

A Successive Gap Constraint Linearization Method for Optimal Control Problems with Equilibrium Constraints^{*}

Kangyu Lin^{*} Toshiyuki Ohtsuka^{*}

^{*} *Department of Systems Science, Graduate School of Informatics, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan (e-mail: {k-lin, ohtsuka}@sys.i.kyoto-u.ac.jp).*

Abstract: In this study, we propose a novel gap-constraint-based reformulation for optimal control problems with equilibrium constraints (OCPECs). We show that the proposed reformulation generates a new constraint system equivalent to the original one but more concise and with favorable differentiability. Moreover, constraint regularity can be recovered by a relaxation strategy. We show that the gap constraint and its gradient can be evaluated efficiently. We then propose a successive gap constraint linearization method to solve the discretized OCPEC. We also provide an intuitive geometric interpretation of the gap constraint. Numerical experiments validate the effectiveness of the proposed reformulation and solution method.

Keywords: Optimization and Model Predictive Control, Optimal Control, Hybrid Systems, Variational Inequalities, Gap Function

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Optimal control problems (OCPs) for a class of nonsmooth dynamical systems governed by *differential variational inequalities* (DVIs) are referred to as *optimal control problems with equilibrium constraints* (OCPECs). Benefiting from the mathematical modeling capability of *variational inequalities* (VIs), DVIs encompass many common nonsmooth systems, such as ordinary differential equations (ODEs) with discontinuous right-hand-side, dynamical complementary systems, and dynamical systems with optimization constraints. Thus, OCPECs provide a broad paradigm for OCPs in many complex engineering systems, such as the trajectory optimization of a mechanical system with frictional contacts (Posa et al., 2014), bilevel optimal control (Dempe et al., 2023), and game-theoretic planning for autonomous driving (Wang et al., 2021).

The direct method (Betts, 2010), that is, first discretize then optimize, is practical for numerically solving OCPs. However, its application to OCPECs is extremely challenging. On the one hand, the nonsmooth state trajectory limits the system discretization to achieve at most first-order accuracy. This leads to a large-scale optimization problem where mixed-integer program solvers often fail due to the large search tree. On the other hand, the discretized OCPEC violates almost all constraint qualifications; therefore, typically, it cannot be solved directly by large-scale nonlinear programming (NLP) solvers. The most common approach to solve the discretized OCPEC is to reformulate it as the *mathematical programming with complementary*

constraints (MPCC) and then utilize MPCC-tailored solution methods, such as relaxation methods (Hoheisel et al., 2013). However, it is well known that MPCC also lacks constraint regularity; thus, this approach still encounters numerous difficulties. Owing to the fundamental absence of constraint regularity in OCPECs, we cannot expect to construct an OCPEC reformulation satisfying constraint qualifications. Nonetheless, we can still attempt to construct a new OCPEC reformulation that exhibits improved numerical performance, which is our motivation.

In this study, based on the regularized gap function for VIs, we propose a novel gap-constraint-based reformulation for the OCPEC, which generates a concise differentiable constraint system and can achieve constraint regularity after a suitable relaxation. To the best of our knowledge, no MPCC or OCPEC reformulations are currently using gap functions. We believe the main reason is that evaluating gap functions and their gradients is typically quite expensive, which also limits the application of gap-function-based methods for solving VIs (Chapter 10, Facchinei and Pang (2003)). However, we show that this process can be accelerated by exploiting either VI or OCP structures. Subsequently, we propose a successive gap constraint linearization method to solve the discretized OCPEC. We show that the proposed reformulation captures the geometric characteristics of equilibrium constraints in a favorable shape. Numerical experiments confirm that the proposed method outperforms the MPCC-tailored method.

1.2 Outline

This paper is organized as follows: Section 2 provides the OCPEC formulation. Section 3 and 4 respectively present the proposed reformulation and solution method. Section 5 provides a geometric interpretation of the proposed reformulation.

^{*} This work was partly supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP22H01510 and JP23K22780. The CSC scholarship supported the author Kangyu Lin (No. 201906150138).

mulation. Section 6 illustrates the numerical experiments. Section 7 concludes this study and discusses future works.

1.3 Notation

We denote the nonnegative orthant of an Euclidean vector space \mathbb{R}^n by \mathbb{R}_+^n . We denote the transposed Jacobian of a vector-valued differentiable function $f(x) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ by $\nabla_x f \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. We denote the Hessian of a real-valued differentiable function $f(x) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $\nabla_{xx} f \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. We denote the A -norm in \mathbb{R}^n by $\|x\|_A = \sqrt{x^T A x}$, $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, with $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ a symmetric positive definite matrix.

2. PROBLEM FORMULATION

2.1 Variational inequalities

The finite-dimensional VI serves as a unified mathematical formalism for various equilibrium problems (Facchinei and Pang, 2003). Its definition is provided as follows:

Definition 1. (Variational Inequalities). Let $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda}$ be a nonempty closed convex set and $F : \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda}$ be a continuous function; the variational inequalities, denoted by $\text{VI}(K, F)$, is to find a vector $\lambda \in K$ such that

$$(\omega - \lambda)^T F(\lambda) \geq 0, \quad \forall \omega \in K. \quad (1)$$

We denote the solution set to the $\text{VI}(K, F)$ as $\text{SOL}(K, F)$. The VI includes many common mathematical formalisms:

- If $K := \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda}$, then the VI is reduced to the *system of equations*: $F(\lambda) = 0$;
- If $K := \mathbb{R}_+^{n_\lambda}$, then the VI is reduced to the *nonlinear complementary problem* (NCP): $0 \leq \lambda \perp F(\lambda) \geq 0$, where $\lambda \perp F(\lambda)$ represents the element-wise complementarity conditions, that is, $\lambda \odot F(\lambda) = 0$ and \odot is the Hadamard product.

In this study, we focus on the general case where set K is finitely representable by convex inequalities:

$$K := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda} | g(\lambda) \geq 0\}, \quad (2)$$

with $g : \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_g}$ a smooth convex function. The most common approach to solving the VI is to use well-developed solution methods for the NCP. This is based on that under certain assumptions (Section 1.3, Facchinei and Pang (2003)), $\text{SOL}(K, F)$ is equivalent to the solution set to the following Karush–Kuhn–Tucker (KKT) system:

$$F(\lambda) - \nabla_\lambda g^T(\lambda) \zeta = 0, \quad (3a)$$

$$0 \leq \zeta \perp g(\lambda) \geq 0, \quad (3b)$$

with a constraint multiplier $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^{n_g}$, and we call (3) the *KKT-condition-based reformulation* for the VI.

An alternative approach is to reformulate the VI as a differentiable optimization problem that optimizes a suitable merit function tailored for the VI. The definition of the merit function is as follows:

Definition 2. (Merit function for the VI). A merit function for the $\text{VI}(K, F)$ on a (closed) set $X \supseteq K$ is a non-negative function $\theta : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $\lambda \in \text{SOL}(K, F)$ if and only if $\lambda \in X$ and $\theta(\lambda) = 0$, that is, if and only if the solution set $\text{SOL}(K, F)$ coincides with the set of global solutions to the optimization problem:

$$\min_{y \in X} \theta(y), \quad (4)$$

and the optimal objective value of this problem is zero.

We call (4) the *merit-function-based reformulation* for the VI. Usually, set X is specified as either the VI set K or the entire space \mathbb{R}^{n_λ} , respectively leading to a constrained and an unconstrained optimization problem for solving the VI.

2.2 Differential variational inequalities

The DVI was first proposed in Pang and Stewart (2008) to model a class of nonsmooth systems under a unified framework. It consists of an ODE and a dynamical VI:

$$\dot{x} = f(x(t), u(t), \lambda(t)), \quad (5a)$$

$$\lambda(t) \in \text{SOL}(K, F(x(t), u(t), \lambda(t))), \quad (5b)$$

where $x(t) : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ is the differential state, $u(t) : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ is the control input, $\lambda(t) : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda}$ is the algebraic variable, $f : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ is the ODE right-hand function, and $\text{SOL}(K, F)$ is the solution set of a (dynamical) VI defined by a set $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda}$ and a function $F : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda}$. We make the following assumptions on the DVI throughout this study:

Assumption 3. K is a nonempty closed convex set given by (2); f, F are twice continuously differentiable functions.

Note that, $\lambda(t)$ may be nonsmooth, discontinuous, or even unbounded w.r.t. time due to the time-varying and multi-valued set $\text{SOL}(K, F)$ in (5b). Thus, substituting $\lambda(t)$ into ODE (5a) may induce nonsmoothness to $x(t)$. In this study, we discretize DVI (5) by the time-stepping method proposed in Pang and Stewart (2008). Specifically, ODE (5a) is discretized by the implicit Euler method, and VI (5b) is enforced at each time point $t_n \in [0, T]$:

$$x_n = x_{n-1} + f(x_n, u_n, \lambda_n) \Delta t, \quad (6a)$$

$$\lambda_n \in \text{SOL}(K, F(x_n, u_n, \lambda_n)), \quad (6b)$$

for $n = 1, 2, \dots, N$, where $x_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ and $\lambda_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda}$ are respectively the value of $x(t)$ and $\lambda(t)$ at the time point t_n , $u_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ is the piecewise constant approximation of $u(t)$ in the interval $(t_{n-1}, t_n]$, N is the number of stages, and $\Delta t := T/N$ is the time step.

2.3 Optimal control problem with equilibrium constraints

We consider the continuous-time OCPEC in the form of

$$\min_{x(\cdot), u(\cdot), \lambda(\cdot)} L_T(x(T)) + \int_0^T L_S(x(t), u(t), \lambda(t)) dt \quad (7a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } G(x(t), u(t)) \geq 0, \quad (7b)$$

$$C(x(t), u(t)) = 0, \quad (7c)$$

$$\dot{x} = f(x(t), u(t), \lambda(t)), \quad (7d)$$

$$\lambda(t) \in \text{SOL}(K, F(x(t), u(t), \lambda(t))) \quad (7e)$$

for $t \in [0, T]$, where: $L_T : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $L_S : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are respectively the terminal and stage cost function, $G : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_G}$ and $C : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_C}$ are respectively the inequality and equality path constraint, and (7d), (7e) represent the DVI defined in (5). We make the following differentiability assumption:

Assumption 4. Functions L_T, L_S, G, C are twice continuously differentiable.

Solving OCPEC (7) is extremely difficult, as equilibrium constraints (7e) lack constraint regularity. Therefore, dealing with equilibrium constraints (7e) is a focal point of this study. By using the direct multiple shooting method

(Betts, 2010) with the DVI discretization (6), we discretize the continuous-time OCPEC (7) into an NLP problem with a given initial state x_0 as follows:

$$\min_{\{x_n, u_n, \lambda_n\}_{n=1}^N} L_T(x_N) + \sum_{n=1}^N \underbrace{L_S(x_n, u_n, \lambda_n) \Delta t}_{:=L(x_n, u_n, \lambda_n)}, \quad (8a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } G(x_n, u_n) \geq 0, \quad (8b)$$

$$C(x_n, u_n) = 0, \quad (8c)$$

$$x_{n-1} + \underbrace{f(x_n, u_n, \lambda_n) \Delta t}_{:=\mathcal{F}(x_n, u_n, \lambda_n)} - x_n = 0, \quad (8d)$$

$$\lambda_n \in \text{SOL}(K, F(x_n, u_n, \lambda_n)), \quad n = 1, \dots, N. \quad (8e)$$

The limits of time-stepping methods for OCPs in nonsmooth systems have been discussed in Nurkanović et al. (2020), which mainly lie in the low discretization accuracy and wrong sensitivity. To mitigate these numerical issues, one practical approach is to specify a sufficiently small Δt , smoothing the nonsmooth system, and then solve the smoothed OCP using a continuation method that tracks the smoothing parameter. In the case of the OCPEC, a common implementation of this approach is to replace VI (8e) with its KKT-condition-based reformulation (3) and further reformulate the complementary constraints using a MPCC-tailored relaxation strategy. For example, employing Scholtes' relaxation strategy (Scholtes, 2001) generates the following *relaxed KKT-condition-based* problem:

$$\min_{\{x_n, u_n, \lambda_n\}_{n=1}^N} L_T(x_N) + \sum_{n=1}^N L(x_n, u_n, \lambda_n), \quad (9a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } G(x_n, u_n) \geq 0, \quad (9b)$$

$$C(x_n, u_n) = 0, \quad (9c)$$

$$x_{n-1} + \mathcal{F}(x_n, u_n, \lambda_n) = 0, \quad (9d)$$

$$F(x_n, u_n, \lambda_n) - \nabla_{\lambda} g^T(\lambda_n) \zeta_n = 0, \quad (9e)$$

$$\zeta_n \geq 0, \quad (9f)$$

$$g(\lambda_n) \geq 0, \quad (9g)$$

$$sI_{n_g \times 1} - \zeta_n \odot g(\lambda_n) \geq 0, \quad (9h)$$

with $n = 1, \dots, N$, $s \geq 0$ the relaxation parameter, and $\zeta_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n_g}$ the constraint multiplier for $g(\lambda_n) \geq 0$. Therefore, solutions to the discretized OCPEC (8) can be obtained by the continuation method, that is, solving a sequence of relaxed problems (9) with $s \rightarrow 0$. However, numerical difficulties arise when s is close to zero, as the relaxed problem (9) degenerates to an MPCC when $s = 0$. This motivates us to explore a new reformulation for the discretized OCPEC (8) that avoids solving the MPCC.

3. PROPOSED REFORMULATION FOR OCPEC

3.1 Motivation: regularized gap function for VI

In this section, we propose a *gap-constraint-based reformulation* for the OCPEC. The core idea of the gap constraint is inspired by the merit-function-based reformulation for the VI. In this study, we consider a differentiable merit function called the *regularized gap function*, which reformulates the VI as a differentiable *constrained* optimization problem. The regularized gap function was first introduced independently in Auchmuty (1989) and Fukushima (1992). Its definition is provided below:

Definition 5. (regularized gap function). Let $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda}$ be a nonempty closed convex set, $F : \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda}$ be a continuous function, $c > 0$ be a scalar, and $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda \times n_\lambda}$ be a symmetric positive definite matrix. The *regularized gap function* $\varphi^c : \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for the VI(K, F) is defined as

$$\varphi^c(\lambda) = \max_{\omega \in K} \{F(\lambda)^T(\lambda - \omega) - \frac{c}{2}(\lambda - \omega)^T A(\lambda - \omega)\}. \quad (10)$$

Given a $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda}$, the maximization problem that defines $\varphi^c(\lambda)$ is a strictly concave program in the variable ω and parameterized by λ . Thus, the solution to this program is unique, denoted by $\hat{\omega}$. Furthermore, it has an explicit expression that is the projection of the stationary point $\lambda - \frac{1}{c}A^{-1}F(\lambda)$ onto the set K under the norm $\|\cdot\|_A$:

$$\hat{\omega} = \omega(\lambda) = \Pi_{K,A}(\lambda - \frac{1}{c}A^{-1}F(\lambda)), \quad (11)$$

where $\Pi_{K,A}(x)$ is the skewed projector and is defined as the unique solution to a strictly convex program:

$$\Pi_{K,A}(x) := \arg \min_{y \in K} \left\{ \frac{1}{2}(y - x)^T A(y - x) \right\}. \quad (12)$$

We thereby can write down $\varphi^c(\lambda)$ explicitly, provided that $\hat{\omega}$ has been evaluated using (11) based on the given λ :

$$\varphi^c(\lambda) = F(\lambda)^T(\lambda - \hat{\omega}) - \frac{c}{2}(\lambda - \hat{\omega})^T A(\lambda - \hat{\omega}). \quad (13)$$

Here, we focus on two properties of $\varphi^c(\lambda)$: its equivalence to the VI and its differentiability, as stated in the following theorem (Theorem 10.2.3, Facchinei and Pang (2003)):

Theorem 6. The following two statements are valid for a regularized gap function $\varphi^c(\lambda)$ given by (10):

- (*Equivalence*) $\varphi^c(\lambda) \geq 0, \forall \lambda \in K$. Furthermore, $\varphi^c(\lambda) = 0, \lambda \in K$ if and only if $\lambda \in \text{SOL}(K, F)$. Hence, $\varphi^c(\lambda)$ is a merit function for VI(K, F) only when $\lambda \in K$, and we can solve VI(K, F) by globally solving a *constrained* optimization problem:

$$\min_{\lambda \in K} \varphi^c(\lambda). \quad (14)$$

- (*Differentiability*) If F is continuously differentiable, then so is $\varphi^c(\lambda)$, and $\nabla_{\lambda} \varphi^c(\lambda)$ is explicitly given by

$$\nabla_{\lambda} \varphi^c(\lambda) = F^T(\lambda) + (\lambda - \hat{\omega})^T (\nabla_{\lambda} F(\lambda) - cA). \quad (15)$$

Remark 7. Although Theorem 6 states the necessity of finding the *global minimizer* of (14), the equivalence still holds when only the *stationary point* of (14) is found, provided that VI(K, F) exhibits certain properties. See Theorem 10.2.5 in Facchinei and Pang (2003) for details.

Based on $\varphi^c(\lambda)$, we propose a new reformulation for the VI, which, in fact, is a variant of the merit-function-based reformulation (4), as stated in the following proposition:

Proposition 8. Let $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda}$ be a nonempty closed convex set given by (2), $F : \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda}$ be a continuous function, and $\varphi^c(\lambda) : \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a regularized gap function given by (10). We have that $\lambda \in \text{SOL}(K, F)$ if and only if λ satisfies a set of $n_g + 1$ inequalities:

$$g(\lambda) \geq 0, \quad (16a)$$

$$\varphi^c(\lambda) \leq 0. \quad (16b)$$

We call (16) the *gap-constraint-based reformulation* for the VI(K, F), and (16b) the *gap constraint*.

Proof. The inequality (16a) implies $\varphi^c(\lambda) \geq 0$; together with inequality (16b), we have $\varphi^c(\lambda) = 0$, and thus the equivalence follows from Theorem 6.

3.2 Gap-constraint-based reformulation for OCPEC

Now, we are in a position to state the proposed OCPEC reformulation. Since the function $F(x, u, \lambda)$ in VI (8e) also includes variables x, u , we introduce an auxiliary variable $\eta = F(x, u, \lambda)$ to reduce the complexity of the regularized gap function. We then have the following proposition that is inherited from Theorem 6 and Proposition 8:

Proposition 9. Let $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda}$ be a nonempty closed convex set given by (2), $F : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda}$ be a continuously differentiable function, c be a positive scalar, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda \times n_\lambda}$ be a symmetric positive definite matrix, and $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda}$ be an auxiliary variable. We define a regularized gap function $\varphi^c : \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\varphi^c(\lambda, \eta) = \max_{\omega \in K} \left\{ \eta^T (\lambda - \omega) - \frac{c}{2} (\lambda - \omega)^T A (\lambda - \omega) \right\}, \quad (17)$$

then, the following two statements are valid:

- $\lambda \in \text{SOL}(K, F(x, u, \lambda))$ if and only if (x, u, λ, η) satisfies a set of n_λ equalities and $n_g + 1$ inequalities:

$$F(x, u, \lambda) - \eta = 0, \quad (18a)$$

$$g(\lambda) \geq 0, \quad (18b)$$

$$\varphi^c(\lambda, \eta) \leq 0. \quad (18c)$$

- $\varphi^c(\lambda, \eta)$ is continuously differentiable; moreover, we can explicitly evaluate $\varphi^c(\lambda, \eta)$ and its gradient by

$$\varphi^c(\lambda, \eta) = \eta^T (\lambda - \hat{\omega}) - \frac{c}{2} (\lambda - \hat{\omega})^T A (\lambda - \hat{\omega}), \quad (19a)$$

$$\nabla_\lambda \varphi^c(\lambda, \eta) = \eta^T - c(\lambda - \hat{\omega})^T A, \quad (19b)$$

$$\nabla_\eta \varphi^c(\lambda, \eta) = (\lambda - \hat{\omega})^T, \quad (19c)$$

with $\hat{\omega}$ being the unique solution to the maximization problem that defines $\varphi^c(\lambda, \eta)$:

$$\hat{\omega} = \omega(\lambda, \eta) = \Pi_{K, A} \left(\lambda - \frac{1}{c} A^{-1} \eta \right). \quad (20)$$

Consequently, by replacing VI (8e) with its gap-constraint-based reformulation (18), and further relaxing the gap constraint (18c), we have the following *relaxed gap-constraint-based* problem for the discretized OCPEC (8):

$$\min_{\{x_n, u_n, \lambda_n\}_{n=1}^N} L_T(x_N) + \sum_{n=1}^N L(x_n, u_n, \lambda_n), \quad (21a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } G(x_n, u_n) \geq 0, \quad (21b)$$

$$C(x_n, u_n) = 0, \quad (21c)$$

$$x_{n-1} + \mathcal{F}(x_n, u_n, \lambda_n) = 0, \quad (21d)$$

$$F(x_n, u_n, \lambda_n) - \eta_n = 0, \quad (21e)$$

$$g(\lambda_n) \geq 0, \quad (21f)$$

$$s - \varphi^c(\lambda_n, \eta_n) \geq 0, \quad (21g)$$

with $n = 1, \dots, N$, $s \geq 0$ the relaxation parameter, and $\eta_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda}$ the auxiliary variable for $F(x_n, u_n, \lambda_n)$.

Even introducing n auxiliary variables η_n , the new relaxed problem (21) still possesses a more concise constraint system: the number of constraints related to equilibrium constraints is only $N(n_\lambda + n_g + 1)$ (i.e., (21e)–(21g)), whereas in the relaxed problem (9), this number is $N(n_\lambda + 3n_g)$ (i.e., (9e)–(9h)). Furthermore, this new relaxed problem (21) exhibits two additional favorable properties: First, it is a differentiable problem benefiting from the continuous differentiability of $\varphi^c(\lambda, \eta)$. Second, its feasible set is equivalent to that of the original problem (8) when $s = 0$,

and possesses a feasible interior when $s > 0$, as shown in Section 5. Thus, solutions to the discretized OCPEC (8) can also be obtained by solving a sequence of relaxed problems (21) with $s \rightarrow 0$.

Remark 10. It is crucial to investigate whether the new relaxed problem (21) satisfies the constraint qualification when $s = 0$. Unfortunately, the answer is negative. In Theorem 6, the zeros of $\varphi^c(\lambda)$ within the set K are also the global solutions to the constrained optimization problem (14). Consequently, for any feasible point that satisfies (16), the gap constraint $\varphi^c(\lambda) \leq 0$ must be active, and the gradient of $\varphi^c(\lambda)$ is either zero or linearly dependent with the gradient of the activated $g(\lambda) \geq 0$, which essentially violates the constraint qualification. A similar discussion about the bilevel optimization can be found in Ouattara and Aswani (2018), where the constraint qualification is interpreted as stating the constraints without the optima of an embedded optimization problem.

4. PROPOSED SOLUTION METHOD FOR OCPEC

4.1 Efficient evaluation of gap constraints

While the gap-constraint-based reformulation exhibits numerous favorable theoretical properties, the evaluation of gap functions is far from straightforward, and one could argue that this is indeed the main drawback of this reformulation. As demonstrated in (19), each computation of the gap function requires solving one constrained optimization problem, which seriously hinders the practical application. Nonetheless, evaluating the skewed projector (20) can be quite efficient in some common cases. For example, if we specify matrix A as an identity matrix, and set K exhibits a box-constraint structure:

$$K := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda} \mid b_l \leq \lambda \leq b_u\}, \quad (22)$$

with $b_l \in \{\mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}\}^{n_\lambda}$, $b_u \in \{\mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}\}^{n_\lambda}$, and $b_l < b_u$, then, the projection operator in (20) requires only one call to the max operator and one call to the min operator:

$$\hat{\omega} = \omega(\lambda, \eta) = \min(\max(b_l, \lambda - \frac{1}{c} \eta), b_u), \quad (23)$$

which involves a very low computational cost.

Even in the absence of the box-constraint structure in set K , the skewed projector (20) can still be computationally tractable by exploiting the OCPEC structure. First, it is noteworthy that we can evaluate $\varphi^c(\lambda_n, \eta_n)$ in a parallel fashion with up to N cores, as $\varphi^c(\lambda_n, \eta_n)$ only depends on the variables of the stage n . Second, even if we evaluate $\varphi^c(\lambda_n, \eta_n)$ in a serial fashion, note that the maximization problem that defines $\varphi^c(\lambda_n, \eta_n)$ is only parameterized by λ_n, η_n , and if the parameters of adjacent problems do not change significantly, we can expect that the optimal active sets of the adjacent problems exhibit slight differences, or even remain unchanged. This enables us to efficiently evaluate the skewed projectors (20) by certain active set warm-start techniques. For example, if set K is polyhedral, then the skewed projector (20) is reduced to the solution to a strictly concave quadratic program (QP):

$$\hat{\omega} = \omega(\lambda, \eta) = \arg \max_{\omega \in K} \left\{ -\frac{c}{2} \omega^T A \omega - (\eta^T - c \lambda^T A) \omega \right\}. \quad (24)$$

In this scenario, a suitable choice is the solver qpOASES (Ferreau et al., 2014), an efficient small-scale QP solver using an *online active set strategy* (Ferreau et al., 2008).

4.2 Successive gap constraint linearization method

Although we cannot directly use off-the-shelf NLP solvers to solve the relaxed problem (21) owing to the particular nature of evaluating $\varphi^c(\lambda_n, \eta_n)$, we can still utilize the NLP algorithm framework to solve the problem (21). Here, we adopt the *sequential quadratic programming* (SQP) framework, which is a Newton-type method and facilitates the use of state-of-the-art QP solvers.

We first make some modifications to the relaxed problem (21). We introduce scalar auxiliary variables v_n for the regularized gap functions $v_n = \varphi^c(\lambda_n, \eta_n)$ to reduce the nonlinearity of inequality constraints and facilitate easier initialization. We also penalize $\varphi^c(\lambda_n, \eta_n)$ *indirectly* by adding a quadratic penalty term for the variable v_n with a penalty parameter $\mu > 0$, as stated in (26). By collecting all decision variables into a vector $\mathbf{z} = [z_1^T, \dots, z_n^T, \dots, z_N^T]^T$ with $z_n = [x_n^T, u_n^T, \lambda_n^T, \eta_n^T, v_n]^T$, all equality constraints into a vector $\mathbf{h} = [h_1^T, \dots, h_n^T, \dots, h_N^T]^T$ with $h_n = [x_{n-1}^T + \mathcal{F}_n^T, C_n^T, F_n^T - \eta_n^T, \varphi_n^c - v_n]^T$, and all inequality constraints into a vector $\mathbf{c} = [c_1^T, \dots, c_n^T, \dots, c_N^T]^T$ with $c_n = [G_n^T, g_n^T, s - v_n]^T$, we can rewrite problem (21) as a general NLP:

$$\min_{\mathbf{z}} \mathbf{J}(\mathbf{z}, \mu), \quad (25a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{z}) = 0, \quad (25b)$$

$$\mathbf{c}(\mathbf{z}, s) \geq 0, \quad (25c)$$

with the cost function being

$$\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{z}, \mu) = L_T(x_N) + \sum_{n=1}^N \{L(x_n, u_n, \lambda_n) + \mu \Delta t v_n^2\}. \quad (26)$$

In the relaxed problem (25), the regularized gap function $\varphi^c(\lambda_n, \eta_n)$ is simultaneously relaxed and penalized. On one hand, the constraint $s - v_n \geq 0$ serves as a *hard constraint* that provides an upper bound on $\varphi^c(\lambda_n, \eta_n)$. On the other hand, the quadratic penalty term $\mu \Delta t v_n^2$ serves as a *soft constraint* that attempts to drive $\varphi^c(\lambda_n, \eta_n)$ to zero.

We now commence the introduction of the proposed SQP-type method, called the *successive gap constraint linearization* (SGCL) method, to solve (25) with a given $s > 0$. Algorithm 1 summarizes the SGCL method. The primary difference between our SGCL method and classical SQP methods lies in step 1, namely, for the current iterate \mathbf{z}^k , it is necessary to *first* evaluate skewed projectors $\{\hat{\omega}_n^k\}_{n=1}^N$ in a stage-wise manner (Lines 4–6) for the computation of the regularized gap function and its gradient (Line 8).

Let the Lagrangian of the relaxed problem (25) be

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{z}, \gamma_h, \gamma_c, \mu, s) = J(\mathbf{z}, \mu) + \gamma_h^T \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{z}) - \gamma_c^T \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{z}, s), \quad (27)$$

with $\gamma_h \in \mathbb{R}^{n_h}$, $\gamma_c \in \mathbb{R}^{n_c}$ being the Lagrangian multipliers for constraints \mathbf{h} and \mathbf{c} , respectively. Let \mathbf{H} be the Hessian of the Lagrangian \mathcal{L} . Then, we can obtain a new search direction $\Delta \mathbf{z}$ and an estimate of the new multipliers $\hat{\gamma}_h^{k+1}$, $\hat{\gamma}_c^{k+1}$ by solving the following structured sparse QP:

$$\min_{\Delta \mathbf{z}} \frac{1}{2} \Delta \mathbf{z}^T \mathbf{H}^k \Delta \mathbf{z} + \nabla_{\mathbf{z}} \mathbf{J}^k \Delta \mathbf{z}, \quad (28a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \mathbf{h}^k + \nabla_{\mathbf{z}} \mathbf{h}^k \Delta \mathbf{z} = 0, \quad (28b)$$

$$\mathbf{c}^k + \nabla_{\mathbf{z}} \mathbf{c}^k \Delta \mathbf{z} \geq 0. \quad (28c)$$

In practice, the cost terms L_T, L in (26) are often formulated as quadratic terms. In this scenario, we can ensure

Algorithm 1 SGCL method to solve the relaxed problem (25) with a given $s > 0$

Input: s, \mathbf{z}^0

Output: \mathbf{z}^*

- 1: **Initialization:** $\mathbf{z}^k \leftarrow \mathbf{z}^0, \gamma_h^k, \gamma_c^k \leftarrow 0$, select $\mu > 0$.
 - 2: **for** $k = 1$ to k_{max} **do**
 - 3: **Step 1.** Evaluate functions and derivatives:
 - 4: **for** $n = 1$ to N **do** in serial or parallel
 - 5: $\hat{\omega}_n^k \leftarrow$ extract λ_n^k, η_n^k from \mathbf{z}^k and use (20).
 - 6: **end for**
 - 7: $\mathbf{J}^k, \mathbf{c}^k, \nabla_{\mathbf{z}} \mathbf{J}^k, \nabla_{\mathbf{z}} \mathbf{c}^k, \mathbf{H}^k \leftarrow \mathbf{z}^k, \mu, s$.
 - 8: $\mathbf{h}^k, \nabla_{\mathbf{z}} \mathbf{h}^k \leftarrow \mathbf{z}^k, \{\hat{\omega}_n^k\}_{n=1}^N$.
 - 9: **Step 2.** Evaluate search direction and multiplier:
 - 10: $\Delta \mathbf{z}, \hat{\gamma}_h^{k+1}, \hat{\gamma}_c^{k+1} \leftarrow$ solve a sparse convex QP (28).
 - 11: **Step 3.** Check termination condition:
 - 12: **if** one of (31) (32) (33) is satisfied **then**
 - 13: $\mathbf{z}^* \leftarrow \mathbf{z}^k$ and break iteration routine.
 - 14: **end if**
 - 15: **Step 4.** Filter line search globalization:
 - 16: $\mathbf{z}^{k+1}, \alpha \leftarrow \mathbf{z}^k, \Delta \mathbf{z}$.
 - 17: **Step 5.** Update Lagrangian multipliers:
 - 18: $\gamma_h^{k+1} \leftarrow \gamma_h^k + \alpha(\hat{\gamma}_h^{k+1} - \gamma_h^k)$.
 - 19: $\gamma_c^{k+1} \leftarrow \gamma_c^k + \alpha(\hat{\gamma}_c^{k+1} - \gamma_c^k)$.
 - 20: **end for**
-

the convexity of QP (28) by the Gauss–Newton approximation that exploits only the convexity of the cost \mathbf{J} :

$$\mathbf{H}^k \approx \nabla_{\mathbf{z}\mathbf{z}} \mathbf{J}^k \succeq 0. \quad (29)$$

Exploiting convexity for other problem structures can be found in an excellent survey (Messerer et al., 2021).

After obtaining the search direction $\Delta \mathbf{z}$, we decide whether to terminate the iteration routine by examining certain quantities. One of these quantities is the optimality errors, including the primal residual E_p^k , dual residual E_d^k , and complementary residual E_c^k . Their definitions are below:

$$E_p^k = \max(\|\mathbf{h}^k\|_{\infty}, \|\min(0, \mathbf{c}^k)\|_{\infty}), \quad (30a)$$

$$E_d^k = \frac{1}{\kappa_d} \max(\|\nabla_{\mathbf{z}} \mathcal{L}^k\|_{\infty}, \|\min(0, \gamma_c^k)\|_{\infty}), \quad (30b)$$

$$E_c^k = \frac{1}{\kappa_c} \|\mathbf{c}^k \odot \gamma_c^k\|_{\infty}, \quad (30c)$$

with $\kappa_d, \kappa_c \geq 1$ the scaling parameters defined in Wächter and Biegler (2006). The iteration routine will be terminated if any of the following three conditions are satisfied:

- Condition based on a composite (KKT) residual:

$$\max(E_p^k, E_d^k, E_c^k) \leq \epsilon_{kkt}; \quad (31)$$

- Condition based on the search direction:

$$\|\Delta \mathbf{z}\|_{\infty} \leq \epsilon_{sd}; \quad (32)$$

- Condition based on the individual residuals:

$$E_p^k \leq \epsilon_p, \quad E_d^k \leq \epsilon_d, \quad E_c^k \leq \epsilon_c, \quad (33)$$

where $\epsilon_{kkt}, \epsilon_{sd}, \epsilon_p, \epsilon_d, \epsilon_c > 0$ are the given tolerances.

In case the terminal conditions are not satisfied, we use the filter line search globalization method (Wächter and Biegler, 2006) to find a new iterate $\mathbf{z}^{k+1} = \mathbf{z}^k + \alpha \Delta \mathbf{z}$ with stepsize α . \mathbf{z}^{k+1} achieves decrease either in the cost $\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{z}, \mu)$ or the constraint violation $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{z}, s)$, where $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{z}, s)$ is defined as the ℓ_1 norm of the constraint scaled by Δt :

$$\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{z}, s) = \Delta t(\|\mathbf{h}\|_1 + \|\min(0, \mathbf{c})\|_1). \quad (34)$$




Fig. 1. Contour of $\varphi^c(\lambda, \eta)$ with $c = 0.5, b_l = -1, b_u = 1$.

We sometimes re-initialize the filter as a heuristic (Wächter and Biegler, 2006) for better performance.

As discussed in Remark 10 about the gradient of $\varphi^c(\lambda, \eta)$, the SGCL method will also encounter numerical difficulties when s is close to zero. These numerical difficulties mainly arise from three aspects: First, QP (28) numerically violates constraint qualifications. Second, the search direction $\Delta \mathbf{z}$ is insufficient to reduce the constraint violation, as the gradient of $\varphi^c(\lambda, \eta)$ may approach zero. Third, the dual residual E_d^k fails to satisfy a composite tolerance ϵ_{kkt} , as the elements in γ_h^k, γ_c^k associated with $\varphi^c(\lambda, \eta), g(\lambda)$ may become extremely large. We mitigate these numerical difficulties using the following two approaches: We solve QP (28) using a robust and efficient solver FBstab (Liao-McPherson and Kolmanovsky, 2020), which needs neither constraint qualifications nor a feasible interior. We carefully select $\epsilon_p, \epsilon_d, \epsilon_c$ in (33) to ensure that the algorithm can still be terminated promptly on an optimal solution.

Remark 11. Our SGCL method is named based on the fact that gap functions appear as the problem constraint rather than being a part of the cost function, and we only make use of its function value and gradient. The difficulty in approximating \mathbf{H}^k is the major reason why we do not directly penalize $\varphi^c(\lambda, \eta)$ but instead indirectly penalize it, as $\varphi^c(\lambda, \eta)$ is generally nonconvex and only once continuously differentiable. Currently, we are exploring methods to efficiently construct a convex approximation for $\varphi^c(\lambda, \eta)$ and hope to exploit its second-order information.

5. GEOMETRIC INTERPRETATION

In this section, we provide an intuitive geometric interpretation of the gap constraint using a simple mathematical programming with equilibrium constraint (MPEC):

$$\min_{\lambda, \eta} J(\lambda, \eta), \quad (35a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \lambda \in \text{SOL}(K, \eta), \quad (35b)$$

where $\lambda, \eta \in \mathbb{R}$ are scalar variables to be optimized, set K exhibits a box-constrained structure in the form of (22), and $J: \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the smooth cost function. The feasible set formed by (35b) includes three pieces: the nonnegative part of axis $\lambda = b_l$, the nonpositive part of axis $\lambda = b_u$, and the segment of axis $\eta = 0$ between $\lambda = b_l$ and $\lambda = b_u$. By specifying $A = I_{1 \times 1}$ and substituting (23) into (19a), we have a relaxed gap-constraint-based problem for MPEC (35) with a relaxation parameter $s \geq 0$:




Fig. 2. Relaxed feasible set $\mathcal{R}^c = \mathcal{R}_1^c \cup \mathcal{R}_2^c \cup \mathcal{R}_3^c$, with $c = 0.5, s = 0.1, b_l = -1$, and $b_u = 1$.

$$\min_{\lambda, \eta} J(\lambda, \eta), \quad (36a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } b_l \leq \lambda \leq b_u, \quad (36b)$$

$$s - \varphi^c(\lambda, \eta) \geq 0, \quad (36c)$$

where $\varphi^c(\lambda, \eta)$ has an explicit expression:

$$\varphi^c(\lambda, \eta) = \begin{cases} \eta(\lambda - b_l) - \frac{c}{2}(\lambda - b_l)^2, & \lambda - \frac{1}{c}\eta \leq b_l, \\ \frac{1}{2c}\eta^2, & b_l \leq \lambda - \frac{1}{c}\eta \leq b_u, \\ \eta(\lambda - b_u) - \frac{c}{2}(\lambda - b_u)^2, & \lambda - \frac{1}{c}\eta \geq b_u, \end{cases} \quad (37)$$

and its contour is shown in Fig. 1. Therefore, the relaxed feasible set \mathcal{R}^c formed by (36b) and (36c) with $s \geq 0$ is divided into three subsets $\mathcal{R}_1^c, \mathcal{R}_2^c$, and \mathcal{R}_3^c along axes $\eta = c(\lambda - b_l)$ and $\eta = c(\lambda - b_u)$ such that $\mathcal{R}^c = \mathcal{R}_1^c \cup \mathcal{R}_2^c \cup \mathcal{R}_3^c$. Here, $\mathcal{R}_1^c, \mathcal{R}_2^c, \mathcal{R}_3^c$ are respectively represented by

$$\mathcal{R}_1^c = \{(\lambda, \eta) | b_l \leq \lambda \leq b_u, \eta \geq c(\lambda - b_l), \eta(\lambda - b_l) - \frac{c}{2}(\lambda - b_l)^2 \leq s\}, \quad (38a)$$

$$\mathcal{R}_2^c = \{(\lambda, \eta) | b_l \leq \lambda \leq b_u, |\eta| \leq \sqrt{2cs}, c(\lambda - b_u) \leq \eta \leq c(\lambda - b_l)\}, \quad (38b)$$

$$\mathcal{R}_3^c = \{(\lambda, \eta) | b_l \leq \lambda \leq b_u, \eta \leq c(\lambda - b_u), \eta(\lambda - b_u) - \frac{c}{2}(\lambda - b_u)^2 \leq s\}, \quad (38c)$$

and shown in Fig. 2, where the blue, red, and green regions are $\mathcal{R}_1^c, \mathcal{R}_2^c$, and \mathcal{R}_3^c , respectively. Clearly, \mathcal{R}^c exhibits two prominent features: First, it always contains the feasible region of the original MPEC (35), regardless of the choice of $s \geq 0$. Second, it is a *connected* set, and thus we can expect that the relaxed problem (36) with a given $s > 0$ can be easily solved by the NLP solving algorithm.

6. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENT

6.1 Benchmark problem and implementation details

We consider OCPEC (7) with a quadratic cost function:

$$L_T = \|x(T) - x_e\|_{Q_T}^2,$$

$$L_S = \|x(t) - x_{ref}(t)\|_{Q_x}^2 + \|u(t)\|_{Q_u}^2 + \|\lambda(t)\|_{Q_\lambda}^2,$$

where Q_T, Q_x, Q_u, Q_λ are weighting matrices, x_e is the terminal state, and $x_{ref}(t)$ is the reference trajectory. We consider an affine DVI generalized from an example of the linear complementary system in Vieira et al. (2020):




Fig. 3. Solution trajectory of the affine DVI example.

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -3 \\ -8 & 10 \end{bmatrix} x + \begin{bmatrix} 4 \\ 8 \end{bmatrix} u + \begin{bmatrix} -3 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix} \lambda, \\ F &= [1 \ -3] x + 3u + 5\lambda, \\ K &= \{\lambda \mid -1 \leq \lambda \leq 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

The goal is to drive the state x from $x_0 = [-\frac{1}{2}, -1]^T$ to $x_e = [0, 0]^T$ using the control u . We specify $x_{ref}(t) \equiv x_e$, $T = 1s$, $N = 100$, and enforce bounds on the variables $-2 \leq x_1, x_2 \leq 2$ and $-2 \leq u \leq 2$.

The SGCL method is implemented in MATLAB R2023b using the CasADi symbolic framework (Andersson et al., 2019). All the experiments were performed on a laptop with a 1.80 GHz Intel Core i7-8550U. We solve the sparse QP (28) by the sparse implementation of the FBstab with its default settings. We specify $c = 1$, $A = I_{n_\lambda \times n_\lambda}$, and tolerance $\epsilon_{kkt} = 10^{-5}$, $\epsilon_d = 10^{-4}$, $\epsilon_{sd}, \epsilon_p, \epsilon_c = 10^{-8}$.

6.2 Comparison between various SGCL implementations

Since the set K in the affine DVI example can be viewed as having both a box-constraint structure and a polyhedral structure, the SGCL implementation is categorized into two types based on the evaluation of the skewed projector (20). One utilizes the explicit expression (23), denoted by SGCL-box. The other solves the concave QP (24) using qpOASES in a serial fashion, denoted by SGCL-polyh. Both implementations use the CasADi construct *map* to speed up the for-loop routine (Lines 4–6 in Algorithm 1).

Fig. 3 illustrates a solution trajectory obtained by solving (25) with a given $s = 10^{-6}$. Both SGCL-box and SGCL-polyh implementations can obtain this solution after 14 iterations, and the only distinction is the time of evaluating $\hat{\omega}$. The majority of the computation time for both implementations is dedicated to solving the sparse QP (28) as indicated in Table 1. The time spent on evaluating $\hat{\omega}$ in SGCL-box is negligible, accounting for $\frac{6.11}{214.09} \approx 2.9\%$ of the total time, which is very promising. The SGCL-polyh, even with the requirement to solve a sequence of QP for evaluating $\hat{\omega}$, is still efficient, and the time spent on evaluating $\hat{\omega}$ accounts for $\frac{26.56}{235.13} \approx 11.3\%$ of the total time. This validates our discussion in Subsection 4.1, where it was stated that evaluating gap constraints in the OCPEC is not a significant challenge.

Table 1. Average computation time [ms] of various SGCL implementations, evaluated by running 100 repeated tests initialized with z^0 a unit vector

	SGCL-box	SGCL-polyh
evaluate $\hat{\omega}$ (20)	6.11	26.56
evaluate derivative	16.42	16.45
solve QP (28)	174.32	174.91
filter line search	15.68	15.66
else	1.55	1.56
total	214.09	235.13

6.3 Comparison of the SGCL and MPCC methods

We also compare the SGCL method (SGCL-box) with the MPCC method, that is, solving the relaxed problem (9) using the NLP solver IPOPT (Wächter and Biegler, 2006) with its default settings (except the KKT tolerance being 10^{-5}). Both methods employ the continuation method that tracks a decreasing parameter sequence $\{s^j\}_{j=0}^J$, with $s^{j+1} = \max\{s^j, \min\{\kappa_t s^j, (s^j)^{\kappa_e}\}\}$ and $s^0 = 10^{-1}$, $\kappa_t = 0.8$, $\kappa_e = 1.5$. We compare the solutions found by these methods under various s^j in terms of the optimal cost, equilibrium constraint violation, and computation time. For a given s^j , each method is initialized with 20 random z^0 that enables the method to find an optimal solution. The violation of equilibrium constraints is measured using the *natural residual* $\Phi = \lambda - \Pi_K(\lambda - F)$ with the Euclidean projector Π_K , and $\Phi = 0$ if and only if $\lambda \in \text{SOL}(K, F)$.

As demonstrated in Figs. 4 and 5, at the same s^j , both methods find a solution with a nearly identical optimal cost, while the MPCC method has a better equilibrium constraint satisfaction. Fig. 6 illustrates that the required computation time grows as s^j decreases, and the anomaly of the MPCC method at $s^j = 10^{-6}$ is caused by the frequent calls to the feasibility restoration phase in IPOPT. Moreover, the MPCC method demands significantly more time than the SGCL method at the same s^j . Since the relaxed problems solved by these two methods exhibit entirely different relaxations for the discretized OCPEC (8), comparing their computation times under the same constraint violations provides a fairer assessment. In this scenario, the SGCL method (at $s^j = 10^{-7}$) still requires less computation time compared to the MPCC method (at $s^j = 10^{-5}$). Intuitive interpretations for the effectiveness of the SGCL method are the connectedness of the relaxed feasible set as illustrated in Fig. 2, and a more concise constraint system as discussed in Subsection 3.2.

7. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

To solve the OCPEC efficiently, we propose a novel gap-constraint-based reformulation for the OCPEC and solve the discretized OCPEC using an SQP-type method called the SGCL method. The numerical experiments demonstrate that the SGCL method outperforms the MPCC-tailored solution method in terms of computational efficiency. The future work will focus on two aspects. On the theoretical front, we will analyze the MPCC-tailored stationarity property of the limit point found by the proposed method. On the practical side, in addition to the discussion in Remark 11, we will attempt to design a remedy mode to overcome a common numerical difficulty in SQP-type




Fig. 4. Box plot for relaxation parameter s^J vs. cost.




Fig. 5. Box plot for relaxation parameter s^J vs. the max violation of equilibrium constraints $\log_{10} \Phi$.




Fig. 6. Box plot for relaxation parameter s^J vs. GPU time. methods, that is, the infeasible QP subproblem due to the inconsistent constraint linearization.

REFERENCES

Andersson, J., Gillis, J., Horn, G., Rawlings, J., and Diehl, M. (2019). CasADi: a software framework for nonlinear optimization and optimal control. *Mathematical Programming Computation*, 11(1), 1–36.

Achmuty, G. (1989). Variational principles for variational inequalities. *Numerical Functional Analysis and Optimization*, 10(9-10), 863–874.

Betts, J.T. (2010). *Practical Methods for Optimal Control and Estimation Using Nonlinear Programming*. SIAM.

Dempe, S., Friedemann, M., Harder, F., Mehrlitz, P., and Wachsmuth, G. (2023). Bilevel optimal control: theory, algorithms, and applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.19786*.

Facchinei, F. and Pang, J.S. (2003). *Finite-Dimensional Variational Inequalities and Complementarity Problems*. Springer.

Ferreau, H., Bock, H., and Diehl, M. (2008). An online active set strategy to overcome the limitations of explicit mpc. *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, 18(8), 816–830.

Ferreau, H., Kirches, C., Potschka, A., Bock, H., and Diehl, M. (2014). qpOASES: A parametric active-set algorithm for quadratic programming. *Mathematical Programming Computation*, 6(4), 327–363.

Fukushima, M. (1992). Equivalent differentiable optimization problems and descent methods for asymmetric variational inequality problems. *Mathematical Programming*, 53, 99–110.

Hoheisel, T., Kanzow, C., and Schwartz, A. (2013). Theoretical and numerical comparison of relaxation methods for mathematical programs with complementarity constraints. *Mathematical Programming*, 137(1), 257–288.

Liao-McPherson, D. and Kolmanovskiy, I. (2020). FBstab: a proximally stabilized semismooth algorithm for convex quadratic programming. *Automatica*, 113, 108801.

Messerer, F., Baumgärtner, K., and Diehl, M. (2021). Survey of sequential convex programming and generalized Gauss–Newton methods. *ESAIM: Proceedings and Surveys*, 71, 64–88.

Nurkanović, A., Albrecht, S., and Diehl, M. (2020). Limits of MPCC formulations in direct optimal control with nonsmooth differential equations. In *2020 European Control Conference (ECC)*, 2015–2020. IEEE.

Ouattara, A. and Aswani, A. (2018). Duality approach to bilevel programs with a convex lower level. In *2018 Annual American Control Conference (ACC)*, 1388–1395. IEEE.

Pang, J.S. and Stewart, D. (2008). Differential variational inequalities. *Mathematical Programming*, 113(2), 345–424.

Posa, M., Cantu, C., and Tedrake, R. (2014). A direct method for trajectory optimization of rigid bodies through contact. *International Journal of Robotics Research*, 33(1), 69–81.

Scholtes, S. (2001). Convergence properties of a regularization scheme for mathematical programs with complementarity constraints. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 11(4), 918–936.

Vieira, A., Brogliato, B., and Prieur, C. (2020). Quadratic optimal control of linear complementarity systems: first-order necessary conditions and numerical analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 65(6), 2743–2750.

Wächter, A. and Biegler, L. (2006). On the implementation of an interior-point filter line-search algorithm for large-scale nonlinear programming. *Mathematical Programming*, 106(1), 25–57.

Wang, M., Wang, Z., Talbot, J., Gerdes, J.C., and Schwager, M. (2021). Game-theoretic planning for self-driving cars in multivehicle competitive scenarios. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, 37(4), 1313–1325.