Abstract—We propose a general approach to directly implement rate constraints on the discretization mesh for all collocation methods, for both state and input variables. Unlike conventional approaches that may lead to singular control arcs, this on-mesh implementation has better guarantees in terms of solution quality. Moreover, faster computations of more than 30% can be achieved by exploiting the properties of the resulting linear constraint equations.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Optimization-based control strategies, such as model predictive control (MPC), can be seen in an increasing number of applications. For many engineering problems, constraints may need to be imposed on the state and/or input variables, to account for physical actuation limitations (e.g. the maximum rotation rate of flight control surfaces on aircraft) or to fulfill certain ride comfort requirements (e.g. the maximum longitudinal and lateral accelerations experienced by passengers).

In optimal control, the underlying optimization problem can often be formulated and implemented in a number of different ways. Under a linear framework, many implementations are computationally comparable, thus the most intuitive approaches are often used. As a result, rate constraints on input variables are generally implemented through additional dynamic equations [1], [2], and rate constraints on state variables are commonly addressed with additional path constraints [3]. However, under a nonlinear framework, the intuitive approaches of implementing rate constraints are known to result in numerical difficulties and introducing fluctuations and ringing phenomena in the solution due to singular control [4]. To improve the solution quality, additional regularization terms may be added to the optimal control problem (OCP) formulation [5]; however, this practice often leads to computational challenges by needing to solve the problem repetitively with appropriate weightings.

In our previous work, we proposed implementing rate constraints directly on the discretization mesh with linear constraints [6]. In this paper, we present a more in-depth analysis of this method. We provide proofs that the proposed method will not introduce singular arcs to the problem, resulting in solutions of higher accuracy than the conventional approach. The computational comparisons with the intuitive implementation as well as the regularization approach are also notably expanded with further insights.

Sections [II-III] aim at providing a brief introduction on solving OCPs with direct collocation methods. Following this, different approaches for implementing rate constraints in the OCP are introduced and analysed in Section [IV]. This is followed by a classical example in Section [V] where the pros and cons of each implementation are demonstrated. In Section [VI] we provide concluding remarks and some guidelines for implementation.

II. OPTIMAL CONTROL PROBLEM

Generally speaking, optimization-based control requires the solution of optimal control problems with the objective functional expressed in the general Bolza form:

\[
\min_{x, u, p, t_0, t_f} \Phi(x(t_0), t_0, x(t_f), t_f, p) + \int_{t_0}^{t_f} L(x(t), u(t), t, p) dt
\]

subject to

\[
\dot{x}(t) = f(x(t), u(t), t, p), \quad \forall t \in [t_0, t_f] \quad (1a)
\]

\[
c(x(t), u(t), t, p) \leq 0, \quad \forall t \in [t_0, t_f] \quad (1b)
\]

\[
\phi(x(t_0), t_0, x(t_f), t_f, p) = 0, \quad (1d)
\]

with \(x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n\) the state of the system, \(u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m\) the control input, \(p \in \mathbb{R}^s\) static parameters, \(t_0 \in \mathbb{R}\) and \(t_f \in \mathbb{R}\) the initial and terminal time, \(\Phi\) is the Mayer cost functional (\(\Phi: \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^s \to \mathbb{R}\)), \(L\) is the Lagrange cost functional (\(L: \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^s \to \mathbb{R}\)), \(f\) is the dynamic constraint (\(f: \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^s \to \mathbb{R}^n\)), \(c\) is the path constraint (\(c: \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^s \to \mathbb{R}^s\)) and \(\phi\) is the boundary condition (\(\phi: \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^s \to \mathbb{R}^s\)).

III. DIRECT COLLOCATION METHOD

Most optimal control problems need to be solved with numerical discretization schemes in practice. With a direct method, the OCP is first discretized through a transcription process, after which the resulting nonlinear programming (NLP) problem is numerically solved. Thanks to its simplicity in implementation, direct methods have become the de facto standard for solving practical optimal control problems [7].
One approach in direct methods is to solve the dynamics equations, the path constraints and the boundary conditions altogether on a discretization mesh. This is often referred to as direct collocation methods. Moreover, it can be further categorized into fixed-order h methods (e.g. Euler, Trapezoidal, Hermite-Simpson (H-S) and the Runge-Kutta (RK) family) [4], and variable higher-order \( php \) methods [8], [9]. Here, we aim to provide a high level overview, which is valid for both \( h \) and \( php \) methods.

With a mesh of size \( N = \sum_{k=1}^{K} N^{(k)} \), the states can be approximated as

\[
 x^{(k)}(\tau) \approx X^{(k)}(\tau) := \sum_{j=1}^{N^{(k)}} A_j^{(k)} B_j^{(k)}(\tau),
\]

with mesh interval \( k \in \{1, \ldots, K\} \), \( N^{(k)} \) denoting the number of collocation points for interval \( k \), and \( B_j^{(k)}(\cdot) \) are basis functions. For classical \( h \) methods, \( \tau \in \mathbb{R}^{N} \) takes on values in the interval \([0,1]\) representing \( [t_0,t_f] \), and \( B_j^{(k)}(\cdot) \) are chosen to be elementary B-splines of various orders. For \( php \) methods, \( B_j^{(k)}(\cdot) \) are Lagrange interpolating polynomials over the normalized time interval \( \tau \in [-1,1] \). We use \( X_j^{(k)} \) to represent the approximated states at collocation point \( \tau_j^{(k)} \), and for \( php \) methods, \( X_j^{(k)} = A_j^{(k)} \) holds. Approximation of the input \( u \) can be made analogously with \( T_j^{(k)} \).

Consequently, the optimal control problem (1) can be approximated by

\[
 \begin{align*}
 &\min_{X,U,p,t_0,t_f} \Phi(X_1^{(1)}, t_0, X_f^{(K)}, t_f, p) \\
 &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{i=1}^{N^{(k)}} w_i^{(k)} L(X_i^{(k)}, U_i^{(k)}, \tau_i^{(k)}, t_0, t_f, p) \\
 \text{subject to, for } i = 1, \ldots, N^{(k)} \text{ and } k = 1, \ldots, K,
 &\sum_{j=1}^{N^{(k)}} A_{ij}^{(k)} X_j^{(k)} + D_i^{(k)} f(X_i^{(k)}, U_i^{(k)}, \tau_i^{(k)}, t_0, t_f, p) = 0 \quad (3b) \\
 &c(X_i^{(k)}, U_i^{(k)}, \tau_i^{(k)}, t_0, t_f, p) \leq 0 \quad (3c) \\
 &\phi(X_1^{(1)}, t_0, X_f^{(K)}, t_f, p) = 0 \quad (3d)
\end{align*}
\]

where \( w_i^{(k)} \) are the quadrature weights for the respective discretization method chosen, \( A \) is the numerical differentiation matrix with \( A_{ij} \) the element \((i,j)\) of the matrix, and \( D \) a constant matrix. The discretized problem can then be solved with off-the-shelf NLP solvers, such as interior point solver IPOPT [10] or sequential quadratic programming solver SNOPT [11].

IV. IMPLEMENTATIONS OF RATE CONSTRAINTS

In many problems, constraints of the form

\[
\begin{align*}
 \dot{u}_L &\leq \frac{du}{dt}(t) \leq \dot{u}_U \\
 \dot{x}_L &\leq \frac{dx}{dt}(t) \leq \dot{x}_U
\end{align*}
\]

may need to be implemented to restrict the rate of change for the state and/or input variables.

A. Conventional Implementation

For input variables, a common approach is to introduce \( u \) as an additional state variable, and \( \nu \) as the new input with a simple bound through the dynamic equation

\[
\dot{u}(t) = \nu(t) \quad \text{with} \quad \dot{u}_L \leq \nu(t) \leq \dot{u}_U. \quad (4)
\]

For rate constraints on the state variable \( x \), additional path constraints are needed:

\[
\dot{x}_L \leq f(x(t), u(t), t, p) \leq \dot{x}_U. \quad (5)
\]

For simplicity, we refer to (4) as the add-state implementation, and (5) as the add-path constraint implementation.

Unfortunately these intuitive implementations exhibit many shortcomings. These are mainly:

1) The number of state variables and constraint equations are increased, resulting in a larger NLP. In addition, the index of the DAE (differential-algebraic equations) of the transcribed problem may also increase, leading to a problem that is often more difficult to solve numerically.

2) When (4) is used, singular arcs may occur and affect the solution quality. This can occur if the original control input \( \tilde{u} \) appears nonlinearly in the Lagrange cost or other system dynamics and the new control \( \nu \) appears linearly instead.

Detailed justification for the first point can be found in [4]. Here, we focus the discussions on the issue of singular arcs, which also falls with a much larger concern regarding the quality of the solution.

Generally speaking, a singular arc is an interval in the OCP solution where the optimality conditions yield no information about the optimal control function. Precise mathematical definitions and an analysis of singular arcs can be found in [12] and [13]. For ease of demonstration, consider the following OCP, which is simplified but still sufficiently general, with the rate constraint on the original control input \( u \) implemented with a new control input \( \nu \):

\[
\begin{align*}
 &\min_{x,u,\nu} \int_0^T g_1(x_1(t)) + g_2(x_1(t), u(t)) dt \quad (6a) \\
 &\text{subject to} \\
 &\dot{x}_1(t) = g_3(x_1(t), u(t)) \quad \forall t \in [t_0, t_f] \quad (6b) \\
 &\dot{u}(t) = \nu(t) \quad \forall t \in [t_0, t_f] \quad (6c) \\
 &\dot{u}_L \leq \nu(t) \leq \dot{u}_U \quad \forall t \in [t_0, t_f]. \quad (6d)
\end{align*}
\]

Proposition 1: If the OCP (6) has a linear objective and dynamics with respect to the original control input \( u \), i.e. if \( g_2 \) and \( g_3 \) are both input-affine functions, the resulting optimal control \( \nu^* \) will not contain singular arc. However, if \( u \) appears nonlinearly in the objective and/or dynamics, i.e. if \( g_2 \) and/or \( g_3 \) are arbitrary nonlinear functions, singular arcs may occur for some intervals of the solution.
**Proof:** First, we formulate the Hamiltonian of the system, with \( \lambda(t) \) the costate of the dynamics

\[
H(x_1(t), u(t), \lambda_{x_1}(t), \lambda_u(t), \nu(t)) := g_1(x_1(t)) + g_2(x_1(t), u(t)) + \lambda_{x_1}(t)g_3(x_1(t), u(t)) + \lambda_u(t)\nu(t).
\]

From Pontryagin’s minimum principle, we know that if the state and costate are optimal, the optimal control \( \nu^* \) minimizes the Hamiltonian, i.e.

\[
\nu^*(t) \in \arg \min_v H(x_1^v(t), u^v(t), \lambda_{x_1}^v(t), \lambda_u^v(t), \nu).
\]

Substituting the Hamiltonian (7) in (8) yields the optimal control

\[
\nu^*(t) = \begin{cases} 
\dot{u}_L & \text{if } \lambda_u^v(t) < 0 \\
? & \text{if } \lambda_u^v(t) = 0 \\
\dot{u}_L & \text{if } \lambda_u^v(t) > 0 
\end{cases}
\]

We first show that this implementation yields a singular arc free solutions with linear OCPs. From the first order necessary conditions for optimality we have \( \lambda_u(t) = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial u} \). Thus, if both \( g_2 \) and \( g_3 \) are input-affine functions, \( \lambda_u(t) \) will then be constant and \( \lambda_u(t) \) will be a linear straight line. Relating this to (9) we can see that the optimal control will exhibit bang-bang behaviour with at most one switch depending on the crossing of \( \lambda_u(t) \) with the x axis. Therefore, the solution is free of singular arcs if the objective and dynamics with respect to the original control input \( u \) are all linear.

To show that this implementation will suffer from singular arc problems when nonlinear OCPs are considered, we assume that \( g_2 \) and/or \( g_3 \) are now arbitrary nonlinear functions. Thus, \( \lambda_u(t) \) can be a function of any shape and the optimal control will not be uniquely defined on intervals where \( \lambda_u(t) = 0 \), a.k.a. the singular arc.

An ad-hoc method sometimes used in practice for dealing with the singular arc is to augment the original objective with an additional regularization term (e.g. in [5]), often in the form of \( \rho u^2 \) or \( \rho |u| \). With relatively large values of the penalty weight \( \rho \), the fluctuations on the singular arc can be suppressed, but at the cost of obtaining sub-optimal trajectories. To get closer to the optimal from this point, the problem may need to be repetitively solved with the penalty weight gradually reduced.

**B. On-mesh Implementation**

To mitigate the above-mentioned shortcomings, a method is proposed to directly impose algebraic rate constraints for input variables on the discretization grid. Based on previous work [4], we generalize this on-mesh approach for all collocation methods (\( h, p \) and \( hp \) type), as well as for state variables.

Since the treatment for state variables \( x \) and input variables \( u \) are similar, for simplicity we will use \( z \) to represent the variable on which the rate constraints are imposed. If \( Z_i \) represents the discretized version of \( z \) at time instance \( i \), then the numerical differentiation of \( z \) at that grid point \( (Z'_i) \) can be calculated using s-point finite difference approximations, with \( s \) the number of data points in the interval (including endpoints). See Table I for the formulations of some of the most commonly used discretization methods, with \( \Delta \tau_i = \tau_{i+1} - \tau_i \), \( \Delta t = t_f - t_0 \), and \( \mathcal{A}_{LGR} \) is the LGR differentiation matrix. Details on the determination of the numerical differentiation equations are available in [14].

Note that for \( p/hp \) methods, the numerical differentiation for all grid points on the polynomial \( (i = 1, \ldots, N^{(b)}) \) are obtained altogether. It is also worth mentioning that if Legendre-Gauss-Radau (LGR) collocation is used, the end-point value for the control \( (U_1^{(K)}) \) may need to be approximated.

It is then straightforward to implement the rate constraints as linear constraints

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{z}_L - Z'_i & \leq 0 & (10a) \\
Z'_i - \dot{z}_U & \leq 0 & (10b)
\end{align*}
\]

for all possible values of \( i \). This approach will refer to as the on-mesh implementation.

The on-mesh implementation of rate constraints has several benefits in comparison to the conventional add-state and add-path constraint approaches. Firstly, we compare the solution quality in terms of singular arcs. A challenge arises here, since the singular arc problem is commonly analyzed with the original OCP (1), but (10) is a discretized formulation that does not have the continuous form.

By noting that (10) can be considered implicitly as linear inequality constraints of \( u \), we will instead show the following:

**Proposition 2:** If the solution to the original nonlinear OCP (7-9) does not exhibit singular arcs, then adding any linear inequality constraints on input variables \( u \) in the form of

\[
l(u(t)) \leq 0, \quad \forall t \in [t_0, t_f] \] 

does not introduce singular arc issues.

**Proof:** We again formulate the Hamiltonian of the system, with \( \lambda \) and \( \mu \) the costate of the dynamics and constraints

\[
H(x_1(t), \lambda_{x_1}(t), \mu_1(t), u(t)) := g_1(x_1(t)) + g_2(x_1(t), u(t)) + \lambda_{x_1}(t)g_3(x_1(t), u(t)) + \mu(t)l(u(t)).
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>No. of Data Points (r)</th>
<th>Numerical Differentiation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trapezoidal (h)</td>
<td>2 (equal spaced)</td>
<td>( Z'<em>i = \frac{Z</em>{i+1} - Z_i}{\Delta t} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermite</td>
<td>3 (equal spaced)</td>
<td>( Z'<em>i = \frac{3z</em>{i+1} + 2z_i - z_{i-1}}{6\Delta t} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson (h)</td>
<td>3 (equal spaced)</td>
<td>( Z'<em>i = \frac{z</em>{i+1} - 2z_i + z_{i-1}}{2\Delta t} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGR (p/hp)</td>
<td>N+1 (LGR bases)</td>
<td>( Z'<em>{1:N+1} = \frac{1}{N+1} \mathcal{A}</em>{LGR} Z_{1:N+1} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE I: Numerical differentiation schemes**
TABLE II: Contribution to the NLP dimensions with an $N$-point mesh for different rate constraint implementations on input variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>add-state</th>
<th>on-mesh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 point, collocated (Trapezoidal)</td>
<td>$N$ linear inequality constraints (defect constraints)</td>
<td>$2N$ linear inequality constraints (pre-computed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 point, collocated (H-S)</td>
<td>$2N - 1$ linear inequality constraints (defect constraints)</td>
<td>$4N - 2$ linear inequality constraints (pre-computed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$ point, collocated (LGR)</td>
<td>$p(N - 1)$ linear inequality constraints (defect constraints)</td>
<td>$2p(N - 1)$ linear inequality constraints (pre-computed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, from Pontryagin’s minimum principle, we have that an optimal control trajectory $u^*$ satisfies

$$ u^*(t) \in \arg \min_u H(x^*_1(t), \lambda^*_1(t), \mu^*_1(t), v). $$

Formulating the corresponding first order optimality condition yields

$$ \frac{\partial H}{\partial u} = \frac{\partial q_2}{\partial u} + \lambda^*_1(t) \frac{\partial q_3}{\partial u} + \mu^*_1(t) c_{st} = 0, $$

with $c_{st}$ a constant. Note that the only contribution due to (11) is the last term, which is not an explicit function of $u$. Thus if a $u^*$ that satisfies $\frac{\partial q_2}{\partial u} + \lambda^*_1 \frac{\partial q_3}{\partial u} = 0$ does not exhibit singular control behavior, having this additional term should only change the solution. The feasibility of the problem might be changed, but not the behaviour regarding existence of singular arcs.

Another major advantage in comparison to the conventional implementation is regarding the computational cost. For systems with nonlinear dynamics, rate constraints on state variables implemented through (5) will be nonlinear path constraints relating different state variables at the same time instance. Thus their Jacobian and Hessian contributions can make the solution of the OCP computationally demanding. In contrast, on-mesh implementation of rate constraints with (10) are linear constraints, with no contribution to the Hessian.

In addition, note that the rate constraints (10) only depend on the numerical differentiation schemes. Thus, once a discretization scheme for the OCP has been chosen, and the corresponding discretization mesh has been determined, the Jacobian contributions of the rate constraint equations can be pre-computed during the transcription process. Therefore, although the NLP dimension increases more rapidly with the on-mesh implementation as shown in Table II and III the computational complexity for obtaining the derivative information with respect to the rate constraint equations is actually lower than the conventional approach. Altogether, the computational advantages can be rather significant, as demonstrated with the example problem.

A remark is appropriate when comparing the on-mesh implementation in Table III to Table I. For Hermite-Simpson discretization, specifically, the increase in the size of the NLP for implementation on input variables is less than that on state variables. This is because, when the control $u$ is discretized as a quadratic function of time, the rate of change w.r.t. time $(\dot{u})$ is linear, thus extreme values only occur at the end-points of each interval ($U_i$ and $U_{i+1}$). In this special case only, the rate constraints relating to the middle points ($U_i^{1/2}$ and $U_{i+1}^{1/2}$) can be neglected. Another situation where the number of constraint equations may be reduced is if $\dot{z}_L = \dot{z}_U$.

V. EXAMPLE: AIRCRAFT GO-AROUND IN THE PRESENCE OF WINDSHEAR

The issues of singular arc are often demonstrated with toy problems in the literature, thus they are sometimes neglected by engineers working on complex problems. To show that it really matters, the following real-world example is presented here to demonstrate the acclaimed benefits of the on-mesh rate constraint implementation.

Based on the developments by [15]–[17], a problem is presented in [4] where the aircraft needs to stay as high above the ground as possible after encountering a severe windshear during landing. The implementation used here contains slight modifications to the windshear modelling, with the exponential functions approximated by piecewise polynomial functions.

The simplified dynamics of the aircraft can be described by

$$ \dot{\delta}(t) = V(t) \cos(\gamma(t)) + w_d(d(t)) $$
$$ \dot{h}(t) = V(t) \sin(\gamma(t)) + w_h(d(t), h(t)) $$
$$ \dot{V}(t) = \frac{1}{m} [T(V(t)) \cos(\alpha(t) + \delta) - D(V(t), \alpha(t))] $$
$$ - g \sin(\gamma(t)) - w_d(d(t), \dot{d}(t)) \cos(\gamma(t)) \sin(\gamma(t)) $$
$$ - w_h(d(t), h(t), \dot{d}(t), \dot{h}(t)) \sin(\gamma(t)) $$

$$ \dot{\gamma}(t) = \frac{1}{nv(t)} [T(V(t)) \sin(\alpha(t) + \delta) + L(V(t), \alpha(t))] $$
$$ - g \cos(\gamma(t)) + \frac{1}{V(t)} w_d(d(t), \dot{d}(t)) \sin(\gamma(t)) $$
$$ - \frac{1}{V(t)} w_h(d(t), h(t), \dot{d}(t), \dot{h}(t)) \cos(\gamma(t)) $$

with $d$ the horizontal distance, $h$ the altitude, $V$ the true airspeed, $\gamma$ the flight path angle, and $\alpha$ the angle of attack.
Polynomial models are used for the maximum thrust $T_{\text{max}}$, lift coefficient $C_L$ and drag coefficient $C_D$, to model the thrust $T$, lift $L$ and drag $D$. A simplified windshear model is used with wind speed contributions represented by a horizontal component $w_d$ and a vertical component $w_h$.

Details about the aerodynamic modelling, as well as parameter values of all relevant variables, are available in the references above, thus will not be reproduced here. The computations of rate constraints can influence the computational performance, the singular arc behaviour will not have noticeable effects on the solution to the state variables. Thus the solution in Figure 1 should be obtainable regardless of the discretization method and the rate constraint implementation.

A. Implementation of Rate Constraints for Input Variables

The last set of constraints in (13) applies directly on the rate of change for the control input $\alpha$. Using the conventional approach, $\alpha$ can be treated as an additional state variable, and $\nu$ introduced as the new control input with the dynamics

$$\dot{\nu}(t) = \nu(t).$$

Thus the rate constraints for $\alpha$ can be implemented as simple bounds on $\nu$: $-3 \leq \nu(t) \leq 3$ [deg/s].

As mentioned earlier, due to the fact that the original control input $\alpha$ appears nonlinearly in the system, whereas the new input $\nu$ appears linearly, singular arc behaviour can occur, which is shown in Figure 2a with large fluctuations in the solution. In contrast, when the rate constraints are directly implemented on the discretization mesh instead (Figure 2b), the optimal control input trajectory can be obtained with little ambiguity.

Comparing the solutions from the two implementations, it is interesting to observe that, although the integrated values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE IV: Mesh refinement criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$d$ [ft]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta_{\text{tol}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\epsilon_{\text{tol}}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1: Solution to the aircraft go-around in the windshear problem, with input rate constraints

Fig. 2: Control input for the solution to the aircraft go-around in the windshear problem, with different implementations for input rate constraints (H-S discretization, circles represent mesh points)
(i.e. angle of attack) along the singular arc solution at the collocation points are generally the same, the interpolated trajectory from the add-state method is actually distorted by the fluctuations of its rate values.

With the LGR orthogonal collocation method, improvements are relatively minor. Because the end-point value for the control input is only approximated, the errors have distortion effects on all previous points of the polynomial (Figure 3b). On the other hand, thanks to this extra level of continuity imposed by higher order polynomials, the problem of singular arc behaviour is far less pronounced with the conventional add-states implementation (Figure 3a), when compared to \( h \) type discretization methods.

The results regarding computation times presented in Figure 4 and 7 were all obtained on an Intel Core i7-4770 computer with 8 GB of RAM, running 64-bit Windows 10 with Matlab 2017a. The OCPs were transcribed into NLP problems using the optimal control software ICLOCS2 [18] and solved with the NLP solver IPOPT version 3.12 compiled with the sparse linear solver MA57 [19]. The computation times are the averages of 10 independent runs, all starting with a very rough initial guess obtained using linear interpolation of initial and terminal conditions. In all test cases the NLP solver converged quickly, with around 20 iterations for a relatively coarse mesh, and about 30 iterations for dense grids.

From Figure 4 it can be seen that, for the computation time per iteration, the on-mesh implementation saw a slight advantage in comparison to the conventional approach. This is because the on-mesh implementation explicitly exploits the fact that the linear rate constraints have no contribution to the Hessian, and the contributions to the Jacobian are constants and can be pre-computed. The scale of the benefit also grows with the size of the mesh, from about 5% for a coarse mesh to around 10% for the dense mesh.

Figure 5 present the computation performance of the problem when regularized with an additional \( \rho \| \nu \|_{E_2}^2 \) term.

It can be seen that a relative large penalty weight is required to suppress the singular arc fluctuations, but with a larger \( \rho \) the result diverges quickly from the optimal. Also note that for a single solve with regularization, the norm of angle of attack rate \( (\| \dot{\alpha}^* - \dot{\alpha} \|_{E_2}) \) never reaches the accuracy level obtained by the on-mesh implementation with the same discretization mesh. Thus, to obtain a good solution, \( \rho \) needs to be gradually reduced, making the process complicated and computationally inefficient — it is also difficult to guarantee solution quality.

B. Implementation of Rate Constraints for State Variables

We will additionally impose a rate constraint for the velocity state

\[-5 \leq \dot{V}(t) \leq 5 \text{ [ft/s]}\].
formsulations for rate constraints on state and input variables may not have the same solution quality and computational complexity in numerical implementations. For all collocation methods tested, and for both state and input variables, the proposed approach to directly implement rate constraints on the discretization mesh appears to be an attractive alternative for nonlinear optimization based control problems.

In contrast to conventional approaches, the proposed method is proven and numerically verified to not introduce singular control arcs, which may lead to severe distortions and fluctuations in the optimal control trajectories. Additionally, this on-mesh implementation replaces the additional dynamic equations and nonlinear path constraints in conventional implementations with linear rate equations. Thus, there is no contribution to the Hessian and the contribution to the Jacobian can be pre-computed, enabling faster iterations. Based on observations, the scale of reduction in computation time seems to grow quite quickly with the increase in mesh size (number of collocation points), making the method especially suitable for the solution of large scale problems.

VI. CONCLUSIONS
Through both the mathematical analysis and a computation example, we demonstrated that mathematically equivalent formulations for rate constraints on state and input variables may not have the same solution quality and computational complexity in numerical implementations. For all collocation methods tested, and for both state and input variables, the proposed approach to directly implement rate constraints on the discretization mesh appears to be an attractive alternative for nonlinear optimization based control problems.

In contrast to conventional approaches, the proposed method is proven and numerically verified to not introduce singular control arcs, which may lead to severe distortions and fluctuations in the optimal control trajectories. Additionally, this on-mesh implementation replaces the additional dynamic equations and nonlinear path constraints in conventional implementations with linear rate equations. Thus, there is no contribution to the Hessian and the contribution to the Jacobian can be pre-computed, enabling faster iterations. Based on observations, the scale of reduction in computation time seems to grow quite quickly with the increase in mesh size (number of collocation points), making the method especially suitable for the solution of large scale problems.
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