This paper develops an output feedback control law in order to damp out traffic oscillations in the congested regime of the linearized two-class Aw-Rascle (AR) traffic model. The macroscopic second-order two-class AR traffic model consists of four hyperbolic partial differential equations (PDEs) describing the dynamics of densities and velocities on freeway. Each vehicle class is characterized by its own vehicle size and driver’s behavior. The considered equilibrium profiles of the model represent evenly distributed traffic with constant densities and velocities of both classes along the investigated track section. After linearizing the model equations around those equilibrium profiles, it is observed that in the congested traffic one of the four characteristic speeds is negative, whereas the remaining three are positive. Backstepping control design is employed to stabilize the $4 \times 4$ heterodirectional hyperbolic PDEs. The control input actuates the traffic flow at outlet of the investigated track section and is realized by a ramp metering. The output feedback controller is obtained by designing an anti-collocated observer and combining it with a full state feedback result. Overall, the output feedback control law achieves the damping of stop-and-go waves in finite time by measuring the velocities and densities of both vehicle classes at the inlet of the investigated track section. The performance of the developed controller is verified by simulation of the linearized model and quantified by performance indices for the fuel consumption, comfort and total travel time.
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1. Introduction

Nowadays, more and more people own a car leading to crowded highways and congested traffic during rush hours in many countries of the world. Stop-and-go traffic is common to appear in congested traffic. This phenomenon is characterized by traffic density and velocity perturbations, causing higher fuel consumption and a higher risk of accidents. The overall challenge addressed in this work is the design of a ramp metering traffic management system to reduce traffic oscillations in the congested regime while distinguishing two different vehicle classes. Thereby, a vehicle class is defined to be a group of vehicles with the same properties, see Logghe (2003).

In general, traffic models are categorized in micro-, meso- and macroscopic models. Macroscopic models describe the traffic as a continuum and are thus more suitable to investigate traffic jams and disturbances in traffic flow. Typically, their model equations are PDEs. Macroscopic second-order multi-class models are introduced in, Gupta and Katiyar (2007), Jiang and Wu (2004), Mohan and Ramadurai (2017), Tang, Huang, Zhao, and Shang (2009) and Tang, Jiang, Wu, Wiwatanapataphee, and Wu (2007). The denoted second-order models differ in the terms that occur in the velocity dynamics and in the principles which are used to deduce them. The main focus of this paper is the macroscopic multi-class model (Mohan & Ramadurai, 2017), because it is validated by simulation and compared to other macroscopic multi-class models as well as considers the size of vehicles. For the case of two different classes, this extension of the AR traffic model yields four coupled nonlinear hyperbolic PDEs which are denoted as the two-class AR traffic model in the following. In order to consider vehicle sizes, the vehicles are assumed to adjust their speed according to a measure called area occupancy which needs to be distinguished from occupancy (Malikarjun & Rao, 2006).

in a multi-class traffic framework considering two classes. The optimization aims to minimize an objective function including total emission and total time spent. Moreover, Deo, De Schutter, and Hegyi (2009) present a Model Predictive Control approach to coordinate traffic management systems like ramp metering and variable speed limits for a multi-class traffic flow model. The cost functional employed in the presented benchmark example is the total time spent by the vehicles in the network. Additionally, Liu, Hellendoorn, and De Schutter (2017) also apply a Model Predictive Control Approach based on multi-class emission and traffic flow models considering the total time spent and total emission with variable speed limits and ramp metering as control measures. Typically, traffic management systems act on the boundary of the investigated track section yielding a boundary control problem. Further efforts focused on boundary control of stop-and-go traffic with traffic management systems are given by Burkhardt, Yu, and Krstic (2020), Yu and Krstic (2018, 2019) and Zhang and Frieue (2017).

In literature, different techniques are proposed that achieve convergence of the states of hyperbolic coupled PDEs to a constant equilibrium with boundary control. The main focus of this paper is on the backstepping stabilization technique (Deuscher, 2017; Hu, Meglio, Vazquez, & Krstic, 2015; Meglio, Vazquez, & Krstic, 2013; Su, Wang, & Krstic, 2017). In fact, the presented output feedback control of this work is based on the full state feedback result of Burkhardt et al. (2020) and corresponds to the special case of the theoretical result in Hu et al. (2015) where three transport systems propagate downstream and one transport system propagates upstream.

**Contribution:** this work presents the first result on output feedback boundary control design with backstepping for traffic congestion consisting of two different vehicle classes. On one hand, this work contributes to traffic modeling in the sense of deducing a macroscopic multi-class traffic model in its characteristic form and investigating the obtained characteristic speeds. On the other hand, the theoretical control design method backstepping is applied to an up-to-date extension of the AR traffic model for two classes is created by designing an output feedback controller as ramp metering signal.

This paper is structured as follows: Section 2 introduces the two-class AR traffic model, the parameters characterizing the two classes and the formulation of the control design model. Furthermore, the output feedback controller result is presented in Section 3. Section 4 verifies the performance of the presented controller with simulation results obtained by the linearized model and covers the computation of performance indices. Future work is discussed in Section 5.

### 2. Problem statement

The two-class AR traffic model is presented and important model parameters are explained. Afterwards, the model equations are linearized around a constant equilibrium, followed by a discussion of boundary conditions, its qualitative behavior in the congested regime and a transformation to Riemann coordinates in order to obtain the control design model.

#### 2.1. Two-class AR traffic model

The extended AR model for heterogeneous traffic presented in Mohan and Ramadurai (2017) is investigated in case of two classes and is then given by

\[
\begin{align*}
\partial_t \rho_1 + \partial_x \left( \rho_1 v_1 \right) &= -\partial_x \left( \rho_1 v_1 \right), \\
\partial_t \left( v_1 + p_1(AO) \right) + v_1 \partial_x \left( v_1 + p_1(AO) \right) &= \frac{V_{e,i}(AO) - v_1}{\tau_1},
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\partial_t \rho_2 = -\partial_x \left( \rho_2 v_2 \right),
\]

\[
\partial_t (v_2 + p_2(AO)) + v_2 \partial_x (v_2 + p_2(AO)) = \frac{V_{e,i}(AO) - v_2}{\tau_2},
\]

where each vehicle class 1 is described by traffic density \( \rho_i(x, t) \) and velocity \( v_i(x, t) \) with \( (0, L) \times (0, \infty) \). The corresponding initial conditions are \( \rho_i(0, t) = \rho_{i,0}(x) \in \mathbb{R}^I_+ \) and \( v_i(0, t) = v_{i,0}(x) \in \mathbb{R}^I_+ \). Additionally, the boundary conditions (11) are motivated and discussed in Section 2.3. The parameter \( L \) is the length of the investigated track section. The traffic density \( \rho_i(x, t) \) is defined as vehicles per unit length. In addition, the velocity \( v_i(x, t) \) describes the velocity at a specified spatial point along the investigated track section. Moreover, \( \tau_i \) is the so-called adaptation time. The variable \( AO(\rho_1, \rho_2) \) describes the area occupancy and is based on the definition of the occupancy introduced (Mallikarjuna & Rao, 2006). In Mohan and Ramadurai (2017), the expression for the area occupancy is simplified to

\[
AO(\rho_1, \rho_2) = \frac{a_1 L p_1 + a_2 L p_2}{WL},
\]

and the equilibrium speed-AO relationship \( V_{e,i}(AO) \) as

\[
V_{e,i}(AO) = V_i \left( 1 - \left( \frac{AO(\rho_1, \rho_2)}{AO_i} \right)^\gamma \right),
\]

according to the model of Greenshield (Greenshields, Channing, & Miller, 1935). The experienced traffic pressure \( p_i(AO) \) grows with \( AO \). The equilibrium speed-AO relationship \( V_{e,i}(AO) \) describes the desired velocity of the drivers. More crowded freeways lead to higher \( AO \) and therefore a lower desired velocity. Therein, \( V_i \) corresponds to the free-flow velocity, \( f_1 > 1 \) to the traffic pressure exponent and \( AO_i \) to the maximum area occupancy. The free-flow velocity \( V_i \) represents the desired velocity of a driver, if no other vehicles of any class are present, \( V_{e,i}(0) = V_i \). The pressure exponent \( \gamma_1 \) is a degree of freedom to model the experienced traffic pressure of the drivers correctly. The maximum area occupancy \( AO_i \) describes the percentage of occupied road surface for which the corresponding vehicle class is jammed, i.e. \( V_{e,i}(AO_i) = 0 \). To obtain physically meaningful results, \( 0 < AO_i \leq 1 \) holds.

#### 2.2. Linearized two-class AR traffic model

The two-class AR traffic model (1) is linearized around a constant equilibrium \( z^* = (\rho_1^*, v_1^*, \rho_2^*, v_2^*)^T \). Inserting this constant state in (1) yields the conditions

\[
v_i^*(\rho_1^*, \rho_2^*) = V_{e,i}(AO(\rho_1^*, \rho_2^*)).
\]

Thus, the equilibrium velocities are determined by the equilibrium densities \( \rho_1^* \) and \( \rho_2^* \). The perturbations of the distributed variables \( \rho_i(x, t) \) and \( v_i(x, t) \) are defined as

\[
\tilde{\rho}_i(x, t) = \rho_i(x, t) - \rho_i^*, \quad \tilde{v}_i(x, t) = v_i(x, t) - v_i^*.
\]

and the linearized model equations are given by

\[
J_1 z_t + J_2 z_x + J_2 z_t = 0,
\]
with state vector \( z = (\tilde{\rho}_1, \tilde{v}_1, \tilde{\rho}_2, \tilde{v}_2)^T \) and where the introduced Jacobian matrices are

\[
J_i = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\beta_{11} & 1 & \beta_{12} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
\beta_{21} & 0 & \beta_{22} & 1
\end{bmatrix}, \quad J_q = \begin{bmatrix}
v_1^* \beta_{11} & v_1^* \beta_{12} & 0 & 0 \\
v_1^* & v_1^* v_2^* \beta_{12} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & v_2^* \beta_{21} & 0 \\
v_2^* v_2^* \beta_{22} & 0 & v_2^* & v_2^*
\end{bmatrix},
\]

including the abbreviation

\[
\beta_{ij}(\rho_i^*, \rho_j^*) = \frac{\partial \rho_i}{\partial \rho_j} \bigg|_{\rho_1=\rho_i^*, \rho_2=\rho_j^*}
\]

with \( i, j = 1, 2 \).

### 2.3. Boundary conditions

The boundary conditions are motivated by a short time period consideration of the track section. Based on averaging over this short time frame at the boundaries, it is assumed that the same total traffic flow enters and leaves the track section which is given by the sum of the class 1 and 2 equilibrium flows. Moreover, the traffic densities of the incoming traffic flow are equivalent to the equilibrium densities. Notice that the traffic flow \( q_i(x, t) \) is given by the product of density and velocity of a class, i.e. \( q_i(x, t) = \rho_i(x, t) v_i(x, t) \). It describes the amount of vehicles passing a spatial point \( x \) in a unit time frame. In addition, ramp metering is considered to be installed at the outlet of the investigated track section. Consequently, the traffic flow at the outlet is obtained by adding the traffic flow of the mainline and the traffic flow of the ramp, i.e.

\[
q_1(L, t) + q_2(L, t) = q_{\text{mainline}}(L, t) + q_{\text{ramp}}(L, t).
\]

Regarding \( q_{\text{ramp}}(L, t) \), it is assumed that a constant entering traffic flow \( q_{\text{ramp}}^n \) is present on the ramp. Then, the control input is defined as the deviation of \( q_{\text{ramp}}^n \) yielding \( q_{\text{ramp}}(L, t) = q_{\text{ramp}}^n + U(t) \). Due to the short time period consideration, the sum of traffic flow of the mainline and the constant entering traffic flow of the ramp is given by sum of the equilibrium traffic flows for each class, i.e. \( q_{\text{mainline}}(L, t) + q_{\text{ramp}}^n = q_1^* + q_2^* \). Briefly summarized, this yields the boundary conditions

\[
\rho_i(0, t) = \rho_i^*, \quad q_1(0, t) + q_2(0, t) = \rho_1^* v_1^* + \rho_2^* v_2^*,
\]

\[
q_1(L, t) + q_2(L, t) = \rho_1^* v_1^* + \rho_2^* v_2^* + U(t)
\]

and the corresponding linearized boundary conditions

\[
0 = \tilde{\rho}_1(0, t),
\]

\[
0 = v_1^* \tilde{\rho}_1(0, t) + \rho_1^* \tilde{v}_1(0, t) + v_2^* \tilde{\rho}_2(0, t) + \rho_2^* \tilde{v}_2(0, t),
\]

\[
U(t) = v_1^* \tilde{\rho}_1(L, t) + \rho_1^* \tilde{v}_1(L, t) + v_2^* \tilde{\rho}_2(L, t) + \rho_2^* \tilde{v}_2(L, t).
\]

### 2.4. Congested regime analysis

In general, two different regimes of traffic are distinguished: the free-flow regime and the congested regime. A partial upstream propagation of information characterizes the traffic flow in the congested regime. The corresponding heterodirectional behavior causes the development of stop-and-go traffic implying increased fuel consumption and risk of accidents. In the following, the qualitative behavior of the linearized model (7) and (12) in the congested regime is investigated by considering the signs of the characteristic speeds. Notice that a negative characteristic speed indicates information propagating upstream. Decoupling in time derivatives and determining the eigenvalues of the resulting Jacobian that is multiplied with the spatial derivatives of the density and velocity perturbations afterwards, yields the characteristic speeds

\[
\lambda_i = v_i^*, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad \lambda_{3/4} = \frac{v_1^* + v_2^* - \beta_1 \rho_1^* - \beta_2 \rho_2^* + \Delta}{2},
\]

where

\[
\Delta(\rho_1^*, \rho_2^*) = \sqrt{\left(\beta_2 \rho_1^* - \beta_1 \rho_2^* + v_1^* - v_2^*\right)^2 + 4 \beta_1 \beta_2 \rho_1^* \rho_2^*}.
\]

For model validity, the equilibrium velocities of both vehicle classes are chosen to be positive, i.e. \( v_1^* > 0 \) and \( v_2^* > 0 \) since all vehicles travel downstream. Thus, the first two characteristic speeds \( \lambda_1 \) and \( \lambda_2 \) are positive. In addition, it is shown in Zhang, Liu, Wong, and Dai (2006) that

\[
\lambda_4 \leq \min\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2\} \leq \lambda_3 \leq \max\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2\}
\]

holds. Hence, the only characteristic speed that may have a negative sign is \( \lambda_4 \). Therefore, traffic is defined to be in the congested regime if the equilibrium and parameters that determine the characteristic speeds satisfy \( \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3 > 0 \) and \( \lambda_4 < 0 \). Since a controller dealing with congested traffic is designed later on, it is assumed that the equilibrium densities and parameters are chosen such that the presented inequalities hold throughout the rest of this paper.

### 2.5. Transformation to Riemann coordinates

The system is transformed to Riemann coordinates in order to obtain the control design model. The control design model variables are denoted by \( w_i = (w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4)^T \). To keep the computations concise, the first three variables are summarized in \( w = (w_1, w_2, w_3)^T \). The transformation achieves zero elements on the diagonal of the coefficient matrix occurring in the source term and sorts the positive characteristic speeds \( \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3 \) in ascending order on the diagonal of the coefficient matrix of the spatial derivatives. Thus, the notation of Hu et al. (2015) can be adapted to increase the readability and the computations are more concise. In the following, it is assumed that class 1 vehicles represent small and fast average vehicles whereas class 2 describes big trucks which are large and slow. Thus, for the equilibrium velocities \( v_1^* > v_2^* \) holds and therefore the ascending order of positive characteristic speeds is \( \lambda_2 < \lambda_3 < \lambda_1 \). The state transformation is defined as

\[
w_i = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & e^{\frac{\beta_1}{2} x} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & e^{\frac{\beta_2}{3} x} & 0 \\
0 & e^{\frac{\beta_1}{4} x} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & e^{\frac{\beta_2}{4} x}
\end{bmatrix} \Theta^{-1} z
\]

where the constant invertible transformation matrix \( \Theta \) satisfies

\[
\text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4) = \Theta^{-1} J_{\text{r}} \Theta
\]

and therefore diagonalizes the Jacobian \( J_{\text{r}} \). The entries of \( \Theta \) are denoted as \( \Theta = [\theta_{ij}]_{1 \leq i \leq 4, 1 \leq j \leq 4} \) and are straightforward to obtain but omitted in this paper due to their complexity and length. In addition, the constants \([\beta_{ij}]_{1 \leq i \leq 2, 1 \leq j \leq 2} \) represent the entries of the matrix \( \tilde{J} = -\Theta^{-1} J_{\text{r}} \Theta \). The transformed model equations are given by

\[
w_1 + \Lambda^+ w_2 = \Sigma^{++}(x) w + \Sigma^{+}(x) w_4,
\]

\[
w_4 - \Lambda^{-} w_4 = \Sigma^{-}(x) w
\]
with
\[
A^+ = \text{diag}(v_2^+, \lambda_3, v_4^+), \quad A^- = -\lambda_4,
\]
\[
\Sigma^{++}(x) = \begin{bmatrix}
J_{02}(x) & 0 & J_{13}(x) \\
J_{21}(x) & J_{32}(x) & 0
\end{bmatrix},
\]
\[
\Sigma^{+-}(x) = \begin{bmatrix}
J_{14}(x) & J_{24}(x) & J_{34}(x)
\end{bmatrix}^T,
\]
\[
\Sigma^{-+}(x) = \begin{bmatrix}
J_{41}(x) & J_{42}(x) & J_{43}(x)
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

The abbreviations for the coefficients of the source term, \(J_{ij}(x), i, j = 1, \ldots, 4\), are not stated here due to space constraints. However, it is important to mention that \(J_{ij}(x)\) are bounded and either positive or negative on the whole domain of \(x\). Applying the transformation to the boundary conditions (12) yields
\[
w(0, t) = \bar{Q}_0 w_4(0, t), \quad w_4(L, t) = \bar{R}_1 w(L, t) + \bar{U}(t)
\]
where the matrices
\[
\bar{Q}_0 = -\begin{bmatrix} \theta_{12} & \theta_{13} & \theta_{11} & \theta_{14} \\ \theta_{22} & \theta_{23} & \theta_{21} & \theta_{24} \\ \kappa_2 & \kappa_3 & \kappa_1 & \kappa_4 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \theta_{14} \\ \theta_{24} \\ \theta_{34} \end{bmatrix},
\]
\[
\bar{R}_1 = -\begin{bmatrix} v_{14}^+ e^{\frac{\lambda_{44}}{4}} & v_{13}^+ e^{\frac{\lambda_{43}}{4}} & v_{12}^+ e^{\frac{\lambda_{42}}{4}} & v_{11}^+ e^{\frac{\lambda_{41}}{4}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_{44} \\ \lambda_{43} \\ \lambda_{42} \\ \lambda_{41} \end{bmatrix}.
\]

are obtained by formulating the linearized boundary conditions in matrix form, inserting the transformation law (16) and decoupling afterwards. Therein, the abbreviation \(\kappa_j = v_j^+ \lambda_j + \rho_j^+ \theta_j + \rho_j^+ \theta_j \theta_j + \rho_j^+ \theta_j \theta_j \theta_j, j = 1, \ldots, 4\) is introduced. All numerical investigations that were performed while carrying out this work show that \(\kappa_4 \neq 0\) if \(v_{13}^+, v_{24}^+ > 0\). In addition, the transformed input \(\bar{U}(t)\) satisfies
\[
\bar{U}(t) = e^{-\frac{\lambda_{44}}{4} t} \frac{1}{\kappa_4} \bar{U}(t).
\]

Briefly summarized, the control design model is given by (18) and (23). Since the transformation (16) is invertible, the stability properties of the linearized model in density and velocity perturbations and the control design model are the same. In Fig. 1, the qualitative behavior of the control design model is illustrated. According to the sign of the characteristic speeds, the propagation direction for each state \(w_j(x, t)\) is drawn in Fig. 1. It shows that the control input \(\bar{U}(t)\) acts at the outlet of the system, first propagating upstream and, after it is carried through the boundary condition at the inlet of the investigated track section, affecting downstream traffic.

3. Output feedback control design

The output feedback controller is designed by combining the full-state feedback result of Burkhardt et al. (2020) with an anti-collocated observer based on Hu et al. (2015). The overall goal is to damp out stop-and-go traffic in the congested regime and achieve convergence to the equilibrium in a finite time for initial conditions \(w_j(x, 0) \in \mathbb{S}^+\). The resulting control law represents the main result of this work and is stated in a theorem.

3.1. Full-state feedback control result

The full-state feedback control law
\[
U(t) = -\kappa_4 e^{\frac{\lambda_{44}}{4} t} R_1 T_{u_1}^{-1}(L) z(L, t)
\]
\[
+ \kappa_4 e^{\frac{\lambda_{44}}{4} t} \int_0^L \left( K(x, \xi) T_{u_1}(\xi) + L_{11}(L, \xi) T_{u_1}^{-1}(\xi) \right) z(\xi, t) d\xi
\]
(26)
is developed in Burkhardt et al. (2020) and computed with the help of the backstepping technique. Therein, the kernels \(K(x, \xi)\) and \(L_{11}(L, \xi)\) are defined on the triangular domain \(\mathbb{T} = [0 \leq \xi \leq x \leq 1]\). The kernel \(K(x, \xi)\) is obtained by solving the well-posed kernel equations
\[
0 = \lambda_4 K(x, \xi) + A^+ K_0(x, \xi) + K(x, \xi) \Sigma^{++}(\xi)
\]
(27a)
\[
- \frac{1}{\lambda_4} K(x - \xi, 0) A^+ \bar{Q}_0 \Sigma^{-+}(\xi)
\]
(27b)
and \(L_{11}(x, \xi)\) is then given by
\[
L_{11}(x, \xi) = -\frac{1}{\lambda_4} K(x - \xi, 0) A^+ \bar{Q}_0
\]
(28)
Moreover, \(T_{u_1}^{-1}(x)\) and \(T_{i_1}^{-1}(x)\) are obtained by separating the transformation (16) in two parts
\[
\begin{bmatrix} T_{u_1}^{-1}(x) \\ T_{i_1}^{-1}(x) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & e^{-\frac{\lambda_{44}}{4} x} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{-\frac{\lambda_{44}}{4} x} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \hat{\Theta}^{-1},
\]
(29)
where \(T_{u_1}^{-1}(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 4}\) and \(T_{i_1}^{-1}(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times 4}\).

3.2. Anti-collocated boundary observer design

Next, a boundary observer design for full-state observation is proposed. In this work, an anti-collocated boundary observer is designed, i.e. the densities and velocities of both classes are measured at the opposite of the boundary where the control input acts. Therefore, it is assumed that \(\hat{y}(t) = w_4(0, t)\) is known. Since \(w_4(0, t)\) cannot be measured directly, it is obtained by measuring the densities \(\rho_j(0, t)\) as well as velocities \(v_j(0, t)\) and applying the transformation (16) afterwards. The observer states \(\hat{w}_c = (\hat{w}_1, \hat{w}_2, \hat{w}_3, \hat{w}_4)^T\) are estimates of the control design model states \(w_c = (w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4)^T\) and analogously \(\hat{w} = (\hat{w}_1, \hat{w}_2, \hat{w}_3)^T\).
represents the estimate of \( w \). The observer equations are
\[
\dot{\hat{w}}_i + \Lambda^t \hat{w}_x = \Sigma^{++}(x)\hat{w} + \Sigma^{-+}(x)\hat{w}_x - P^+(x)(\hat{w}_4(0,t) - w_4(0,t))
\]
with the boundary conditions
\[
\hat{w}(0,t) = \hat{\bar{Q}}_0 w_4(0,t), \quad \hat{w}_4(L,t) = \hat{\bar{R}}_1 \hat{w}(L,t) + \bar{U}(t),
\]
where \( L \) is the length of the domain. Notice that \( \hat{w} = \hat{w}_i - w \) and \( \hat{w}_x = \hat{w}_i - w_i \) follow according to the introduced error definition. The convergence to the equilibrium at zero in finite time is achieved by the backstepping technique. The state vector of the target system is denoted as \( \{\hat{\alpha}_1, \hat{\alpha}_2, \alpha_3, \hat{\beta}\}^T \) with \( \hat{\alpha} = (\hat{\alpha}_1, \hat{\alpha}_2, \alpha_3)^T \) and the kernels introduced in the backstepping transformation are \( \hat{M}(x, \xi) = \left[ m_j(x, \xi) \right]_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \) and \( \hat{N}_{11}(x, \xi) \). Thus, the backstepping transformation is given by
\[
\hat{w}(x,t) = \hat{\tilde{\omega}}(x,t) + \int_0^\infty \hat{M}(x, \xi) \hat{\beta}(\xi, t)d\xi,
\]
\[
\hat{w}_4(x,t) = \hat{\tilde{\beta}}(x,t) + \int_0^\infty \hat{N}_{11}(x, \xi) \hat{\beta}(\xi, t)d\xi.
\]
Thus, the full-state feedback design, solving the PDE for \( N_{11}(x, \xi) \) with the method of characteristics delivers the expression
\[
N_{11}(x, \xi) = \hat{\bar{R}}_1 M(L, L - (x - \xi)) + \int_0^{\frac{x - L}{4}} \Sigma^{+1}(-\lambda_4 v + x) M(-\lambda_4 v + x, -\lambda_4 v + \xi)d\xi,
\]
depending on \( M(x, \xi) \). Hence, the kernel equations are reduced to three PDEs and three boundary conditions
\[
0 = -\Lambda^t M_0(x, \xi) + \Lambda^t M_0(x, \xi) - \Sigma^{++}(x) M(x, \xi)
\]
\[
= -\Sigma^{++}(x) \hat{R}_1 M(L, L - (x - \xi))
\]
\[
0 = M(x, \xi) \Lambda^t + \Lambda^t M(x, \xi) - \Sigma^{-+}(x).
\]

Besides, the computation of the kernel equations yields the expressions of \( D^+(x, \xi) \) and \( D^-(x, \xi) \) as well as
\[
P^+(x) = -\lambda_4 M_0(x, 0), \quad P^{-1}(x) = -\lambda_4 N_{11}(x, 0).
\]
Thus, the observer design is completed. Employing the inverse of the transformation (16) to the estimates \( \hat{w}_i \) generated by the observer yields the estimates of the density and velocity perturbations \( \hat{\dot{\rho}} = (\hat{\rho}_1, \hat{\dot{v}}_1, \hat{\rho}_2, \hat{\dot{v}}_2)^T \). Then, the estimates of the densities and velocities
\[
\hat{\rho}_i(x, t) = \hat{\rho}_i(x, t) + \rho_i^*, \quad \hat{\dot{v}}_i(x, t) = \hat{\dot{v}}_i(x, t) + v_i^*
\]
are obtained based on \( \hat{\dot{\rho}} \).

3.3. Main result

In a final step, the full-state feedback (26) and anti-collocated observer (30) with (31) are combined resulting in an output feedback control that damp out stop-and-go traffic based on a single measurement at the inlet of the track section. Therefore, the control law is reformulated in terms of the generated estimates. This is done by replacing the densities and velocities by their estimates yielding the output feedback controller
\[
U(t) = -\kappa_0 \frac{\lambda_4}{24} \hat{\bar{R}}_1 T^{-1}(L, t) \hat{\dot{\rho}}(L, t)
\]
\[
+ \kappa_0 \frac{\lambda_4}{24} \int_0^L \left( K(L, \xi) T^{-1}(\xi, \xi) \right) \hat{\dot{\rho}}(x, t) d\xi
\]
This main result is summarized in a theorem.

**Theorem 1.** The linearized two-class AR model is given by (7) with boundary conditions (12). If the control law (42) is applied in (12c), where the estimates are generated by the anti-collocated observer (30) and (31) with (25) and the initial profiles satisfy
\[
\hat{\rho}_1(x, 0), \hat{\dot{v}}_1(x, 0), \hat{\rho}_2(x, 0), \hat{\dot{v}}_2(x, 0) \in \mathcal{S}^\infty([0, L])
\]
then the perturbations converge to the equilibrium at zero
\[
\hat{\rho}_{e,1}(x) = \hat{\rho}_{e,2}(x) = 0
\]
in the finite time \( 2T_f \), where \( T_f \) is given by (37). The kernels \( K(x, \xi) \) and \( L_{11}(x, \xi) \) are obtained by solving the well-posed kernel Eqs. (27) as well as computing (28) afterwards and the observer gains are given by (40), where the kernels \( M(x, \xi) \) represent the solution of the well-posed system of Eqs. (39) and \( N_{11}(x, \xi) \) is given by (38).

The finite convergence time is \( 2T_f \), because the controller requires \( T_f \) to obtain correct state estimates and afterwards the
controller needs another $t_F$ to achieve convergence of the state variable to equilibrium state.

A statement on the stability properties of the closed loop with respect to the original problem can be made considering results on robustness like in Auriol and Meglio (2020). Therein, it is shown that the output of the closed loop system along with the controller is Input-to-State stable, see Karafyllis and Krstic (2019), if specific assumptions and conditions hold.

4. Numerical simulation

In this section, the performance of the output feedback controller is investigated by a simulation of the closed loop involving the original nonlinear model (1). First, the simulation setup and plots of the resulting densities and velocities as well as the control input are discussed. Afterwards, performance indices are computed in order to evaluate whether the output feedback controller achieves fuel savings, more comfort or a reduced total travel time.

4.1. Simulation setup and results

For the implementation, the model equations are transformed to the conservative variables $\rho_1$, $\rho_2$, $\gamma_1 = \rho_1 (v_1 - V_e, 1(\rho_1, \rho_2))$ and $\gamma_2 = \rho_2 (v_2 - V_e, 2(\rho_1, \rho_2))$. The update for each time step is computed in a two-stage Lax–Wendroff scheme (LeVeque, 1992). More details on applying the scheme to AR-type traffic models can be found in Yu, Gan, Bayen, and Krstic (2020). The equilibrium densities are chosen to $\rho_1^* = 150 \text{ veh/km}$ and $\rho_2^* = 75 \text{ veh/km}$ such that the investigated traffic is in the congested regime. The equilibrium velocities are determined by the choice of the equilibrium densities and result in $v_1^* \approx 38 \text{ km/h}$ and $v_2^* \approx 20 \text{ km/h}$. The initial profiles

$$\begin{align*}
\rho_1(x, 0) &= \rho_1^* + \frac{\rho_1^*}{8} \sin \left( \frac{4\pi}{L} x \right), \\
v_1(x, 0) &= v_1^* - \frac{v_1^*}{5} \sin \left( \frac{4\pi}{L} x \right)
\end{align*}$$

(45)

represent stop-and-go traffic with oscillations in density and velocity of sinusoidal shape.

The open loop simulation results are illustrated in Figs. 2 and 3. In each figure, the left plot shows the density of the corresponding vehicle class, whereas the plot on the right hand side illustrates the velocity. The values of the states at the outlet of the track section are marked with a red line, whereas the blue line emphasizes the initial profiles (45). The figures show that the oscillations in the densities and velocities do not vanish without any control input.

Figs. 4 to 5 show the simulation results for the initial profiles using the designed output feedback control. Since the observer requires $t_F$ to estimate the states without error and afterwards the controller needs $t_F$ to achieve finite time convergence, the total finite convergence time is $2t_F \approx 474 \text{ s}$ highlighted with a green line. The results verify that the controller achieves finite time convergence of all states $\rho_i(x, t)$ and $v_i(x, t)$ to their equilibrium values. Considering the control input in Fig. 6, it shows that $U(t)$ is continuous and nontrivial for this test case. Additionally, the control input is negative and bounded satisfying $|U(t)| < 0.25 \text{ veh/s}$. While taking (11b) into account, the constant total boundary flow rate is $q^* = \rho_1^* v_1^* + \rho_2^* v_2^* = 2.0242 \text{ veh/s}$. Furthermore, we assume that the open-loop ramp inflow $q_{in}^*$ is $0.4 \text{ veh/s}$ around 20% of the mainline flow, thus it holds that

$$q_{in}^* + U(t) > 0, \forall t \in [0, t_{sim}]$$

(46)

and therefore the traffic flow leaving the track section is positive.
4.2. Performance indices

The considered performance indices

\begin{align}
J_{\text{fuel}} &= \int_0^{t_{\text{sim}}} \int_0^{L} \max\{0, b_0 + b_1 v(x, t) + b_2 v(x, t) a(x, t) + b_3 a(x, t)^2\} \rho(x, t) \, dx \, dt \\
J_{\text{comfort}} &= \int_0^{t_{\text{sim}}} \int_0^{L} (a(x, t)^2 + q(x, t)^2) \rho(x, t) \, dx \, dt \\
J_{\text{TTT}} &= \int_0^{t_{\text{sim}}} \int_0^{L} \rho(x, t) \, dx \, dt
\end{align}

are introduced in chapter 21 of Treiber and Kesting (2013) and the fuel consumption model is adopted according to Ahn (1998) such that a crucial dependence in order to demonstrate fuel savings by damping of traffic oscillations is included. Thereby, the parameters are given by \( L = 1 \text{ km} \), \( t_{\text{sim}} = 600 \text{ s} \), \( b_0 = 25 \times 10^{-3} \text{ l/s} \), \( b_1 = 24.5 \times 10^{-6} \text{ l/m}^2 \text{s} \), \( b_2 = 125 \times 10^{-6} \text{ l/m}^2 \text{s} \), and it is assumed that \( b_3 = 95 \times 10^{-4} \text{ l/m}^3 \text{s} \). Notice that \( a(x, t) \) is defined as the local acceleration \( a(x, t) = v_t(x, t) + v(x, t) v_x(x, t) \). The performance of the controller is evaluated by computing (47) for the open loop simulation and comparing it to the values obtained by the closed loop simulation. In the following, \( J_X, \text{OL} \) denote the performance indices with respect to the open loop results, whereas \( J_X, \text{CL} \) denote the indices with respect to the closed loop results, where \( X \in \{\text{fuel, comfort, TTT}\} \). The relative values

\begin{align*}
\frac{J_{\text{fuel}, \text{CL}}}{J_{\text{fuel}, \text{OL}}} &= 0.9407, \quad \frac{J_{\text{comfort}, \text{CL}}}{J_{\text{comfort}, \text{OL}}} = 0.7933, \quad \frac{J_{\text{TTT}, \text{CL}}}{J_{\text{TTT}, \text{OL}}} \approx 1.0
\end{align*}

indicate that the vehicles consume 5.93% less fuel, feel 20.67% more comfortable and require the same total travel time, if the controller is applied within \( t_{\text{sim}} = 600 \text{ s} \).

5. Concluding remarks

This paper develops an output feedback controller for the linearized two-class AR traffic PDE model. The local exponential H^2 stability result can be proved for the quasi-linear hyperbolic PDE model of this paper following Hu, Vazquez, Meglio, and Krstic (2019), but that so far a local finite-time stabilization for coupled hyperbolic PDEs has not been obtained yet in the literature. If the initial condition is far from the equilibrium profile, the finite-time
convergence is not guaranteed when the proposed controller is applied to the original system.

This work leads to further problems that will be explored in the future. First, it is typically preferred that the measurement for the observer is at the same spot where the control input acts on the system. Therefore, the design of the collocated observer is a result of great interest. In addition, the extended AR traffic model presented in Mohan and Ramadurai (2017) is formulated for $n$ classes and there are results for $n + m$ heterodirectional behaving linear PDEs in the literature which enables the extension to more than two classes and hence even more realistic considerations.
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