Dynamical System Approach for Optimal Control Problems with Equilibrium Constraints Using Gap-Constraint-Based Reformulation

Kangyu Lin and Toshiyuki Ohtsuka

Abstract—Optimal control problems for nonsmooth dynamical systems governed by differential variational inequalities (DVI) are called optimal control problems with equilibrium constraints (OCPEC). It provides a general formalism for nonsmooth optimal control. However, solving OCPEC using the direct method (i.e., first-discretize-then-optimize) is challenging owing to the lack of correct sensitivity and constraint regularity. This study uses the direct method to solve OCPEC and overcomes the numerical difficulties from two aspects: In the discretization step, we propose a class of novel approaches using gap functions to smooth the DVI, where gap functions are initially proposed for solving variational inequalities. The generated smoothing approximations of discretized OCPEC are called gap-constraintbased reformulations, which have a concise and semismoothly differentiable constraint system; In the optimization step, we propose an efficient dynamical system approach to solve the discretized OCPEC, where a sequence of gap-constraint-based reformulations is solved approximately. This dynamical system approach involves a semismooth Newton flow and achieves local exponential convergence under standard assumptions. The benchmark test shows that the proposed method is computationally tractable and achieves fast local convergence.

Index Terms—Optimal control, differential variational inequalities, gap functions, dynamical system approach.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background

Optimal control is a powerful optimization-based control method that has been applied in many complex control tasks of smooth dynamical systems. Technological advancements have recently focused on the optimal control of nonsmooth dynamical systems, which arises in several cutting-edge engineering problems, such as the trajectory optimization of a mechanical system with contact-rich behavior [1], [2], bilevel optimal control [3], and game-theoretic planning for autonomous driving [4]. Hence, an urgent demand exists to study efficient and reliable numerical methods for nonsmooth optimal control.

Historically, several mathematical formalisms have been proposed in various scenarios for modeling nonsmooth dynamical systems [5]–[8], such as differential inclusions (DIs), differential variational inequalities (DVIs), and dynamical complementarity systems (DCSs). DVI [5] has garnered significant attention owing to its generality and ability to exploit the system structures using the mature theory of variational inequalities (VIs), where VI is a unified mathematical formalism for equilibrium problems [9]. Thus, this study considers optimal control problems (OCPs) for a class of nonsmooth systems governed by DVI, known as *optimal control problems* with equilibrium constraints (OCPECs). We briefly review VI and DVI in subsections II-D and II-E, respectively.

The direct method, also called first-discretize-then-optimize method, is practical for numerically solving OCPs of smooth dynamical systems [10]. However, its extension to OCPEC, that is, first discretize the DVI using time-stepping methods [6] and then solve the discretized OCPEC using nonlinear programming (NLP) solvers, encounters great challenges: In the discretization step, time-stepping methods achieve only firstorder accuracy. Moreover, the numerical sensitivities are incorrect, that is, the gradient information of the discretized OCPEC does not match that of the continuous-time OCPEC, which implies that many artificial local minima exist in the discretized OCPEC [11]; In the optimization step, the discretized OCPEC is a difficult NLP problem called mathematical programming with equilibrium constraints (MPECs), which violates almost all constraint qualifications (CQs) required by the NLP theory. One approach to alleviating difficulties caused by the lack of correct sensitivity and constraint regularity is to smooth the DVI and then use the continuation method in the smoothing parameter. However, the smoothed DVI behaves similarly to the nonsmooth system when the smoothing parameter is small. Thus, we need to solve a sequence of large-scale problems that become increasingly difficult. Difficulties in solving OCPEC are discussed in detail in subsection III-B and III-C.

Recently, advanced discretization methods with switch detection [12] have been proposed for a class of nonsmooth systems that can be transformed into an index-zero DCS: In the discretization step, higher-order accuracy and correct numerical sensitivity are achieved by locating the nonsmooth points at the discretization time points; However, in the optimization step, the resulting discretized OCP is an NLP problem called *mathematical programming with complementarity constraints* (MPCCs), which is a special case of MPEC and violates CQs as well. Their extension to DVI also needs to be explored.

B. Motivation and related works

Despite the aforementioned challenges, the direct method remains the preferred approach to developing numerical methods for nonsmooth optimal control because it allows the use of many well-established optimization theories and algorithms. This study considers solving OCPEC using the direct method; thus, the following two critical problems need to be addressed:

- How can the DVI be smoothed to make the smoothing approximation of discretized OCPEC easier to solve?
- How can a sequence of smoothing approximations of the discretized OCPEC be solved efficiently?

Classical approaches to smoothing the DVI replace the VI with its Karush–Kuhn–Tucker (KKT) conditions, where the

This work was supported in part by the JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP22H01510 and JP23K22780. Kangyu Lin was supported by the CSC scholarship (No. 201906150138). The authors are with the Systems Science Course, Graduate School of Informatics, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan. Corresponding author: Kangyu Lin. Email: k-lin@sys.i.kyoto-u.ac.jp, ohtsuka@i.kyoto-u.ac.jp.

complementarity conditions are further smoothed or relaxed [13]–[18]. These approaches introduce Lagrange multipliers, thus generating a smoothing approximation of the discretized OCPEC with many additional variables and constraints. We review some of these approaches in subsection III-C. Inspired by the merit-function-based algorithm for solving the VI, our previous work [19] provides a new approach to smoothing the DVI. This approach uses a tailored merit function called regularized gap function [20] to reformulate the VI as a small number of inequalities, where one of the inequalities is further relaxed. This is a multiplier-free approach and thus generates a smaller smoothing approximation of the discretized OCPEC. A recent study in bilevel optimization [21] also used a doubly regularized gap function to reformulate the lower-level problem and reported some promising results. However, gap functions were shown to be only once continuously differentiable when initially proposed; thus, solution methods presented in [19] and [21] only use the first-order gradient information of gap functions and achieve a slow local convergence rate.

The smoothing of DVI enables us to obtain the solution to the discretized OCPEC by solving a sequence of smoothing approximations of the discretized OCPEC. This is known as the continuation method [22], which is a general methodology to develop algorithms for solving difficult problems. Its core idea is to obtain the solution to a difficult problem by solving a sequence of easier problems, where the solution method of each problem is warm-started by the solution of the previous problem. Its standard implementation is to solve each problem exactly using off-the-shelf solvers, where one example is the NLP-based method [18] for solving MPCC. However, the later problems become increasingly difficult; thus, solving them exactly often requires more time. An alternative implementation is to solve each problem approximately while ensuring that the approximation error is bounded, or better yet, finally converges to zero. This implementation can be regarded as a case of the dynamical system approach, also known as the systems theory of algorithm [23], where the iterative algorithm is viewed as a dynamical system and studied from a system perspective. Benefiting from the mature and fruitful theory of dynamical systems, we can make a trade-off between the efficiency and accuracy of computing intermediate iterates while guaranteeing the feasibility [24] and convergence [25]. The dynamical system approaches have a long history and remain vibrant in many real-world applications, such as real-time optimization, differential games, machine learning, supply-chain systems, and network systems [23]-[32].

C. Contribution

This study addresses the numerical difficulties of using the direct method to solve the OCPEC. Our contributions can be summarized in the following two aspects, which are our solutions to the problems listed in subsection I-B:

• We propose a class of novel and general approaches to smoothing the DVI, where the VI is replaced with a set of relaxed inequalities using *gap functions*. These functions are derived from Auchmuty's saddle function [33] and initially proposed to develop algorithms for

solving the VI; however, they only apply to certain special cases owing to their inherent computational drawbacks (see Subsection IV-A). We mitigate these drawbacks by properly reformulating these functions and exploiting the OCP and VI structures; Compared with the smoothing approaches based on the KKT conditions of the VI, the proposed approach is *multiplier-free* and thus generates a smaller smoothing approximation of the discretized OCPEC; Compared with the only two existing studies [19] and [21] using gap functions and their first-order gradient for problem reformulations and solution methods, we show that with additional trivial assumptions on the VI, the differentiability of gap functions can be strengthened from once continuous differentiability to semismooth differentiability (see Definition 2). Thus, we can use the second-order gradient information of the gap functions to develop locally fast-converging algorithms.

 We propose a *semismooth Newton flow* dynamical system approach to solve the discretized OCPEC and prove the local exponential convergence under mild assumptions. We confirm the convergence properties and computation efficiency using an illustrative example and a benchmark test. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first dynamical system approach to solve the nonsmooth OCP, which facilitates solving a difficult nonsmooth OCP efficiently by leveraging the mature theory and algorithm for smooth dynamical systems.

D. Outline

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section II reviews some background material; Section III formulates the OCPEC and discusses the difficulties in using the direct method to solve the OCPEC and its smoothing approximation; Section IV presents a novel class of merit-function-based approaches to smoothing the DVI; Section V presents an efficient dynamical approach to solve a sequence of the smoothing approximation of the discretized OCPEC; Section VI provides the benchmark tests; and Section VII concludes this study.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Notation

Given an Euclidean vector space \mathbb{R}^n , we denote its nonnegative orthant by \mathbb{R}^n_+ ; Given a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we denote the Euclidean norm by $||x||_2 = \sqrt{x^T x}$, the A-norm by $||x||_A = \sqrt{x^T A x}$ with $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ a symmetric positive definite matrix, and the open ball with center at x and radius r > 0 by $\mathbb{B}(x, r) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid ||y - x||_2 < r\}$; Given a closed convex set $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, we denote the Euclidean projector of a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ onto K by $\Pi_K(x) := \arg \min_{y \in K} \frac{1}{2} \|y - x\|_2^2$. Given two variables $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we denote the element-wise complementarity conditions between x and y by $0 \le x \perp y \ge$ 0, i.e., $x, y \ge 0$ and $x \odot y = 0$, with \odot the Hadamard product. Given a differentiable function f(x), we denote its Jacobian by $\nabla_x f \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^m$, and its Hessian by $\nabla_{xx} f \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$. We say that function f(x)is k-th Lipschitz continuously differentiable (LC^k in short) if its k-th derivative is Lipschitz continuous.

B. Nonsmooth Analysis

We review several basic concepts from nonsmooth analysis (Subsections 7.1 and 7.4, [9]). Rademacher's theorem states that the Lipschitz continuous function is *differentiable almost everywhere*. Hence, generalized derivatives are first defined:

Definition 1 (Generalized derivatives): Let $G : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^m$ be a locally Lipschitz continuous function in an open set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. Let N_G be the set of points where G is not differentiable.

• The *B*-subdifferential of G at $x \in \Omega$ is defined by

$$\partial_B G(x) = \{ H \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} \mid H = \lim_{k \to \infty} \nabla_x G(x^k) \}, \quad (1)$$

with sequence $\{x^k\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \to x$ and $x^k \notin N_G$;

• The (Clarke) generalized Jacobian of G at $x \in \Omega$ is defined as the convex hull of $\partial_B G(x)$:

$$\partial G(x) = \operatorname{conv} \,\partial_B G(x),\tag{2}$$

We say that $\partial G(x)$ is *nonsingular* if all matrices in $\partial G(x)$ are nonsingular;

If G is also directionally differentiable at x̄ ∈ Ω, (i.e., the directional derivative at x̄ exists in all directions), and ∂G provides a Newton approximation for G at x̄, that is, the following limits holds for any x in the neighborhood of x̄ and any matrix in ∂G(x):

$$\lim_{\substack{\bar{x}\neq x\to \bar{x}\\ H\in\partial G(x)}} \frac{G(x) - G(\bar{x}) - H(x-\bar{x})}{\|x-\bar{x}\|_2} = 0, \qquad (3)$$

then we say that G is semismooth at $\bar{x} \in \Omega$. \Box

Semismoothness is attractive because solving the Lipschitz continuous equation G(x) = 0 using Newton's method with $\partial G(x)$ generally fails unless G(x) is semismooth. It also defines an important class of differentiable functions

Definition 2 (Semismoothly differentiable): We say that θ : $\Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, with $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ open, is semismoothly differentiable (SC¹ in short) at $x \in \Omega$ if θ is LC^1 in a neighborhood of x and $\nabla_x \theta$ is semismooth at x. We say that a vector-valued function is SC^1 if all its component functions are SC^1 . \Box

Some properties of $\partial G(x)$ are summarized below:

Proposition 1 (Proposition 7.1.4, [9]): Let $G : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^m$ be a locally Lipschitz continuous function in an open set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$.

- $\partial G(x)$ is nonempty, convex, and compact for any $x \in \Omega$;
- $\partial G(x)$ is *closed* at x, that is, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that $\partial G(y) \subseteq \partial G(x) + \mathbb{B}(0, \varepsilon), \forall y \in \mathbb{B}(x, \delta)$.

The *mean value theorem* for differentiable functions can be extended to Lipschitz continuous functions, see Proposition 6.

C. Constraint Qualification

In the NLP theory, CQs are certain critical assumptions for the constraint system to characterize the optimality condition.

Definition 3 (Constraint qualification): Consider a feasible set $C := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x} | \mathbf{h}(x) = 0, \mathbf{c}(x) \ge 0\}$, where the constraint functions $\mathbf{h} : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \to \mathbb{R}^{n_h}$ and $\mathbf{c} : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \to \mathbb{R}^{n_c}$ are continuous differentiable. Let $\mathcal{I}(x^*) = \{i \in \{1, \dots, n_c\} | \mathbf{c}_i(x^*) = 0\}$ be the active set of a point $x^* \in C$.

• We say that the *linear independence constraint qualification* (LICQ) holds at $x^* \in C$ if vectors $\nabla_x h_i(x^*)$ with $i \in \{1, \dots, n_h\}$ and $\nabla_x c_i(x^*)$ with $i \in \mathcal{I}(x^*)$ are linearly independent;

• We say that the Mangasarian-Fromovitz constraint qualification (MFCQ) holds at $x^* \in C$ if vectors $\nabla_x h_i(x^*)$ with $i \in \{1, \dots, n_h\}$ are linearly independent and a vector $d_x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ exists such that $\nabla_x h(x^*) d_x = 0$ and $\nabla_x c_i(x^*) d_x > 0, \forall i \in \mathcal{I}(x^*). \square$

LICQ implies MFCQ; moreover, LICQ and MFCQ ensure the uniqueness and boundedness of the Lagrange multipliers in the NLP theory, respectively [34].

D. Variational inequalities

Finite-dimensional VI is a unified mathematical formalism to model and analyze various equilibrium problems [9]:

Definition 4 (Variational inequalities): Let $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}}$ be a nonempty closed convex set and $F : \mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}} \to \mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}}$ be a continuous function, the variational inequalities, denoted by VI(K, F), is to find a vector $\lambda \in K$ such that

$$(\omega - \lambda)^T F(\lambda) \ge 0, \quad \forall \omega \in K.$$
 (4)

The solution set of VI(K, F) is denoted by SOL(K, F). \Box

Most mathematical formalisms for equilibrium problems are the special cases of the VI(K, F) with specified K and F, as listed in Table I. In this study, we focus on the general case where set K can be represented by finitely many inequalities:

$$K := \{ \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}} | g(\lambda) \ge 0 \}, \tag{5}$$

with $g: \mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}} \to \mathbb{R}^{n_{g}}$ a smooth convex function.

Algorithms for solving the VI can be categorized into two types based on various reformulations for the VI. The first is the *KKT-condition-based algorithm*, which utilizes algorithms for the nonlinear complementarity problem to solve the KKT conditions of the VI(K, F):

$$F(\lambda) - \nabla_{\lambda} g(\lambda)^{T} \zeta = 0, \qquad (6a)$$

$$0 \le \zeta \perp g(\lambda) \ge 0, \tag{6b}$$

with $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^{n_g}$ the Lagrange multiplier for $g(\lambda)$. We refer to (6) as the *KKT-condition-based reformulation* for the VI(*K*, *F*). The second is the *merit-function-based algorithm*, which utilizes optimization algorithms to solve an optimization problem that minimizes a merit function tailored for the VI:

Definition 5 (Merit function for the VI): A merit function for the VI(K, F) on a (closed) set $X \supseteq K$ is a nonnegative function $\theta : X \to \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $\lambda \in SOL(K, F)$ if and only if $\lambda \in X$ and $\theta(\lambda) = 0$. In other words, SOL(K, F) coincides with the set of global solutions to the optimization problem:

$$\min_{y \in X} \theta(y), \tag{7}$$

where the optimal objective value of this problem is zero. \Box We refer to (7) as the *merit-function-based reformulation* for the VI(K, F). A class of merit functions is introduced in subsection IV-A. Set X in (7) is often specified as either the VI set K or the entire space $\mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}}$, leading to the constrained and unconstrained optimization problem, respectively. In practice, KKT-condition-based algorithms are preferred to solve the VI owing to the inherent drawbacks of merit functions, see section 10 in [9] or discussions in subsection IV-A.

Table I SPECIAL CASES OF VI AND DVI

| Specified K and F | $K = \mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}}$ | $K = \mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}}_{+}$ | $F = \nabla_{\lambda} \theta$ with convex function θ | |
|-----------------------|---|---|---|--|
| Special cases of VI | System of nonlinear equations $F(\lambda) = 0$ | Nonlinear complementarity problem $0 \le \lambda \perp F(\lambda) \ge 0$ | Convex programming $\min_{\lambda \in K} \theta(\lambda)$ | |
| Special cases of DVI | Differential-algebraic equations $\dot{x}(t) = f(x(t), u(t), \lambda(t))$ $F(x(t), u(t), \lambda(t)) = 0$ | $ \begin{array}{l} \text{Dynamical complementarity systems} \\ \dot{x}(t) = f(x(t), u(t), \lambda(t)) \\ 0 \leq \lambda(t) \perp F(x(t), u(t), \lambda(t)) \geq 0 \end{array} $ | $ \begin{array}{l} \text{Optimization-constrained differential equations} \\ \dot{x}(t) = f(x(t), u(t), \lambda(t)) \\ \lambda(t) \in \arg\min_{\lambda \in K} \theta(x(t), u(t), \lambda(t)) \end{array} $ | |

E. Differential variational inequalities

DVI is a unified mathematical formalism for a broad class of nonsmooth dynamical systems [5]. It is defined as an ordinary differential equation (ODE) coupled with a VI:

$$\dot{x}(t) = f(x(t), u(t), \lambda(t)), \quad x(0) = x_0,$$
(8a)

$$\lambda(t) \in \text{SOL}(K, F(x(t), u(t), \lambda(t))), \tag{8b}$$

where $x : [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ is the differential state with a given $x_0, u : [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ is the control input, $\lambda : [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda}$ is the algebraic variable, $f : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda} \to \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ is the ODE r.h.s. function, and SOL(K,F) denotes the set of solutions to a VI defined by a set $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda}$ and a function $F : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda} \to \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda}$. Note that $\lambda(t)$ does not exhibit any continuity properties as it belongs to SOL(K,F), which in general is time-varying and set-valued. This is also the main source of discontinuities in x(t) and its time derivatives.

Most mathematical formalisms for the nonsmooth dynamical system can be formulated as a DVI with specified K and F, as listed in Table I. Benefiting from the mature theory and algorithm for the VI, nonsmooth systems modeled as DVI can be studied systematically [5]–[8]. Beyond physical systems, many other practical problems, such as real-time optimizations [27] and differential games [29], can also be abstracted as a nonsmooth system and explored through the lens of DVI.

III. PROBLEM FORMULATION

A. Optimal control problem with equilibrium constraints

This study focuses on solving OCPs of nonsmooth dynamical systems modeled as DVI. Specifically, we consider the finite horizon continuous-time OCPEC:

$$\min_{x(\cdot),u(\cdot),\lambda(\cdot)} L_T(x(T)) + \int_0^T L_S(x(t),u(t),\lambda(t))dt$$
 (9a)

s.t.
$$\dot{x}(t) = f(x(t), u(t), \lambda(t)), \quad x(0) = x_0, \quad (9b)$$

$$\lambda(t) \in \text{SOL}(K, F(x(t), u(t), \lambda(t))), \qquad (9c)$$

$$G(x(t), u(t)) \ge 0, \tag{9d}$$

$$C(x(t), u(t)) = 0,$$
 (9e)

where: $L_T : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $L_S : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda} \to \mathbb{R}$ are the terminal and stage cost functions, respectively, dynamical system (9b) (9c) is a DVI as defined in (8), $G : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \to \mathbb{R}^{n_G}$ and $C : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \to \mathbb{R}^{n_C}$ are the inequality and equality path constraint, respectively. We make the following assumptions on the continuous-time OCPEC (9):

Assumption 1: Set K is nonempty, closed, convex, in the form of (5), and satisfies LICQ;

Assumption 2: Functions L_T, L_S, f, F, G, C are LC^2 .

Solving the continuous-time OCPs by the direct multiple shooting method [10] first requires discretizing the dynamical system. We discretize the DVI by the time-stepping method [6], which involves discretizing the ODE (9b) implicitly and enforcing the VI (9c) at each time point $t_n \in [0, T]$. As a result, the infinite-dimensional continuous-time OCPEC (9) is discretized into a finite-dimensional OCP-structured MPEC:

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{\lambda}} L_T(x_N) + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \underbrace{L_S(x_n, u_n, \lambda_n) \Delta t}_{:=L(x_n, u_n, \lambda_n)}, \quad (10a)$$

s.t.
$$x_{n-1} + \mathcal{F}(x_n, u_n, \lambda_n) = 0,$$
 (10b)

$$\lambda_n \in \mathrm{SOL}(K, F(x_n, u_n, \lambda_n)), \tag{10c}$$

$$G(x_n, u_n) \ge 0, \tag{10d}$$

$$C(x_n, u_n) = 0, \quad n = 1, \dots, N,$$
 (10e)

with given x_0 , where $x_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ and $\lambda_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda}$ denote the value of x(t) and $\lambda(t)$ at the time point t_n , respectively, $u_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ is the piecewise constant approximation of u(t) in the interval $(t_{n-1}, t_n]$, N is the number of stages, $\Delta t := T/N$ is the time step, $L : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda} \to \mathbb{R}$ represents the numerical integration of the stage cost function L_S , and $\mathcal{F} : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \to \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ forms the discretization of the ODE (9b) as discussed in Remark 1. We define vectors $\boldsymbol{x} = [x_1^T, \cdots, x_N^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{Nn_x}$, $\boldsymbol{u} = [u_1^T, \cdots, u_N^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{Nn_u}$, and $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = [\lambda_1^T, \cdots, \lambda_N^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{Nn_\lambda}$ that collects all states, controls, and algebraic variables along the horizon, respectively.

Remark 1: The discretization method for ODE (9b) must be stiffly accurate and algebraically stable, which are achieved by the implicit discretization and certain algebraic equations (subsection 8.4.1 in [6]). One method that meets these requirements is the implicit Euler method, with $\mathcal{F}(x_n, u_n, \lambda_n) :=$ $f(x_n, u_n, \lambda_n)\Delta t - x_n$ in (10b). Some Runge-Kutta methods are also available [6]. However, the time-stepping methods generally have only first-order accuracy, unless x(t) is smooth or combined with switch detection that can divide nonsmooth x(t) into segments of smooth trajectories. \Box

The main reason we chose the time-stepping method is that it minimizes the complexity of coupling between neighboring stages, that is, the equilibrium constraints (10c) it introduces are *stage-wise*, involving variables only from the same stage. Additional switch detection [12] is promising, but only works for certain cases of DVI and introduces many more complex constraints, such as the *cross-wise* complementarity constraints that involve variables from multiple stages. Hence, we consider the stage-wise MPEC (10) to streamline the presentation.

The numerical difficulties in solving (10) mainly lie in two aspects: First, in nonsmooth systems, the sensitivities that x(t)w.r.t. parameters (e.g., x_0) and other variables (e.g., controls) are *discontinuous* [11], which can not be revealed by the discretized DVI (10b) (10c) no matter how small Δt we chose, as the overall x(t) is approximated by numerical integration rather than being segmented into smooth trajectories. In other words, the gradient information of the discretized OCPEC (10)does not match that of the continuous-time OCPEC (9). As a result, many artificial local minima exist in the discretized OCPEC; Second, the equilibrium constraints (10c) violate CQs at any feasible point. These two difficulties prohibit us from using off-the-shelf NLP solvers to solve discretized OCPEC, where the gradient-based optimizer will be trapped in certain spurious solutions near the initial guess owing to the wrong sensitivity or fail owing to the lack of constraint regularity.

The wrong sensitivity is the fundamental limitation of the time-stepping methods for nonsmooth systems (Chapter 5 in [11]). A seminal paper [35] revealed that the sensitivity of a smoothing approximation to the discontinuous ODE is correct if the time step Δt is sufficiently smaller than the smoothing parameter s. This observation has also been confirmed in several other nonsmooth systems, such as DCS [11] and DVI [36]. The smoothing of DVI (8) is generally achieved by smoothing or relaxing the VI (8b). These smoothing or relaxation strategies are also employed in many MPEC-tailored methods to recover the constraint regularity. Therefore, one potential approach to alleviating numerical difficulties in solving (10) is to smooth the DVI and then use the continuation method in the smoothing parameter. We briefly discuss this approach and its potential difficulties in the next subsection.

C. KKT-condition-based reformulation for OCPEC

The existing approaches to smoothing the DVI (8) replace the VI (8b) with its KKT-condition-based reformulation (6), where the complementarity conditions (6b) are further relaxed into a set of parameterized inequalities using certain relaxation strategy [37]. Table II summarizes several popular relaxation strategies with a relaxation parameter $s \ge 0$. The inequalities generated by these strategies can be compactly written as:

$$\Phi(\zeta, g(\lambda), s) \ge 0, \tag{11}$$

with function Φ : $\mathbb{R}^{n_g} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_g} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^{n_{\Phi}}$, where n_{Φ} depends on the specific relaxation strategy. Applying these smoothing approaches to the discretized DVI in (10) results in the *KKT-condition-based reformulation* for the discretized OCPEC (10), which is a parameterized NLP problem:

$$\mathcal{P}_{kkt}(s): \quad \min_{\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{\lambda}} L_T(x_N) + \sum_{n=1}^N L(x_n, u_n, \lambda_n), \quad (12a)$$

s.t.
$$x_{n-1} + \mathcal{F}(x_n, u_n, \lambda_n) = 0,$$
 (12b)

$$F(x_n, u_n, \lambda_n) - \nabla_{\lambda} g(\lambda_n)^T \zeta_n = 0, \qquad (12c)$$

$$\Phi(\zeta_n, g(\lambda_n), s) \ge 0, \tag{12d}$$

$$G(x_n, u_n) \ge 0, \tag{12e}$$

$$C(x_n, u_n) = 0, \quad n = 1, \dots, N,$$
 (12f)

where $\zeta_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n_g}$ is the Lagrange multiplier for $g(\lambda_n) \ge 0$.

As stated in subsection III-B, the sensitivity of the smoothed discretized DVI (12b) - (12d) is correct if condition $\Delta t \ll s$ holds. Moreover, the feasible set of $0 \leq \zeta \perp q(\lambda) \geq 0$ (the nonnegative part of axes $\zeta_i = 0$ and $g_i = 0$) can be relaxed into a region with the feasible interior, as shown in Fig. 1. Thus, the constraint regularity is also recovered when s > 0, and we can ideally solve (10) using the continuation method with the standard implementation, that is, solving a sequence of $\mathcal{P}_{kkt}(s)$ with $s \to 0$, where each $\mathcal{P}_{kkt}(s)$ is solved exactly using off-the-shelf NLP solvers. However, this approach still presents three numerical difficulties: First, a small Δt should be specified for the discretization accuracy and correct sensitivity, and numerous inequalities are introduced owing to the existing relaxation strategies. As a result, $\mathcal{P}_{kkt}(s)$ becomes a large-scale problem that active-set-based solvers fail to solve; Second, the feasible interior shrinks toward the empty set as $s \to 0$. Thus, the difficulty of solving $\mathcal{P}_{kkt}(s)$ increases dramatically as $s \to 0$, and the interior-point-based solvers may stall or fail when s is small; Third, the sensitivity becomes incorrect when s is reduced to the point where $\Delta t \ll s$ is violated. This implies that further decreasing s from this point cannot drive the iterates to converge to a solution of the continuous-time OCPEC, but only improve their feasibility. Thus, it is inappropriate to solve $\mathcal{P}_{kkt}(s)$ with small s exactly, which is often time-consuming even if it is solved successfully.

We alleviate these numerical difficulties through the following two points: First, we propose a new class of approaches to smoothing the DVI, where the resulting smoothing approximation of the discretized OCPEC has many favorable properties; Second, we propose a dynamical system approach to perform the continuation method efficiently. The following two sections provide a detailed introduction to the proposed methods.

IV. GAP-CONSTRAINT-BASED REFORMULATION FOR OCPEC

This section presents the proposed approaches to smoothing the DVI. Our smoothing approaches are inspired by the meritfunction-based reformulations for the VI. The core idea is to leverage two properties of the merit function: its equivalence to the VI and its differentiability. This study considers a class of merit functions derived from Auchmuty's saddle function [33], called *gap functions*. Thus, using the proposed approach to smoothing the discretized DVI in (10) generates the *gapconstraint-based reformulations* for the discretized OCPEC.

A. Auchmuty's saddle function and gap functions for VI

We begin with Auchmuty's saddle function and the corresponding gap functions for the VI given in Definition 4. The definition of the saddle problem is first provided:

Definition 6 (Saddle problem): Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and $Y \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ be two given closed sets, let $L : X \times Y \to \mathbb{R}$ denote an arbitrary function, called a saddle function. The saddle problem associated with this triple (L, X, Y) is to find a pair of vectors $(x^*, y^*) \in X \times Y$, called a saddle point, such that $L(x^*, y) \leq L(x^*, y^*) \leq L(x, y^*), \forall (x, y) \in X \times Y$. \Box

Table II Several existing relaxation strategies with a parameter $s \ge 0$ for the complementarity conditions $0 \le \zeta \perp g(\lambda) \ge 0$

| Relaxation strategy | Scholtes [13] | Lin-Fukushima [14] | Kadrani [15] | Steffensen-Ulbrich [16] | Kanzow-Schwartz [17] |
|----------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| Parameterized inequalities | $\begin{array}{c} \zeta \geq 0 \\ g \geq 0 \\ \zeta \odot g \leq s I_{n_g} \end{array}$ | $\begin{split} \zeta \odot g &\leq s^2 I_{ng} \\ \Phi_{LF}(\zeta,g,s) &\geq 0 \end{split}^{\mathbf{a}}$ | $\begin{array}{l} \zeta \geq -sI_{n_g} \\ g \geq -sI_{n_g} \\ \Phi_{Ka}(\zeta,g,s) \leq 0 \ ^{\mathrm{b}} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} \zeta \geq 0 \\ g \geq 0 \\ \Phi_{SU}(\zeta,g,s) \leq 0 \ ^{c} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c} \zeta \geq 0 \\ g \geq 0 \\ \Phi_{KS}(\zeta,g,s) \leq 0 \end{array}^{\rm d}$ |

 $\begin{array}{l} {}^{a} \ \Phi_{LF} : \mathbb{R}^{n_g} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_g} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^{n_g} \text{ is defined by } \Phi_{LF}(\zeta,g,s) = (\zeta + sI_{n_g}) \odot (g + sI_{n_g}) - s^2 I_{n_g}. \\ {}^{b} \ \Phi_{Ka} : \mathbb{R}^{n_g} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_g} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^{n_g} \text{ is defined by } \Phi_{Ka}(\zeta,g,s) = (\zeta - sI_{n_g}) \odot (g - sI_{n_g}). \\ {}^{c} \ \Phi_{SU} : \mathbb{R}^{n_g} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_g} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^{n_g} \text{ is a twice continuously differentiable piecewise function defined by some auxiliary functions.} \\ {}^{d} \ \Phi_{KS} : \mathbb{R}^{n_g} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_g} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^{n_g} \text{ is a once continuously differentiable piecewise function defined by some auxiliary functions.} \end{array}$



Figure 1. Geometric interpretation of several existing relaxation strategies for the complementarity conditions $0 \le \zeta \perp g(\lambda) \ge 0$

In [33], Auchmuty establishes the relationship between the VI(K, F) and a class of saddle functions, as follows:

Theorem 1: Let $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}}$ be a closed convex set, d: $\mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a convex, continuously differentiable function, and $F : \mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}} \to \mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}}$ be a continuous function. Define a saddle function $L_{Au}: K \times K \to \mathbb{R}$ with

$$L_{Au}(\lambda,\omega) := d(\lambda) - d(\omega) + (F(\lambda)^T - \nabla_\lambda d(\lambda))(\lambda - \omega).$$
(13)

We have that if (λ^*, ω^*) is a saddle point of L_{Au} on the set $K \times K$, then λ^* is a solution of the VI(K, F). \Box

Proof: See the proof in Appendix A.

A class of merit functions called generalized primal gap function can be defined based on Auchmuty's saddle function, which casts VI(K, F) as a *constrained* optimization problem.

Definition 7 (generalized primal gap function): Let the function $\varphi_{Au} : \mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}} \to \mathbb{R}$ be given by:

$$\varphi_{Au}(\lambda) = \sup_{\omega \in K} L_{Au}(\lambda, \omega).$$
(14)

We refer to $\varphi_{Au}(\lambda)$ as the generalized primal gap function. \Box

The properties of φ_{Au} we focus on are summarized below. Theorem 2: The following two statements are valid for the

generalized primal gap function $\varphi_{Au}(\lambda)$ given by (14):

• (Equivalence) $\varphi_{Au}(\lambda) \geq 0, \forall \lambda \in K$. Furthermore, $\varphi_{Au}(\lambda) = 0, \lambda \in K$ if and only if $\lambda \in SOL(K, F)$. Hence, $\varphi_{Au}(\lambda)$ is a merit function for the VI(K, F) only when $\lambda \in K$, and the solution to the VI(K, F) can be obtained by solving a *constrained* optimization problem:

$$\min_{\lambda \in K} \varphi_{Au}(\lambda). \tag{15}$$

• (*Differentiability*) For any given λ , let $\hat{\omega} = \omega(\lambda)$ be the solution to the maximization problem defining $\varphi_{Au}(\lambda)$:

$$\hat{\omega} = \omega(\lambda) = \arg\max_{\omega \in K} \{-d(\omega) - (F(\lambda)^T - \nabla_\lambda d(\lambda))\omega\}.$$
(16)

If function d is strongly convex and LC^3 , function F is LC^2 , and set K satisfies the LICQ, then $\hat{\omega} = \omega(\lambda)$ is unique and semismooth. Moreover, $\varphi_{Au}(\lambda)$ is SC^1 with the gradient given by:

$$\nabla_{\lambda}\varphi_{Au}(\lambda) = F(\lambda)^{T} + (\lambda - \hat{\omega})^{T} (\nabla_{\lambda}F(\lambda) - \nabla_{\lambda\lambda}d(\lambda)).$$
(17)

Proof: See the proof in Appendix **B**.

As mentioned below (7), it is possible to define a merit function on the entire space $\mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}}$ such that the VI is reformulated as an *unconstrained* optimization problem, which is generally easier than the constrained problem. One such merit function is first proposed by Peng [38], called *D*-gap function, where D stands for Difference because it is defined as the difference of two regularized gap functions [20]. Inspired by Peng's study, we define a class of merit functions called generalized D-gap *function*, which is based on a variant of $\varphi_{Au}(\lambda)$ and casts VI as an unconstrained optimization problem.

Definition 8 (generalized D-gap function): Considering a variant of $\varphi_{Au}(\lambda)$ denoted by $\varphi_{Au}^c(\lambda)$, which is defined by scaling the function d in $L_{Au}(\lambda, \omega)$ with a constant c > 0:

$$\varphi_{Au}^{c}(\lambda) = \sup_{\omega \in K} \{ cd(\lambda) - cd(\omega) + (F(\lambda)^{T} - c\nabla_{\lambda}d(\lambda))(\lambda - \omega) \}.$$
(18)

Let a and b be two given constants satisfying b > a > 0. Let $\varphi_{Au}^{ab}: \mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a function given by:

$$\varphi_{Au}^{ab}(\lambda) = \varphi_{Au}^{a}(\lambda) - \varphi_{Au}^{b}(\lambda), \qquad (19)$$

where $\varphi_{Au}^{a}(\lambda)$ and $\varphi_{Au}^{b}(\lambda)$ are functions defined by (18) with constant a and b, respectively. We refer to function $\varphi^{ab}_{Au}(\lambda)$ as the generalized D-gap function. \Box The properties of φ^{ab}_{Au} we focus on are summarized below.

Theorem 3: The following two statements are valid for the generalized D-gap function $\varphi_{Au}^{ab}(\lambda)$ given by (19):

• (Equivalence) $\varphi_{Au}^{ab}(\lambda) \geq 0, \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}}$. Furthermore, $\varphi_{Au}^{ab}(\lambda) = 0$ if and only if $\lambda \in \mathrm{SOL}(K, F)$. Hence, $\varphi^{ab}_{Au}(\lambda)$ is a merit function for the VI(K, F) for all $\lambda \in$

 $\mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}}$, and the solution to the VI(K, F) can be obtained by solving an *unconstrained* optimization problem:

$$\min_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}}} \varphi_{Au}^{ab}(\lambda).$$
(20)

- (Differentiability) If function d is strongly convex and LC³, function F is LC², and set K satisfies the LICQ, then φ^{ab}_{Au}(λ) is SC¹. □
 - *Proof:* See the proof in Appendix C.

We call $\varphi_{Au}(\lambda)$ and $\varphi_{Au}^{ab}(\lambda)$ generalized because they include many existing gap functions, such as functions proposed by Fukushima [20] and Peng [38], and we follow the naming of a monograph [9]. However, $\varphi_{Au}(\lambda)$ and $\varphi_{Au}^{ab}(\lambda)$ are still not general enough and can be regarded as the special cases of Wu's primal gap function [39] and Yamashita's D-gap function [40], respectively. Detailed studies of gap functions can be found in [39]–[44]. Nonetheless, these studies only prove that gap functions are (*Lipschitz*) continuously differentiable. Inspired by the Newton-type methods for Nash equilibrium problems [45], we enhance the differentiability of gap functions to be semismoothly differentiable, with additional assumptions that function d and F have stronger differentiability and set K satisfies LICQ. These assumptions are trivial but facilitate the development of fast-converging algorithms to solve VI.

The properties of φ_{Au} and φ_{Au}^{ab} enable us to solve VI using Newton-type optimization algorithms; however, the inherent drawbacks of φ_{Au} and φ_{Au}^{ab} hinder their practical application: First, only the global minimizers of optimization problems (15) and (20) coincide with the solutions of VI, whereas in general, φ_{Au} and φ_{Au}^{ab} are *nonconvex* and optimization algorithms are only capable of finding stationary points; Second, evaluating φ_{Au} , φ_{Au}^{ab} and their gradients requires solving at least one constrained maximization problem, which typically is expensive. Thus, merit-function-based algorithms using φ_{Au} and φ_{Au}^{ab} only apply to certain special cases. For example, under stronger assumptions on VI, the equivalence holds even for stationary points (Theorem 10.2.5 and 10.3.4 in [9]), or φ_{Au} and φ_{Au}^{ab} exhibit convexity [43], [44]. Our smoothing approaches for DVI are based on φ_{Au} and φ_{Au}^{ab} but mitigate their drawbacks by properly reformulating these functions and exploiting problem structures, as stated in the next subsection.

B. Gap-constraint-based reformulations

We are ready to state the proposed two gap-constraint-based reformulations for the discretized OCPEC (10). Since function $F(x, u, \lambda)$ in (10c) also includes variables x, u, we introduce an auxiliary variable $\eta = F(x, u, \lambda)$ to reduce the complexity of the gap function. The first proposed reformulation is based on the generalized primal gap function.

Proposition 2: Let $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}}$ be a closed convex set given by (5) and satisfies LICQ, $F : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}} \to \mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}}$ be a LC^2 function, $d : \mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a strongly convex and LC^3 function, and $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}}$ be an auxiliary variable. We define the generalized primal gap function $\varphi_{Au} : \mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}} \to \mathbb{R}$ as:

$$\varphi_{Au}(\lambda,\eta) = \sup_{\omega \in K} \{ d(\lambda) - d(\omega) + (\eta^T - \nabla_\lambda d(\lambda))(\lambda - \omega) \},$$
(21)

then the following two statements are valid:

λ ∈ SOL(K, F(x, u, λ)) if and only if (x, u, λ, η) satisfies a set of n_λ equalities and n_g + 1 inequalities:

$$F(x, u, \lambda) - \eta = 0, \qquad (22a)$$

$$q(\lambda) \ge 0, \tag{22b}$$

$$\varphi_{Au}(\lambda, \eta) < 0. \tag{22c}$$

We call (22) generalized-primal-gap-constraint-based reformulation for VI $(K, F(x, u, \lambda))$, and (22c) generalized primal gap constraint.

• $\varphi_{Au}(\lambda, \eta)$ is SC^1 ; moreover, we can evaluate $\varphi_{Au}(\lambda, \eta)$ and its gradient by:

$$\varphi_{Au}(\lambda,\eta) = d(\lambda) - d(\hat{\omega}) + (\eta^T - \nabla_\lambda d(\lambda))(\lambda - \hat{\omega}),$$
(23a)

$$\nabla_{\lambda}\varphi_{Au}(\lambda,\eta) = \eta^{T} - (\lambda - \hat{\omega})^{T} \nabla_{\lambda\lambda} d(\lambda), \qquad (23b)$$

$$\nabla_{\eta}\varphi_{Au}(\lambda,\eta) = (\lambda - \hat{\omega})^T, \qquad (23c)$$

with $\hat{\omega}$ being the unique solution to the strongly concave maximization problem that defines $\varphi_{Au}(\lambda, \eta)$:

$$\hat{\omega} = \omega(\lambda, \eta) = \arg\max_{\omega \in K} \{-d(\omega) - (\eta^T - \nabla_\lambda d(\lambda))\omega\}.$$
(24)

Proof: Based on the first statement of Theorem 2, from (22a) and (22b) we first have $\varphi_{Au}(\lambda,\eta) \ge 0$; together with (22c), we have $\varphi_{Au}(\lambda,\eta) = 0$, thus, the equivalence between SOL $(K, F(x, u, \lambda))$ and the reformulation (22) holds. The differentiability of $\varphi_{Au}(\lambda,\eta)$ is inherited from the second statement of Theorem 2.

Proposition 2 provides a new approach to smooth the DVI (8), that is, replacing the VI (8b) with its generalized-primalgap-constraint-based reformulation (22) and then relaxing the gap constraint (22c). Consequently, we obtain the *generalized-primal-gap-constraint-based reformulation* for the discretized OCPEC (10), which is a parameterized NLP problem:

$$\mathcal{P}_{gap}(s): \quad \min_{\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{\lambda}} L_T(x_N) + \sum_{n=1}^N L(x_n, u_n, \lambda_n), \quad (25a)$$

s.t.
$$x_{n-1} + \mathcal{F}(x_n, u_n, \lambda_n) = 0,$$
 (25b)

$$F(x_n, u_n, \lambda_n) - \eta_n = 0, \qquad (25c)$$

$$q(\lambda_n) \ge 0, \tag{25d}$$

$$s - \varphi_{Au}(\lambda_n, \eta_n) \ge 0,$$
 (25e)

$$G(x_n, u_n) \ge 0,\tag{25f}$$

$$C(x_n, u_n) = 0, \quad n = 1, \dots, N,$$
 (25g)

where $s \ge 0$ is a scalar relaxation parameter, and $\eta_n \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\lambda}$ is the auxiliary variable for VI function $F(x_n, u_n, \lambda_n)$. The relaxation strategy (25e) for (22c) is called *generalized primal gap relaxation strategy*.

The second proposed reformulation is based on the generalized D-gap function.

Proposition 3: Let $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}}$ be a closed convex set given by (5) and satisfies LICQ, $F : \mathbb{R}^{n_x} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_u} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}} \to \mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}}$ be a LC^2 function, $d : \mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a strongly convex and LC^3 function, and $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}}$ be an auxiliary variable. Let a and bbe two given constants satisfying b > a > 0. We define the generalized D-gap function $\varphi_{Au}^{ab} : \mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}} \to \mathbb{R}$ as:

$$\varphi_{Au}^{ab}(\lambda,\eta) = \varphi_{Au}^{a}(\lambda,\eta) - \varphi_{Au}^{b}(\lambda,\eta), \qquad (26)$$

where $\varphi^a_{Au}(\lambda,\eta)$ and $\varphi^b_{Au}(\lambda,\eta)$ are functions defined by:

$$\varphi_{Au}^{a}(\lambda,\eta) = \sup_{\omega \in K} \{\eta^{T}(\lambda-\omega) + ap(\lambda,\omega)\}, \qquad (27a)$$

$$\varphi_{Au}^{b}(\lambda,\eta) = \sup_{\omega \in K} \{\eta^{T}(\lambda-\omega) + bp(\lambda,\omega)\}, \qquad (27b)$$

with $p(\lambda, \omega) = d(\lambda) - d(\omega) + \nabla_{\lambda} d(\lambda)(\omega - \lambda)$, then the following two statements are valid:

λ ∈ SOL(K, F(x, u, λ)) if and only if (x, u, λ, η) satisfies a set of n_λ equalities and one inequality:

$$F(x, u, \lambda) - \eta = 0, \tag{28a}$$

$$\varphi_{Au}^{ab}(\lambda,\eta) \le 0. \tag{28b}$$

We call (28) generalized-D-gap-constraint-based reformulation for VI($K, F(x, u, \lambda)$), and (28b) generalized Dgap constraint.

• $\varphi_{Au}^{ab}(\lambda,\eta)$ is SC^1 ; moreover, we can evaluate $\varphi_{Au}^{ab}(\lambda,\eta)$ and its gradient by:

$$\varphi_{Au}^{ab}(\lambda,\eta) = (\hat{\omega}^b - \hat{\omega}^a)^T \eta + ap(\lambda,\hat{\omega}^a) - bp(\lambda,\hat{\omega}^b),$$
(29a)

$$\nabla_{\lambda}\varphi_{Au}^{ab}(\lambda,\eta) = (b(\lambda - \hat{\omega}^b) - a(\lambda - \hat{\omega}^a))^T \nabla_{\lambda\lambda} d(\lambda),$$
(29b)

$$\nabla_{\eta}\varphi^{ab}_{Au}(\lambda,\eta) = (\hat{\omega}^b - \hat{\omega}^a)^T, \qquad (29c)$$

with $\hat{\omega}^a$ and $\hat{\omega}^b$ being the unique solution to the strongly concave maximization problem that defines $\varphi^a_{Au}(\lambda,\eta)$ and $\varphi^b_{Au}(\lambda,\eta)$, respectively:

$$\hat{\omega}^{a} = \omega^{a}(\lambda, \eta)$$

= $\arg \max_{\omega \in K} \{-ad(\omega) - (\eta^{T} - a\nabla_{\lambda}d(\lambda))\omega\},$ (30a)

$$\hat{\omega}^{b} = \omega^{b}(\lambda, \eta)$$

= $\arg \max_{\omega \in K} \{-bd(\omega) - (\eta^{T} - b\nabla_{\lambda}d(\lambda))\omega\}.$ (30b)

Proof: Proposition 3 is a direct result of Theorem 3. Its proof is identical to that of Proposition 2 and is omitted.

Similar to (25), we can smooth the DVI (8) based on Proposition 3 and thereby obtain the *generalized-D-gap-constraint-based reformulation* for the discretized OCPEC (10):

$$\mathcal{P}_{gap}^{ab}(s): \quad \min_{\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{\lambda}} L_T(x_N) + \sum_{n=1}^N L(x_n, u_n, \lambda_n), \quad (31a)$$

s.t.
$$x_{n-1} + \mathcal{F}(x_n, u_n, \lambda_n) = 0,$$
 (31b)

$$F(x_n, u_n, \lambda_n) - \eta_n = 0, \qquad (31c)$$

$$s - \varphi_{Au}^{ab}(\lambda_n, \eta_n) \ge 0, \tag{31d}$$

$$G(x_n, u_n) \ge 0,\tag{31e}$$

$$C(x_n, u_n) = 0, \quad n = 1, \dots, N.$$
 (31f)

The relaxation strategy (31d) for (28b) is called *generalized D*-gap relaxation strategy.

C. Favorable properties

We now summarize the favorable properties of the proposed gap-constraint-based reformulations (25) and (31).

First, they mitigate the drawbacks of φ_{Au} and φ_{Au}^{ab} . Since φ_{Au} and φ_{Au}^{ab} are formulated as *hard constraints* rather than

cost functions, we only need to ensure the feasibility of the iterates, which is more manageable than finding the global minimizer of a non-convex cost function. Moreover, the computation bottleneck can be overcome by exploiting the OCP or VI structure, as discussed in subsection IV-D.

Second, they are *multiplier-free* (i.e., establishing the equivalence without additional Lagrange multipliers) and thereby possess a *more concise constraint system*, as shown in the fourth column of Table III.

Third, they are *semismoothly differentiable* regardless of the value of s. Hence, we can solve $\mathcal{P}_{gap}(s)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{gap}^{ab}(s)$ with any given s using Newton-type methods. The fifth column of Table III compares the differentiability of various reformulations. Note that the Kanzow–Schwartz strategy can only generate a continuously differentiable constraint system.

Fourth, their feasible set is equivalent to that of the original problem (10) when s = 0 and *exhibits a feasible interior* when s > 0 (see subsection IV-E). Hence, although $\mathcal{P}_{gap}(s)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{gap}^{ab}(s)$ lack constraint regularity when s = 0 (see subsection IV-F), their regularity is recovered when s > 0. Thus, we can solve the original problem (10) using the continuation method that solves a sequence of $\mathcal{P}_{gap}(s)$ (or $\mathcal{P}_{gap}^{ab}(s)$) with $s \to 0$.

D. Computation considerations

We discuss how to accelerate the evaluation of gap functions and their gradients by exploiting the OCP and VI structure.

First, since $\varphi_{Au}(\lambda_n, \eta_n)$, $\varphi_{Au}^{ab}(\lambda_n, \eta_n)$ and their gradients in (25) and (31) only depend on variables of the stage *n*, they can be computed in parallel with up to *N* cores using certain fast projection methods for convex optimization [46];

Second, if $\varphi_{Au}(\lambda_n, \eta_n)$, $\varphi_{Au}^{ab}(\lambda_n, \eta_n)$ and their gradients are computed in serial, observe that the maximization problems in (24) and (30) are only parameterized by λ_n and η_n , and the parameters of adjacent problems may not change significantly. Consequently, the optimal active sets of the adjacent problems may exhibit slight differences or even remain unchanged. This enables us to solve these maximization problems using certain solvers that are based on active set warm-start techniques. For example, if set K is polyhedral, we can specify a quadratic function $d(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2}\lambda^T\lambda$ to simplify the maximization problems in (24) and (30) into concave quadratic programming (QP):

$$\hat{\omega} = \omega(\lambda, \eta) = \arg\max_{\omega \in K} \{-\frac{1}{2}\omega^T \omega - (\eta - \lambda)^T \omega\}, \quad (32a)$$

$$\hat{\omega}^a = \omega^a(\lambda, \eta) = \arg\max_{\omega \in K} \{-\frac{a}{2}\omega^T \omega - (\eta - a\lambda)^T \omega\}, \quad (32b)$$

$$\hat{\omega}^b = \omega^b(\lambda, \eta) = \arg\max_{\omega \in K} \{-\frac{b}{2}\omega^T \omega - (\eta - b\lambda)^T \omega\}.$$
 (32c)

In this case, a well-suited QP solver is qpOASES [47], which uses the *online active set strategy* [48]. The effectiveness of this approach has been confirmed in our previous study [19];

Third, the solution to the maximization problems in (24) and (30) may even possess an explicit expression. For example, if set *K* exhibits a box-constrained structure:

$$K := \{ \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}} | b_l \le \lambda \le b_u \}, \tag{33}$$

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 we can specify a quadratic function $d(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2}\lambda^T\lambda$ such

Table III Comparison of different reformulation for the equilibrium constraints (10c)

| Reformulation | Relaxed constraints | Relaxation strategy | Sizes | Differentiability (under Assumption 1, 2) |
|----------------------|--|---|--|--|
| KKT-condition-based | complementarity constraint (6b) | Scholtes Lin-Fukushima Kadrani Steffensen–Ulbrich Kanzow–Schwartz | $ \begin{array}{l} N(n_{\lambda}+3n_{g})\\ N(n_{\lambda}+2n_{g})\\ N(n_{\lambda}+3n_{g})\\ N(n_{\lambda}+3n_{g})\\ N(n_{\lambda}+3n_{g}) \end{array} $ | twice Lipschitz continuously differentiable twice Lipschitz continuously differentiable twice Lipschitz continuously differentiable twice continuously differentiable once continuously differentiable |
| Gap-constraint-based | gap constraint (22c) gap constraint (28b) | Generalized primal gap Generalized D-gap | $\frac{N(n_{\lambda}+n_{g}+1)}{N(n_{\lambda}+1)}$ | semismoothly differentiable semismoothly differentiable |

that the solution to problems in (24) and (30) are the projection of the stationary point of these problems onto set K:

$$\hat{\omega} = \omega(\lambda, \eta) = \prod_{[b_l, b_u]} (\lambda - \eta), \tag{34a}$$

$$\hat{\omega}^a = \omega^a(\lambda, \eta) = \Pi_{[b_l, b_u]}(\lambda - \frac{1}{a}\eta), \qquad (34b)$$

$$\hat{\omega}^b = \omega^b(\lambda, \eta) = \Pi_{[b_l, b_u]}(\lambda - \frac{1}{b}\eta), \qquad (34c)$$

with Π_K the Euclidean projector. Since box-constrained projection operators are formed by min and max functions, their computational cost is negligible and has also been confirmed in our previous study [19]. Furthermore, the derivatives of boxconstrained projection operators, which are necessary for the computation of the second-order derivatives of gap functions, can be computed efficiently by the algorithmic differentiation software, such as CasADi symbolic framework [49].

E. Geometric interpretation

We provide a geometric interpretation of the relaxed feasible sets formed by the gap-constraint-based reformulations (25) and (31) through two simple yet common MPEC examples. The MPEC examples have the form:

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

where $\lambda, \eta \in \mathbb{R}$ are scalar decision variables, and $J : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth cost function. Here we specify a quadratic function $d(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2$ in the gap functions (23a) and (29a).

Example 1: The first example is an MPCC in the form of

$$\min_{\lambda,\eta} J(\lambda,\eta), \text{ s.t. } 0 \le \lambda \perp \eta \ge 0.$$
(36)

This is a special case of MPEC (35) with $K = \mathbb{R}_+$. By regarding λ as the VI variable and substituting (34a) into (23a), we have a generalized-primal-gap-constraint-based reformulation for the MPCC (36) with a relaxation parameter $s \ge 0$:

$$\min_{\lambda,\eta} J(\lambda,\eta), \text{ s.t. } \lambda \ge 0, \ s - \varphi_{Au}(\lambda,\eta) \ge 0,$$
(37)

where $\varphi_{Au}(\lambda, \eta) = \frac{1}{2} \{\eta^2 - (\max(0, \eta - \lambda))^2\}$, and its contour is shown in Fig. 2(a). Hence, the feasible set of (37) is the colored region in Fig. 2(b). Similarly, given two constants b > a > 0, by regarding λ as the VI variable and substituting (34b) and (34c) into (29a), we have a generalized-D-gap-constraintbased reformulation for the MPCC (36):

$$\min_{\lambda,\eta} J(\lambda,\eta), \text{ s.t. } s - \varphi_{Au}^{ab}(\lambda,\eta) \ge 0,$$
(38)

where $\varphi_{Au}^{ab}(\lambda,\eta) = \frac{b-a}{2ab}\eta^2 - \frac{\{\max(0,\eta-a\lambda)\}^2}{2a} + \frac{\{\max(0,\eta-b\lambda)\}^2}{2b}$, and its contour is shown in Fig. 2(c). Hence, the feasible set of (38) is the colored region in Fig. 2(d). Note that $\varphi_{Au}(\lambda,\eta)$ and $\varphi_{Au}^{ab}(\lambda,\eta)$ are SC^1 , which can also be derived from the semismoothness of max (or min) function on affine functions (Proposition 7.4.7, [9]). \Box

Example 2: We next consider the MPEC (35) with a boxconstrained set $K = \{\lambda \mid b_l \le \lambda \le b_u\}$. This box-constrained MPEC can be further written down as:

$$\min_{\lambda,\eta} J(\lambda,\eta), \tag{39a}$$

s.t.
$$b_l \le \lambda \le b_u$$
, $(\lambda - b_l)\eta \le 0$, $(b_u - \lambda)\eta \ge 0$. (39b)

Its feasible set 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 $\lambda = b_u$. Its generalized-primal-gap-constraint-based reformulation is:

$$\min_{\lambda,\eta} J(\lambda,\eta), \text{ s.t. } b_l \le \lambda \le b_u, \ s - \varphi_{Au}(\lambda,\eta) \ge 0, \quad (40)$$

and its generalized-D-gap-constraint-based reformulation is:

$$\min_{\lambda,\eta} J(\lambda,\eta), \text{ s.t. } s - \varphi_{Au}^{ab}(\lambda,\eta) \ge 0,$$
(41)

with $s \ge 0$ the relaxation parameter. φ_{Au} and φ_{Au}^{ab} can be explicitly expressed and their contours are shown in Fig. 3(a) and 3(c), respectively. Thus, the feasible sets of (40) and (41) are the colored region in Fig. 3(b) and 3(d), respectively. \Box

Remark 2: Our reformulations also provide a new class of MPCC-tailored relaxation strategies. The relaxed feasible set in Fig. 2(b) and 2(d) intuitively appears to be a combination of the Scholtes method (Fig. 1(a)) and Kanzow–Schwartz method (Fig. 1(e)), where the nonsmooth original point is smoothed and the perpendicular axis structures are (partially) preserved. In [37], it is concluded that under the standard implementation of the continuation method, that is, each problem is solved exactly using NLP solvers, the Scholtes method has the best practical performance, while the Kanzow–Schwartz method has the strongest theoretical convergence properties. Thus, a question worth discussing is whether our reformulations can combine the advantages of both methods to solve MPCC. We leave it for future research. \Box

F. Constraint regularity

We investigate whether the gap-constraint-based reformulations satisfy the constraint qualifications when s = 0.



Figure 2. Geometric interpretation of the gap-constraint-based reformulations: MPCC example



Figure 3. Geometric interpretation of the gap-constraint-based reformulations: box-constrained MPEC example

Theorem 4: The gap-constraint-based reformulations (25) and (31) violate the LICQ and MFCQ at any feasible point when s = 0. \Box

Proof: See the proof in Appendix **D**.

The violation of LICQ and MFCQ in the constraint system (22) and (28) is inevitable owing to their equivalences with the VI solution set. Nonetheless, the constraint system (22) and (28) have a feasible interior when their inequalities are relaxed. Thus, if the constraint Jacobian of the proposed reformulations (25) and (31) satisfies certain full rank assumptions, then the LICQ and MFCQ hold on their constraint system when s > 0.

Remark 3: Similar discussions also arise in bilevel optimization. In [50], the constraint qualification is interpreted as stating the constraints without the optima of an embedded optimization problem; In [51], regarding various reformulations of the bilevel problem, it is concluded that if the equivalence between the reformulations and the original problem holds, these reformulations must violate constraint qualification. \Box

V. DYNAMICAL SYSTEM APPROACH TO SOLVE OCPEC

A. Problem setting and assumptions

The proposed reformulations enable us to solve discretized OCPEC (10) using the continuation method that solves a sequence of $\mathcal{P}_{gap}(s)$ (or $\mathcal{P}_{gap}^{ab}(s)$) with $s \to 0$. However, similar to $\mathcal{P}_{kkt}(s)$, it is still difficult to solve $\mathcal{P}_{gap}(s)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{gap}^{ab}(s)$ when s is small. Thus, instead of using the standard implementation of the continuation method that solves each problem exactly using NLP solvers, we propose a novel dynamical system approach to perform the continuation method, which achieves a fast local convergence by exploiting the semismooth differentiability of the gap function.

Since both $\mathcal{P}_{gap}(s)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{gap}^{ab}(s)$ are the parameterized NLP with an OCP-type sparse structure, we consider the following NLP with parameterized inequalities throughout this section to stream the presentation:

$$\mathcal{P}(s): \min_{\boldsymbol{z}} \boldsymbol{J}(\boldsymbol{z}),$$
 (42a)

s.t.
$$h(z) = 0,$$
 (42b)

$$\boldsymbol{c}(\boldsymbol{z},s) \ge 0, \tag{42c}$$

where $z \in \mathbb{R}^{n_z}$ is the decision variable, $s \ge 0$ is the relaxation parameter, $J : \mathbb{R}^{n_z} \to \mathbb{R}$ is the cost function, $h : \mathbb{R}^{n_z} \to \mathbb{R}^{n_h}$ and $c : \mathbb{R}^{n_z} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^{n_c}$ are the equality and inequality constraints, respectively. A point z satisfying (42b) and (42c) is referred to as a *feasible point* of $\mathcal{P}(s)$. Let $\gamma_h \in \mathbb{R}^{n_h}$ and $\gamma_c \in \mathbb{R}^{n_c}$ be the Lagrange multipliers for constraints h and c, respectively. The Lagrangian of $\mathcal{P}(s)$ is defined as:

$$\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_h, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_c, s) = \boldsymbol{J}(\boldsymbol{z}) + \boldsymbol{\gamma}_h^T \boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{z}) - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_c^T \boldsymbol{c}(\boldsymbol{z}, s), \qquad (43)$$

and the KKT conditions associated with $\mathcal{P}(s)$ are:

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{z}} \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_h, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_c, \boldsymbol{s}) = 0, \tag{44a}$$

$$\boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{z}) = 0, \tag{44b}$$

$$\boldsymbol{c}(\boldsymbol{z},s) \ge 0, \ \boldsymbol{\gamma}_c \ge 0, \ \boldsymbol{c}(\boldsymbol{z},s) \odot \boldsymbol{\gamma}_c = 0.$$
 (44c)

A triple $(z^*, \gamma_h^*, \gamma_c^*)$ satisfying (44) is referred to as a *KKT* point of $\mathcal{P}(s)$. We make the following assumptions on $\mathcal{P}(s)$: Assumption 3: J and h are LC^2 , whereas c is SC^1 w.r.t. z and affine in s;

Assumption 4: Any feasible point violates MFCQ if s = 0; Assumption 5: At least one KKT point exists and satisfies LICQ if s > 0; Assumption 6: For each $\mathcal{H} \in \partial \nabla_{z} \mathcal{L}$, the reduced Hessian $W^{T} \mathcal{H} W$ is positive definite at the KKT point, where $\partial \nabla_{z} \mathcal{L} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_{z} \times n_{z}}$ is the generalized Jacobian of $\nabla_{z} \mathcal{L}$ w.r.t. z, and $W \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{z} \times (n_{z} - n_{h})}$ is a matrix whose columns are the basis for the null space of $\nabla_{z} h$.

Here, Assumption 3 is consistent with Assumption 2, the differentiability of φ_{Au} and φ_{Au}^{ab} , and the relaxation strategies (25e) and (31d); Assumption 4 follows from discussions in subsection IV-F; and Assumptions 5 and 6 are used to ensure the nonsingularity of the KKT matrix, as shown in Lemma 2.

B. Fictitious-time semismooth Newton flow dynamical system

We now present the proposed dynamical approach to solve a sequence of $\mathcal{P}(s)$ with $s \to 0$. We first transform the KKT system (44) into a system of equations. This is achieved by using the smoothed FB function [52]:

$$\psi(a, b, \sigma) = \sqrt{a^2 + b^2 + \sigma^2} - a - b,$$
 (45)

with scalar variables a, b and a smoothed parameter $\sigma \ge 0$. The function ψ is smooth for any $\sigma > 0$, and nonsmooth only when $a = b = \sigma = 0$. Furthermore, we have that:

$$\psi(a,b,\sigma) = 0 \iff a \ge 0, \ b \ge 0, \ ab = \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2.$$
 (46)

We collect all variables into a vector $\boldsymbol{Y} = [\boldsymbol{z}^T, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_h^T, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_c^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n_Y}$ with $n_Y = n_z + n_h + n_c$, and all parameters into a vector $\boldsymbol{p} = [s, \sigma]^T \in \mathbb{R}^2_+$. The KKT system (44) can be rewritten as:

$$\boldsymbol{T}(\boldsymbol{Y}, \boldsymbol{p}) = \begin{bmatrix} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{z}} \mathcal{L}^{T}(\boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{h}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{c}, s) \\ \boldsymbol{h}(\boldsymbol{z}) \\ \Psi(\boldsymbol{c}(\boldsymbol{z}, s), \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{c}, \sigma) \end{bmatrix} = 0, \quad (47)$$

where the KKT function $T : \mathbb{R}^{n_Y} \times \mathbb{R}^2_+ \to \mathbb{R}^{n_Y}$ is semismooth (see Lemma 1). Here, the complementarity conditions (44c) are mapped into $\Psi(c(z, s), \gamma_c, \sigma) = 0$ by using the smoothed FB function in an element-wise manner.

Let \mathbf{Y}^* be a solution to (47) with a given parameter p. We aim to find a solution \mathbf{Y}^* associated with a small parameter p. Instead of considering \mathbf{Y}^* as a function of p and computing a sequence of solutions $\{\mathbf{Y}^{*,l}\}_{l=0}^{l_{max}}$ by solving (47) exactly based on a given sequence of decreasing parameter $\{p^l\}_{l=0}^{l_{max}}$, we consider both \mathbf{Y}^* and p as functions of a *fictitious time* $\tau \in [0, \infty)$, i.e., we define the optimal solution trajectory and parameter trajectory as $\mathbf{Y}^*(\tau)$ and $p(\tau)$ respectively such that

$$\boldsymbol{T}(\boldsymbol{Y}^*(\tau), \boldsymbol{p}(\tau))) = 0, \quad \forall \tau \ge 0.$$
(48)

Regarding $p(\tau)$, since p is a user-specified parameter, we define a dynamical system to govern $p(\tau)$, called *p*-system:

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{p}} = -\epsilon_p (\boldsymbol{p} - \boldsymbol{p}_e), \ \boldsymbol{p}(0) = \boldsymbol{p}_0, \tag{49}$$

where $\epsilon_p > 0$ is the stabilization parameter, and $p_0, p_e \in \mathbb{R}^2$ are the points where we expect $p(\tau)$ to start and converge.

Regarding $Y^*(\tau)$, let it start from $Y^*(0) = Y_0^*$, with Y_0^* the solution to (47) associated with the given p_0 . Since Y_0^* in general is non-unique, multiple trajectories $Y^*(\tau)$ exist satisfying (48) for a given $p(\tau)$, and here we focus on tracking one of these trajectories. Inspired by our earlier research in real-time optimization [26], we define a dynamical system evolving along the fictitious time axis such that its system state $\mathbf{Y}(\tau)$, with $\mathbf{Y}(0) = \mathbf{Y}_0$ in the neighborhood of \mathbf{Y}_0^* , finally converge to $\mathbf{Y}^*(\tau)$ with $\mathbf{Y}^*(0) = \mathbf{Y}_0^*$ as $\tau \to \infty$. This dynamical system is derived as follows.

Since $Y^*(\tau)$ must satisfy (48), we first define a dynamical system to stabilize $T(Y(\tau), p(\tau)) = 0$:

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{T}}(\boldsymbol{Y}(\tau),\boldsymbol{p}(\tau)) = -\epsilon_T \boldsymbol{T}(\boldsymbol{Y}(\tau),\boldsymbol{p}(\tau)), \quad (50)$$

with stabilization parameter $\epsilon_T > 0$. Since T is semismooth, we next replace the left-hand side of (50) with the Newton approximation of T and obtain a linear equation w.r.t. \dot{Y} :

$$\mathcal{K}\dot{\boldsymbol{Y}} = -\epsilon_T \boldsymbol{T} - \mathcal{S}\dot{\boldsymbol{p}},\tag{51}$$

with $\mathcal{K} \in \partial T \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_Y \times n_Y}$ and $\mathcal{S} := \nabla_p T \in \mathbb{R}^{n_Y \times 2}$. Here, the KKT matrix ∂T is the generalized Jacobian of T w.r.t. Y, and we have that ∂T is nonsingular in the neighborhood of Y^* when p > 0 (see Lemma 2) and all \mathcal{K} have the form:

$$\mathcal{K}(\boldsymbol{Y}, \boldsymbol{p}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{H} & \nabla_{\boldsymbol{z}} \boldsymbol{h}^T & -\nabla_{\boldsymbol{z}} \boldsymbol{c}^T \\ \nabla_{\boldsymbol{z}} \boldsymbol{h} & 0 & 0 \\ \nabla_{\boldsymbol{c}} \Psi \nabla_{\boldsymbol{z}} \boldsymbol{c} & 0 & \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\gamma}_c} \Psi \end{bmatrix}.$$
 (52)

The parameter sensitivity matrix S has the form:

$$\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{Y}, p) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0\\ \nabla_{\boldsymbol{c}} \Psi \nabla_{\boldsymbol{s}} \boldsymbol{c} & \nabla_{\sigma} \Psi \end{bmatrix}.$$
 (53)

Thus, following from (49) and (51), we obtain a differential equation for $Y(\tau)$, called *Y*-system:

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{Y}} = -\mathcal{K}^{-1}(\epsilon_T \boldsymbol{T} - \epsilon_p \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{p} - \boldsymbol{p}_e)), \ \boldsymbol{Y}(0) = \boldsymbol{Y}_0, \quad (54)$$

where the initial value $Y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_Y}$ and the given p_0 satisfy (47) within the desired tolerance. Finally, with the sampling of $p(\tau)$ governed by (49), we can compute $Y(\tau)$ by numerically integrating \dot{Y} . In the next subsection, we show that $Y(\tau)$ converges to $Y^*(\tau)$ exponentially.

Remark 4: The right-hand side function in (54) can be evaluated efficiently using either OCP-structure-exploiting methods (e.g., Riccati recursion if variables are rearranged stage-wise) or forward difference generalized minimum residual method [26]. The computation time of solving (54) mainly depends on the size of T and thereby is almost constant. Thus, even though the proposed dynamical system approach is also applicable to $\mathcal{P}_{kkt}(s)$, the proposed reformulations are preferred as they possess a more concise constraint system. \Box

C. Convergence analysis

First, we investigate the KKT function and matrix.

Lemma 1: Let Assumption 3 holds. For any given p > 0, the KKT function T(Y, p) is semismooth. \Box

Proof: This is a direct result based on Assumption 3, the smoothness of smoothed FB function ψ , and the composition rule of semismooth functions (Proposition 7.4.4, [9]).

Lemma 2: Let Assumptions 3 - 6 hold. For any given p > 0, let Y^* be the solution to (47). Every $\mathcal{K}(Y, p) \in \partial T(Y, p)$ is nonsingular for any $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n_Y}$ in the neighborhood of Y^* . \Box

Proof: Assumption 5 implies that $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{z}} \boldsymbol{h}$ is full row rank at \boldsymbol{Y}^* . Thus, the nonsingularity of each $\mathcal{K}(\boldsymbol{Y}, \boldsymbol{p})$ at \boldsymbol{Y}^* can

be proved by Theorem 1 in [36]. Based on Lemma 7.5.2 in [9], the nonsingularity holds in the neighborhood of Y^* .

We now show the exponential convergence property.

Theorem 5: Let Assumption 3 – 6 hold. Let $\mathbf{Y}(\tau)$ and $\mathbf{p}(\tau)$ be the trajectories governed by the Y-system (54) and p-system (49), respectively. Let $\mathbf{Y}^*(\tau)$ be an optimal solution trajectory satisfying (48) and starting from $\mathbf{Y}^*(0) = \mathbf{Y}_0^*$, where \mathbf{Y}_0^* is a solution to (47) associated with the given \mathbf{p}_0 . Then, there exists a neighborhood of \mathbf{Y}_0^* denoted by \mathcal{N}_{exp}^* , such that for any $\mathbf{Y}(0) = \mathbf{Y}_0 \in \mathcal{N}_{exp}^*$, we have that $\mathbf{Y}(\tau)$ exponentially converges to $\mathbf{Y}^*(\tau)$ as $\tau \to \infty$, that is, the following inequality holds:

$$\|\mathbf{Y}(\tau) - \mathbf{Y}^{*}(\tau)\|_{2} \le k_{1} \|\mathbf{Y}(0) - \mathbf{Y}^{*}(0)\|_{2} e^{-k_{2}\tau},$$
 (55)

with constants $k_1, k_2 > 0$. \Box

Proof: See the proof in Appendix E.

Remark 5: The exponential convergence of the dynamical system (54) is a standard result if the KKT function T(Y, p) is continuously differentiable, which requires that functions in the NLP problem (42) are at least LC^2 , see Proposition 2 in [30]. Here we weaken the differentiability assumption, that is, we show that the exponential convergence holds even if T(Y, p) is semismooth, which only requires that functions in the NLP problem (42) are at least SC^1 . \Box

VI. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENT

The proposed reformulation and dynamical system approach were implemented in MATLAB 2023b based on the CasADi symbolic framework [49]. An NLP solver called IPOPT [53] (with default setting) was utilized through the CasADi interface when we needed to solve NLP problems. All experiments were performed on a laptop PC with a 1.80 GHz Intel Core i7-8550U. We consider examples with a box-constrained set *K* and specify a quadratic function such that φ_{Au} and φ_{Au}^{ab} have an explicit expression, as stated in subsection IV-D and IV-E. The code is available at https://github.com/KY-Lin22/ Gap-OCPEC.

We discretize the ODE (10b) by the implicit Euler method with various Δt . We specify the p-system by $\epsilon_p = 10$, $\mathbf{p}_0 = [1, 10^{-2}]^T$, and $\mathbf{p}_e = [10^{-6}, 10^{-6}]^T$. We specify the Y-system by $\epsilon_T = 100$ and compute $\mathbf{Y}(\tau)$ at each fictitious time point $\tau_l := l\Delta \tau$ by integrating $\dot{\mathbf{Y}}$ using either explicit Euler method or RK4 method, where $l \in \{0, \dots, l_{max}\}$ with $l_{max} = 500$ is called continuation step and $\Delta \tau = 10^{-2}$ is the fictitious time step. Here $\mathbf{Y}(0)$ is obtained by solving (42) exactly with given \mathbf{p}_0 using IPOPT.

A. Illustrative example

We provide a one-dimensional $(n_x, n_u, n_\lambda = 1)$ simple example to illustrate the convergence properties of the proposed approach. The example is in the form of

$$\min_{x(\cdot),u(\cdot),\lambda(\cdot)} \int_0^T (\|x(t)\|_2^2 + \|u(t)\|_2^2) dt$$
(56a)

s.t.
$$\dot{x}(t) = 3x(t) + 3u(t) - 0.5\lambda(t),$$
 (56b)

$$\eta(t) = -2u(t) + \lambda(t), \tag{56c}$$

$$0 \le \lambda(t) \perp \eta(t) \ge 0, \tag{56d}$$





Figure 4. Error between the analytical and numerical solutions.



Figure 5. KKT residual w.r.t the continuation step.

with x(0) = 1 and T = 1. It is an OCP of the linear complementarity system with an analytical optimal solution, denoted by $x_{ana}^*(t)$, $u_{ana}^*(t)$ and $\lambda_{ana}^*(t)$ (see Example 1 in [54]). We discretize (56) with $\Delta t = 10^{-2}$ into a parameterized NLP (42) using various gap-constraint-based reformulations, where φ_{Au}^{ab} is specified with various a, b. We solve the parameterized NLP using the proposed dynamical system approach, where \dot{Y} is integrated by the RK4 method. We return the iterate at l_{max} as the numerical optimal solution we found, denoted by $x_{num}^*(t)$, $u_{num}^*(t)$ and $\lambda_{num}^*(t)$. The error between the analytical and numerical solutions is shown in Fig. 4, indicating that all the numerical solutions successfully converged to the analytical solution. The error is bounded by $\Delta t = 10^{-2}$ as the timestepping method has only the first-order accuracy.

The history of the KKT residual $||T||_2/N$ w.r.t. the continuation step is shown in Fig. 5. The plots are linear on the log scale before converging to the point within machine accuracy. Thus, the local exponential convergence is confirmed.

B. Benchmark test

We collect some continuous-time OCPEC examples from [54], specify various cost functions and initial conditions in these OCPEC, and discretize them with time steps $N \in$



(a) Performance profile (cost function value).

Figure 6. Performance profiles of the large benchmark test

 $\{100, 200, 300, 400, 500\}$. This leads to a benchmark problem set including 90 discretized OCPEC in the form of (10).

Regarding the implementation of the proposed reformulations and approach, φ_{Au}^{ab} is specified with a = 0.1, b = 10, and \dot{Y} is integrated by the explicit Euler method. Several stateof-the-art solution methods are implemented for comparison. The comparison methods use the KKT-condition-based reformulations with various relaxation strategies as listed in Table II, and solve the parameterized NLP using the continuation method with IPOPT, where the relaxation parameter is updated by $s^{l+1} = 0.5s^l$. We measure the violation of equilibrium constraints using the *natural residual* $r_{na} = \lambda - \prod_{K} (\lambda - F)$, where $r_{na} = 0$ if and only if $\lambda \in SOL(K, F)$. We measure the violation of KKT conditions (44) using the KKT error $r_{KKT} = [\nabla_{\boldsymbol{z}} \mathcal{L}, \boldsymbol{h}^T, \min(\boldsymbol{c}, 0)^T, \min(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_c, 0)^T, (\boldsymbol{c} \odot \boldsymbol{\gamma}_c)^T]^T.$ All the proposed and comparison methods are terminated if the iterate satisfying $||r_{na}||_{\infty} \leq 10^{-2}$ and $||r_{KKT}||_{\infty} \leq 10^{-4}$. Performances are compared in terms of the cost function value and computation time and demonstrated using the Dolan-Moré performance profiles [55].

As demonstrated in Fig. 6(a), solutions obtained by various solution methods have very similar cost function values. Thus, the focus of the comparison is on the computation time. As demonstrated in Fig. 6(b), the primal-gap-constraint-based and D-gap-constraint-based reformulations with the dynamical system approach have the probability, which is 58.9% and 8.9%, of being the fastest solver to find an optimal solution. The best comparison method is the KKT-condition-based reformulation using Scholtes' relaxation strategy and IPOPT solver, with the probability 31.1% of being the best. However, its plot is lower than that of the proposed methods, indicating that it is not as competitive as the proposed method when solving the remaining problems where it is not the best choice.

This benchmark test also shows that the proposed methods failed to converge in approximately 6.7% of the problems. Additionally, although the D-gap-constraint-based reformulation has an advantage in solving (54) owing to the smaller



(b) Performance profile (computation time).

problem size, it requires more continuation steps under the unified parameters ϵ_p , ϵ_T , a, b given in this study. However, we observe that its performance on some problems can be improved by adjusting these parameters, although their results are omitted in this study. This presents a future research direction: the convergence properties might be enhanced by modifying the Y-system structure. Some recent studies in dynamical system approaches might provide helpful insights, for example, scaling the right-hand-side of the system [32] or introducing certain feedback structures [31].

VII. CONCLUSION

This study focused on using the direct method to solve the OCPEC. We addressed the numerical difficulties by proposing a new smoothing approach to the DVI and a dynamical system approach to solve a sequence of the smoothing approximations of the discretized OCPEC. The fast local convergence properties and computational efficiency were confirmed using an illustrative example and a benchmark test. This study can be extended to solve a large class of challenge problems, including other nonsmooth OCP, MPCC, MPEC, mixed-integer programming (and optimal control), and bilevel optimization (and optimal control). Regarding our future works, we plan to investigate how to solve the MPCC using a dynamical system approach (with a feedback structure) such that the solutions finally converge to a strong MPCC-tailored stationary point.

Appendix

A. Proof of Theorem 1

The proof needs the properties of the saddle function:

Proposition 4 (Theorem 1.4.1, [9]): Let $L: X \times Y \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}$ be a given saddle function. It holds that:

$$\inf_{x \in X} \sup_{y \in Y} L(x, y) \ge \sup_{y \in Y} \inf_{x \in X} L(x, y).$$
(57)

Let $\varphi(x) := \sup_{y \in Y} L(x, y)$ and $\psi(y) = \inf_{x \in X} L(x, y)$ be a pair of scalar functions associated with the saddle function L(x, y). Then, for a given pair $(x^*, y^*) \in X \times Y$, the following three statements are equivalent:

- (x^*, y^*) is a saddle point of L on $X \times Y$;
- x* is a minimizer of φ(x) on X, y* is a maximizer of ψ(y) on Y, and equality holds in (57);
- $\varphi(x^*) = \psi(y^*) = L(x^*, y^*).$

We formally state the proof of Theorem 1 as below.

Proof: For any given $\hat{\lambda} \in K$, supposing that the maximum of $L_{Au}(\hat{\lambda}, \omega)$ is obtained at $\hat{\omega} \in K$, then we have $L_{Au}(\hat{\lambda}, \hat{\omega}) \geq L_{Au}(\hat{\lambda}, \omega), \forall \omega \in K$, which includes the case that $\omega = \hat{\lambda}$:

$$L_{Au}(\hat{\lambda},\hat{\omega}) \ge \underbrace{d(\hat{\lambda}) - d(\hat{\lambda}) + (F(\hat{\lambda})^T - \nabla_{\lambda} d(\hat{\lambda}))(\hat{\lambda} - \hat{\lambda})}_{L_{Au}(\hat{\lambda},\hat{\lambda})} = 0.$$

As a result, we have $\varphi_{Au}(\lambda) := \sup_{\omega \in K} L_{Au}(\lambda, \omega) \ge 0, \forall \lambda \in K$, and similarly $\psi_{Au}(\omega) := \inf_{\lambda \in K} L_{Au}(\lambda, \omega) \le 0, \forall \omega \in K$. Thus, if (λ^*, ω^*) is a saddle point of L_{Au} , then from Proposition 4 and the properties that $\varphi_{Au}(\lambda) \ge 0$ and $\psi_{Au}(\omega) \le 0$, we have $\varphi_{Au}(\lambda^*) = L_{Au}(\lambda^*, \omega^*) = \psi_{Au}(\omega^*) = 0$. From:

$$\underbrace{d(\lambda^*) - d(\omega) + (F(\lambda^*)^T - \nabla_{\lambda} d(\lambda^*))(\lambda^* - \omega)}_{L_{Au}(\lambda^*, \omega)}$$

$$\leq \varphi_{Au}(\lambda^*) = 0, \quad \forall \omega \in K,$$

the maximum of $L_{Au}(\lambda^*, \omega)$ can be obtained at $\omega = \lambda^*$. Thus, we have the first order primal necessary condition:

$$\underbrace{(-\nabla_{\lambda}d(\lambda^{*}) - (F(\lambda^{*})^{T} - \nabla_{\lambda}d(\lambda^{*})))}_{\nabla_{\omega}L_{Au}(\lambda^{*},\lambda^{*})}(\omega - \lambda^{*})} = -F(\lambda^{*})^{T}(\omega - \lambda^{*}) \leq 0, \quad \forall \omega \in K,$$

which means that λ^* solves the VI(K, F).

Remark 6: Our proof of Theorem 1 is based on Proposition 4 and the optimality conditions in the form of VI, which is slightly different from [33], where Auchmuty proves Theorem 1 using Proposition 4 and generalized Young's inequality. \Box

B. Proof of Theorem 2

<

The proof needs the semismoothness of the solution to the parameterized convex minimization problem, as stated below.

Proposition 5 (Corollary 3.5, [45]): Considering the parameterized convex minimization problem in the form of

min
$$f(x, y)$$
, s.t. $g(y) \le 0$, (58)

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the parameter, $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the decision variable, $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is LC^2 and uniformly convex in y, and $g : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^m$ is LC^2 and convex. Let the Lagrangian of (58) be $L(x, y, \lambda) = f(x, y) + \lambda^T g(y)$ with the Lagrange multiplier $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^m$. For a given x^* , let y^* be the solution to (58) and λ^* be the associated multiplier. Suppose that strong regularity holds in y^* , that is, $\nabla_{yy}L(x^*, y^*, \lambda^*) \succ 0$ and LICQ holds in y^* , then there exists neighborhoods U and V of x^* and y^* respectively, and a semismooth function $F : U \to V$ such that, $y^* = F(x^*)$, and for every $\bar{x} \in U$, $\bar{y} = F(\bar{x})$ is the unique solution to problem (58) with parameter $x = \bar{x}$. \Box

Proposition 5 is the application of the *implicit function the orem* for Lipschitz continuous functions, see [45] for details. We formally state the proof of Theorem 2 as below. **Proof:** For the first statement, the nonnegativity of $\varphi_{Au}(\lambda)$ and the sufficient condition that $\varphi_{Au}(\lambda) = 0 \Rightarrow \lambda \in$ SOL(K, F) have been shown in the proof of Theorem 1. Thus, we only show the necessary condition that $\lambda \in$ SOL $(K, F) \Rightarrow \varphi_{Au}(\lambda) = 0$. Suppose $\hat{\lambda} \in$ SOL(K, F), we have:

$$\underbrace{(-\nabla_{\lambda} d(\hat{\lambda}) - F(\hat{\lambda})^T + \nabla_{\lambda} d(\hat{\lambda}))}_{\nabla_{\omega} L_{Au}(\hat{\lambda}, \hat{\lambda})} (\omega - \hat{\lambda}) \le 0, \quad \forall \omega \in K.$$

This implies that the maximum of $L_{Au}(\hat{\lambda}, \omega)$ can be obtained at $\omega = \hat{\lambda}$, which is $L_{Au}(\hat{\lambda}, \hat{\lambda}) = 0$. Hence $\varphi_{Au}(\hat{\lambda}) = 0$.

For the second statement, the uniqueness of $\hat{\omega} = \omega(\lambda)$ is ensured by the strong convexity of the function d, and the semismoothness of $\hat{\omega} = \omega(\lambda)$ follows from Proposition 5. Specifically, the strong regularity holds because $\hat{\omega} = \omega(\lambda)$ is the solution to the strongly concave maximization problem (16), which has a negative definite Lagrangian Hessian, and the LICQ is assumed to be satisfied in set K. Thus, from the uniqueness of $\hat{\omega} = \omega(\lambda)$ and the differentiability property of a function defined by the supremum (Theorem 10.2.1 in [9]), we have the explicit formula $\nabla_{\lambda}\varphi_{Au}(\lambda) = \nabla_{\lambda}L_{Au}(\lambda,\omega)$, which is (17). Consequently, we have that $\varphi_{Au}(\lambda)$ is SC^1 based on the semismoothness of $\hat{\omega} = \omega(\lambda)$ and the differentiability assumptions on functions d and F.

C. Proof of Theorem 3

The proof needs the following lemma about the properties of the generalized D-gap function:

Lemma 3: The generalized D-gap function $\varphi_{Au}^{ab}(\lambda)$ given by (19) satisfies the following inequalities:

$$\varphi_{Au}^{ab}(\lambda) \ge \frac{m(b-a)}{2} \|\hat{\omega}^b - \lambda\|_2^2, \tag{59}$$

with m > 0 a constant for the strong convexity of d:

$$d(\omega) \ge d(\lambda) + \nabla_{\lambda} d(\lambda)(\omega - \lambda) + \frac{m}{2} \|\omega - \lambda\|_{2}^{2}$$

Proof: The proof is inspired by Lemma 10.3.2 in [9]. The inequality (59) is derived by:

$$\begin{split} \varphi_{Au}^{ab}(\lambda) \\ &= \varphi_{Au}^{a}(\lambda) - \varphi_{Au}^{b}(\lambda) \\ &\geq F(\lambda)^{T}(\lambda - \hat{\omega}^{b}) + a(d(\lambda) - d(\hat{\omega}^{b}) + \nabla_{\lambda}d(\lambda)(\hat{\omega}^{b} - \lambda)) \\ &- F(\lambda)^{T}(\lambda - \hat{\omega}^{b}) - b(d(\lambda) - d(\hat{\omega}^{b}) + \nabla_{\lambda}d(\lambda)(\hat{\omega}^{b} - \lambda)) \\ &= -(b - a)(d(\lambda) - d(\hat{\omega}^{b}) + \nabla_{\lambda}d(\lambda)(\hat{\omega}^{b} - \lambda)) \\ &\geq \frac{m(b - a)}{2} \|\hat{\omega}^{b} - \lambda\|_{2}^{2}. \end{split}$$

We formally state the proof of Theorem 3 as below.

Proof: The proof is inspired by Theorem 10.3.3 in [9]. For the first statement, $\varphi_{Au}^{ab}(\lambda) \ge 0, \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n$ follows from (59). For the sufficient condition that $\varphi_{Au}^{ab}(\lambda) = 0 \Rightarrow \lambda \in$ SOL(K, F), if $\varphi_{Au}^{ab}(\lambda) = 0$, from (59) we have $\lambda = \hat{\omega}^b$, which implies that $\lambda \in K$ and $\varphi_{Au}^b(\lambda) = 0$, hence $\lambda \in$ SOL(K, F). For the necessary condition that $\lambda \in$ SOL $(K, F) \Rightarrow \varphi_{Au}^{ab}(\lambda) = 0$, since $\lambda \in$ SOL(K, F), based on the first statement of Theorem 2, we have $\varphi_{Au}^a(\lambda) = \varphi_{Au}^b(\lambda) = 0$ hence $\varphi_{Au}^{ab}(\lambda) = 0$. For the second statement, the differentiability properties of $\varphi_{Au}^{ab}(\lambda)$ follow from the second statement of Theorem 2.

D. Proof of Theorem 4

We formally state the proof of Theorem 4 as below.

Proof: We only need to investigate the constraint regularity of the constraint system (22) and (28).

Regarding the LICQ, we have that the zeros of φ_{Au} within the set K are the global solutions to the constrained optimization problem (15), as stated in Theorem 2. As a result, for any feasible point that satisfies constraints (22), the gap constraints $\varphi_{Au}(\lambda, \eta) \leq 0$ must be active, and the gradient of φ_{Au} is either zero or linearly dependent with the gradient of activated $g(\lambda) \geq 0$, which violates LICQ. Similarly, the constraint system (28) also violates LICQ, because $\varphi_{Au}^{ab}(\lambda, \eta) \leq 0$ must be active and its gradient should be zero.

Regarding the MFCQ, it implies the existence of a feasible interior point. As has been mentioned, $\varphi_{Au}(\lambda,\eta) \leq 0$ must be active for any feasible point satisfying constraints (22). Since φ_{Au} is nonnegative for any $\lambda \in K$ as stated in Theorem 2, it is impossible to find a point $\lambda \in K$ such that $\varphi_{Au}(\lambda,\eta) < 0$ holds, in other words, constraint system (22) does not have a feasible interior and thereby violates MFCQ. Similarly, it is impossible to find a point $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\lambda}}$ such that $\varphi_{Au}^{ab}(\lambda,\eta) < 0$ holds, thus constraint system (28) also violates MFCQ.

E. Proof of Theorem 5

The proof of Theorem 5 needs the *mean value theorem* for Lipschitz continuous functions, as stated below.

Proposition 6 (Proposition 7.1.16, [9]): Let function $G : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^m$ be Lipschitz continuous on an open set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ containing the segment [x, y]. There exists m points z^i in (x, y) and m scalars $\alpha^i \ge 0$ with $\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha^i = 1$ such that

$$G(y) = G(x) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha^{i} H^{i}(y-x),$$
(60)

where for each i, H^i belongs to $\partial G(z^i)$. \Box

Lemma 4: Let Assumption 3 holds. Let $\mathbf{Y}(\tau)$ and $\mathbf{p}(\tau)$ be the solutions to the Y-system and p-system, respectively. For each $\tau \geq 0$, there exists n_Y points z_{τ}^i in $(\mathbf{Y}(\tau), \mathbf{Y}^*(\tau))$ and n_Y scalars $\alpha_{\tau}^i \geq 0$ with $\sum_{i=1}^{n_Y} \alpha_{\tau}^i = 1$ such that

$$\boldsymbol{T}(\boldsymbol{Y}(\tau), \boldsymbol{p}(\tau)) = \boldsymbol{T}(\boldsymbol{Y}^{*}(\tau), \boldsymbol{p}(\tau)) + \mathcal{M}_{\tau}(\boldsymbol{Y}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{Y}^{*}(\tau))$$
(61)

with $\mathcal{M}_{\tau} = \sum_{i=1}^{n_Y} \alpha_{\tau}^i \mathcal{K}_{\tau}^i$ and $\mathcal{K}_{\tau}^i \in \partial \boldsymbol{T}(z_{\tau}^i, \boldsymbol{p}(\tau)).$

Proof: Since T(Y, p) is Lipschitz continuous, this lemma is the direct result of Proposition 6.

We formally state the proof of Theorem 5 as below.

Proof: We first prove the asymptotic convergence property. The following candidate Lyapunov function is considered:

$$V(Y, p) = \frac{1}{2} ||T(Y, p)||_2^2.$$

We have that $V(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{p}) \ge 0$, and $V(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{p}) = 0$ if and only if $\mathbf{Y}(\tau) = \mathbf{Y}^*(\tau)$. The time derivative of V can be written as:

$$\dot{V} = \mathbf{T}^{T} (\mathcal{K} \dot{\mathbf{Y}} + \mathcal{S} \dot{\mathbf{p}}) = \mathbf{T}^{T} (\mathcal{K} (-\mathcal{K}^{-1} (\epsilon_{T} \mathbf{T} + \mathcal{S} \dot{\mathbf{p}})) + \mathcal{S} \dot{\mathbf{p}}) = -2\epsilon_{T} V.$$

Thus, $\dot{V} < 0$ for all $Y(\tau) \neq Y^*(\tau)$. Consequently, following from Theorem 3.3 in [56], there exists a neighborhood of Y_0^* denoted by \mathcal{N}_{asy}^* , such that for any $Y_0 \in \mathcal{N}_{asy}^*$, we have that $Y(\tau)$ asymptotically converges to $Y^*(\tau)$ as $\tau \to \infty$.

In the following, we prove the exponential convergence, which is inspired by Proposition 2 in [30].

First, since $Y(\tau)$ is derived from the stable system (50), the following inequality holds with a constant α_T satisfying $0 < \alpha_T < \epsilon_T$:

$$\|\boldsymbol{T}(\boldsymbol{Y}(\tau), \boldsymbol{p}(\tau))\|_{2} \le \|\boldsymbol{T}(\boldsymbol{Y}(0), \boldsymbol{p}(0))\|_{2} e^{-\alpha_{T}\tau}.$$
 (62)

Next, based on the closeness of ∂T (Proposition 1), for each $\tau \geq 0$, we can find a neighborhood of $\partial T(Y^*(\tau), p(\tau))$ defined by $\mathcal{N}_{\tau}^{\varepsilon} := \partial T(Y^*(\tau), p(\tau)) + \mathbb{B}(0, \varepsilon_{\tau})$ with $\varepsilon_{\tau} > 0$, such that $\partial T(z_{\tau}^i, p(\tau)) \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{\tau}^{\varepsilon}$ for all z_{τ}^i in $(Y(\tau), Y^*(\tau))$. Therefore, \mathcal{M}_{τ} also belongs to $\mathcal{N}_{\tau}^{\varepsilon}$ because it is a convex combination of $\mathcal{K}_{\tau}^i \in \partial T(z_{\tau}^i, p(\tau))$. Moreover, since $Y(\tau)$ asymptotically converges to $Y^*(\tau)$ as $\tau \to \infty$, we have that $\{z_{\tau}^i\}_{\tau=0}^{\infty} \to Y^*(\tau)$ as $\tau \to \infty$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n_Y\}$. Thus, $\{\varepsilon_{\tau}\}_{\tau=0}^{\infty} \to 0$ as $\tau \to \infty$ and $\{\mathcal{M}_{\tau}\}_{\tau=0}^{\infty}$ converges to one element in $\partial T(Y^*(\tau), p(\tau))$, which implies that \mathcal{M}_{τ} becomes nonsingular as $\tau \to \infty$.

Finally, following from (61) and (62), and the nonsingularity of \mathcal{M}_{τ} , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\boldsymbol{Y}(\tau) - \boldsymbol{Y}^{*}(\tau)\|_{2} \\ = \|\mathcal{M}_{\tau}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{T}(\boldsymbol{Y}(\tau), \boldsymbol{p}(\tau)) - \boldsymbol{T}(\boldsymbol{Y}^{*}(\tau), \boldsymbol{p}(\tau)))\|_{2} \\ \leq \beta_{M} \|\boldsymbol{T}(\boldsymbol{Y}(0), \boldsymbol{p}(0))\|_{2} e^{-\alpha_{T}\tau} \\ \leq \beta_{M} L_{T} \|\boldsymbol{Y}(0) - \boldsymbol{Y}^{*}(0)\|_{2} e^{-\alpha_{T}\tau}, \end{aligned}$$
(63)

where $L_T > 0$ is the Lipschitz constant for T, and $\beta_M > 0$ is the constant that $\beta_M \ge \|\mathcal{M}_{\tau}^{-1}\|_2$. Thus, the proof is completed with $k_1 = \beta_M L_T$ and $k_2 = \alpha_T$.

REFERENCES

- G. Kim, D. Kang, J.-H. Kim, S. Hong, and H.-W. Park, "Contact-implicit model predictive control: Controlling diverse quadruped motions without pre-planned contact modes or trajectories," *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, 2024.
- [2] K. Yunt and C. Glocker, "Trajectory optimization of mechanical hybrid systems using SUMT," in 9th IEEE International Workshop on Advanced Motion Control, 2006, pp. 665–671.
- [3] S. Dempe, M. Friedemann, F. Harder, P. Mehlitz, and G. Wachsmuth, "Bilevel optimal control: theory, algorithms, and applications," *arXiv* preprint arXiv:2305.19786, 2023.
- [4] M. Wang, Z. Wang, J. Talbot, J. C. Gerdes, and M. Schwager, "Gametheoretic planning for self-driving cars in multivehicle competitive scenarios," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 1313– 1325, 2021.
- [5] J.-S. Pang and D. Stewart, "Differential variational inequalities," *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 113, no. 2, pp. 345–424, 2008.
- [6] D. E. Stewart, Dynamics with Inequalities: Impacts and Hard Constraints. SIAM, 2011.
- [7] V. Acary and B. Brogliato, Numerical Methods for Nonsmooth Dynamical Systems: Applications in Mechanics and Electronics. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [8] B. Brogliato and A. Tanwani, "Dynamical systems coupled with monotone set-valued operators: formalisms, applications, well-posedness, and stability," *SIAM Review*, vol. 62, no. 1, pp. 3–129, 2020.
- [9] F. Facchinei and J.-S. Pang, Finite-Dimensional Variational Inequalities and Complementarity Problems. Springer, 2003.
- [10] J. T. Betts, Practical Methods for Optimal Control and Estimation Using Nonlinear Programming. SIAM, 2010.
- [11] A. Nurkanović, "Numerical Methods for Optimal Control of Nonsmooth Dynamical Systems," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Freiburg, Germany, 2023.

- [12] A. Nurkanović, M. Sperl, S. Albrecht, and M. Diehl, "Finite elements with switch detection for direct optimal control of nonsmooth systems," *Numerische Mathematik*, pp. 1–48, 2024.
- [13] S. Scholtes, "Convergence properties of a regularization scheme for mathematical programs with complementarity constraints," *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 918–936, 2001.
- [14] G.-H. Lin and M. Fukushima, "A modified relaxation scheme for mathematical programs with complementarity constraints," *Annals of Operations Research*, vol. 133, no. 1, pp. 63–84, 2005.
- [15] A. Kadrani, J.-P. Dussault, and A. Benchakroun, "A new regularization scheme for mathematical programs with complementarity constraints," *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 78–103, 2009.
- [16] S. Steffensen and M. Ulbrich, "A new relaxation scheme for mathematical programs with equilibrium constraints," *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 20, no. 5, pp. 2504–2539, 2010.
- [17] C. Kanzow and A. Schwartz, "A new regularization method for mathematical programs with complementarity constraints with strong convergence properties," *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 770–798, 2013.
- [18] Y. Kim, S. Leyffer, and T. Munson, "MPEC methods for bilevel optimization problems," *Bilevel Optimization: Advances and Next Challenges*, pp. 335–360, 2020.
- [19] K. Lin and T. Ohtsuka, "A successive gap constraint linearization method for optimal control problems with equilibrium constraints," in *the 8th IFAC Conference on Nonlinear Model Predictive Control (NMPC 2024)*, 2024, pp. 165–172.
- [20] M. Fukushima, "Equivalent differentiable optimization problems and descent methods for asymmetric variational inequality problems," *Mathematical programming*, vol. 53, pp. 99–110, 1992.
- [21] W. Yao, H. Yin, S. Zeng, and J. Zhang, "Overcoming lower-level constraints in bilevel optimization: A novel approach with regularized gap functions," arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.01992, 2024.
- [22] E. L. Allgower and K. Georg, Numerical Continuation Methods: An Introduction. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [23] F. Dörfler, Z. He, G. Belgioioso, S. Bolognani, J. Lygeros, and M. Muehlebach, "Towards a systems theory of algorithms," *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 2024.
- [24] A. Allibhoy and J. Cortés, "Control barrier function-based design of gradient flows for constrained nonlinear programming," *IEEE Transactions* on Automatic Control, vol. 69, no. 6, pp. 3499–3514, 2024.
- [25] R. Raveendran, A. D. Mahindrakar, and U. Vaidya, "Dynamical system approach for time-varying constrained convex optimization problems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 69, no. 6, pp. 3822–3834, 2024.
- [26] T. Ohtsuka, "A continuation/GMRES method for fast computation of nonlinear receding horizon control," *Automatica*, vol. 40, no. 4, pp. 563– 574, 2004.
- [27] M. Anitescu and V. M. Zavala, "MPC as a DVI: implications on sampling rates and accuracy," in the 56th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), 2017, pp. 1933–1938.
- [28] D. Liao-McPherson, M. M. Nicotra, and I. V. Kolmanovsky, "A semismooth predictor corrector method for real-time constrained parametric optimization with applications in model predictive control," in *the 57th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2018, pp. 3600–3607.
- [29] X. Chen and Z. Wang, "Differential variational inequality approach to dynamic games with shared constraints," *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 146, no. 1, pp. 379–408, 2014.
- [30] M. Fazlyab, S. Paternain, V. M. Preciado, and A. Ribeiro, "Predictioncorrection interior-point method for time-varying convex optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 63, no. 7, pp. 1973–1986, 2017.
- [31] G. Belgioioso, D. Liao-McPherson, M. H. de Badyn, S. Bolognani, R. S. Smith, J. Lygeros, and F. Dörfler, "Online feedback equilibrium seeking," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 2024.
- [32] I. K. Ozaslan and M. R. Jovanović, "From exponential to finite/fixed-time stability: Applications to optimization," arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.11713, 2024.
- [33] G. Auchmuty, "Variational principles for variational inequalities," Numerical Functional Analysis and Optimization, vol. 10, no. 9-10, pp. 863–874, 1989.
- [34] L. T. Biegler, Nonlinear Programming: Concepts, Algorithms, and Applications to Chemical Processes. SIAM, 2010.
- [35] D. E. Stewart and M. Anitescu, "Optimal control of systems with discontinuous differential equations," *Numerische Mathematik*, vol. 114, no. 4, pp. 653–695, 2010.

- [36] K. Lin and T. Ohtsuka, "A non-interior-point continuation method for the optimal control problem with equilibrium constraints," *Automatica*, no. 111940, 2024.
- [37] T. Hoheisel, C. Kanzow, and A. Schwartz, "Theoretical and numerical comparison of relaxation methods for mathematical programs with complementarity constraints," *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 137, no. 1, pp. 257–288, 2013.
- [38] J.-M. Peng, "Equivalence of variational inequality problems to unconstrained minimization," *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 78, no. 3, pp. 347–355, 1997.
- [39] J. H. Wu, M. Florian, and P. Marcotte, "A general descent framework for the monotone variational inequality problem," *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 61, pp. 281–300, 1993.
- [40] N. Yamashita, K. Taji, and M. Fukushima, "Unconstrained optimization reformulations of variational inequality problems," *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, vol. 92, pp. 439–456, 1997.
- [41] M. Fukushima, "Merit functions for variational inequality and complementarity problems," *Nonlinear Optimization and Applications*, pp. 155– 170, 1996.
- [42] C. Kanzow and M. Fukushima, "Theoretical and numerical investigation of the D-gap function for box constrained variational inequalities," *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 83, no. 1, pp. 55–87, 1998.
- [43] T. Larsson and M. Patriksson, "A class of gap functions for variational inequalities," *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 64, pp. 53–79, 1994.
- [44] J.-M. Peng, "Convexity of the implicit lagrangian," *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, vol. 92, pp. 331–341, 1997.
 [45] A. Von Heusinger and C. Kanzow, "SC¹ optimization reformulations of
- [45] A. Von Heusinger and C. Kanzow, "SC¹ optimization reformulations of the generalized nash equilibrium problem," Optimisation Methods and Software, vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 953–973, 2008.
- [46] I. Usmanova, M. Kamgarpour, A. Krause, and K. Levy, "Fast projection onto convex smooth constraints," in *the 38th International Conference* on Machine Learning (ICML), 2021, pp. 10476–10486.
- [47] H. Ferreau, C. Kirches, A. Potschka, H. Bock, and M. Diehl, "qpOASES: A parametric active-set algorithm for quadratic programming," *Mathe-matical Programming Computation*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 327–363, 2014.
- [48] H. Ferreau, H. Bock, and M. Diehl, "An online active set strategy to overcome the limitations of explicit MPC," *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, vol. 18, no. 8, pp. 816–830, 2008.
- [49] J. A. E. Andersson, J. Gillis, G. Horn, J. B. Rawlings, and M. Diehl, "CasADi: a software framework for nonlinear optimization and optimal control," *Mathematical Programming Computation*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 1–36, 2019.
- [50] A. Ouattara and A. Aswani, "Duality approach to bilevel programs with a convex lower level," in 2018 Annual American Control Conference (ACC), 2018, pp. 1388–1395.
- [51] S. Dempe and P. Mehlitz, "Duality-based single-level reformulations of bilevel optimization problems," arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.07672, 2024.
- [52] C. Kanzow, "Some noninterior continuation methods for linear complementarity problems," *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 851–868, 1996.
- [53] A. Wächter and L. T. Biegler, "On the implementation of an interiorpoint filter line-search algorithm for large-scale nonlinear programming," *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 106, no. 1, pp. 25–57, 2006.
- [54] A. Vieira, B. Brogliato, and C. Prieur. (2018) Quadratic optimal control of linear complementarity systems: First order necessary conditions and numerical analysis. [Online]. Available: https://inria.hal.science/ hal-01690400
- [55] E. D. Dolan and J. J. Moré, "Benchmarking optimization software with performance profiles," *Mathematical programming*, vol. 91, pp. 201– 213, 2002.
- [56] H. K. Khalil, Nonlinear Control. Pearson, 2015.