Distributed Mixed-Integer Quadratic Programming for Mixed-Traffic Intersection Control

Viet-Anh Le^{a,b}, Andreas A. Malikopoulos^{b,c}

^aDepartment of Mechanical Engineering, University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19716 USA ^bSystems Engineering Program, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14850 USA

^cSchool of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853 USA

Abstract

In this paper, we present a distributed algorithm utilizing the proximal alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM) in conjunction with sequential constraint tightening to address mixed-integer quadratic programming (MIQP) problems associated with traffic light systems and connected automated vehicles (CAVs) in mixed-traffic intersections. We formulate a comprehensive MIQP model aimed at optimizing the coordination of traffic light systems and CAVs, thereby fully capitalizing on the advantages of CAV integration under conditions of high penetration rates. To effectively approximate the intricate multi-agent MIQP challenges, we develop a distributed algorithm that employs proximal ADMM for solving the convex relaxation of the MIQP while systematically tightening the constraint coefficients to uphold integrality requirements. The performance of our control framework and the efficacy of the distributed algorithm are rigorously validated through a series of simulations conducted across varying penetration rates and traffic volumes.

Key words: Connected and automated vehicles, traffic signal control, mixed traffic, mixed-integer quadratic programming.

1 Introduction

1.1 Motivation

Coordination of connected autonomous vehicles (CAVs) has shown promise in improving various traffic metrics, including energy consumption, greenhouse gas emissions, and travel time while ensuring safety, as demonstrated in recent studies; e.g., see (Malikopoulos et al., 2021; Chalaki and Malikopoulos, 2022; Katriniok et al., 2022). However, a transportation network with full CAV penetration is not anticipated in the near future; see (Alessandrini et al., 2015). Therefore, addressing the planning and control of CAVs in mixed traffic, given the coexistence of human-driven vehicles (HDVs), is a crucial research focus and has gained significant attention in recent years; see (Le et al., 2024) for a comprehensive review. Our early work on this topic focused on problems in unsignalized mixed-traffic scenarios with a single conflict point, such as merging at roadways; see (Le et al., 2023, 2024), or single-lane intersections; see (Le and Malikopoulos, 2022, 2023). In more complex scenarios, such as multi-lane intersections, coordinating CAVs together with multiple HDVs without traffic signals may be unrealistic. On the other hand, intelligent traffic signal control can exert a certain level of control over HDVs at intersections and has been shown to be effective in ensuring traffic safety and alleviating congestion in regular traffic consisting entirely of HDVs; see (Varaiya, 2013). Therefore, integrating traffic signal optimization with CAV coordination presents a promising and efficient approach to managing mixed-traffic scenarios, such as multi-lane intersections. In particular, when CAV penetration rates are low, optimizing traffic signals is more critical to ensuring conflict-free vehicle maneuvers and improving traffic flow, while CAV trajectory optimization can still be considered to optimize energy consumption. Meanwhile, under the high penetration rates of CAVs, their coordination can fully exploit the benefits of avoiding stop-and-go driving behavior.

1.2 Literature Review

1.2.1 Traffic light and CAV coordination

The idea of combining traffic signal control and CAVs in mixed traffic has gained growing attention in recent years; see (Li et al., 2023). The current state-of-the-art methods for the coordination of traffic light systems and

 $^{^{\}star}$ This research was supported in part by NSF under Grants CNS-2149520, CMMI-2348381, IIS-2415478, and in part by Mathworks.

Email addresses: v1299@cornell.edu (Viet-Anh Le), amaliko@cornell.edu (Andreas A. Malikopoulos).

CAVs in mixed-traffic intersections can be classified into three main categories: (1) reinforcement learning, (2) bilevel optimization, and (3) joint optimization. Reinforcement learning (RL) aims to train control policies that optimize a specific reward function using traffic simulators. (Guo et al., 2023) used multi-agent deep RL, where the behavior of HDVs is simulated by the intelligent driver model (IDM) during training. (Song and Fan, 2021) improved the deep Q-network by transferring the policy of a previous deep Q-network model under similar traffic scenarios. However, RL generally faces training instability in large-scale systems. Moreover, real-time safety implications are not taken into account in reinforcement learning.

Optimization-based approaches, on the other hand, are well-studied for their ability to ensure real-time safety against the uncertain behavior of HDVs. Bi-level optimization approaches separate traffic signal optimization from CAV trajectory planning. First, traffic signal optimization is solved using an approximate traffic model, followed by solving the CAV trajectory optimization. (Kamal et al., 2019) used a receding horizon control framework that minimizes the approximate total crossing times of all vehicles in the intersection using optimal traffic signals. (Du et al., 2021) formulated an upper-level signal timing optimization to find a set of green times, where the objective is to optimize the delay time for all delayed vehicles and minimize the difference among all phases to ensure fairness. Given the signal timing, the CAV eco-driving trajectory is generated based on the planned arrival time and the trigonometric function algorithm.

In joint optimization approaches, optimization problems considering both traffic signal control and CAV trajectory planning are formulated. (Niroumand et al., 2023) proposed a white phase that uses CAVs as mobile traffic controllers, which negotiate the right-of-way to lead a group of trailing HDVs and formulated the joint signal timing and trajectory optimization problem as a mixed-integer nonlinear program (MINLP). (Ghosh and Parisini, 2022) formulated an optimization problem considering a linear combination of energy cost, and travel time, maximizing the velocity at which vehicles can enter the intersection, and minimizing the overall time taken for all vehicles to cross the intersection. (Tajalli and Hajbabaie, 2021) formulated a MINLP to maximize the distance traveled by each vehicle and minimize acceleration while optimizing the signal timing parameters through a cycle- and phase-free plan. (Ravikumar et al., 2021) formulated a mixed-integer linear program (MILP) for scheduling and coordination of CAVs in an interconnected network of conflict zones. (Firoozi et al., 2022) improved upon the work in (Ravikumar et al., 2021) by introducing a switching dynamic model based on logic conditions for HDVs. (Suriyarachchi et al., 2023) presented a MILP formulation for joint vehicle and intersection coordination and developed a decentralized implementation by decoupling the MILP. In our prior work (Le and Malikopoulos, 2024), we presented a novel formulation that fully leverages both the long-term coordination of CAVs at higher penetration rates and intelligent traffic management using traffic lights at lower penetration rates. Compared to related existing work, we incorporated mixed-integer lateral constraints for CAVs to enable coordinated crossing without traffic lights. As a result, the framework requires more binary variables in addition to those representing traffic light states. Since the resulting optimization problem is a multi-agent MIQP that needs to be implemented in a receding horizon manner, we developed penalization-enhanced maximum block improvement, a distributed algorithm that can solve the problem faster than a centralized algorithm using GUROBI, a state-of-the-art optimizer for mixedinteger convex programming; see (Gurobi Optimization, LLC, 2021). However, in the algorithm, the subproblems are still MIQPs, and at each iteration, only one agent can update its solution, which results in a higher number of iterations to achieve convergence as the number of agents grows. As a result, to reduce the complexity of the resulting MIQP problem, we used single binaries over the control horizon for lateral collision avoidance between CAVs, which limits the efficiency of CAV coordination.

1.2.2 Distributed Algorithms for Mixed-Integer Convex Programming

One of the main challenges for optimization-based frameworks for joint traffic signal control and CAV trajectory planning, or receding horizon motion planning in general, is real-time practicality, as these approaches require solving multi-agent mixed-integer optimization problems. Thus, in this section, we focus on the algorithms developed to date that aim to solve multi-agent mixed-integer optimization. Reducing computation time for finding a solution to multi-agent mixed-integer optimization can be achieved using decomposition-based distributed algorithms. (Vujanic et al., 2016) and (Falsone et al., 2019) proposed decomposition methods for largescale MILPs combined with tightening the coupling constraints. A dualization approach with tightening of the coupling constraints was proposed to determine a feasible solution. (Falsone et al., 2018) extended the framework in (Falsone et al., 2019) to a distributed framework where agents exchange information only with their neighbors, and no central unit is needed. (Camisa et al., 2018) and (Camisa et al., 2021) presented a distributed algorithm based on primal decomposition, in which the optimal allocation for each agent in coupling constraints was found using a projected subgradient method, and then a local MILP was solved by each agent. (Testa et al., 2019) developed a distributed algorithm based on cutting-plane generation from relaxed solutions and active constraint exchanges between agents. However, the above papers are only applicable to MILPs since they rely on the Shapley-Folkman lemma; see (Bertsekas, 2014), which cannot be extended to mixed-integer quadratic program (MIQP). Moreover, the algorithms may prefer the total number of subsystems (agents) to be much greater than the number of coupling constraints.

On the other hand, research on distributed algorithms for MIQPs is still limited but has received increasing attention in recent years. (Liu and Stursberg, 2021) proposed a three-stage algorithm to solve the MIQP problem; however, the algorithm requires an initial feasible guess of the solution. (Liu and Stursberg, 2022) proposed a two-stage alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM) algorithm to solve MIQP by selecting penalty weights that satisfy certain conditions. (Sun and Dai, 2018) decoupled the large-scale problem into subproblems, where each local update is a convex projection subproblem except for one handling the integrality constraint. A distributed projected subgradient algorithm is then used. Though these methods exploit distributed computation to reduce solving time, their implementation still involves solving mixed-integer subproblems. (Klostermeier et al., 2024) presented a dual decomposition-based distributed optimization method for finding a lower bound for the optimal solution in a branch-and-cut algorithm. The use of ADMM algorithms as a heuristic for solving MIQP with relaxation was also explored in (Takapoui et al., 2020), (Stellato et al., 2018), and (Alavian and Rotkowitz, 2017). However, since MIQP is a nonconvex problem, ADMM may fail to converge or may converge to an incorrect solution, as mentioned in (Takapoui et al., 2020), even for a simple problem like integer linear programming.

1.3 Our Contributions

In this paper, we aim to develop a simple and computationally efficient distributed algorithm to find approximate solutions of the MIQP arising from joint traffic signal control and CAV coordination in mixed traffic. Compared to (Le and Malikopoulos, 2024), we refine the optimization formulation to allow the binary variables used for collision avoidance between CAVs to change over the control horizon, enabling full CAV coordination. However, this new formulation significantly increases the number of binary variables. For this reason, we develop a distributed optimization algorithm based on the proximal ADMM algorithm and a sequential constrainttightening technique to solve the multi-agent MIQP. We first consider the convex problem where the integrality constraints are relaxed so that parallel proximal ADMM can efficiently find the optimal solution in a distributed manner. To enforce the integrality constraints, we sequentially adapt the constraint coefficients to tighten the constraints. We restrict the constraint-tightening technique to big-M constraints, a technique commonly used in mixed-integer motion planning; see (Alrifaee et al., 2014). We show that the proximal ADMM, combined with constraint tightening, can quickly find a mixedinteger solution to MIQP problems.

1.4 Organization

The remainder of this article is organized as follows. Section 2 formulates an MIQP problem for joint traffic signal control and CAV coordination in mixed-traffic intersections. Section 3 and Section 4 present the sequential constraint tightening technique and the proximal ADMM algorithm for solving the multi-agent MIQP, respectively. Section 5 shows the simulation results to validate the effectiveness of the proposed control framework. Finally, we provide concluding remarks in Section 6.

2 Problem Formulation

In this section, we present the MIQP formulation for the joint optimization problem of traffic light control and CAV coordination that was developed in (Le and Malikopoulos, 2024) subject to an improvement for better CAV coordination.

2.1 Traffic Light Control and CAV Coordination

We focus on an isolated intersection, as depicted in Fig. 1, considering dedicated lanes for right turns, through traffic, and left turns. We assume that lane changes are not permitted within this control zone. Although the scenario in Fig. 1 includes 12 lanes, rightturn lanes can be treated separately since they do not conflict with other lanes, thus reducing the problem to 8 relevant lanes. A *control zone* is defined around the intersection, where CAVs and traffic light controllers (TLCs) can communicate and be managed within the proposed framework. Moreover, we define a *conflict zone* as the region where a lateral collision may occur. Next, we introduce several definitions for the entities involved in the intersection scenario.

Definition 1. (Lanes) Let lane–*l* be the *l*-th lane in the scenario and \mathcal{L} be the set of all lanes' indices. Each lane–*l* is equipped with a traffic light controller denoted by TLC–*l*. We set each lane's origin location at the control zone's entry and let $\psi_l \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\phi_l \in \mathbb{R}$ be the positions of the conflict zone's entry and exit points along lane–*l*. Note that ψ_l can be also the position of the stop line of lane–*l*.

Definition 2. (Vehicles) Let a tuple (i, l) be the index of the *i*-th vehicle traveling in lane–*l*. For each lane–*l*, let $C_l(k)$ and $\mathcal{H}_l(k)$ be the sets of CAVs and HDVs in lane–*l* at any time step k.

We formulate a joint optimization problem for TLCs and CAVs and implement it in a receding horizon framework. At each step, the controller solves an optimization problem to determine the best control actions, applies only the first control input, and then repeats the process at the next time step with updated system states. Therefore, receding horizon control can be robust against the uncertainty caused by HDVs. Let k_0 be the current time step, H be the control horizon, and $\mathcal{I} = \{k_0+1, \ldots, k_0+$ $H\}$ be the set of time steps in the next control horizon. Our optimization problem restricts each lane to at most one traffic light switch for each lane over the control horizon. Let $\kappa_l \in [1, H + 1]$ so that the traffic light of lane-lswitches at $k_0 + \lfloor \kappa_l \rfloor$ where $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ denotes the floor function. If $\lfloor \kappa_l \rfloor = 1$, the traffic light switches at the next time



Fig. 1. An intersection scenario in mixed traffic with 12 lanes, including separate lanes for right turns, straight-through traffic, and left turns. The control zone and conflict zone are represented by the green and blue regions, respectively.

step, while if $\lfloor \kappa_l \rfloor = H$, the traffic light switches at the last time step of the control horizon, and $\lfloor \kappa_l \rfloor = H + 1$ means that the traffic light does not switch over the next control horizon. At each time step k, let $s_l(k) \in \{0, 1\}$ be the traffic light state of lane–l, $l \in \mathcal{L}$, where $s_l(k) = 0$ if the traffic light is red and $s_l(k) = 1$ if the traffic light is green. The traffic light states can be modeled as follows:

$$s_l(k) = \begin{cases} 1 - s_l(k_0), & \text{if } k \ge k_0 + \kappa_l, \\ s_l(k_0), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$
(1)

for all $k \in \mathcal{I}$. Next, we impose a constraint for the minimum and maximum time gaps between traffic light switches. Let \bar{k}_l be the time of the last traffic light switch of lane–l, $\delta_{\min} \in \mathbb{R}^+$, and $\delta_{\max} \in \mathbb{R}^+$ be the minimum and maximum time gaps, respectively. As a result, the next switching time must be within $[\delta_{\min} + \bar{k}_l, \delta_{\max} + \bar{k}_l]$. Since we consider $\kappa_l \in [1, H+1]$, to guarantee feasibility for κ_l , the constraints are formulated as follows:

$$\kappa_l \ge \min\{\delta_{\min} + k_l - k_0, H + 1\},
\kappa_l \le \max\{\delta_{\max} + \bar{k}_l - k_0, 1\}.$$
(2)

Note that the constraints (2) can be ignored if all vehicles in lane-*l* are CAVs.

For each CAV–(l, i), let $p_{l,i}(k) \in \mathbb{R}$, $v_{l,i}(k) \in \mathbb{R}$, and $u_{l,i}(k) \in \mathbb{R}$ be the position, speed, and control input (acceleration/deceleration) at time step k. We consider the discrete double-integrator dynamics for CAV–(l, i) as follows:

$$p_{l,i}(k) = p_{l,i}(k-1) + \Delta T v_{l,i}(k-1) + \frac{1}{2} \Delta T^2 u_{l,i}(k-1),$$

$$v_{l,i}(k) = v_{l,i}(k-1) + \Delta T u_{l,i}(k-1),$$
(3)

for all $k \in \mathcal{I}$, where ΔT is the sample time. In addition,

we impose the following speed and acceleration limit constraints,

$$v_{\min} \le v_{l,i}(k) \le v_{\max}, \ u_{\min} \le u_{l,i}(k-1) \le u_{\max}, \ (4)$$

for all $k \in \mathcal{I}$, where $u_{\min} \in \mathbb{R}^-$ and $u_{\max} \in \mathbb{R}^+$ are the minimum and maximum control inputs, $v_{\min} \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $v_{\max} \in \mathbb{R}^+$ are the minimum and maximum speeds, respectively.

In this work, we assume that HDV trajectories over the control horizon are predicted using the constant acceleration model, meaning each HDV maintains a constant acceleration while adhering to the speed constraint in (4). The predicted trajectories, computed by the TLC of the lane, are then communicated to the CAVs to ensure rear-end safety constraints. While the constant acceleration model may not perfectly capture HDV behavior, the high-frequency receding horizon implementation can mitigate this limitation.

Coordinating traffic lights and CAVs requires them to satisfy several coupling safety constraints. First, the traffic lights must guarantee no lateral conflicts between a CAV and an HDV or between two HDVs. Let lane–land lane–m be two lanes with lateral conflicts, then the lights for those lanes cannot be both green if there are HDV-CAV or HDV-HDV conflicts, i.e.,

$$s_l(k) + s_m(k) \le 1, \ \forall k \in \mathcal{I}, \ \text{if } \eta(l, m, k_0) > 0,$$
 (5)

where $\eta(l, m, k_0)$ counts the number of CAV-HDV or HDV-HDV pairs that have lateral conflicts between lane–*l* and lane–*m* at the current time step k_0 . If a pair of vehicles travel on two intersecting lanes and neither vehicle has yet crossed the conflict point, they have lateral conflicts. Next, we impose the following constraints ensuring that the CAVs stop at red lights,

$$p_{l,i}(k) \le \psi_l, \ \forall k \in \mathcal{I}, \ \text{if } s_l(k) = 0.$$
 (6)

Note that we only need to impose (6) if CAV-(l, i) is the first vehicle in the queue of lane-l, i.e., CAV-(l, i) has not crossed the stop line, and can stop by the line under maximum deceleration. To avoid rear-end collisions, we consider safety constraints for each CAV-(l, i) if there is a preceding vehicle, which can be either a CAV or an HDV, as follows:

$$p_{l,i}(k) + \tau v_{l,i}(k) + d_{\min} \le p_{l,i-1}(k), \ \forall k \in \mathcal{I},$$
(7)

where $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is the desired time headway, and $d_{\min} \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is the minimum distance. Note that if vehicle–(l, i-1) is an HDV, then (7) is considered as a local constraint of CAV–(l, i), while vehicle–(l, i - 1) is a CAV, (7) is a coupling constraint between the two CAVs. We also consider lateral safety constraints between two CAVs, e.g., CAV–(l, i) and CAV–(m, j), if they travel on two lanes with a lateral conflict point. The lateral safety constraints which

require at every time step that two conflicting CAVs are not inside in the conflict zone simultaneously, i.e.,

$$p_{l,i}(k) - \psi_l \geq 0,$$
OR $\phi_l - p_{l,i}(k) \geq 0,$
OR $p_{m,j}(k) - \psi_m \geq 0,$
OR $\phi_m - p_{m,j}(k) \geq 0.$
(8)

In our formulation, each agent has its separate objective. For the TLCs, the goal is to maximize traffic throughput by prioritizing green lights for lanes with higher priority. We define the following sigmoid-based priority function γ_l for each lane that takes the vehicles' current positions as inputs

$$\gamma_{l} = \sum_{\substack{i \in \mathcal{C}_{l}(k_{0}) \cup \mathcal{H}_{l}(k_{0}), \\ p_{l,i}(k_{0}) < \psi_{l}}} \operatorname{sigmoid}\left(\frac{p_{l,i}(k_{0}) - \psi_{l}/2}{\psi_{l}/2}\right).$$
(9)

The idea of the above priority function is to take into account the number of vehicles in each lane while considering a higher priority for the vehicles near the intersection.

For the CAVs, we optimize the trajectories over the control horizon using a weighted sum of three terms: (1) maximizing the travel distance to reduce travel time, (2) tracking the desired speed, and (3) minimizing acceleration rates to reduce energy consumption. Thus, our optimization problem minimizes the following objective

$$J\Big(\{\boldsymbol{s}_{l}, \boldsymbol{p}_{l,i}, \boldsymbol{v}_{l,i}\boldsymbol{u}_{l,i}\}_{l\in\mathcal{L},i\in\mathcal{C}_{l}(k_{0})}\Big) = \sum_{k\in\mathcal{I}}\sum_{l\in\mathcal{L}}\left(-\gamma_{l}\,s_{l}(k) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{C}_{l}(k_{0})} -\omega_{p}p_{l,i}(k) + \omega_{v}(v_{l,i}(k) - v_{\max})^{2} + \omega_{u}u_{l,i}^{2}(k-1)\Big),$$
(10)

where ω_p , ω_v and $\omega_u \in \mathbb{R}^+$ are the positive weights, while we let $\mathbf{s}_l = [s_l(k)]_{k \in \mathcal{I}}$, $\mathbf{p}_{l,i} = [p_{l,i}(k)]_{k \in \mathcal{I}}$, $\mathbf{v}_{l,i} = [v_{l,i}(k)]_{k \in \mathcal{I}}$, and $\mathbf{u}_{l,i} = [u_{l,i}(k-1)]_{k \in \mathcal{I}}$ be the vectors of variables for TLC-*l* and CAV-(*l*, *i*) over the control horizon, respectively.

In our problem formulation, the objective function is quadratic, while all the constraints are linear, which results in an MIQP problem. The MIQP problem is given as follows:

$$\begin{array}{l} \underset{\substack{s_{l}, p_{l,i}, u_{l,i}, u_{l,i} \\ \forall l \in \mathcal{L}, i \in \mathcal{C}_{l}(k_{0})}}{\text{subject to:}} & J\left(\{s_{l}, p_{l,i}, v_{l,i}, u_{l,i}\}_{l \in \mathcal{L}, i \in \mathcal{C}_{l}(k_{0})}\right), \\ (1), (2), \forall l \in \mathcal{L}, \\ (3), (4), \forall i \in \mathcal{C}_{l}(k_{0}), \\ (5), (6), (7), (8), \end{array} \right)$$

$$(11)$$

where the constraints hold for all the time step over the control horizon.

2.2 Big-M Constraint Formulation

In mixed-integer optimization, continuous variables and binary variables are often used in conjunction with big-M constraint formulations. The general form of big-M constraint formulation is given in the following definition.

Definition 3. Let $M \in \mathbb{R}^+$ be a large positive number. A big-M constraint involving a binary $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$ and a function $\Phi(\cdot)$ of continuous variable ν has the following form

$$\Phi(\boldsymbol{\nu}) \le M\delta,\tag{12}$$

where M must satisfy

$$M \ge \sup_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \Phi(\boldsymbol{\nu}). \tag{13}$$

The big-*M* constraint (12) implies that $\Phi(\boldsymbol{\nu}) \leq 0$ is active if $\delta = 0$, otherwise, it is not activated. Note that this definition also applies if δ is replaced by $(1 - \delta)$.

The big-M constraints are commonly used to model OR statements or IF-ELSE statements as a set of linear constraints. Using big-M formulation, the IF-ELSE statement in (1) is equivalent to

$$k - k_0 - \kappa_l \ge -M(1 - s_l(k)),$$

$$k - k_0 - \kappa_l + \epsilon \le M s_l(k),$$
(14)

if given $s_l(k_0) = 0$ and

$$k - k_0 - \kappa_l \ge -M s_l(k),$$

$$k - k_0 - \kappa_l + \epsilon \le M(1 - s_l(k)),$$
(15)

if given $s_l(k_0) = 1$, where $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is a sufficiently small number. Next, we can formulate (6) as

$$p_{l,i}(k) \le \psi_l + M s_l(k) \tag{16}$$

The OR statement can be equivalently formulated using the following set of linear constraints using the big-M method,

$$p_{l,i}(k) - \psi_l \ge -Mc_{l,i}(k),$$

$$\phi_l - p_{l,i}(k) \ge -Me_{l,i}(k),$$

$$p_{m,j}(k) - \psi_m \ge -Mc_{m,j}(k),$$

$$\phi_m - p_m(k) \ge -Me_{m,j}(k),$$

(17)

and

$$c_{l,i}(k) + e_{l,i}(k) + c_{m,j}(k) + e_{m,j}(k) \le 3,$$
 (18)

for all $k \in \mathcal{I}$, where $c_{l,i}(k), e_{l,i}(k), c_{m,j}(k), e_{m,j}(k) \in \{0,1\}$. The constraint (18) implies that at least a binary among $c_{l,i}(k), e_{l,i}(k), c_{m,j}(k)$, and $e_{m,j}(k)$ must be

0, which, when combined with (17), guarantees the distance of at least one vehicle to the conflict point is greater than or equal to d_{\min} . Note that all the binary variables $c_{l,i}(k)$ and $e_{l,i}(k)$, $\forall i \in C_l(k_0)$ are handled by TLC-*l*, leading to (17) is a coupling constraint between TLC-*l* and CAV-(*l*, *i*), while (18) is a coupling constraint between TLC-*l* and TLC-*m*. It can be observed that all the binary variables in the problem are involved in big-M constraints.

Remark 1. Compared to the formulation presented in (Le and Malikopoulos, 2024), we do not consider fixed binaries $c_{l,i}, e_{l,i}, c_{m,j}, e_{m,j}$ used in the lateral safety constraints over the next control horizon. As a result, it can better exploit the long-term coordination of CAVs within the receding horizon framework. However, it significantly increases the number of binary variables in the MIQP.

3 Sequential Tightening of Constraint Coefficients

Constraint coefficient tightening is one of the techniques commonly used to reduce the number of explored nodes in the branch-and-bound method implemented in a presolve routine (Quirynen and Di Cairano, 2023). The main idea is to tighten the coefficients in the constraints involving integer variables so that solving the relaxed problem generates a solution that nearly satisfies the mixed-integer requirement. As stated in (Quirynen and Di Cairano, 2023), this technique is highly efficient for problems with big-M constraints. Inspired by this idea, we propose a heuristic strategy for constraint coefficient tightening in a sequential manner, given the relaxed solution obtained at each iteration. We first illustrate the method in a centralized algorithm to solve the MIQP problem presented in Section 2.

Let $\boldsymbol{x} = [\boldsymbol{y}^{\top}, \boldsymbol{z}^{\top}]^{\top}$ be the vector of optimization variables, where $\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $\boldsymbol{z} \in \mathcal{Z}$ are the integer part and continuous part of \boldsymbol{x} , respectively. Let us rewrite the optimization problem (11) in the following centralized form

$$\begin{array}{l} \underset{\boldsymbol{y}\in\mathcal{Y},\boldsymbol{z}\in\mathcal{Z}}{\text{minimize }} f(\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{z}),\\ \text{subject to } \boldsymbol{C}\boldsymbol{y} + \boldsymbol{D}\boldsymbol{z} \leq \boldsymbol{b}, \end{array}$$
(19)

where $\boldsymbol{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n_y}$, $\boldsymbol{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n_z}$, $\boldsymbol{b} \in \mathbb{R}^m$. We impose the following assumption on the feasibility of (19).

Assumption 1. The problem (19) is feasible, i.e., admits at least a solution.

Note that if Assumption 1 is not satisfied for our problem presented in Section 2, we convert some hard constraints, e.g., local constraints, into soft constraints by using the max penalty function (or equivalently, slack variables) and penalize the deviation in the objective function. Next, we consider the following convex relaxation for (19)

minimize
$$f(\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{z}),$$

 $\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathcal{Y}', \boldsymbol{z} \in \mathcal{Z}$ $f(\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{z}),$
subject to $\boldsymbol{C} \boldsymbol{y} + \boldsymbol{D} \boldsymbol{z} \leq \boldsymbol{b},$
(20)

where \mathcal{Y}' is the set obtained from \mathcal{Y} by removing the integrality constraints. In more specific, for our problem, we replace the constraint set $\{0, 1\}$ by [0, 1] for all the binary variables.

The main idea is to reconstruct a solution of (19) starting from a solution of (20) by sequentially tightening the big-M constraints. Since C and b may involve M, we can express the linear constraint in (19) in the following form

$$\boldsymbol{C}(M)\boldsymbol{y} + \boldsymbol{D}\boldsymbol{z} \le \boldsymbol{b}(M). \tag{21}$$

Note that D does not involve M. Let \mathcal{I}_M be the set for the indices of big-M constraints, and without loss of generality, we assume that the first m_M constraints of (21) are big-M constraints. Let us consider the q-th constraint that involves big-M, $q \in \mathcal{I}_M$ in the following form

$$\boldsymbol{C}_{[q]}(M)\boldsymbol{y} + \boldsymbol{D}_{[q]}\boldsymbol{z} \le b_{[q]}(M), \qquad (22)$$

where $C_{[q]}$ and $D_{[q]}$ are the q-th row of C and D, respectively. To update the coefficients of (22), we first identify the element in $C_{[q]}$ that involves M, e.g., r-th element, and let us denote it by $C_{[q,r]}$. We start with setting $M_{[q]}^{(0)}$ with the smallest valid value based on the bound given in (13). At each iteration t, we solve the relaxed problem and let $\bar{y}^{(t)}$ be the solution obtained from solving the relaxed problem at iteration t. If $\bar{y}_{[r]}^{(t)}$ is not binary yet, we scale $M_{[m,r]}$ by a factor that depends on $\bar{y}_{[r]}^{(t)}$. In other words, we update $M_{y,[r]}^{(t)}$ by the following strategy. We update $M_{[q]}^{(t+1)}$ as follows:

$$M_{[q]}^{(t+1)} = \begin{cases} M_{[q]}^{(t)}, & \text{if } \bar{\boldsymbol{y}}_{[r]}^{(t)} \in \{0, 1\}, \\ M_{[q]}^{(t)} \max(\xi, \bar{\boldsymbol{y}}_{[r]}^{(t)}), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$
(23)

where $\xi > 0$ is a small positive constant to avoid sharp change in $M_{[q]}^{(t)}$ if $\bar{\boldsymbol{y}}_{[r]}^{(t)}$ is close to 0.

Remark 2. To avoid numerical issues, in the implementation, we replace the condition $\bar{\boldsymbol{y}}_{[r]}^{(t)} \in \{0,1\}$ by checking whether $\bar{\boldsymbol{y}}_{[r]}^{(t)}$ is sufficiently close to 0 or 1, i.e., $\operatorname{dist}(\boldsymbol{y}^{(t)}, \{0,1\}) < \epsilon$ where $\epsilon > 0$ is a convergence tolerance.

Note that the relaxed problem can be infeasible if the constraints are overly tightened. To address this issue, we utilize the max penalty function to find the solution Algorithm 1 Centralized Algorithm

Require: t_{\max} , ϵ 1: for $t = 1, 2, ..., t_{\max}$ do 2: Solve the relaxed QP problem (24) to obtain $\bar{y}^{(t+1)}$ 3: Update the constraint coefficients using (23) 4: if dist($\bar{y}^{(t)}, \{0, 1\}$) $\leq \epsilon$ then 5: return $\bar{y}^{(t)}$ 6: end if 7: end for 8: return $\bar{y}^{(t)}$

with minimal violation, resulting in the following optimization problem at each iteration

 $\begin{array}{l} \underset{\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathcal{Y}', \boldsymbol{z} \in \mathcal{Z}}{\text{minimize}} \quad f(\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{z}) + \sum_{q \in \mathcal{I}_M} \max(0, \boldsymbol{C}_{[q]} \boldsymbol{y} + \boldsymbol{D}_{[q]} \boldsymbol{z} - b_{[q]}), \\ \text{subject to} \quad \boldsymbol{C}_{[q]} \boldsymbol{y} + \boldsymbol{D}_{[q]} \boldsymbol{z} \leq b_{[q]}, \ q \notin \mathcal{I}_M. \end{aligned}$ (24)

The centralized algorithm is thus given in Algorithm 1.

Lemma 1. For each q-th constraint, the sequence $\{M_{lol}^{(t)}\}$ converges to a limit point.

Proof. Given the update strategy (23), $\{M_{[q]}^{(t)}\}$ is non-increasing and is lower bounded by 0, thus it converges to a limit point (Rudin, 2021).

As a corollary of Lemma 1, the centralized algorithm converges. Once the algorithm converges and returns a solution, we recover the binary solutions by checking whether the constraint with continuous variables is active or not. Then, we fix the binary variables and solve the QP problem with the original big-M constraints again to obtain the optimal values for the continuous variables. To better illustrate the sequential constrainttightening process, we consider the following simple example.

Example 1.

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{minimize} \quad \boldsymbol{x}^{\top}\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{q}^{\top}\boldsymbol{x}, \end{array} \tag{25a}$$

subject to
$$x \le [5, 12, 9, 6]^+, x - M \delta \le 0,$$
 (25b)

$$\mathbf{1}^{\top} \boldsymbol{x} < 20, \ \mathbf{1}^{\top} \boldsymbol{\delta} < 3, \tag{25c}$$

$$\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^4, \ \boldsymbol{\delta} \in \{0, 1\}^4.$$

where $\boldsymbol{q}^{\top} = [-30, -20, -24, -10].$

The mixed-integer optimal solution of (25) is $\boldsymbol{x} = [5.0, 6.5, 8.5, 0.0]^{\top}$, $\boldsymbol{\delta} = [1, 1, 1, 0]^{\top}$. The parameters of proximal ADMM are chosen as: $\rho = 0.1$, $\beta = 0.5$, $\gamma = 1$. Using our algorithm, convergence is achieved after 8 iterations. In Fig. 2, we show the solution trajectory obtained from solving the relaxed QP over iterations,



Fig. 2. The solutions obtained from the relaxed QP of (25), for continuous variables (top), and integer variables (bot-tom).

which demonstrates that the relaxed binary variables converge.

4 Distributed Mixed-Integer Quadratic Programming

In this section, we present the distributed algorithm to solve the MIQP problem based on proximal ADMM (Deng et al., 2017) and the constraint tightening technique. Though ADMM algorithms were originally introduced as a tool for convex optimization problems, they have proven to be a powerful heuristic method even for NP-hard nonconvex problems; see (Boyd et al., 2011). A natural extension of the algorithm presented in the last section is to utilize proximal ADMM until convergence in the inner loop to find the solution of the relaxed QP at each iteration of Algorithm 1. However, we propose a single-loop algorithm where, at each iteration, we perform proximal ADMM while tightening the constraints.

First, we describe the communication between the agents in our multi-agent optimization problem as follows.

Definition 4. Let N be the total number of agents, $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \ldots, N\}$ be the set of agents, and $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ be the set of edges. We assume that the edges are undirected. For each agent- $i, i \in \mathcal{V}$, let $\mathcal{N}_i = \{j \in \mathcal{V} \mid (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}\}$ be the set of its neighbors.

Next, we rewrite the optimization problem (11) in the following general form with separable objectives and coupling constraints

$$\begin{array}{ll} \underset{\boldsymbol{x}_{i} \in \mathcal{X}_{i}}{\text{minimize}} & \sum_{i=1}^{N} f_{i}(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}), \\ \text{subject to} & \boldsymbol{A}_{i} \boldsymbol{x}_{i} \leq \boldsymbol{b}_{i}, \\ & \sum_{i=1}^{N} \boldsymbol{C}_{i} \boldsymbol{x}_{i} \leq \boldsymbol{d}, \end{array}$$
(26)

where \mathcal{X}_i is the mixed-integer-valued set for \boldsymbol{x}_i , f_i is the local objective function of each agent-i, \boldsymbol{A}_i , and \boldsymbol{b}_i are the matrices and vectors of coefficients for the local constraints, while \boldsymbol{C}_i and \boldsymbol{d} are the matrices and vectors of coefficients for the coupling constraints, respectively. The optimization problem (26) follows the standard formulation in (Deng et al., 2017), which covers the case where the coupling constraints are pairwise in our problem.

We convert an inequality constraint into an equality constraint by introducing auxiliary allocation variables. Let \boldsymbol{w}_i be the allocation variables agent-*i* which satisfy $\sum_{i=1}^{N} \boldsymbol{w}_i = \boldsymbol{d}$. Thus, we can formulate the equivalent problem (26) as follows:

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}_i, \boldsymbol{w}_i} \sum_{i=1}^N f_i(\boldsymbol{x}_i), \qquad (27a)$$

subject to
$$\boldsymbol{A}_i \boldsymbol{x}_i \leq \boldsymbol{b}_i,$$
 (27b)

$$C_i \boldsymbol{x}_i \leq \boldsymbol{w}_i, \qquad (27c)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \boldsymbol{w}_i = \boldsymbol{d}, \qquad (27d)$$

where let $\boldsymbol{w} = [\boldsymbol{w}_i]_{i \in \mathcal{V}}^{\top}$ is the concatenated vector of all auxiliary variables.

The convex relaxation of (27) is given by

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{x}_i \in \mathcal{X}'_i, \boldsymbol{w}_i} \sum_{i=1}^N f_i(\boldsymbol{x}_i),$$
(28a)

subject to
$$\boldsymbol{A}_i \boldsymbol{x}_i \leq \boldsymbol{b}_i,$$
 (28b)

$$C_i x_i \le w_i, \tag{28c}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \boldsymbol{w}_i = \boldsymbol{d}.$$
 (28d)

The augmented Lagrangian for the problem with equality constraints is formulated as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{w}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} f_i(\boldsymbol{x}_i) + \left\langle \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \sum_{i=1}^{N} \boldsymbol{w}_i - \boldsymbol{d} \right\rangle + \frac{\rho}{2} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{N} \boldsymbol{w}_i - \boldsymbol{d} \right\|^2,$$
(29)

where λ is the vector of dual variables (Lagrangian multipliers), and $\rho > 0$ are positive constants.

The proximal ADMM algorithm for solving (28) works as follows. At each iteration t + 1, each agent-*i* solves the following *x*-minimization problem in parallel

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_{i}^{(t+1)}, \boldsymbol{w}_{i}^{(t+1)} = \underset{\boldsymbol{x}_{i} \in \mathcal{X}_{i}^{\prime}, \boldsymbol{w}_{i}}{\arg\min} f_{i}(\boldsymbol{x}_{i}) + \frac{\beta}{2} \left\| \boldsymbol{w}_{i} - \boldsymbol{w}_{i}^{(t)} \right\|^{2} \\ + \frac{\rho}{2} \left\| \boldsymbol{w}_{i} - \left(\boldsymbol{d} - \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^{N} \boldsymbol{w}_{j}^{(t)} \right) + \frac{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(t)}}{\rho} \right\|^{2},$$

subject to: $\boldsymbol{A}_{i} \boldsymbol{x}_{i} \leq \boldsymbol{b}_{i},$
 $\boldsymbol{C}_{i} \boldsymbol{x}_{i} \leq \boldsymbol{w}_{i},$
(30)

where $\beta > 0$. Given the relaxed solution $\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{(t+1)}$, agent-i adjusts the constraint coefficients based on the big-M update strategy presented in (23). Next, agent-i transmits $\boldsymbol{w}_i^{(t+1)}$ to agent $-j, j \in \mathcal{N}_i$. After receiving all the information from the neighbors, agent-i updates the dual variables as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(t+1)} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(t)} + \gamma \rho \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} \boldsymbol{w}_{i}^{(t+1)} - \boldsymbol{d} \right), \qquad (31)$$

where $\gamma > 0$ is a damping coefficient. Note that in distributed implementation, each agent can keep a copy of the dual variables $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ and update them in parallel. Compared to regular ADMM, proximal ADMM adds a proximal term $\frac{\beta}{2} \| \boldsymbol{w}_i - \boldsymbol{w}_i^{(t)} \|^2$ to the *x*-minimization problem and a damping coefficient to the dual update. The proximal ADMM algorithm can fully exploit parallel computation for solving subproblems and achieve convergence at a rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/k)$. The algorithm with distributed implementation can also be summarized in Algorithm 2.

Similar to the centralized algorithm, in the second stage of the distributed algorithm, we fix the binary variables found in the first stage and utilize proximal ADMM to find the optimal values for continuous variables with the original big-M constraints. Since the second stage follows the standard implementation of proximal ADMM, the details are omitted. In practice, the second stage converges very quickly since the solution returned from the first stage is close to the true solution of the QP problem with fixed binary variables.

Lemma 2. (Deng et al., 2017) The proximal ADMM converges if the following conditions on the parameters hold

$$\beta > \rho \left(\frac{N}{2 - \gamma} - 1 \right). \tag{32}$$

Therefore, combining Lemma 1 and Lemma 2 yields that the distributed proximal ADMM algorithm with

Algorithm 2 Distributed Algorithm

Require: t_{\max} , ϵ , ρ , β , γ

1: for $t = 1, 2, ..., t_{\max}$ do

- Agent-*i* solves the *x*-minimization problem (30) in parallel to obtain $\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_i^{(t+1)}$ and $\boldsymbol{w}_i^{(t+1)}$ Agent-*i* update the constraint coefficients using 2:
- 3: (23)
- Agent-*i* transmits $\boldsymbol{w}_i^{(t+1)}$ to agent-*j*, $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$ 4:
- 5:

```
Agent-i update the dual variables using (31)

if dist(\bar{\boldsymbol{y}}_{i}^{(t+1)}, \{0,1\}) \leq \epsilon and \left\| \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_{i}^{(t+1)} - \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_{i}^{(t)} \right\| \leq
6:
          \epsilon, \forall i \in \mathcal{V} then
```

- return $\bar{\boldsymbol{y}}^{(t+1)}$ 7:
- end if 8:

9: end for

10: return $\bar{y}^{(t_{\max})}$



Fig. 3. The solutions obtained from the relaxed QP of (25), for continuous variables (top), and integer variables (bottom).

sequential constraint tightening converges. To better demonstrate the convergence property of the distributed algorithm, we revisit Example 1 presented in Section 3, in which we consider 4 agents coordinating to solve the problem. The variable of each agent-*i* is $\boldsymbol{x}_{[i]}$ and $\boldsymbol{\delta}_{[i]}$. The agents share two coupling constraints in (25c). The parameters of proximal ADMM are chosen as: $\rho = 0.1$, $\beta = 0.5$, and $\gamma = 1$. Our numerical simulation shows that the distributed algorithm converges after 24 iterations, and its solution trajectory over iterations is shown in Fig 3.

$\mathbf{5}$ **Numerical Studies**

In this section, we demonstrate the control performance of the proposed framework by numerical simulations.

5.1 Simulation Setups

We validated our framework using a mixed-traffic simulation environment in SUMO interfacing with the Ju-

Table 1			
Parameters of the	$\operatorname{problem}$	formulation.	

Parameters	Values	Values Parameters	
Н	20	ΔT	$0.5\mathrm{s}$
δ_{\min}	20	$\delta_{ m max}$	100
$v_{\rm max}$	$15.0\mathrm{m/s}$	v_{\min}	$0.0\mathrm{m/s}$
a_{\max}	$3.0\mathrm{m/s}$	a_{\min}	$-4.0\mathrm{m/s^2}$
au	$1.0\mathrm{s}$	d_{\min}	$6.0\mathrm{m}$
ω_p	10^{0}	ω_v	10^{0}
ω_u	10^{-1}	M	10^{3}

Table 2

Accuracy rates of binary solutions from Algorithm 2 in comparison with the optimal binary solution from the GUROBI solver.

Number of agents	15	20	25	30
Accuracy rate	98.5%	97.6%	96.6%	96.2%

lia programming language via TraCI (Lopez et al., 2018) and the PyCall package. We conducted simulations for three traffic volumes: 1200, 1400, and 1600 vehicles per hour, and six different penetration rates: 0%, 20%, 40%, 60%, 80%, and 100%. In the simulations, the vehicles are randomly assigned to the lanes, with balanced entry rates across four directions. The parameters of the problem formulation are given in Table 1.

5.2Simulation Results

We first evaluate the performance of our proposed optimization algorithm by comparing the solutions with the GUROBI solver. We randomly generate problems with different numbers of agents and initial conditions. We compute the accuracy rates by comparing the binary solution from our algorithm to the optimal binary solution returned by the GUROBI solver (see (Gurobi Optimization, LLC, 2021)), averaging from 1,000 problems for each fixed number of agents and we present the results in Table 2. Overall, we observe that our proposed algorithm achieves an accuracy of more than 95% in terms of binary solutions, though the accuracy rates slightly decrease as the number of agents increases. However, our distributed algorithm can find an approximate solution in a reasonable amount of time, and it is more scalable with the number of agents than the centralized approach, as shown in Table 3. Although the solution obtained from our algorithm does not reach 100% optimality, its integration within the receding horizon control framework generally ensures good performance for our problem, as we demonstrate next.

Videos and data from the simulations can be found at https://sites.google.com/cornell.edu/ tlc-cav-admm. The simulations show that the proposed framework efficiently manages traffic light systems and CAVs under different traffic volumes and penetration rates. It enables CAVs to coordinate intersection crossings while reducing complete stops at traffic lights, par-

Table 3

Average computation time (in seconds) for the centralized optimization using GUROBI solver and the proposed distributed optimization algorithm (Algorithm 2) across different numbers of agents.

Number of agents	15	20	25	30
Algorithm 2's computation time	0.09	0.20	0.35	0.44
GUROBI's computation time	0.15	0.46	0.87	1.90

ticularly when penetration rates are high, such as 80% or 100%. In Fig. 4, we show an example of the vehicle trajectories and traffic light states for two conflicting lanes in simulations with 60% and 100% penetration rates and 1600 vehicles per hour.

To thoroughly evaluate the performance of our proposed framework, we conduct 30-minute simulations for different traffic volumes and penetration rates to collect statistical results. We compare two metrics: (1) the average travel time and (2) the total acceleration averaging among all the vehicles. The total acceleration of each vehicle is computed from the time it enters the control zone until it exits, which may be indirectly related to its total energy consumption (Malikopoulos et al., 2008). The results can be shown in Fig. 5. Overall, in all three examined traffic volumes, starting from a penetration rate of 60%, the framework achieves remarkable travel time improvement compared to the scenario with pure HDVs. The framework also performs well at lower penetration rates (20% and 40%), and differences compared to the pure HDV case remain relatively small. Moreover, we can observe that CAV penetration generally leads to lower total acceleration rates, which may result in less energy consumption (see (Malikopoulos et al., 2008)). and a more comfortable travel experience. Especially under 100% penetration, the CAV coordination can significantly improve the metrics. That is because the framework allows CAVs to coordinate their intersection crossings while mitigating full stops at traffic lights.

To demonstrate the improvement of fully leveraging CAV coordination for intersection crossing presented in this paper, we compare it with a baseline approach using the formulation we developed in our prior work; see (Le and Malikopoulos, 2024). The statistics are computed from simulations conducted with the high traffic volume of 1600 vehicles per hour and are shown in Fig. 6. The top figure shows that approach #1 in this paper results in a significant reduction in average travel time as the penetration rate increases, whereas approach #2 exhibits a more gradual decrease. This suggests that the CAV coordination formulation in this paper improves traffic efficiency at higher penetration rates compared to the formulation in (Le and Malikopoulos, 2024). Meanwhile, the bottom figure shows no significant difference in average total acceleration between the two approaches.

6 Conclusions

In this paper, we presented an MIQP framework designed to coordinate traffic signals and CAVs within mixed-traffic intersections, effectively leveraging the benefits of long-term CAV coordination. To address the challenges posed by the resulting multi-agent MIQP, characterized by a substantial number of binary variables, we developed a distributed optimization algorithm capable of solving the problem within a reasonable timeframe. This distributed optimization approach utilized proximal ADMM for resolving the convex relaxation and employed a sequential constraint tightening heuristic to uphold integrality constraints. The simulation results demonstrated that our distributed algorithm successfully ensured the performance of the control framework across various CAV penetration rates and traffic volumes, with notable improvements observed as the CAV penetration rate increased. We believe that further enhancements to the algorithm can be achieved through additional techniques aimed at optimizing mixed-integer solutions and minimizing computation time, which will be the focus of our future research.

References

- A. Alavian and M. C. Rotkowitz. Improving ADMMbased optimization of mixed integer objectives. In 2017 51st Annual Conference on Information Sciences and Systems (CISS), pages 1–6. IEEE, 2017.
- A. Alessandrini, A. Campagna, P. Delle Site, F. Filippi, and L. Persia. Automated vehicles and the rethinking of mobility and cities. *Transportation Research Procedia*, 5:145–160, 2015.
- B. Alrifaee, M. G. Mamaghani, and D. Abel. Centralized non-convex model predictive control for cooperative collision avoidance of networked vehicles. In 2014 IEEE International Symposium on Intelligent Control (ISIC), pages 1583–1588. IEEE, 2014.
- D. P. Bertsekas. Constrained optimization and Lagrange multiplier methods. Academic press, 2014.
- S. Boyd, N. Parikh, E. Chu, B. Peleato, J. Eckstein, et al. Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine learning*, 3(1): 1–122, 2011.
- A. Camisa, I. Notarnicola, and G. Notarstefano. A primal decomposition method with suboptimality bounds for distributed mixed-integer linear programming. In 2018 IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), pages 3391–3396. IEEE, 2018.
- A. Camisa, I. Notarnicola, and G. Notarstefano. Distributed primal decomposition for large-scale MILPs. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 67(1):413– 420, 2021.
- B. Chalaki and A. A. Malikopoulos. Optimal control of connected and automated vehicles at multiple adjacent intersections. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, 30(3):972–984, 2022. doi: 10.1109/TCST.2021.3082306.



Fig. 4. Vehicle trajectories and traffic light states for two conflicting lanes. The trajectories for CAVs and HDVs are represented by orange and black curves, respectively. Solid and dashed curves distinguish the vehicles moving on different lanes. The conflict zone is depicted as a shaded blue area.



Fig. 5. Average travel time (top) and average acceleration (bottom) under different penetration rates and traffic volumes.

- W. Deng, M.-J. Lai, Z. Peng, and W. Yin. Parallel multiblock ADMM with O (1/k) convergence. *Journal of Scientific Computing*, 71:712–736, 2017.
- Y. Du, W. ShangGuan, and L. Chai. A coupled vehiclesignal control method at signalized intersections in mixed traffic environment. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, 70(3):2089–2100, 2021.
- A. Falsone, K. Margellos, and M. Prandini. A distributed iterative algorithm for multi-agent MILPs: Finite-time feasibility and performance characterization. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 2(4):563–568, 2018.



Fig. 6. Comparison of average travel time (top) and average acceleration (bottom) between two formulations: this work (#1) and (Le and Malikopoulos, 2024) (#2).

- A. Falsone, K. Margellos, and M. Prandini. A decentralized approach to multi-agent MILPs: finite-time feasibility and performance guarantees. *Automatica*, 103:141–150, 2019.
- R. Firoozi, R. Quirynen, and S. Di Cairano. Coordination of autonomous vehicles and dynamic traffic rules in mixed automated/manual traffic. In 2022 American Control Conference (ACC), pages 1030–1035. IEEE, 2022.
- A. Ghosh and T. Parisini. Traffic control in a mixed autonomy scenario at urban intersections: An optimal control approach. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent*

Transportation Systems, 23(10):17325–17341, 2022.

- J. Guo, L. Cheng, and S. Wang. CoTV: Cooperative control for traffic light signals and connected autonomous vehicles using deep reinforcement learning. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 24(10):10501–10512, 2023.
- Gurobi Optimization, LLC. Gurobi optimizer reference manual, 2021. URL http://www.gurobi.com.
- M. A. S. Kamal, T. Hayakawa, and J.-i. Imura. Development and evaluation of an adaptive traffic signal control scheme under a mixed-automated traffic scenario. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 21(2):590–602, 2019.
- A. Katriniok, B. Rosarius, and P. Mähönen. Fully distributed model predictive control of connected automated vehicles in intersections: Theory and vehicle experiments. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 23(10):18288–18300, 2022.
- M. Klostermeier, V. Yfantis, A. Wagner, and M. Ruskowski. A numerical study on the parallelization of dual decomposition-based distributed mixedinteger programming. In 2024 European Control Conference (ECC), pages 2724–2729. IEEE, 2024.
- V.-A. Le and A. A. Malikopoulos. A Cooperative Optimal Control Framework for Connected and Automated Vehicles in Mixed Traffic Using Social Value Orientation. In 2022 61th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), pages 6272–6277, 2022.
- V.-A. Le and A. A. Malikopoulos. Optimal weight adaptation of model predictive control for connected and automated vehicles in mixed traffic with bayesian optimization. In 2023 American Control Conference (ACC), pages 1183–1188. IEEE, 2023.
- V.-A. Le and A. A. Malikopoulos. Distributed Optimization for Traffic Light Control and Connected Automated Vehicle Coordination in Mixed-Traffic Intersections. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 8:2721–2726, 2024.
- V.-A. Le, H. M. Wang, G. Orosz, and A. A. Malikopoulos. Coordination for Connected Automated Vehicles at Merging Roadways in Mixed Traffic Environment. In 2023 62nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), pages 4150–4155. IEEE, 2023.
- V.-A. Le, B. Chalaki, F. N. Tzortzoglou, and A. A. Malikopoulos. Stochastic time-optimal trajectory planning for connected and automated vehicles in mixedtraffic merging scenarios. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, 2024.
- J. Li, C. Yu, Z. Shen, Z. Su, and W. Ma. A survey on urban traffic control under mixed traffic environment with connected automated vehicles. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 154:104258, 2023.
- Z. Liu and O. Stursberg. Distributed solution of MIQP problems arising for networked systems with coupling constraints. In 2021 European Control Conference (ECC), pages 2420–2425. IEEE, 2021.
- Z. Liu and O. Stursberg. Distributed solution of mixedinteger programs by ADMM with closed duality gap.

In 2022 IEEE 61st Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), pages 279–286. IEEE, 2022.

- P. A. Lopez, M. Behrisch, L. Bieker-Walz, J. Erdmann, Y.-P. Flötteröd, R. Hilbrich, L. Lücken, J. Rummel, P. Wagner, and E. Wießner. Microscopic traffic simulation using SUMO. In 2018 21st International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC), pages 2575–2582. IEEE, 2018.
- A. A. Malikopoulos, D. N. Assanis, and P. Y. Papalambros. Optimal engine calibration for individual driving styles. Technical report, SAE Technical Paper, 2008.
- A. A. Malikopoulos, L. E. Beaver, and I. V. Chremos. Optimal time trajectory and coordination for connected and automated vehicles. *Automatica*, 125 (109469), 2021.
- R. Niroumand, L. Hajibabai, and A. Hajbabaie. White phase intersection control through distributed coordination: A mobile controller paradigm in a mixed traffic stream. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 24(3):2993–3007, 2023.
- R. Quirynen and S. Di Cairano. Tailored presolve techniques in branch-and-bound method for fast mixedinteger optimal control applications. *Optimal Control Applications and Methods*, 44(6):3139–3167, 2023.
- S. Ravikumar, R. Quirynen, A. Bhagat, E. Zeino, and S. Di Cairano. Mixed-integer programming for centralized coordination of connected and automated vehicles in dynamic environment. In 2021 IEEE Conference on Control Technology and Applications (CCTA), pages 814–819. IEEE, 2021.
- W. Rudin. Principles of mathematical analysis. 2021.
- L. Song and W. Fan. Traffic signal control under mixed traffic with connected and automated vehicles: a transfer-based deep reinforcement learning approach. *IEEE Access*, 9:145228–145237, 2021.
- B. Stellato, V. V. Naik, A. Bemporad, P. Goulart, and S. Boyd. Embedded mixed-integer quadratic optimization using the osqp solver. In 2018 European Control Conference (ECC), pages 1536–1541. IEEE, 2018.
- C. Sun and R. Dai. Distributed optimization for convex mixed-integer programs based on projected subgradient algorithm. In 2018 IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), pages 2581–2586. IEEE, 2018.
- N. Suriyarachchi, R. Quirynen, J. S. Baras, and S. Di Cairano. Optimization-based coordination and control of traffic lights and mixed traffic in multiintersection environments. In 2023 American Control Conference (ACC), pages 3162–3168. IEEE, 2023.
- M. Tajalli and A. Hajbabaie. Traffic signal timing and trajectory optimization in a mixed autonomy traffic stream. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transporta*tion Systems, 23(7):6525–6538, 2021.
- R. Takapoui, N. Moehle, S. Boyd, and A. Bemporad. A simple effective heuristic for embedded mixed-integer quadratic programming. *International journal of control*, 93(1):2–12, 2020.
- A. Testa, A. Rucco, and G. Notarstefano. Distributed mixed-integer linear programming via cut generation and constraint exchange. *IEEE Transactions on Au*-

tomatic Control, 65(4):1456-1467, 2019.

- P. Varaiya. Max pressure control of a network of signalized intersections. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 36:177–195, 2013.
- R. Vujanic, P. M. Esfahani, P. J. Goulart, S. Mariéthoz, and M. Morari. A decomposition method for large scale MILPs, with performance guarantees and a power system application. *Automatica*, 67:144–156, 2016.