithms, formation parameters, and the reliability of the sensors and communication systems used by the vehicles. The formation parameters are either pre-defined (i.e., desired spacing between vehicles) or captured in real-time (surrounding vehicle information).

AV platooning strategies include both longitudinal and lateral control strategies. However, the scope of this review study is chosen to include only longitudinal control strategies for AV platooning due to the vast body of related existing studies. There are several review studies on vehicle platooning strategies. For example, Kavathekar and Chen [64] reviewed the vehicle platoon-related research published over a period of 16 years, starting from 1994. The authors identified general categories to group the published research on platoons, which include obstacle sensing and avoidance, vehicle-to-vehicle communication, platoon string stability, trajectory planning, and platoon control strategies (i.e., longitudinal and lateral control). Later, Zheng et al. [174] formulated a four-component framework for automated platooning, which includes models of vehicles forming the platoon, information flow topology (among the platoon forming vehicles), platoon controller, and platoon formation geometry. However, the framework in [174] does not consider the impacts of latency in communication systems, vehicle heterogeneity in platoons, noise in the data captured by unreliable AV sensors or caused by malicious attackers, etc. Several studies focused on specific components of the four-component framework [4,33,130]. Feng et al. [33] expanded the four-component framework and considered the quality of communication (latency and packet loss) and perturbation caused by the platooning vehicles (i.e., sudden fluctuation in spacing, speed, or acceleration) as additional components. Soni and Hu [130] studied the platoon formation approaches in detail and categorized the formation approaches into three groups: (i) leader-follower group, where the followers track the leader, (ii) behavior-based group, where in a new environment, a coordinator monitors behaviors based on each AV data, and assigns tasks for each AV, and (iii) virtual structure group, in which virtual agents are assigned to follow a desired motion and real AVs are operated to follow the virtual agents' motion.

The recent emergence of novel AV sensors and reliable communication technologies has provided further opportunities to refine the platooning framework. The objective of this paper is to synthesize literature on AV platooning strategies, identify challenges, and provide future research directions for AV platooning. In section 2 of this paper, the contribution of this study is discussed. Section 3 presents a review of the existing studies based on a five-component platooning framework. In section 4, we discuss potential future research directions, and section 5 presents the conclusions.

## 2 CONTRIBUTION

In this paper, we perform a comprehensive review of the existing AV platooning studies. Research on AV platooning strategies has been ongoing for many years, and as a result, numerous methods have been developed by researchers, which need to be reviewed strategically for articulating the current knowledge, the limitations and open challenges, and the paths to move forward.


There are a few studies in the literature that performed a comprehensive review of AV platooning strategies [64,33,130,4,74,23,75,127]. Zheng et al. [174] presented a four-component framework for AV platooning based on node dynamics, information flow topology, formation geometry, and distributed controller, which was adopted by other studies. However, the information-receiving process, i.e., via sensors or communication, is also a crucial part of the AV platooning strategy. In the real world, the information-receiving process can impose additional constraints and challenges, such as communication latency, data packet losses, and noisy data from sensors, that must be accounted for while designing the controller. Thus, we extend the framework presented in [174] to a five-component framework by including the information-receiving process. We categorize the existing AV platooning studies according to what type of vehicle models, information-receiving processes and topologies, spacing policies, and controllers they have adopted and then present them with general mathematical representations along with their corresponding strengths and weaknesses. Finally, we present some open challenges for AV platooning in section 4 (i.e., Future Research Directions) that need to be addressed by the researchers to bring wide-scale adoption of AV platooning to reality.

## 3 AV PLATOONING FRAMEWORK

The primary objective of an AV platoon control strategy is to maintain a stable platoon formation. This formation needs to follow a desired formation geometry, which, in the case of AV platooning, can be defined by an inter-vehicle spacing policy (e.g., constant spacing policy). To track this desired inter-vehicle spacing, the controller of a subject AV in a platoon requires motion-related data (e.g., position and speed) of the subject AV and from the subject AV's neighboring vehicles. This data can be obtained via on-board sensors, such as inertial measurement units (IMUs), cameras, radars, lidars, and global positioning system (GPS) sensors, or via on-board communication devices, such as cellular vehicle-to-everything or C-V2X direct communication devices. Also, depending on the control objectives, the subject vehicle may require these data from some selected vehicles in the platoon only; for example, a subject AV may need the motion-related data only from its immediate predecessor and the platoon leader. Thus, an AV platoon control strategy also needs to include a topology that presents how these motion-related data will flow among the AVs in a platoon. Finally, an AV platoon control strategy must define a controller that will provide control inputs (e.g., throttle and brake commands) to a subject AV that are essential for operating the AV. These control inputs are determined based on the current states of the subject AV and the current states of the neighboring vehicles of the subject AV as well. A vehicle model is therefore needed to realize how the chosen control inputs will affect the subject AV or the platoon based on the current states of the platoon, which helps in determining the most suitable control inputs at a given timestamp. Therefore, in this study, we review the existing AV platooning studies based on a five-component framework presented in Figure 1. In this section, we discuss in detail how researchers have incorporated these components in their AV platooning studies.

### 3.1 Vehicle Model

Vehicle modeling is a key component of AV platooning. However, high-fidelity vehicle models can be highly nonlinear and computationally expensive for on-board processing. Therefore, researchers tend to utilize simplified or linearized models for vehicles in AV platooning. These models represent both longitudinal and lateral kinematics and dynamics of



vehicles. However, few studies in the AV platooning literature include lateral kinematics or dynamics consideration [1,113,157,158]. Since most AV platooning studies in the literature focus only on the longitudinal aspect, we present a detailed review of various types of longitudinal models used in existing AV platooning studies in this section (as listed in Table 1).

The longitudinal models represent vehicles' longitudinal behavior, such as speed and acceleration/braking, in a platoon. Nonlinearities in AV powertrain systems (e.g., engine, drivetrain, and brake system) and aerodynamic drag cause the longitudinal behavior to be nonlinear by nature. In the literature, different studies considered the nonlinearity in longitudinal modeling to different extents, whereas others have utilized linear models to express longitudinal behaviors. To present various types of longitudinal models used in the existing AV platooning literature, we categorize these models as follows: (i) First-order, (ii) Second-order, (iii) Third-order, and (iv) Single-input-single-output (SISO).

Table 1: Categories of existing AV platooning studies based on vehicle longitudinal models

First-order model	[30,85,86,105,138,163]
Second-order model	[6,8,10,13,16,19,20,22,24,25,29,48–51,55,58,61–63,65,66,70,71,77–79,81–85,104,108,116,119,126,129,133,134,136,138–145,155,156,159,162,164,166,171]
Third-order model	[11,14,15,17,18,27,32,38–47,56,67,68,73,80,89–91,97–99,101–103,109–111,113,112,117,118,123,125,131,135,137,147–149,152,161,168,172–180]
SISO model	[7,31,52,69,72,96,121,122,124,157,158]

### 3.1.1 First-order Model

First-order longitudinal vehicle models are single-integrator models that consider the speed of a subject AV as the control input and its position as the state [30,85,105,138]. These models directly relate the rate of change in position of a subject AV along the longitudinal axis to the control input, i.e., speed. The general representation of the first-order longitudinal models in the literature can be written as follows,

$$\dot{p}_i = u_i + \omega_i \quad (1)$$

where,  $u_i$  is the control input (i.e., speed, in this case) to the  $i$ -th follower AV in the platoon,  $p_i$  is the position of the  $i$ -th follower AV, and  $\omega_i$  is the external disturbance or noise associated with the  $i$ -th follower AV, respectively.

As observed in (1), the first-order models significantly simplify the longitudinal dynamics of the AVs in a platoon. This simplification, along with linearity, helps convert the design of an AV platoon optimal controller into a convex (quadratic) optimization problem and reduces computational complexity, as observed in [30,85]. Thus, the first-order models can minimize the onboard computational cost. Also, due to simplicity, first-order models can be useful to better understand how information flow topologies can affect AV platooning [59,92,100,150]. However, this simplification substantially deviates from the actual nonlinear longitudinal behavior of AVs in a platoon, causing controllers to suffer from issues such as string instability, i.e., increment in perturbations such as gap error throughout the AVs in a platoon.

### 3.1.2 Second-order Model

Second-order models have been widely used in the existing AV platooning studies. Some studies formulate the vehicle longitudinal models as double-integrator models [6,8,10,16,19,20,24,48–51,58,61,62,70,71,78,79,82–84,108,119,126,129,133,138,139,144,145,162,166,171]. Others consider an AV platoon as a mass-spring-damper mechanical system, which can be represented as a system of second-order ordinary differential equations [29,55,116,136,141–143]. Both types of studies assume acceleration or driving/braking force as the control input without considering a vehicle's internal dynamics.

The double-integrator models that consider the AVs in a platoon as point masses can be divided into two subcategories: (i) non-linear double-integrator models and (ii) linear double-integrator models. Non-linear double-integrator models in the AV platooning literature (e.g., [13,58,71,129,162]) can be presented as follows,

$$\dot{p}_i = v_i \quad (2a)$$

$$\dot{v}_i = u_i - F_i + \omega_i \quad (2b)$$

where,  $p_i$ ,  $v_i$ , and  $u_i$  are the position, speed, and control input (e.g., acceleration or driving force) of the  $i$ -th follower AV in the platoon,  $u_i$  is the control input to that AV,  $\omega_i$  is the external disturbance or noise associated with the AV, and  $F_i$  is the sum of the driving resistances for the AV, which can be written as,

$$F_i = F_r + F_a + F_g \quad (2c)$$

where,  $F_r = c_{0,i} + c_{1,i}v_i$ ,

$$F_a = \frac{1}{2}\rho C_{d,i}A_i v_i^2, \text{ and}$$

$$F_g = g \sin(\varphi)$$

Here,  $F_r$ ,  $F_a$ , and  $F_g$  are the rolling resistance, the aerodynamic drag, and the resistance due to road grades, respectively;  $c_{0,i}$  and  $c_{1,i}$  are the coefficients of rolling resistance;  $\rho$ ,  $C_{d,i}$ , and  $A_i$  are air density, the coefficient of aerodynamic drag, and the cross-sectional projected area of the  $i$ -th AV, respectively; and  $g$  and  $\varphi$  are the gravitational constant and the road grade, respectively.

Feedback linearization is often used in studies to transform nonlinear systems into linear systems to ease designing a control law that will help achieve a desired input-output system behavior [131,132]. Several studies in the literature utilized this technique to obtain a linear double-integrator model [6,8,10,16,19,20,24,48–51,61–63,70,77,79,81–84,108,119,138,144,145,164,171], which can be written as,

$$\dot{p}_i = v_i \quad (3a)$$

$$\dot{v}_i = u_i + c_i v_i + \omega_i \quad (3b)$$

where,  $c_i$  is the drag coefficient and  $\omega_i$  is the disturbance or noise associated with the  $i$ -th follower AV. The other terms in (3) hold the same meanings as before. Some studies utilize feedback linearization to cancel out the effect of nonlinear aerodynamic drag, which further simplifies the model [8,10,16,19,20,24,48–51,61,62,70,77,81–84,119,138,144,145,164,171].

Some studies [2,3,21,36,37,167,169] adopted more detailed models for their AV control strategies by considering the change in speed and torque from the engine to the transmission system. A general representation of these nonlinear models is given by,

$$\dot{p}_i = v_i \quad (4a)$$

$$m_i \dot{v}_i = \frac{T_d}{r_w} - F_i \quad (4b)$$

$$\text{here, } F_i = \frac{T_b}{r_w} + F_g + F_a + F_r$$

$$T_d = \eta_T i_g i_0 T_t$$

$$T_t = k_{TC} T_p$$

$$T_p = T_e - J_e \dot{\omega}_e$$

$$T_e = \frac{1}{\tau_e s + 1} T_{es}$$

$$T_{es} = MAP(\omega_e, \alpha_{thr})$$

$$T_b = \frac{k_b}{\tau_b s + 1} P_{brk}$$

$$F_g = m_i g \sin(\varphi)$$

$$F_a = \frac{1}{2} \rho C_{d,i} A_i (v_i + v_w)^2$$

$$F_r = m_i g f_r \cos(\varphi)$$

where,  $m_i$ ,  $v_i$ ,  $r_w$ , and  $T_d$  are the mass, speed, effective wheel radius, and driving torque of the  $i$ -th follower AV, respectively;  $F_i$  is the sum of the driving resistances experienced by the  $i$ -th follower AV, which includes the gravitational resistance (denoted by  $F_g$ ), the aerodynamic drag (denoted by  $F_a$ ), the rolling resistance (denoted by  $F_r$ ), and the brake force (denoted by  $\frac{T_b}{r_w}$ );  $T_b$  is the braking torque;  $\omega_t$  and  $T_t$  are the turbine speed and torque of the torque converter, respectively;  $i_g$  and  $i_0$  are the transmission gear ratio and the final gear ratio, respectively;  $\eta_T$  is the mechanical efficiency of driveline;  $k_{TC}$  and  $T_p$  are the torque ratio and pump torque of the torque converter, respectively;  $T_e$  and  $T_{es}$  are the actual and static engine torque of the engine, respectively;  $\omega_e$  and  $\tau_e$  are the engine speed and time constant, respectively;  $J_e$  is the moment of inertia of the flywheel;  $MAP(*,*)$  is a nonlinear tabular function of the engine torque characteristics;  $\alpha_{thr}$  is the throttle angle, which can be considered as the control input;  $k_b$ ,  $\tau_b$ , and  $P_{brk}$  are the total braking gain of the wheels, the time constant of the braking system, and the braking pressure, respectively;  $g$  and  $\varphi$  are the gravitational constant and the road grade, respectively;  $\rho$  is the air density;  $C_{d,i}$  and  $A_i$  are the coefficient of aerodynamics drag and windward area

of the  $i$ -th follower AV, respectively;  $v_w$  is the wind speed; and  $f_r$  is the coefficient of rolling resistance. Figure 2 presents a schematic diagram of the powertrain system to supplement the nonlinear model presented in (4).

A second approach to incorporate a second-order model as the vehicle longitudinal dynamics model is to assume an AV platoon as a mass-spring-damper mechanical system [29,55,116,136,141–143], where an AV is represented by a mass, a distance-dependent term is represented by a spring, and a linear speed-dependent term is represented by a damper. A general representation of such a spring-mass-damper system based on a bidirectional AV platoon, where each follower AV receives motion-related data (e.g., position, speed) from its immediate neighbors from both sides, is given by,

$$\dot{p}_i = v_i \quad (5a)$$

$$\dot{v}_i = u_i = k_{d_1}(p_{i-1} - p_i - d_{des}) + k_{d_2}(p_i - p_{i+1} - d_{des}) + k_{v_1}(v_{i-1} - v_i) + k_{v_2}(v_i - v_{i+1}) \quad (5b)$$

where,  $k_{d_1}$  and  $k_{d_2}$  are the control gains for the relative distances of the  $i$ -th follower AV with respect to the  $(i-1)$ -th and  $(i+1)$ -th follower AVs, respectively;  $d_{des}$  is the desired inter-vehicular distance; and  $k_{v_1}$  and  $k_{v_2}$  are the control gains for the relative speeds of the  $i$ -th follower AV with respect to the  $(i-1)$ -th and  $(i+1)$ -th follower AVs, respectively. The other terms in (5) hold the same meanings as before. When  $k_{d_1} = k_{d_2}$  and  $k_{v_1} = k_{v_2}$ , i.e., motion-related data from both immediate neighboring AVs are weighted equally, then the corresponding control law is *symmetric* (e.g., [29,55,141–143]); otherwise, it is *asymmetric* (e.g., [116,136])

As observed from (2)-(5), second-order models assume that the acceleration of the AVs can be directly controlled and often do not take inertial or parasitic delays and lags into consideration, which is not practical. Note that parasitic delays and lags include (i) delays associated with the actuators and sensors in the AVs, for example, delays and lags associated with the powertrain system, and (ii) lags associated with filters used for sensors, such radars, pressure sensors, and wheel speed sensors [114,115,151,152]. Neglecting these delays can cause instability in a real-world driving scenario [67,75,109,131,151]. Therefore, second-order models are also not practical in terms of replicating real-world driving conditions [152]. As a result, these models are often considered in only upper-level control models in a hierarchical control structure, where a lower-level controller maps the desired acceleration based on the upper-level control model to the required throttle input.

### 3.1.3 Third-order Model

As parasitic delays and lags are critical considerations for real-world implementation of AV platooning strategies, many studies [10,14,15,17,18,27,32,38–44,46,47,56,67,68,73,80,89–91,97–99,101–103,109–113,117,118,123,125,131,135,137,147–149,152,161,172–180] incorporate a third-order model by taking acceleration as an additional state variable to the second-order models. A general nonlinear third-order model to represent the vehicle longitudinal dynamics can be written as follows,




Figure 2: Mapping of the nonlinear model to the powertrain system.

$$\dot{p}_i = v_i \quad (6a)$$

$$\dot{v}_i = a_i \quad (6b)$$

$$\dot{a}_i = f_i(v_i, a_i) + g_i(v_i)b_i + \omega_i \quad (6c)$$

where,  $p_i$ ,  $v_i$ , and  $a_i$  are the position, speed, and acceleration of the  $i$ -th follower AV in a platoon, respectively;  $b_i$  is the control input to the engine;  $\omega_i$  is the external disturbance associated with the AV; and  $f_i$  and  $g_i$  are nonlinear functions given by,

$$f_i(v_i, a_i) = -\frac{1}{\tau_i} \left[ a_i + \frac{\rho C_{d,i} A_i}{2m_i} v_i^2 + \frac{d_{m,i}}{m_i} \right] - \frac{\rho C_{d,i} A_i}{m_i} v_i a_i \quad (6d)$$

$$g_i(v_i) = \frac{1}{m_i \tau_i} \quad (6e)$$

where,  $m_i$ ,  $C_{d,i}$ , and  $A_i$  are the mass, the coefficient of aerodynamic drag, and the windward area of the  $i$ -th follower AV, respectively;  $\rho$  is air density; and  $d_{m,i}$  and  $\tau_i$  are the mechanical drag or resistance and engine time constant (also known as the time constant of the first-order inertial lag or “lumped” parasitic lag) of the  $i$ -th follower AV, respectively. A widely adopted approach in platooning studies is to transform the system in (6) through feedback linearization by taking,

$$b_i = m_i u_i(t - \Delta_i) + \frac{1}{2} \rho C_{d,i} A_i v_i^2 + d_{m,i} + \tau_i \rho C_{d,i} A_i v_i a_i \quad (7)$$

where,  $\Delta_i$  is the “lumped” parasitic delay associated with the  $i$ -th follower AV, and  $u_i(t - \Delta_i)$  is a new control input to the  $i$ -th follower AV from the feedback linearization. Substituting (7) into (6), the third-order vehicle longitudinal dynamics model can be rewritten in a linear form as,

$$\dot{p}_i = v_i \quad (8a)$$

$$\dot{v}_i = a_i \quad (8b)$$

$$\dot{a}_i = \frac{1}{\tau_i} [u_i(t - \Delta_i) - a_i] + \omega_i \quad (8c)$$

Some studies utilize this model for the upper-level controller in a hierarchical control architecture [39,40]. The equations in (6)-(8) can also be written in terms of driving and braking torques (e.g., [27,152,174–176]). However, the overall representation of the linear third-order model in (8) remains the same.

### 3.1.4 Single-input-single-output (SISO) Model

While all the previously discussed models are represented in the time domain, another approach to represent the vehicle longitudinal model is to use a linear single-input-single-output (SISO) transfer function model for frequency domain analysis, which is also adopted by several studies in the AV platooning literature [7,31,52,69,72,96,121,122,124,157,158]. A set of assumptions are generally taken for formulating a SISO model [7,121], such as assuming that (i) all the AVs in a platoon are represented by the same vehicle model and have the same control law, (ii) the SISO transfer function is linear, strictly proper, and has a minimum of one integrator, and (iii) all the AVs in a platoon have zero initial spacing errors from idle starting positions. Based on these assumptions, the SISO model adopted by most studies that fall into this category (e.g., [7,72,96,121,122,124]) can be generalized as follows,

$$X_i(s) = H(s)[U_i(s) + D_i(s)] + \frac{x_i(0)}{s} \quad (9)$$

where,  $X_i(s)$  is the Laplace transform of a given signal  $x_i(t)$ , i.e., the position of the  $i$ -th follower AV in a platoon, in the time domain, i.e.,  $X_i(s) = \mathcal{L}(x_i(t))$ ;  $U_i(s)$  and  $D_i(s)$  are the Laplace transforms of the time-domain control input  $u_i(t)$



and external disturbance  $d_i(t)$  to the  $i$ -th follower AV, respectively; and  $x_i(0)$  is the initial position of the  $i$ -th follower AV from a fixed reference point. The transfer function,  $H(s)$ , can be different based on the order of the vehicle longitudinal dynamics model adopted. For example,  $H(s)$  for a second-order model (e.g., [63,96,107]) can be written as,  $H(s) = \frac{1}{ms(\tau s+1)}$ , and  $H(s)$  for a third-order model (e.g., [7,72,121,124]) can be written as,  $H(s) = \frac{1}{ms^2(\tau s+1)}$ , where,  $m$  is the common mass for all the AVs in the platoon, and  $\tau$  is the inertial lag of the engine. Note that, although SISO models are helpful for frequency domain analysis of string stability, assumptions such as system homogeneity and the same controllers limit its applicability for real-world scenarios.

Higher-fidelity nonlinear models than the models discussed in this section can be considered for AV platooning strategies. However, such higher-fidelity models result in high computational costs and may be unnecessary for AV platoon control strategies. Thus, most studies tend to simplify the vehicle dynamics to an extent that is suitable to their AV platoon controller development. For example, Xu et al. [157,158] considered a six DOF (including longitudinal and lateral positions and speeds, heading angle, and yaw rate) double-track nonlinear vehicle dynamics model and used feedback linearization to simplify the model to three SISO models to design simultaneous longitudinal and lateral controllers.

### 3.2 Information-Receiving Process

To achieve and maintain a platoon formation, AVs are required to obtain neighboring vehicles' motion-related data, such as position, speed, and acceleration. This information can be obtained using (i) on-board sensors and/or (ii) on-board wireless communication devices. In this section, we discuss the information-receiving process assumed by the studies in the AV platooning literature (as listed in Table 2), along with the common challenges associated with it and the corresponding solutions discussed by the researchers.

Table 2: Categories of existing AV platooning studies based on information-receiving process

Sensing	[2,3,10,13,21,26,27,35,38,40,41,43,50,52,53,55,61,65–68,71,73,76,77,79,86,91,97,103,105,121,123,126,140,142–144,147,155–158,160–162,164,168,174–177,179]		
Communication	Packet dropout	No dropout	[2,3,10,11,13–18,25,27,30,32,37,39,41,42,47,56,67,68,73,77–83,87,89,90,96–98,101–105,108–113,121,123,126,131,133,136,138,140,145,147–149,157,159,161–167,170–176,178,179]
		With dropout	[19,20,24,36,40,58,61,62,91,99,117,119,122,125,137,144,146,155,156,158]
	Latency	Without latency	[2,3,13,15,24,25,27,30,32,36,41,42,47,56,67,68,73,77–79,81,83,90,96,99,105,108,111–113,121–123,125,126,131,133,136,138,140,145,147–149,159,163,166,167,171–176]
		With latency	[10,11,14,16–20,24,37,39,40,58,61,62,80,82,87,89,91,97,98,101–104,109,110,117,119,137,144,146,155–158,161,162,164,165,170,178,179]

#### 3.2.1 Sensing

AVs are typically equipped with various sensors that can be used to determine the relative distance and speed of neighboring vehicles. Due to measurement uncertainties, sensor data typically contain random noises that can result in platoon instability [157]. Studies in the AV platooning literature assumed different distributions, such as Gaussian and uniform distributions, to model the noise in sensor measurements [50,61,140].

A common approach to obtain state estimation via sensors is to utilize sensor fusion of multiple on-board sensors. In sensor fusion, filtering algorithms, such as Kalman filter, unscented Kalman filter, extended Kalman filter, and particle filter, are often used by a subject AV to estimate the states (e.g., position, speed) of the neighboring AVs in a platoon. Although there are various filtering techniques, in general, the most common filtering algorithms involve two steps: (i) a prediction step that predicts the current states of an AV based on its states information from the previous timestamp and (ii) a measurement step that compares the predicted states to the measured states [67].

A second issue associated with the data measured by on-board sensors is latency. A common approach to account for the latency associated with sensor measurements is to include a bounded latency term in the feedback controller. For example, Xu et al. [155,157] included an equivalent latency into their control law to quantify the discretization in sensor data. It was shown in [57] that the latencies associated with discrete sensor data are bounded by the minimum sampling frequency of a sensor, which was adopted in [155,157]. However, latency is a bigger concern in wireless communication than in sensing. Thus, most studies in the literature tend to focus on latency associated with communication, which is discussed in the next subsection.

### 3.2.2 Communication

If AVs in a platoon are equipped with wireless communication devices, such as cellular vehicle-to-everything (C-V2X) devices, then the motion-related data can be directly sent to the other AVs in the platoon within the sender AV's communication range. As listed in Table 2, many studies in the literature assume perfect vehicle-to-vehicle (V2V) communication, i.e., no latency or packet dropout associated with V2V communication, among the platoon AVs. However, this assumption does not hold well in real-world driving conditions due to network-induced issues, such as transmission latencies, bandwidth limitations, and multiple connected AVs trying to share their information over the same network. Besides, on-board communication devices have limited communication range, which can be affected by vehicles' locations, speeds, and obstacles and cause loss of packets [12,54]. Therefore, it is critical to consider issues, such as latency and packet loss, associated with V2V communication while designing an AV platoon control strategy [153,154].

Studies in the AV platooning literature adopted some common assumptions to explore the effect of communication latency and packet dropout and to incorporate them into controller design as follows: (i) communication latencies are typically assumed to be bounded and detectable, and (ii) it is assumed that each AV that is receiving some information via wireless communication can estimate the latency incurred during transmission using the timestamp on the received data [10,11,17,19,20,24,40,61,62,89,119,144]. A common practice for approximation-based latency estimation is to adopt the third-order Padé approximation, as shown in [85].

Researchers presented various strategies to account for communication imperfections, such as communication latency and packet dropout, in their developed control strategies. For example, Hao *et al.* [11] considered the aggregate communication latency as a bounded stochastic piecewise function in their AV platoon control law. Integration of motion-related data obtained via onboard sensors and wireless communication into the control law is utilized in some studies, for example, [10,104,119]. Chen *et al.* [20] designed a consensus algorithm that utilizes outdated motion-related data (e.g., position and speed) from the AVs in a platoon for homogeneous time-varying delay compensation. Wang *et al.* [144] considered switching the communication topology and the spacing policy if there is a communication failure. For example, while using a leader and predecessor-following (LPF) topology, if there occurs a communication failure with the leader, then the 1<sup>st</sup> follower AV can be assumed to be the leader by the rest of the AVs in the platoon, and the desired spacing can be increased to ensure safety. The authors in [144] included packet dropout as a latency of the data sampling period, which was also adopted by Guo and Yue [40]. The authors in [40] divided the motion-related data into two parts: information

related to the preceding AV is obtained via sensors, whereas information related to the leader AV is obtained via wireless communication. Then, they introduced a symmetric logarithmic quantizer that maps the communicated information to different quantization levels to reduce the effect of delayed information. Öncü *et al.* [103,104] introduced a sampled-data protocol-based network control system to account for communication delay. On the other hand, Hu *et al.* [58] assumed LPF communication topology with limited-range and low-volume information receiving to reduce the effect of communication latency and packet dropout. Sheikholeslam and Desoer [125] designed a control law to reduce the impact of communication loss with the leader AV on platoon performance. The control law minimizes the deviation of the 1<sup>st</sup> follower AV from its desired position when there is a change in the leader AV's speed from its steady state value. Naus *et al.* [98] used a system without any communication latency to design an estimator to estimate the acceleration of the preceding AV and later used that estimator in case communication with the preceding AV is interrupted. Chehardoli and Homaeinezhad [18] adopted a method introduced by Ergenc *et al.* [28], known as the cluster treatment characteristic root (CTCR) method, which determines the region of stability with respect to parasitic and communication latencies.

### 3.3 Information Flow Topology

Aside from whatever technology is being utilized to send and/or receive the motion-related data, information flow topology varies largely depending on the information requirement set by the AV platoon controllers. Based on the existing AV platooning studies, information flow topology can be broadly categorized as unidirectional, bidirectional, directed, and undirected flow of information (as listed in Table 3).

Table 3: Categories of existing AV platooning studies based on information flow topology

Unidirectional flow of information	Leader-following (LF)	[146,166]
	Predecessor-following (PF)	[2,3,13,16,26,29,32,34–36,46,47,50,53,56,58,65–69,76,83,84,87,91,97–99,101–104,109–111,118,119,121,124,129,135,138,139,146,152,160,164,166–168,170,172,175–178]
	Two predecessor-following (TPF)	[13,36,56,87,102,109,135,172,175,176]
	Leader and predecessor-following (LPF)	[10,11,20,25,29,39–43,58,80,87,89,90,101,102,108,111–113,117,119,121–125,131,133–135,137,144,147,155–158,165,166,172,175,176]
	Leader and two predecessor-following (LPTF)	[37,102,137,166,172,175,176]
Bidirectional flow of information	Bidirectional (BD)	[7,8,16,21,29,36,38,44,48–52,55,70–72,85,87,96,101,102,116,119,121,136,137,142,143,145,148,162,169,173–176,180]
	Bidirectional leader (BDL)	[13,18,42,72,73,77,87,102,137,148,174–176]
	Bidirectional double nearest neighbors (BDNN)	[148,179]
Directed flow of information	[14–17,24,31,51,61–63,78,82,117,137,140,146,161,163,172,176]	
Undirected flow of information	[22,27,30,79,81,86,105,126,144,149,159,173,174,176]	

### 3.3.1 Unidirectional Flow of Information

When the AVs in a platoon only require downstream or preceding AVs' information, it is called a unidirectional or unilateral flow of information. Unidirectional topologies can be divided further into (i) Leader-following or LF topology (where each follower AV in the platoon receives motion-related data from the leader AV of the platoon only), (ii) predecessor-following or PF topology (where each follower AV in a platoon only requires motion-related data from its predecessor), (iii) two predecessor-following or TPF topology (where each follower AV in a platoon requires motion-related data from its predecessor and the predecessor of its predecessor), (iv) leader and predecessor following or LPP topology (where each AV in a platoon requires motion-related data from its predecessor and the leader AV of the platoon), and (v) leader and two predecessor-following or LTPF topology (where each AV in a platoon requires motion-related data from its predecessor, the predecessor of its predecessor, and the platoon leader). Figure 3 illustrates these topologies, where the arrows represent the flow of information from one AV in a platoon to another. Because in a unidirectional flow of information, the follower AVs in a platoon receive motion-related data from the AVs in the downstream direction, any deviations of an AV in the platoon from its desired behavior only affect the AVs in the upstream direction. Thus, such deviations propagate through and get absorbed by only the upstream AVs for a string stable AV platoon using unidirectional flow information.

### 3.3.2 Bidirectional Flow of Information

Some studies proposed platoon controllers that require motion-related data from AVs in both the upstream and downstream directions. These are referred to as bidirectional (or bilateral) controllers. Studies that assumed a bidirectional flow of information used 1) bidirectional or BD topology (where each AV in a platoon requires motion-related data only from its immediate neighbors, i.e., its predecessor AV and follower AV), 2) bidirectional leader-following or BDL topology (where each AV in a platoon requires motion-related data from its immediate neighbors, i.e., its predecessor and follower AVs, as well as the leader AV), and 3) bidirectional double nearest neighbors or BDNN topology (where AV requires motion-related data from two of its immediate neighbors from each direction, i.e., two predecessors and two followers). Figure 3 illustrates the topologies under this category as well. Because in a bidirectional flow of information, the follower AVs in a platoon send/receive motion-related data to/from the AVs in both the upstream and downstream directions, any deviations of an AV in the platoon from its desired behavior affect the AVs both in the upstream and downstream directions. Thus, for a string stable AV platoon using a bidirectional flow of information, such deviations propagate through and get absorbed by the AVs in both the upstream and downstream directions, which helps in faster attenuation of disturbances than using unidirectional flow of information [55,142].

### 3.3.3 Directed and Undirected Flow of Information

Apart from unidirectional and bidirectional information flow topologies, some studies assume general information flow topologies. General topologies include directed and undirected information flow, where information flow is assumed not to be limited to nearest neighbors only (e.g., immediate predecessor and/or follower, and two predecessors and/or two followers) but beyond that, depending on factors such as the communication range. These topologies can be explained better using a graph theory approach. Assume that the information flow among the AVs in a platoon can be represented by a graph,  $G = \{V, \varepsilon\}$ , where  $V = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, N\}$  denotes the set of nodes (i.e., AVs in the platoon), and  $\varepsilon \subseteq V \times V$  denotes the set of edges among the nodes  $V$  in a network. Then, the information flow topology for the AV platoon is said to be undirected if the graph  $G$  is undirected, i.e.,  $j \in \mathcal{N}_i \Leftrightarrow i \in \mathcal{N}_j$ , where  $i, j = 1, 2, 3, \dots, N$  denote the follower AVs in the platoon, and  $\mathcal{N}_i$  denotes the neighboring vehicles of the  $i^{th}$  AV, otherwise, the information flow topology is said to be directed.




Figure 3: Different information flow topologies.

### 3.4 Spacing Policies

Spacing policies define the geometry of the AV platoon formation. In general, the control objective of AV platoon controllers is to maintain a desired formation, i.e., maintaining a desired inter-vehicle spacing, while tracking the leader AV's speed,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|v_i(t) - v_L(t)\| = 0 \quad (10a)$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|p_{i-1}(t) - p_i(t) - d_{i,des}(t)\| = 0 \quad (10b)$$

where,  $p_i(t)$  and  $v_i(t)$  are the position and speed of the  $i$ -th follower AV in a platoon at  $t$ ,  $v_L(t)$  is the speed of the leader AV of the platoon at  $t$  timestamp, and  $d_{i,des}(t)$  is the desired spacing of the  $i$ -th follower AV with its predecessor at  $t$  timestamp, and we assume that the positions are measured from a point of reference that is located in the opposite direction of the platoon's heading. Spacing policy determines what  $d_{i,des}(t)$  should be used for an AV platoon.

In general, there are three major spacing policies (as listed in Table 4): (i) constant distance headway (CDH) policy, (ii) constant time headway (CTH) policy, and (iii) variable time headway (VTH). In CDH policy, the AV platooning controller tries to maintain constant inter-vehicle distance regardless of whatever speed the AVs are operating at, i.e.,

$$d_{i,des}(t) = d_{constant} \quad (11)$$

where,  $d_{constant}$  denotes the constant inter-vehicle spacing or distance an AV platoon wants to maintain. In CTH policy, the AVs in a platoon want to maintain a constant time headway between each two AVs. Therefore, the desired spacing or distance may vary based on the operating speed of a particular AV. In CTH policy,

$$d_{i,des}(t) = d_0 + v_i(t) * T_h \quad (12)$$

where,  $d_0$  is the standstill intervehicle spacing,  $v_i$  is the speed of the  $i^{th}$  follower AV, which is trying to maintain a desired gap (based on the CTH policy) with its predecessor, and  $T_h$  is a constant desired time headway. On the other hand, VTH is a nonlinear spacing policy, where the desired spacing for a follower AV in a platoon is a nonlinear function of that AV's speed, i.e.,

$$d_{i,des}(t) = d_0 + f(v_i(t)) \quad (13)$$

where,  $f(v_i(t))$  is a nonlinear function of  $v_i(t)$ . Note that the CDH policy can achieve high traffic throughput, whereas the CTH might have a lower traffic throughput than the CDH policy but better mimics a human driving behavior. On the other hand, the VTH policy has the potential to achieve high traffic throughput as well as maintain flow stability [118,177].

Table 4: Categories of existing AV platooning studies based on spacing policy

Constant distance headway (CDH)	[6–8,14,16,18,22,25,27,29–31,36–43,47–52,56,62,63,65,66,70–72,78,81,82,85–87,89,90,96,98,102,105,106,108,111–113,121–125,131,133–137,140,146–149,155,157–159,161–167,171–176,179]
Constant time headway (CTH)	[2,3,10,11,13,15,17,21,24,29,32,34,35,44,46,58,67–69,73,76,83,84,91,96–99,101,103,104,109,110,116,117,119,139,144,145,152,160,165,167–170,178]
Variable time headway (VTH)	[20,80,118,177,180]

### 3.5 Controller

The objective of the controller in AV platooning is to determine specific control input to a subject AV in a platoon to achieve and/or maintain some desired formation based on the vehicle modeling assumptions and chosen spacing policy utilizing the motion-related data from the subject AV itself and its neighbors defined by the chosen information flow topology. Therefore, the controller in AV platooning is a component where all other components (e.g., vehicle model, information-receiving process, information flow topology, and spacing policy) in the AV platooning framework come together to determine the control input based on a specific control law. Table 5 lists various types of controllers adopted in the existing AV platooning studies. Discussion on all the controllers listed in Table 5 is out of scope for this paper. Therefore, in this subsection, we choose to discuss the four most popular controllers among them, namely, (i) Linear controller, (ii) Sliding mode control (SMC), (iii)  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$  control, and (iv) Model predictive control (MPC).

For each of the above controllers, we also discuss different approaches taken by researchers to ensure platoon performance, for example, local stability (which has to be guaranteed for any AV platoon controller), string stability, and stability margin of the platoon. In general, a platoon of AVs with LTI dynamics is considered stable if the real parts of all the eigenvalues of its closed-loop system are all strictly negative. Local stability refers to the stability of individual AVs in a platoon. Stability margin refers to the absolute value of the system's least stable eigenvalue's real part. String stability is achieved for an AV platoon when it is guaranteed that any perturbations, such as sudden braking of a vehicle within or in front of the AV platoon, will not be amplified across the upstream vehicles (for unidirectional flow of information) or

both the upstream and downstream vehicles (for bidirectional flow of information). Apart from the abovementioned metrics, there are some other metrics used in the AV platooning literature, such as jerk or passenger comfort, safety, fuel economy, convergence, and traffic throughput or efficiency, which have not been included in our discussion as these are derivative-type metrics that can come as benefits of AV platooning rather than revealing how well an AV platoon is performing while operating using a particular AV platooning strategy.

Table 5: Categories of existing AV platooning studies based on controller

Linear controller	[6–8,10,11,14,16–18,21,22,24,27,29,31,38,39,48–52,55,61,62,65–67,69,70,72,78,79,96–99,102–105,108,110,111,116–119,121,122,124,125,135,136,140,142,143,146,159,161,163,164,169,174–176]
Sliding mode control (SMC)	[35,36,41,42,46,47,71,73,80,83,89,106,112,113,129,134,139,145,148,152,177,180]
$\mathcal{H}_\infty$ control	[37,40,43,109,123,155–158,173,178]
Model predictive control (MPC)	[25,26,32,44,58,68,76,90,137,144,147,165–167,171,172]
Other	Different other optimal controllers: [3,30,63,84,85,91,131,162,167] Adaptive: [13,44,56,133] Nonlinear consensus: [20,77,81,82] Neural Network-based: [1,45,60,120] Backstepping: [138,179] Passivity: [70] Impulsive: [149] Flatness-based: [34]

### 3.5.1 Linear Controller

Linear controller is the most common type of controller among the existing AV platooning studies (as listed in Table 5). These controllers are the most popular ones as they are relatively easier for theoretical analysis, numerical analysis, and real-world deployment through hardware implementation compared to other types of controllers [175]. To provide a general representation of the linear controllers, we consider a third-order vehicle longitudinal model. Then, the tracking error for a desired spacing policy can be written as,

$$\mathbf{e}_{ij}(t) = \mathbf{x}_i(t) - \mathbf{x}_j(t) - \mathbf{d}_i(t) \quad (14)$$

$$\text{here, } \mathbf{x}_i(t) = [p_i(t), v_i(t), a_i(t)]^T$$

$$\mathbf{d}_i(t) = [d_{i,des}(t), 0, 0]^T$$

where,  $\mathbf{e}_{ij}(t)$  is the tracking error of the  $i$ -th AV with respect to the  $j$ -th AV in the platoon at time  $t$ ;  $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$  with  $\mathcal{N}_i$  denoting the set of the neighbors of the  $i$ -th follower AV; and the other symbols hold the same meaning as before. Then, the control law can be expressed as,

$$u_i(t) = - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \mathbf{k}_{ij} \mathbf{e}_{ij}(t) \quad (15)$$

$$\text{here, } \mathbf{k}_{ij} = [k_{ij,p}, k_{ij,v}, k_{ij,a}]$$

where,  $k_{ij,p}$ ,  $k_{ij,v}$ , and  $k_{ij,a}$  are the control gains associated with position, speed, and acceleration. Although linear controllers are popular among the platooning strategies presented in the literature due to their usefulness for theoretical

analysis, they cannot explicitly handle string stability and the nonlinearities and constraints involved in realistic driving conditions.

Studies that adopted a linear controller included different metrics to evaluate the platoon performance. First, local (asymptotic) or internal stability must be guaranteed for any AV platooning strategies. For linear controllers, the local stability of an AV platoon largely depends on the adopted information flow topology [176]. For instance, Lestas and Vinnicombe [72] provided a closed-loop stability theorem for establishing stability thresholds for various information flow topologies, such as PF, TPF, LPF, LPTF, BD, and BDL topologies. Second, different platoon control strategies based on linear consensus controllers have been developed to ensure string stability of an AV platoon, i.e., to ensure that any disturbances (e.g., errors in desired distance or speed tracking) imposed by a vehicle are not amplified over the following vehicles in that platoon. For example, in [65,66], Khair and Davison showed that while using “identical” controllers, it is impossible to ensure string stability for a homogeneous platoon of AVs under the CDH policy. This problem can be solved by using non-identical linear controllers, as presented in [66,72,124]. Another approach to solve the issue of string instability is to introduce the CTH policy as seen in [69,132]. Stability margin has been adopted by several studies in the literature that incorporated linear controllers for AV platooning [8,24,27,31,48–51,110,140,174,175]. Barooah et al. [8] showed that the stability margin for an AV platoon is dependent on the size of the AV platoon, the longitudinal behavior of the vehicles, and the information flow topology. Using an asymmetric distributed linear control (as presented in [49]), the stability margin can be bounded away from zero, making it independent of the size of the AV platoon.

### 3.5.2 Sliding Model Control (SMC)

Sliding mode control (SMC) is a variable structure nonlinear control strategy that utilizes a discontinuous control input to force a system to slide along or, in reality, “chatter” about some prescribed sliding surface after the system trajectory merges with the sliding surface in finite time. Different studies adopted different approaches for defining the sliding surface. For example, among the initial studies on SMC-based AV platoon controllers, Rajamani et al. [112,113] adopted the sliding surface design approach from [128] given by,

$$S_i = \dot{e}_i + \frac{\omega_n}{\zeta + \sqrt{\zeta^2 - 1}} \frac{e_i}{1 - C_1} + \frac{C_1}{1 - C_1} (v_i - v_L) \quad (16a)$$

$$\dot{S}_i + \lambda S_i = 0 \quad (16b)$$

$$\text{here, } \lambda = \omega_n (\zeta + \sqrt{\zeta^2 - 1})$$

where,  $S_i$  is the sliding surface;  $\omega_n$  is bandwidth of the controller;  $\zeta$  is the damping ratio;  $C_1$  is a weight term;  $e_i$  and  $\dot{e}_i$  are tracking errors with respect to desired spacing and speed, respectively; and  $v_i$  and  $v_L$  denote the speed of the  $i$ -th AV and the leader AV, respectively.

Among the recent studies, Gao et al. [36] defined the sliding surface as follows,

$$S_i = a_i + \mathbf{K} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \begin{bmatrix} e_{ij} \\ \dot{e}_{ij} \end{bmatrix} \quad (17a)$$

$$\text{here, } e_{ij} = p_i - p_j - d_{ij,des}$$

and the corresponding control law is determined based on,

$$\dot{S}_i + \gamma_i S_i = 0 \quad (17b)$$

where,  $\mathbf{K} \in \mathbf{R}^2$  is the control gain;  $e_{ij}$  and  $d_{ij,des}$  is the spacing error and the desired spacing between the  $i$ -th and  $j$ -th AV in the platoon, respectively;  $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$  denotes the set of neighbors of the  $i$ -th AV;  $\gamma_i > 0$  is responsible for the convergence speed of  $S_i$ ; and other symbols hold the same meanings as before.



Studies incorporating SMC-based AV platooning strategies took various approaches to ensure and evaluate the string stability of the platoon. For example, Xiao and Gao [152] presented how to design the control gains for their SMC to ensure that the practical string stability of both homogeneous and heterogeneous AV platoons would be maintained under the CTH policy in realistic conditions, such as experiencing time delays and lags. In another study [73], Li and Guo presented a new spacing policy by incorporating a platoon reference speed received by all the AVs in the platoon that is provided by a virtual leader acting as the upper-level platoon planning layer. Guo and Li [42] presented two SMCs for LPF and BDL topology-based AV platoons under the CDH policy that can guarantee individual vehicle's bounded stability as well as the whole platoon's string stability (i.e., errors are not amplified over the vehicles in the platoon).

SMC has several advantages for AV platooning, such as (i) SMC can be designed so that it is robust to external disturbances and model uncertainties by using an appropriate strategy, for example, by combining a switching control part with an equivalent controller [5,36,95], (ii) the switching function in SMC can be chosen to modify the controller's dynamic behavior [4], and (iii) SMC can directly specify platoon performance [73,88]. On the other hand, SMC's main disadvantages are the "chattering" problem and not being able to handle constraints on the control input explicitly.

### 3.5.3 $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ control

H-infinity ( $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ ) is a robust control design method that has been adopted by many studies. An AV platooning strategy must ensure that the platoon controller can handle uncertainties, such as a mismatch between the actual vehicle dynamics and the considered vehicle dynamic model, as well as the external disturbances caused by real-world driving conditions. In recent years, studies have shown how an  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$  control design can be utilized for an AV platoon to handle such model uncertainties and external disturbances as well as sensor and communication delays while satisfying asymptotic and string stability criteria [40,155–157]. To formulate a general representation of  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$  control for an AV platoon, we consider a homogeneous platoon of AVs operating using the PF topology under a CDH policy. If we assume a second-order vehicle longitudinal model as presented in (3) and define,

$$e_i = p_{i-1} - p_i - d_{i,des} \quad (18a)$$

$$\dot{e}_i = v_{i-1} - v_i \quad (18b)$$

where,  $e_i$  and  $\dot{e}_i$  are the position and speed tracking error of the  $i$ -th AV in a platoon with respect to its predecessor AV, respectively; and the other symbols hold the same meaning as before. Then, we can write combining (3) and (18),

$$\dot{e}_i = v_{i-1} - v_i \quad (19a)$$

$$\ddot{e}_i = a_{i-1} - u_i - c_i v_i - \omega_i \quad (19b)$$

Then, we define a linear control law as,

$$u_i = k_1 e_i + k_2 \dot{e}_i \quad (20)$$

where,  $k_1$  and  $k_2$  are control gains for the position and speed tracking, respectively. Plugging  $u_i$  from (20) into (19) and taking  $\xi_i = [e_i, \dot{e}_i]^T$ , we can write,

$$\dot{\xi}_i = A \xi_i + H W_i \quad (21a)$$

$$Z_i = C \xi_i \quad (21b)$$

$$\text{here, } A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -k_1 & -k_2 \end{bmatrix}, H = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & -c_i & -1 \end{bmatrix}, \text{ and}$$

$$W_i = [a_{i-1}, v_i, \omega_i]^T$$

Then, we can represent the cost as follows,

$$J(W_i) = \int_0^{\infty} [Z_i^T(t)Z_i(t) - \gamma^2 W_i^T(t)W_i(t)]dt \quad (22)$$

where,  $\gamma \geq 0$  is a constant. Then, the optimal  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$  control action,  $u_i^*$ , is to be determined to optimize the cost function defined in (21) while satisfying some predefined control objectives (e.g., some platoon consensus, fuel usage, and stability) along with  $J(W_i) < 0$ ,  $\forall W_i(t) \neq 0$  such that  $\int_0^{\infty} \|W_i(t)\|dt < \infty$ . Researchers adopted various approaches to design the  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$  control law for satisfying the above criteria. For example, the authors in [155–157] designed the  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$  control law based on the Lyapunov-Krasovskii functionals, whereas the authors in [40,43] designed the  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$  control law based on linear matrix inequality (LMI) tool.

Studies that adopted  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$  controllers for AV platoons took various approaches to ensure the stability of the platoon. For example, in [109], Ploeg et al. synthesized an  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$  controller for an AV platoon, where the string stability condition was satisfied explicitly utilizing an LMI. Zhou et al. [178] provided conditions for “head-to-tail” string stability, i.e., a disturbance is not amplified for a heterogeneous AV platoon system starting from the first vehicle to the last vehicle. In another study [173], Zheng et al. determined the stability margin of their developed  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$  controller using a graph theoretic approach along with the Routh-Hurwitz criterion and presented how it can work for a wide range of information flow topologies.

As shown above, the  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$  controllers formulate the control problems in the form of optimization problems and determine the optimal control law by solving an optimization problem.  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$  is a robust control method as it minimizes the effects of undesired signals and helps with stabilization. However, the real-world adaptation of an  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$  controller is challenging for AV platooning since this control method also cannot handle constraints.

### 3.5.4 Model Predictive Control (MPC)

MPC is an optimal control technique that predicts the future states of a plant based on the current states information and chosen control inputs. MPC utilizes numerical optimization to find the optimal control inputs while handling nonlinearity and satisfying a given set of constraints. As a result, many studies in the AV platooning literature have adopted centralized MPC-based controllers, for example, see [144,171], and distributed MPC-based controllers, for example, see [25,32,58,68,90,137,147,166,167,172], for AV platooning. However, a centralized MPC is not suitable for AV platooning application as it requires knowledge of the states of all the AVs in the platoon. To provide a general representation of the distributed MPC-based controllers, we consider the third-order vehicle longitudinal model. Then, the plant model and its output can be written as,

$$\dot{x}_i(t) = Ax_i(t) + Bu_i(t) \quad (23a)$$

$$y_i(t) = Cx_i(t) \quad (23b)$$

$$\text{here, } x_i(t) = [p_i(t), v_i(t), a_i(t)]^T$$

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1/\tau_i \end{bmatrix}, B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1/\tau_i \end{bmatrix}, C = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

where, the symbols hold the same meaning as before. Rewriting (23) in discrete time,

$$x_i^p(k+1|t) = \tilde{A}x_i^p(k|t) + \tilde{B}u_i^p(k|t) \quad (24a)$$

$$y_i^p(k+1|t) = \tilde{C}x_i^p(k+1|t) \quad (24b)$$

$$\text{here, } \tilde{A} = I_{3 \times 3} + A\Delta t, \tilde{B} = B\Delta t, \text{ and } \tilde{C} = C$$

where,  $x_i^p$ ,  $y_i^p$ , and  $u_i^p$  are predicted state, output, and control input vectors at time  $t + k\Delta t$ , respectively, where  $\Delta t$  denotes the time step size; and  $I_{3 \times 3}$  is a 3-by-3 identity matrix. Then, the open-loop optimal control action can be written as,

$$u_i^*(t) = \underset{u_i^p(0|t), u_i^p(1|t), \dots, u_i^p(N_c-1|t)}{\operatorname{argmin}} J_i(y_i^p, u_i^p, y_i^a, y_{-i}^a) \quad (25a)$$

$$\text{here, } J_i = \int_0^{N_p} l_i(y_i^p, u_i^p, y_i^a, y_{-i}^a) dt + \eta_i(y_i^p(N_p|t)) \quad (25b)$$

where,  $u_i^*(t)$  is the optimal control input to the  $i$ -th AV in an AV platoon at time  $t$ ;  $y_i^a$  and  $y_{-i}^a$  are assumed state vectors of the  $i$ -th AV and the neighbors of the  $i$ -th AV, respectively;  $N_c$  and  $N_p$  are the control and prediction horizons, respectively;  $l_i$  and  $\eta_i$  are the costs associated with  $y_i^p$  until the final prediction step and at the final prediction step, respectively. Equation (25) can be subjected to a set of constraints depending on requirements, for example, the lower and upper bounds of speed and acceleration. Although MPC-based controllers are capable of handling constraints and nonlinearity explicitly, they suffer from high computational costs, which require AVs to be equipped with fast on-board computing devices.

Studies in the literature that adopted centralized or distributed MPC for controlling AV platoons took various approaches to ensure the stability and robustness of the platoon. For example, Wang et al. [144] analyzed the asymptotic stability and the string stability for their centralized MPC-based AV platooning strategy. The authors in [144] adopted the asymptotic stability conditions for MPC developed by Mayne et al. [93] to ensure the asymptotic stability of a platoon and analyzed the string stability using the  $\mathcal{L}_2$  string stability, i.e., spacing error attenuation notion of string stability, conditions presented in [33]. Dunbar and Caveney [25] ensured string stability to their distributed MPC-based platoon control strategy for PF and LF topologies by including additional constraints based on  $\mathcal{L}_2$  string stability.

MPC is advantageous in AV platooning since it can provide an optimal control law that can explicitly handle constraints on the states and the control input. However, MPC requires a model of the plant dynamics (i.e., individual vehicle dynamics or dynamics of the whole platoon) that represent the plant quite well as MPC exploits the model to predict the future states of the system and optimizes the control law based on it. This also results in a high computational cost for MPC-based AV platooning strategies.

## 4 FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

AV platooning has been an important topic of research and development for the last few decades. Although numerous studies in this field have been conducted over the years, several gaps remain where future research is needed before full-scale AV platooning can be realized in the real world. In this section, we shed light on several gaps with potential future research directions.

### 4.1 Vehicle Dynamics

An appropriate vehicle dynamics model is critical to maintaining a stable AV platoon formation since it helps determine a suitable control law by estimating the effect of the chosen control input on individual vehicles as well as the overall platoon. However, as mentioned before, the higher the fidelity of a vehicle dynamics model is, the higher the computational burden on the on-board processing unit. Therefore, selecting an appropriate model for accurate vehicle states estimation while keeping the computational cost within a reasonable limit is a challenging and ongoing matter of research.

## **4.2 Information-Receiving Process**

In AVs, many sensors are utilized for perception and navigation. Each sensor has its own objective, advantages, and limitations. An interesting future research direction for AV platooning is to explore the effects of fusing multiple on-board sensors as well as data received via wireless communication to obtain robust states information of the neighboring vehicles. Many sensor fusion techniques have been presented in the literature; however, their usefulness in AV platooning strategies has yet to be explored. Also, latency is a major concern for wireless communication-based information receiving. 5G's reliable and faster communication has the potential to solve this issue. Researchers need to put more focus on studying the effects of these state-of-the-art technologies on AV platooning through real-world testing.

## **4.3 Spacing Policy**

Various spacing policies have been introduced for AV platooning over the years, considering various factors, such as traffic throughput, safety, fuel economy, passenger comfort, and communication range. However, their effect on platoon stability for heterogeneous roadway traffic and switching communication topologies is a matter of ongoing research. While leaving a larger gap among the vehicles in a platoon might be better for safety and stability due to human reaction and actuation delays, larger gaps reduce traffic throughput and increase fuel usage due to higher aerodynamic drag. Therefore, an optimal spacing policy that can optimize the above factors while helping the stable operation of a platoon is required. Besides, merging and diverging are very important considerations for AV platooning that are missing in many of the existing studies. Any AV platooning strategy should account for merging and diverging coordination among the AVs in a platoon and design the controller accordingly.

## **4.4 Controller**

The controller is a key component of AV platooning. Over the years, many AV platoon controllers have been developed. However, they all share a common issue of relying on an appropriate vehicle dynamics model, which is very challenging in a real-world scenario where there are heterogeneous vehicles on the road. Very recently, researchers have started to focus on designing model-free AV platooning strategies, such as neural network (NN)-based AV platooning strategies [1,45,60,120]. However, the biggest challenge associated with such strategies is the requirement of a huge amount of data for training the NNs effectively to perform platooning operations. While a part of this data can be collected through high-fidelity simulations, data from the real world is still much needed.

## **4.5 Wide-scale Real-world Testing and Evaluation**

Most of the AV platooning studies found in the literature focus primarily on simulation-based validation and suffer from real-world testing and validation. In real-world driving conditions, many factors, such as roadway and environmental conditions, sensor, communication and actuator delays, latencies and lags, packet drops, heterogeneous wireless communication, mixed (e.g., human-driven, semi-automated, fully automated, and connected or non-connected) and heterogeneity of the roadway traffic, and human factors, can play crucial roles for safety-critical applications such as AV platooning. These factors have partially or hardly been accounted for while designing the controllers in the existing AV platooning studies. Thus, a controller that has been validated to maintain local stability and string stability through simulation-based testing might not be able to maintain them in real-world driving conditions. AV platooning studies need to consider these effects to design real-time adaptive or switching platoon control strategies and validate them through real-world testing followed by various simulation-based testing, such as human-, software-, and hardware-in-the-loop simulations, as found appropriate to specific strategies.

## 5 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we reviewed different AV platooning strategies presented by researchers over the last few decades. First, we divide the overall AV platooning framework into five components: vehicle longitudinal dynamics, information-receiving process, information flow topology, spacing policy, and controller. We categorized the existing AV platooning studies based on the approach taken by the studies regarding each component of the framework. For each category (e.g., for each vehicle longitudinal dynamic model and for each controller type), we reviewed the corresponding studies to present the category with a general mathematical representation and discussed the strengths and weaknesses. For each AV platoon controller, we also presented some exemplary approaches taken by the corresponding studies to ensure and evaluate the robustness and stability of the platoon. Finally, we discussed some future research directions that can lead researchers in this field to conduct further research toward making wide-scale AV platooning a reality.

Based on the review of the existing studies, we found some open challenges that need to be addressed for developing an AV platoon control. An AV platoon control strategy needs to account for the nonlinearity in vehicle dynamics and the delays and lags in the powertrain system while not overburdening the on-board processing unit. It also needs to consider common issues with wireless communications, such as latencies and packet dropouts, as well as adapt to switching among the most suitable information flow topologies when needed. Stability and robustness to external disturbances are crucial for an AV platoon controller to be implemented in the real world. While meeting all these requirements is quite challenging, there remain some practical requirements from an AV platoon control strategy, such as improving the roadway traffic throughput/capacity, improving safety, reducing aerodynamic drag, improving overall fuel efficiency, and considering passenger comfort.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by Clemson University's Virtual Prototyping of Autonomy Enabled Ground Systems (VIPR-GS), under Cooperative Agreement W56HZV-21-2-0001 with the US Army DEVCOM Ground Vehicle Systems Center (GVSC).

## REFERENCES

- [1] Abdussalam Ali Ahmed and Omer SM Jomah. 2020. Vehicle yaw rate control for lane change maneuver using fuzzy PID controller and neural network controller. 2020. IEEE, 1–6. .
- [2] Assad Al Alam, Ather Gattami, and Karl Henrik Johansson. 2010. An experimental study on the fuel reduction potential of heavy duty vehicle platooning. In *13th international IEEE conference on intelligent transportation systems*, 2010. IEEE, 306–311. .
- [3] Assad Alam, Ather Gattami, Karl H Johansson, and Claire J Tomlin. 2014. Guaranteeing safety for heavy duty vehicle platooning: Safe set computations and experimental evaluations. *Control Engineering Practice* 24, (2014), 33–41.
- [4] Sareh Badnava, Nader Meskin, Adel Gastli, Mohammed Al-Hitmi, Jawher Ghommam, Mostefa Mesbah, and Faical Mnif. 2021. Platoon transitional maneuver control system: A review. *IEEE Access* (2021).
- [5] Jaemin Baek, Maolin Jin, and Soohee Han. 2016. A new adaptive sliding-mode control scheme for application to robot manipulators. *IEEE Transactions on industrial electronics* 63, 6 (2016), 3628–3637.
- [6] Bassam Bamieh, Mihailo R Jovanovic, Partha Mitra, and Stacy Patterson. 2012. Coherence in large-scale networks: Dimension-dependent limitations of local feedback. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 57, 9 (2012), 2235–2249.
- [7] Prabir Barooah and Joao P Hespanha. 2005. Error amplification and disturbance propagation in vehicle strings with decentralized linear control. 2005. IEEE, 4964–4969. .
- [8] Prabir Barooah, Prashant G. Mehta, and João P. Hespanha. 2009. Mistuning-Based Control Design to Improve Closed-Loop Stability Margin of Vehicular Platoons. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 54, 9 (September 2009), 2100–2113. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2009.2026934>
- [9] Carl Bergenhem, Steven Shladover, Erik Coelingh, Christoffer Englund, and Sadayuki Tsugawa. 2012. Overview of platooning systems. 2012. .
- [10] Mario di Bernardo, Paolo Falcone, Alessandro Salvi, and Stefania Santini. 2015. Design, analysis, and experimental validation of a distributed protocol for platooning in the presence of time-varying heterogeneous delays. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology* 24, 2 (2015), 413–427.
- [11] Mario di Bernardo, Alessandro Salvi, Stefania Santini, and Antonio Saverio Valente. 2015. Third-order consensus in vehicles platoon with heterogeneous time-varying delays. *IFAC-PapersOnLine* 48, 12 (January 2015), 358–363. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ifacol.2015.09.404>
- [12] Annette Böhm, Kristoffer Lidström, Magnus Jonsson, and Tony Larsson. 2010. Evaluating CALM M5-based vehicle-to-vehicle communication in various road settings through field trials. 2010. IEEE, 613–620. .

- [13] Hossein Chehardoli and Ali Ghasemi. 2018. Adaptive Centralized/Decentralized Control and Identification of 1-D Heterogeneous Vehicular Platoons Based on Constant Time Headway Policy. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 19, 10 (October 2018), 3376–3386. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2017.2781152>
- [14] Hossein Chehardoli and Ali Ghasemi. 2019. Formation control of longitudinal vehicular platoons under generic network topology with heterogeneous time delays. *Journal of Vibration and Control* 25, 3 (February 2019), 655–665. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077546318791025>
- [15] Hossein Chehardoli, Ali Ghasemi, and Ali Najafi. 2019. Centralized and decentralized distributed control of longitudinal vehicular platoons with non-uniform communication topology. *Asian Journal of Control* 21, 6 (2019), 2691–2699. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asjc.2235>
- [16] Hossein Chehardoli and Mohamad R Homaeinezhad. 2017. Stable control of a heterogeneous platoon of vehicles with switched interaction topology, time-varying communication delay and lag of actuator. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part C: Journal of Mechanical Engineering Science* 231, 22 (2017), 4197–4208.
- [17] Hossein Chehardoli and Mohammad R Homaeinezhad. 2018. Third-order safe consensus of heterogeneous vehicular platoons with MPF network topology: constant time headway strategy. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part D: Journal of Automobile Engineering* 232, 10 (2018), 1402–1413.
- [18] Hossein Chehardoli and Mohammad Reza Homaeinezhad. 2018. Third-order leader-following consensus protocol of traffic flow formed by cooperative vehicular platoons by considering time delay: constant spacing strategy. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part I: Journal of Systems and Control Engineering* 232, 3 (2018), 285–298.
- [19] Gang Chen and Frank L Lewis. 2011. Leader-following control for multiple inertial agents. *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control* 21, 8 (2011), 925–942.
- [20] Jianzhong Chen, Huan Liang, Jing Li, and Zekai Lv. 2020. Connected automated vehicle platoon control with input saturation and variable time headway strategy. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 22, 8 (2020), 4929–4940.
- [21] CC Chien, Youping Zhang, and CY Cheng. 1995. Autonomous intelligent cruise control using both front and back information for tight vehicle following maneuvers. 1995. IEEE, 3091–3095. .
- [22] S. Darbha and P. R. Pagilla. 2010. Limitations of employing undirected information flow graphs for the maintenance of rigid formations for heterogeneous vehicles. *International Journal of Engineering Science* 48, 11 (November 2010), 1164–1178. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jengsci.2010.08.013>
- [23] Kakan Dey, Li Yan, Xujie Wang, Yue Wang, Haiying Shen, Mashrur Chowdhury, Lei Yu, Chenxi Qiu, and Vivekgautham Soundararaj. 2016. A Review of Communication, Driver Characteristics, and Controls Aspects of Cooperative Adaptive Cruise Control (CACC). *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 17, 2 (February 2016), 491–509. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2015.2483063>
- [24] Mario Di Bernardo, Alessandro Salvi, and Stefania Santini. 2014. Distributed consensus strategy for platooning of vehicles in the presence of time-varying heterogeneous communication delays. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 16, 1 (2014), 102–112.
- [25] William B. Dunbar and Derek S. Caveney. 2012. Distributed Receding Horizon Control of Vehicle Platoons: Stability and String Stability. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 57, 3 (March 2012), 620–633. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2011.2159651>
- [26] Shengbo Eben Li, Keqiang Li, and Jianqiang Wang. 2013. Economy-oriented vehicle adaptive cruise control with coordinating multiple objectives function. *Vehicle System Dynamics* 51, 1 (January 2013), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00423114.2012.708421>
- [27] Shengbo Eben Li, Yang Zheng, Keqiang Li, and Jianqiang Wang. 2015. Scalability limitation of homogeneous vehicular platoon under undirected information flow topology and constant spacing policy. 2015. IEEE, 8039–8045. .
- [28] Ali Fuat Ergenc, Nejat Olgac, and Hassan Fazelinia. 2007. Extended Kronecker summation for cluster treatment of LTI systems with multiple delays. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization* 46, 1 (2007), 143–155.
- [29] J. Eyre, D. Yanakiev, and I. Kanellakopoulos. 1998. A Simplified Framework for String Stability Analysis of Automated Vehicles. *Vehicle System Dynamics* 30, 5 (November 1998), 375–405. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00423119808969457>
- [30] Makan Fardad, Fu Lin, and Mihailo R Jovanović. 2011. Sparsity-promoting optimal control for a class of distributed systems. 2011. IEEE, 2050–2055. .
- [31] J Alexander Fax and Richard M Murray. 2004. Information flow and cooperative control of vehicle formations. *IEEE transactions on automatic control* 49, 9 (2004), 1465–1476.
- [32] Shuo Feng, Haowei Sun, Yi Zhang, Jianfeng Zheng, Henry X. Liu, and Li Li. 2020. Tube-Based Discrete Controller Design for Vehicle Platoons Subject to Disturbances and Saturation Constraints. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology* 28, 3 (May 2020), 1066–1073. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TCST.2019.2896539>
- [33] Shuo Feng, Yi Zhang, Shengbo Eben Li, Zhong Cao, Henry X Liu, and Li Li. 2019. String stability for vehicular platoon control: Definitions and analysis methods. *Annual Reviews in Control* 47, (2019), 81–97.
- [34] Axel Fritz and Werner Schiehlen. 1999. Automatic cruise control of a mechatronically steered vehicle convoy. *Vehicle System Dynamics* 32, 4–5 (1999), 331–344.
- [35] Axel Fritz and Werner Schiehlen. 2001. Nonlinear ACC in simulation and measurement. *Vehicle System Dynamics* 36, 2–3 (2001), 159–177.
- [36] Feng Gao, Xiaosong Hu, Shengbo Eben Li, Keqiang Li, and Qi Sun. 2018. Distributed adaptive sliding mode control of vehicular platoon with uncertain interaction topology. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics* 65, 8 (2018), 6352–6361.
- [37] Feng Gao, Shengbo Eben Li, Yang Zheng, and Dongsuk Kum. 2016. Robust control of heterogeneous vehicular platoon with uncertain dynamics and communication delay. *IET Intelligent Transport Systems* 10, 7 (2016), 503–513. <https://doi.org/10.1049/iet-its.2015.0205>
- [38] Ali Ghasemi, Reza Kazemi, and Shahram Azadi. 2013. Stable decentralized control of a platoon of vehicles with heterogeneous information feedback. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology* 62, 9 (2013), 4299–4308.
- [39] Jian Gong, Yuan Zhao, and Zibao Lu. 2018. Sampled-data vehicular platoon control with communication delay. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part I: Journal of Systems and Control Engineering* 232, 1 (January 2018), 39–49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0959651817733590>
- [40] G. Guo and W. Yue. 2011. Hierarchical platoon control with heterogeneous information feedback. *IET Control Theory & Applications* 5, 15 (October 2011), 1766–1781. <https://doi.org/10.1049/iet-cta.2010.0765>
- [41] Ge Guo and Dandan Li. 2018. PMP-Based Set-Point Optimization and Sliding-Mode Control of Vehicular Platoons. *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems* 5, 2 (June 2018), 553–562. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TCSS.2018.2829626>
- [42] Ge Guo and Dandan Li. 2019. Adaptive sliding mode control of vehicular platoons with prescribed tracking performance. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology* 68, 8 (2019), 7511–7520.
- [43] Ge Guo and Wei Yue. 2012. Autonomous platoon control allowing range-limited sensors. *IEEE Transactions on vehicular technology* 61, 7 (2012), 2901–2912.

- [44] Hongyan Guo, Jun Liu, Qikun Dai, Hong Chen, Yulei Wang, and Wanzhong Zhao. 2020. A distributed adaptive triple-step nonlinear control for a connected automated vehicle platoon with dynamic uncertainty. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal* 7, 5 (2020), 3861–3871.
- [45] Xiang-Gui Guo, Jian-Liang Wang, Fang Liao, and Rodney Swee Huat Teo. 2017. CNN-based distributed adaptive control for vehicle-following platoon with input saturation. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 19, 10 (2017), 3121–3132.
- [46] Xianggui Guo, Jianliang Wang, Fang Liao, and Rodney Swee Huat Teo. 2019. Neuroadaptive quantized PID sliding-mode control for heterogeneous vehicular platoon with unknown actuator deadzone. *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control* 29, 1 (2019), 188–208. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rnc.4394>
- [47] Xiang-Gui Guo, Wei-Dong Xu, Jian-Liang Wang, and Ju H. Park. 2021. Distributed neuroadaptive fault-tolerant sliding-mode control for 2-D plane vehicular platoon systems with spacing constraints and unknown direction faults. *Automatica* 129, (July 2021), 109675. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.automatica.2021.109675>
- [48] He Hao and Prabir Barooah. 2010. Control of large 1D networks of double integrator agents: Role of heterogeneity and asymmetry on stability margin. In *49th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, December 2010. 7395–7400. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CDC.2010.5717477>
- [49] He Hao and Prabir Barooah. 2012. On achieving size-independent stability margin of vehicular lattice formations with distributed control. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 57, 10 (2012), 2688–2694.
- [50] He Hao and Prabir Barooah. 2013. Stability and robustness of large platoons of vehicles with double-integrator models and nearest neighbor interaction. *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control* 23, 18 (2013), 2097–2122.
- [51] He Hao, Prabir Barooah, and Prashant G Mehta. 2011. Stability margin scaling laws for distributed formation control as a function of network structure. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 56, 4 (2011), 923–929.
- [52] Ivo Herman, Dan Martinec, Zdeněk Hurák, and Michael Šebek. 2014. Nonzero bound on Fiedler eigenvalue causes exponential growth of H-infinity norm of vehicular platoon. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 60, 8 (2014), 2248–2253.
- [53] Akira Higashimata, Kazutaka Adachi, Takenori Hashizume, and Satoshi Tange. 2001. Design of a headway distance control system for ACC. *JSAE review* 22, 1 (2001), 15–22.
- [54] Mohammad A Hoque, Jackeline Rios-Torres, Ramin Arvin, Asad Khattak, and Salman Ahmed. 2020. The extent of reliability for vehicle-to-vehicle communication in safety critical applications: an experimental study. *Journal of Intelligent Transportation Systems* 24, 3 (2020), 264–278.
- [55] Berthold K. P. Horn and Liang Wang. 2018. Wave Equation of Suppressed Traffic Flow Instabilities. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 19, 9 (September 2018), 2955–2964. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2017.2767595>
- [56] Junyan Hu, Parijat Bhowmick, Farshad Arvin, Alexander Lanson, and Barry Lennox. 2020. Cooperative control of heterogeneous connected vehicle platoons: An adaptive leader-following approach. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters* 5, 2 (2020), 977–984.
- [57] Li-Sheng Hu, Tao Bai, Peng Shi, and Ziming Wu. 2007. Sampled-data control of networked linear control systems. *Automatica* 43, 5 (2007), 903–911.
- [58] Xiaorong Hu, Lantao Xie, Lei Xie, Shan Lu, Weihua Xu, and Hongye Su. 2022. Distributed Model Predictive Control for Vehicle Platoon With Mixed Disturbances and Model Uncertainties. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* (2022), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2022.3153307>
- [59] A. Jadbabaie, Jie Lin, and A.S. Morse. 2003. Coordination of groups of mobile autonomous agents using nearest neighbor rules. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 48, 6 (June 2003), 988–1001. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2003.812781>
- [60] Xuewu Ji, Xiangkun He, Chen Lv, Yahui Liu, and Jian Wu. 2018. Adaptive-neural-network-based robust lateral motion control for autonomous vehicle at driving limits. *Control Engineering Practice* 76, (2018), 41–53.
- [61] Dongyao Jia and Dong Ngoduy. 2016. Enhanced cooperative car-following traffic model with the combination of V2V and V2I communication. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 90, (2016), 172–191.
- [62] Dongyao Jia and Dong Ngoduy. 2016. Platoon based cooperative driving model with consideration of realistic inter-vehicle communication. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies* 68, (2016), 245–264.
- [63] Mihailo R Jovanovic and Bassam Bamieh. 2005. On the ill-posedness of certain vehicular platoon control problems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 50, 9 (2005), 1307–1321.
- [64] Pooja Kavathekar and YangQuan Chen. 2011. Vehicle platooning: A brief survey and categorization. 2011. 829–845. .
- [65] Maziar E Khatir and Edward J Davison. 2004. Decentralized control of a large platoon of vehicles using non-identical controllers. 2004. IEEE, 2769–2776. .
- [66] Maziar E Khatir and EJ Davison. 2004. Bounded stability and eventual string stability of a large platoon of vehicles using non-identical controllers. 2004. IEEE, 1111–1116. .
- [67] Roozbeh Kianfar, Bruno Augusto, Alireza Ebadighajari, Usman Hakeem, Josef Nilsson, Ali Raza, Reza S. Tabar, Naga VishnuKanth Irukulapati, Cristofer Englund, Paolo Falcone, Stylianos Papanastasiou, Lennart Svensson, and Henk Wymeersch. 2012. Design and Experimental Validation of a Cooperative Driving System in the Grand Cooperative Driving Challenge. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 13, 3 (September 2012), 994–1007. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2012.2186513>
- [68] Roozbeh Kianfar, Paolo Falcone, and Jonas Fredriksson. 2011. A receding horizon approach to string stable cooperative adaptive cruise control. 2011. IEEE, 734–739. .
- [69] Steffi Klinge and Richard H Middleton. 2009. Time headway requirements for string stability of homogeneous linear unidirectionally connected systems. 2009. IEEE, 1992–1997. .
- [70] Steffi Knorn, Alejandro Donaire, Juan C Agüero, and Richard H Middleton. 2014. Passivity-based control for multi-vehicle systems subject to string constraints. *Automatica* 50, 12 (2014), 3224–3230.
- [71] Ji-Wook Kwon and Dongkyoung Chwa. 2014. Adaptive Bidirectional Platoon Control Using a Coupled Sliding Mode Control Method. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 15, 5 (October 2014), 2040–2048. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2014.2308535>
- [72] Ioannis Lestas and Glenn Vinnicombe. 2007. Scalability in heterogeneous vehicle platoons. In *2007 American Control Conference*, July 2007. 4678–4683. . <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACC.2007.4283022>
- [73] Dandan Li and Ge Guo. 2020. Prescribed performance concurrent control of connected vehicles with nonlinear third-order dynamics. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology* 69, 12 (2020), 14793–14802.
- [74] Shengbo Eben Li, Yang Zheng, Keqiang Li, and Jianqiang Wang. 2015. An overview of vehicular platoon control under the four-component framework. 2015. IEEE, 286–291. .
- [75] Shengbo Eben Li, Yang Zheng, Keqiang Li, Yujia Wu, J Karl Hedrick, Feng Gao, and Hongwei Zhang. 2017. Dynamical modeling and distributed control of connected and automated vehicles: Challenges and opportunities. *IEEE Intelligent Transportation Systems Magazine* 9, 3 (2017), 46–58.

- [76] Shengbo Li, Keqiang Li, Rajesh Rajamani, and Jianqiang Wang. 2010. Model predictive multi-objective vehicular adaptive cruise control. *IEEE Transactions on control systems technology* 19, 3 (2010), 556–566.
- [77] Yongfu Li, Wenbo Chen, Srinivas Peeta, and Yibing Wang. 2019. Platoon control of connected multi-vehicle systems under V2X communications: design and experiments. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 21, 5 (2019), 1891–1902.
- [78] Yongfu Li and Changpeng He. 2018. Connected autonomous vehicle platoon control considering vehicle dynamic information. 2018. IEEE, 7834–7839. .
- [79] Yongfu Li, Kezhi Li, Taixiong Zheng, Xiangdong Hu, Huizong Feng, and Yinguo Li. 2016. Evaluating the performance of vehicular platoon control under different network topologies of initial states. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 450, (2016), 359–368.
- [80] Yongfu Li, Qingxiu Lv, Hao Zhu, Haiqing Li, Huaqing Li, Simon Hu, Shuyou Yu, and Yibing Wang. 2022. Variable Time Headway Policy Based Platoon Control for Heterogeneous Connected Vehicles With External Disturbances. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* (2022), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2022.3170647>
- [81] Yongfu Li, Chuancong Tang, Kezhi Li, Srinivas Peeta, Xiaozheng He, and Yibing Wang. 2018. Nonlinear finite-time consensus-based connected vehicle platoon control under fixed and switching communication topologies. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies* 93, (2018), 525–543.
- [82] Yongfu Li, Chuancong Tang, Srinivas Peeta, and Yibing Wang. 2018. Nonlinear consensus-based connected vehicle platoon control incorporating car-following interactions and heterogeneous time delays. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 20, 6 (2018), 2209–2219.
- [83] Yongfu Li, Chuancong Tang, Srinivas Peeta, and Yibing Wang. 2018. Integral-sliding-mode braking control for a connected vehicle platoon: Theory and application. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics* 66, 6 (2018), 4618–4628.
- [84] Chi-Ying Liang and Hwei Peng. 1999. Optimal Adaptive Cruise Control with Guaranteed String Stability. *Vehicle System Dynamics* 32, 4–5 (November 1999), 313–330. <https://doi.org/10.1076/vesd.32.4.313.2083>
- [85] Fu Lin, Makan Fardad, and Mihailo R Jovanovic. 2011. Optimal control of vehicular formations with nearest neighbor interactions. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 57, 9 (2011), 2203–2218.
- [86] Fu Lin, Makan Fardad, and Mihailo R Jovanović. 2014. Algorithms for leader selection in stochastically forced consensus networks. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 59, 7 (2014), 1789–1802.
- [87] Bao Liu, Feng Gao, Yingdong He, and Caimei Wang. 2019. Robust Control of Heterogeneous Vehicular Platoon with Non-Ideal Communication. *Electronics* 8, 2 (February 2019), 207. <https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics8020207>
- [88] Jinkun Liu and Xinhua Wang. 2011. Adaptive sliding mode control for mechanical systems. In *Advanced Sliding Mode Control for Mechanical Systems*. Springer, 117–135.
- [89] Xiangheng Liu, A. Goldsmith, S.S. Mahal, and J.K. Hedrick. 2001. Effects of communication delay on string stability in vehicle platoons. In *ITSC 2001. 2001 IEEE Intelligent Transportation Systems. Proceedings (Cat. No.01TH8585)*, August 2001. 625–630. . <https://doi.org/10.1109/ITSC.2001.948732>
- [90] Qianye Luo, Anh-Tu Nguyen, James Fleming, and Hui Zhang. 2021. Unknown input observer based approach for distributed tube-based model predictive control of heterogeneous vehicle platoons. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology* 70, 4 (2021), 2930–2944.
- [91] Fangwu Ma, Jiawei Wang, Sheng Zhu, Sukru Yaren Gelbal, Yu Yang, Bilin Aksun-Guvenc, and Levent Guvenc. 2020. Distributed Control of Cooperative Vehicular Platoon With Nonideal Communication Condition. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology* 69, 8 (August 2020), 8207–8220. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TVT.2020.2997767>
- [92] J.A. Marshall, M.E. Broucke, and B.A. Francis. 2004. Formations of vehicles in cyclic pursuit. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 49, 11 (November 2004), 1963–1974. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2004.837589>
- [93] David Q Mayne, James B Rawlings, Christopher V Rao, and Pierre OM Sokaert. 2000. Constrained model predictive control: Stability and optimality. *Automatica* 36, 6 (2000), 789–814.
- [94] Brian McAuliffe, Mark Croken, Mojtaba Ahmadi-Baloutaki, and Arash Raeesi. 2017. Fuel-economy testing of a three-vehicle truck platooning system. (2017).
- [95] Adel Merabet, Khandker Tawfique Ahmed, Hussein Ibrahim, and Rachid Beguenane. 2016. Implementation of sliding mode control system for generator and grid sides control of wind energy conversion system. *IEEE Transactions on Sustainable Energy* 7, 3 (2016), 1327–1335.
- [96] Richard H Middleton and Julio H Braslavsky. 2010. String instability in classes of linear time invariant formation control with limited communication range. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 55, 7 (2010), 1519–1530.
- [97] Vicente Milanés, Steven E. Shladover, John Spring, Christopher Nowakowski, Hiroshi Kawazoe, and Masahide Nakamura. 2014. Cooperative Adaptive Cruise Control in Real Traffic Situations. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 15, 1 (February 2014), 296–305. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2013.2278494>
- [98] Gerrit J. L. Naus, René P. A. Vugts, Jeroen Ploeg, Marinus J. G. van de Molengraft, and Maarten Steinbuch. 2010. String-Stable CACC Design and Experimental Validation: A Frequency-Domain Approach. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology* 59, 9 (November 2010), 4268–4279. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TVT.2010.2076320>
- [99] Maarten RI Nieuwenhuijze, Thijs van Keulen, Sinan Öncü, Bram Bonsel, and Henk Nijmeijer. 2012. Cooperative driving with a heavy-duty truck in mixed traffic: Experimental results. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 13, 3 (2012), 1026–1032.
- [100] R. Olfati-Saber and R.M. Murray. 2004. Consensus problems in networks of agents with switching topology and time-delays. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 49, 9 (September 2004), 1520–1533. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2004.834113>
- [101] René Oliveira, Carlos Montez, Azzedine Boukerche, and Michelle S Wigham. 2021. Co-Design of Consensus-Based Approach and Reliable Communication Protocol for Vehicular Platoon Control. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology* 70, 9 (2021), 9510–9524.
- [102] Fernando de Oliveira Souza, Leonardo Antonio Borges Torres, Leonardo Amaral Mozelli, and Armando Alves Neto. 2020. Stability and Formation Error of Homogeneous Vehicular Platoons With Communication Time Delays. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 21, 10 (October 2020), 4338–4349. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2019.2939777>
- [103] Sinan Öncü, Jeroen Ploeg, Nathan van de Wouw, and Henk Nijmeijer. 2014. Cooperative Adaptive Cruise Control: Network-Aware Analysis of String Stability. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 15, 4 (August 2014), 1527–1537. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2014.2302816>
- [104] Sinan Öncü, Nathan Van de Wouw, WP Maurice H Heemels, and Henk Nijmeijer. 2012. String stability of interconnected vehicles under communication constraints. 2012. IEEE, 2459–2464. .
- [105] Stacy Patterson and Bassam Bamieh. 2010. Leader selection for optimal network coherence. 2010. IEEE, 2692–2697. .
- [106] Bo Peng, Dexin Yu, Huxing Zhou, Xue Xiao, and Yunfeng Fang. 2020. A platoon control strategy for autonomous vehicles based on sliding-mode control theory. *IEEE Access* 8, (2020), 81776–81788.



- [107] Lloyd Peppard. 1974. String stability of relative-motion PID vehicle control systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 19, 5 (1974), 579–581.
- [108] Andrés A Peters, Richard H Middleton, and Oliver Mason. 2014. Leader tracking in homogeneous vehicle platoons with broadcast delays. *Automatica* 50, 1 (2014), 64–74.
- [109] Jeroen Ploeg, Dipan P. Shukla, Nathan van de Wouw, and Henk Nijmeijer. 2014. Controller Synthesis for String Stability of Vehicle Platoons. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 15, 2 (April 2014), 854–865. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2013.2291493>
- [110] Jeroen Ploeg, Nathan Van De Wouw, and Henk Nijmeijer. 2013. Lp string stability of cascaded systems: Application to vehicle platooning. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology* 22, 2 (2013), 786–793.
- [111] Xiaohui Qin, Yougang Bian, Zhanyi Hu, Ning Sun, and Manjiang Hu. 2020. Distributed Vehicular Platoon Control Considering Communication Topology Disturbances. In *2020 IEEE 23rd International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)*, September 2020. 1–6. . <https://doi.org/10.1109/ITSC45102.2020.9294333>
- [112] R. Rajamani, S. B. Choi, B. K. Law, J. K. Hedrick, R. Prohaska, and P. Kretz. 1998. Design and Experimental Implementation of Longitudinal Control for a Platoon of Automated Vehicles. *Journal of Dynamic Systems, Measurement, and Control* 122, 3 (June 1998), 470–476. <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.1286682>
- [113] R. Rajamani, Han-Shue Tan, Boon Kait Law, and Wei-Bin Zhang. 2000. Demonstration of integrated longitudinal and lateral control for the operation of automated vehicles in platoons. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology* 8, 4 (July 2000), 695–708. <https://doi.org/10.1109/87.852914>
- [114] Rajesh Rajamani. 2011. *Vehicle dynamics and control* (2nd ed.). Springer Science & Business Media.
- [115] Rajesh Rajamani and Steven E Shladover. 2001. An experimental comparative study of autonomous and co-operative vehicle-follower control systems. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies* 9, 1 (2001), 15–31.
- [116] M. Sabbir Salek, Mashrur Chowdhury, Mizanur Rahman, Kakan Dey, and Md Rafiul Islam. 2021. Theoretical Development and Numerical Validation of an Asymmetric Linear Bilateral Control Model- Case Study for an Automated Truck Platoon. *arXiv:2112.14528 [cs, eess]* (December 2021). Retrieved May 8, 2022 from <http://arxiv.org/abs/2112.14528>
- [117] Alessandro Salvi, Stefania Santini, and Antonio Saverio Valente. 2017. Design, analysis and performance evaluation of a third order distributed protocol for platooning in the presence of time-varying delays and switching topologies. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies* 80, (2017), 360–383.
- [118] Kumaragovindhan Santhanakrishnan and Rajesh Rajamani. 2003. On spacing policies for highway vehicle automation. *IEEE Transactions on intelligent transportation systems* 4, 4 (2003), 198–204.
- [119] Stefania Santini, Alessandro Salvi, Antonio Saverio Valente, Antonio Pescapé, Michele Segata, and Renato Lo Cigno. 2016. A consensus-based approach for platooning with intervehicular communications and its validation in realistic scenarios. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology* 66, 3 (2016), 1985–1999.
- [120] Paul Sathiyam, Merry Cherian, and Benin Pratap. 2020. Neural network based vehicle longitudinal controller—design and validation using hardware in loop testing. *Int. J. Sci. Technol. Res.* 9, 3 (2020), 7109–7114.
- [121] P. Seiler, A. Pant, and K. Hedrick. 2004. Disturbance propagation in vehicle strings. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 49, 10 (October 2004), 1835–1842. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2004.835586>
- [122] P. Seiler and R. Sengupta. 2001. Analysis of communication losses in vehicle control problems. In *Proceedings of the 2001 American Control Conference. (Cat. No.01CH37148)*, June 2001. 1491–1496 vol.2. . <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACC.2001.945935>
- [123] P. Seiler and Raja Sengupta. 2005. An H-infinity approach to networked control. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 50, 3 (March 2005), 356–364. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2005.844177>
- [124] Elaine Shaw and J. Karl Hedrick. 2007. String Stability Analysis for Heterogeneous Vehicle Strings. In *2007 American Control Conference*, July 2007. 3118–3125. . <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACC.2007.4282789>
- [125] S. Sheikholeslam and C.A. Desoer. 1993. Longitudinal control of a platoon of vehicles with no communication of lead vehicle information: a system level study. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology* 42, 4 (November 1993), 546–554. <https://doi.org/10.1109/25.260756>
- [126] Zhiping Shen, Yonggui Liu, Zeming Li, and Mahmudul Hasan Nabin. 2022. Cooperative Spacing Sampled Control of Vehicle Platoon Considering Undirected Topology and Analog Fading Networks. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* (2022), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2022.3150565>
- [127] Steven E Shladover, Christopher Nowakowski, Xiao-Yun Lu, and Robert Ferlis. 2015. Cooperative adaptive cruise control: Definitions and operating concepts. *Transportation Research Record* 2489, 1 (2015), 145–152.
- [128] Jean-Jacques E Slotine and Weiping Li. 1991. *Applied Nonlinear Control*. Prentice hall Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- [129] Jia-cheng Song and Yong-feng Ju. 2020. Distributed Adaptive Sliding Mode Control for Vehicle Platoon with Uncertain Driving Resistance and Actuator Saturation. *Complexity* 2020, (July 2020). <https://doi.org/10.1155/2020/7581517>
- [130] Aakash Soni and Huosheng Hu. 2018. Formation control for a fleet of autonomous ground vehicles: A survey. *Robotics* 7, 4 (2018), 67.
- [131] S.S. Stankovic, M.J. Stanojevic, and D.D. Siljak. 2000. Decentralized overlapping control of a platoon of vehicles. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology* 8, 5 (September 2000), 816–832. <https://doi.org/10.1109/87.865854>
- [132] D. Swaroop, J. K. Hedrick, C. C. Chien, and P. Ioannou. 1994. A Comparison of Spacing and Headway Control Laws for Automatically Controlled Vehicles. *Vehicle System Dynamics* 23, 1 (January 1994), 597–625. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00423119408969077>
- [133] D. Swaroop, J.K. Hedrick, and S.B. Choi. 2001. Direct adaptive longitudinal control of vehicle platoons. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology* 50, 1 (January 2001), 150–161. <https://doi.org/10.1109/25.917908>
- [134] Darbha Swaroop and J Karl Hedrick. 1996. String stability of interconnected systems. *IEEE transactions on automatic control* 41, 3 (1996), 349–357.
- [135] DVAHG Swaroop and J Karl Hedrick. 1999. Constant spacing strategies for platooning in automated highway systems. (1999).
- [136] Folkert M Tangerman, JJP Veerman, and Borko D Stosic. 2012. Asymmetric decentralized flocks. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 57, 11 (2012), 2844–2853.
- [137] Tugba Tapli and Mehmet Akar. 2020. Cooperative Adaptive Cruise Control Algorithms for Vehicular Platoons Based on Distributed Model Predictive Control. In *2020 IEEE 16th International Workshop on Advanced Motion Control (AMC)*, September 2020. 305–310. . <https://doi.org/10.1109/AMC44022.2020.9244429>
- [138] Jiange Wang, Xiaoyuan Luo, Wai-Choong Wong, and Xiping Guan. 2019. Specified-time vehicular platoon control with flexible safe distance constraint. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology* 68, 11 (2019), 10489–10503.

- [139] Jianmei Wang, Xiaoyuan Luo, Li Wang, Zhiqiang Zuo, and Xiping Guan. 2020. Integral Sliding Mode Control Using a Disturbance Observer for Vehicle Platoons. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics* 67, 8 (August 2020), 6639–6648. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIE.2019.2936990>
- [140] Le Yi Wang, Ali Syed, Gang George Yin, Abhilash Pandya, and Hongwei Zhang. 2014. Control of vehicle platoons for highway safety and efficient utility: Consensus with communications and vehicle dynamics. *J Syst Sci Complex* 27, 4 (August 2014), 605–631. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11424-014-2115-z>
- [141] Liang Wang and Berthold K. P. Horn. 2019. Multinode Bilateral Control Model. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 64, 10 (October 2019), 4066–4078. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2019.2891490>
- [142] Liang Wang and Berthold K. P. Horn. 2020. On the Stability Analysis of Mixed Traffic With Vehicles Under Car-Following and Bilateral Control. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 65, 7 (July 2020), 3076–3083. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2019.2945888>
- [143] Liang Wang and Berthold K. P. Horn. 2020. On the Chain Stability of Bilateral Control Model. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 65, 8 (August 2020), 3397–3408. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2019.2945877>
- [144] Pangwei Wang, Hui Deng, Juan Zhang, Li Wang, Mingfang Zhang, and Yongfu Li. 2021. Model Predictive Control for Connected Vehicle Platoon Under Switching Communication Topology. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* (2021), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2021.3073012>
- [145] Yanbo Wang and Chenglin Liu. 2021. Dynamic Integral Sliding Mode for Vehicle Platoon Control with Constant Time Headway Policy. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Biomimetics (ROBIO)*, December 2021. 1479–1484. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ROBIO54168.2021.9739280>
- [146] Shixi Wen and Ge Guo. 2019. Control of leader-following vehicle platoons with varied communication range. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles* 5, 2 (2019), 240–250.
- [147] Hyoungjong Wi, Honggi Park, and Daehie Hong. 2020. Model Predictive Longitudinal Control for Heavy-Duty Vehicle Platoon Using Lead Vehicle Pedal Information. *Int.J Automot. Technol.* 21, 3 (June 2020), 563–569. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12239-020-0053-4>
- [148] Yujia Wu, Shengbo Eben Li, Jorge Cortés, and Kameshwar Poolla. 2020. Distributed Sliding Mode Control for Nonlinear Heterogeneous Platoon Systems With Positive Definite Topologies. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology* 28, 4 (July 2020), 1272–1283. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TCST.2019.2908146>
- [149] Zhibei Wu, Jitao Sun, and Ruihua Xu. 2021. Consensus-based connected vehicles platoon control via impulsive control method. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* 580, (October 2021), 126190. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2021.126190>
- [150] Lin Xiao, Stephen Boyd, and Seung-Jean Kim. 2007. Distributed average consensus with least-mean-square deviation. *Journal of Parallel and Distributed Computing* 67, 1 (January 2007), 33–46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpdc.2006.08.010>
- [151] Lingyun Xiao and Feng Gao. 2010. A comprehensive review of the development of adaptive cruise control systems. *Vehicle system dynamics* 48, 10 (2010), 1167–1192.
- [152] Lingyun Xiao and Feng Gao. 2011. Practical String Stability of Platoon of Adaptive Cruise Control Vehicles. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 12, 4 (December 2011), 1184–1194. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2011.2143407>
- [153] Lijian Xu, George Yin, and Hongwei Zhang. 2014. Communication information structures and contents for enhanced safety of highway vehicle platoons. *IEEE Transactions on vehicular Technology* 63, 9 (2014), 4206–4220.
- [154] Lijian Xu, George Yin, and Hongwei Zhang. 2014. Impact of communication erasure channels on the safety of highway vehicle platoons. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 16, 3 (2014), 1456–1468.
- [155] Liwei Xu, Weichao Zhuang, Guodong Yin, and Chentong Bian. 2018. Stable Longitudinal Control of Heterogeneous Vehicular Platoon With Disturbances and Information Delays. *IEEE Access* 6, (2018), 69794–69806. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2018.2880572>
- [156] Liwei Xu, Weichao Zhuang, Guodong Yin, and Chentong Bian. 2019. Energy-oriented cruising strategy design of vehicle platoon considering communication delay and disturbance. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies* 107, (October 2019), 34–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trc.2019.07.019>
- [157] Liwei Xu, Weichao Zhuang, Guodong Yin, Chentong Bian, and Huawei Wu. 2019. Modeling and Robust Control of Heterogeneous Vehicle Platoons on Curved Roads Subject to Disturbances and Delays. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology* 68, 12 (December 2019), 11551–11564. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TVT.2019.2941396>
- [158] Liwei Xu, Weichao Zhuang, Guodong Yin, Guangmin Li, and Chentong Bian. 2018. Simultaneous Longitudinal and Lateral Control of Vehicle Platoon Subject to Stochastic Communication Delays. *Journal of Dynamic Systems, Measurement, and Control* 141, 4 (December 2018). <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.4042031>
- [159] Sai Krishna Yadlapalli, S. Darbha, and K.R. Rajagopal. 2005. Information flow and its relation to the stability of the motion of vehicles in a rigid formation. In *Proceedings of the 2005. American Control Conference, 2005.*, June 2005. 1853–1858 vol. 3. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACC.2005.1470238>
- [160] Yoshinori Yamamura, Yoji Seto, Hikaru Nishira, and Taketoshi Kawabe. 2008. An ACC design method for achieving both string stability and ride comfort. *Journal of System Design and Dynamics* 2, 4 (2008), 979–990.
- [161] Panpan Yang, Ye Tang, Maode Yan, and Xu Zhu. 2019. Consensus based control algorithm for nonlinear vehicle platoons in the presence of time delay. *International Journal of Control, Automation and Systems* 17, 3 (2019), 752–764.
- [162] Zeyu Yang, Jin Huang, Diange Yang, and Zhihua Zhong. 2021. Collision-Free Ecological Cooperative Robust Control for Uncertain Vehicular Platoons With Communication Delay. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology* 70, 3 (March 2021), 2153–2166. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TVT.2021.3060808>
- [163] George Forrest Young, Luca Scardovi, and Naomi Ehrich Leonard. 2010. Robustness of noisy consensus dynamics with directed communication. 2010. IEEE, 6312–6317. .
- [164] Tengchan Zeng, Omid Semiari, Walid Saad, and Mehdi Bennis. 2019. Joint Communication and Control for Wireless Autonomous Vehicular Platoon Systems. *IEEE Transactions on Communications* 67, 11 (November 2019), 7907–7922. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TCOMM.2019.2931583>
- [165] Chunjie Zhai, Xiyan Chen, Chenggang Yan, Yonggui Liu, and Huajun Li. 2020. Ecological Cooperative Adaptive Cruise Control for a Heterogeneous Platoon of Heavy-Duty Vehicles With Time Delays. *IEEE Access* 8, (2020), 146208–146219. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3015052>
- [166] Chunjie Zhai, Yonggui Liu, and Fei Luo. 2019. A Switched Control Strategy of Heterogeneous Vehicle Platoon for Multiple Objectives With State Constraints. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 20, 5 (May 2019), 1883–1896. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2018.2841980>
- [167] Chunjie Zhai, Fei Luo, and Yonggui Liu. 2018. Cooperative Look-Ahead Control of Vehicle Platoon for Maximizing Fuel Efficiency Under System Constraints. *IEEE Access* 6, (2018), 37700–37714. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2018.2848480>

- [168] Hao Zhang, Juan Liu, Zhuping Wang, Chao Huang, and Huaicheng Yan. 2021. Adaptive Switched Control for Connected Vehicle Platoon With Unknown Input Delays. *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics* (2021), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TCYB.2021.3104622>
- [169] Youping Zhang, B Kosmatopoulos, Petros A Ioannou, and CC Chien. 1999. Using front and back information for tight vehicle following maneuvers. *IEEE Transactions on vehicular technology* 48, 1 (1999), 319–328.
- [170] Hang Zhao, Dihua Sun, Min Zhao, Qiankun Pu, and Chuancong Tang. 2021. Combined Longitudinal and Lateral Control for Heterogeneous Nodes in Mixed Vehicle Platoon Under V2I Communication. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* (2021), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2021.3061413>
- [171] Huarong Zheng, Jun Wu, Weimin Wu, and Rudy R. Negenborn. 2019. Cooperative distributed predictive control for collision-free vehicle platoons. *IET Intelligent Transport Systems* 13, 5 (2019), 816–824. <https://doi.org/10.1049/iet-its.2018.5366>
- [172] Yang Zheng, Shengbo Eben Li, Keqiang Li, Francesco Borrelli, and J Karl Hedrick. 2016. Distributed model predictive control for heterogeneous vehicle platoons under unidirectional topologies. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology* 25, 3 (2016), 899–910.
- [173] Yang Zheng, Shengbo Eben Li, Keqiang Li, and Wei Ren. 2017. Platooning of connected vehicles with undirected topologies: Robustness analysis and distributed H-infinity controller synthesis. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 19, 5 (2017), 1353–1364.
- [174] Yang Zheng, Shengbo Eben Li, Keqiang Li, and Le-Yi Wang. 2015. Stability margin improvement of vehicular platoon considering undirected topology and asymmetric control. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology* 24, 4 (2015), 1253–1265.
- [175] Yang Zheng, Shengbo Eben Li, Jianqiang Wang, Dongpu Cao, and Keqiang Li. 2015. Stability and scalability of homogeneous vehicular platoon: Study on the influence of information flow topologies. *IEEE Transactions on intelligent transportation systems* 17, 1 (2015), 14–26.
- [176] Yang Zheng, Shengbo Eben Li, Jianqiang Wang, Le Yi Wang, and Keqiang Li. 2014. Influence of information flow topology on closed-loop stability of vehicle platoon with rigid formation. In *17th International IEEE Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)*, October 2014, 2094–2100. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ITSC.2014.6958012>
- [177] Jing Zhou and Hui Peng. 2005. Range policy of adaptive cruise control vehicles for improved flow stability and string stability. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 6, 2 (June 2005), 229–237. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2005.848359>
- [178] Yang Zhou, Soyoun Ahn, Meng Wang, and Serge Hoogendoorn. 2020. Stabilizing mixed vehicular platoons with connected automated vehicles: An H-infinity approach. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 132, (February 2020), 152–170. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trb.2019.06.005>
- [179] Yang Zhu and Feng Zhu. 2018. Distributed Adaptive Longitudinal Control for Uncertain Third-Order Vehicle Platoon in a Networked Environment. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology* 67, 10 (October 2018), 9183–9197. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TVT.2018.2863284>
- [180] Lei Zuo, Ye Zhang, Maode Yan, and Wenrui Ma. 2020. Distributed Integrated Sliding Mode-Based Nonlinear Vehicle Platoon Control with Quadratic Spacing Policy. *Complexity* 2020, (December 2020). <https://doi.org/10.1155/2020/4949520>

## 6 HISTORY DATES

Received March 2024.