

©2025 IEEE. Personal use of this material is permitted. Permission from IEEE must be obtained for all other uses, in any current or future media, including reprinting/republishing this material for advertising or promotional purposes, creating new collective works, for resale or redistribution to servers or lists, or reuse of any copyrighted component of this work in other works.

Biasing the Driving Style of an Artificial Race Driver for Online Time-Optimal Maneuver Planning*

Sebastiano Taddei^{1,2}, Mattia Piccinini³, and Francesco Biral¹

Abstract—In this work, we present a novel approach to bias the driving style of an artificial race driver (ARD) for online time-optimal trajectory planning. Our method leverages a nonlinear model predictive control (MPC) framework that combines time minimization with exit speed maximization at the end of the planning horizon. We introduce a new MPC terminal cost formulation based on the trajectory planned in the previous MPC step, enabling ARD to adapt its driving style from early to late apex maneuvers in real-time. Our approach is computationally efficient, allowing for low replan times and long planning horizons. We validate our method through simulations, comparing the results against offline minimum-lap-time (MLT) optimal control and online minimum-time MPC solutions. The results demonstrate that our new terminal cost enables ARD to bias its driving style, and achieve online lap times close to the MLT solution and faster than the minimum-time MPC solution. Our approach paves the way for a better understanding of the reasons behind human drivers’ choice of early or late apex maneuvers.

Index Terms—MPC, Driving Style, Autonomous Racing

I. INTRODUCTION

Professional race car drivers are able to set minimum-lap-times by exploiting their driving skills and experience. As discussed in [1], human drivers may have different driving styles, yet achieving very similar lap times. This indicates the existence of many local minima in the space of minimum-lap-time maneuvers. Recently, *artificial* drivers were developed, to compete in autonomous racing series [2]–[5] or become digital twins of professional drivers [6]. However, open research questions remain on how to change the driving style of an artificial driver, while performing online (*i.e.*, real-time) trajectory planning.

In this paper, we aim to analyze and bias the driving style of an artificial race driver (ARD) for online time-optimal trajectory planning. We implement a nonlinear model predictive control (MPC) planner, which combines the time minimization and the exit speed maximization at the end of the planning horizon. Through a new terminal cost

formulation, our ARD can be biased towards early- or late-apex maneuvers, and achieves online lap times very close to a minimum-lap-time offline solution.

A. Motivation

Our motivation for biasing the driving style of artificial drivers is multifaceted. Human race drivers do not act like time-optimal MPC planners [7], as they adapt their maneuvers online based on factors such as the geometry of the track that follows a corner, local execution errors, changing track and weather conditions, and whether they are in the lead or following an opponent.

Similarly, when performing MPC maneuver planning and execution close to the vehicle limits, adapting the MPC cost function terms in different corners can result in better overall performance [8]. Also, in autonomous racing, changing the driving style based on the current race scenario can help overtake other cars or adapt to varying track conditions. Finally, when using an artificial race coach to train human drivers to improve their trajectories [9], the driving style of the artificial coach could be adapted to that of the human driver, and the coach could show the impact of different driving styles in different corners.

B. Apex Definition

Throughout this paper, we define the *apex* as the point of a vehicle trajectory where the driver reaches the lowest speed (*i.e.*, stops decelerating and starts accelerating), and the *clipping point* as the point of the trajectory that is closest to the inside of a corner.

C. Related Work

The research of Anderson *et al.* [7], [8], [10] recently showed that the trajectories of human race drivers can be modeled using receding horizon MPC, where the cost function combined time minimization and exit speed maximization. They used a genetic algorithm to locally tune the weights of the MPC cost function, and showed that the maximization of the exit speed improves the lap times and changes the planned maneuvers. Their approach is relevant, but has the following limitations. In [7], they tracked a pre-computed minimum-time trajectory, and the MPC maneuver times were quite higher (1.7%) than the optimal reference. In [8], [10], the MPC was computationally expensive (1 hour for a single corner) and thus not suitable for real-time planning, and they did not compare the results with minimum-lap-time optimal control.

Some authors, like [11]–[13], conducted surveys and interviews with professional race drivers, to understand

*This work was partly supported by the European Union - Next Generation Eu - under the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (NRRP), Mission 4 Component 1 Investment 3.4 - Decree No. 351 of Italian Ministry of University and Research - Concession Decree No. 2152 of the Italian Ministry of University and Research, Project code D93C22000500001, within the Italian National Program PhD Programme in Autonomous Systems (DAuSy).

¹Sebastiano Taddei and Francesco Biral are with the Department of Industrial Engineering, University of Trento, 38123 Trento, Italy name.surname@unitn.it

²Sebastiano Taddei is also with the Department of Electrical and Information Engineering, Politecnico di Bari, 70125 Bari, Italy s.taddei@phd.poliba.it

³Mattia Piccinini is with the Professorship of Autonomous Vehicle Systems, Technical University of Munich, 85748 Garching, Germany mattia.piccinini@tum.de

their preferences and adaptation strategies in search of the minimum-lap-times and the optimal driving style.

Recently, a new stream of research has emerged around the use of imitation learning (IL) and reinforcement learning (RL) to model and imitate the driving styles of professional drivers. The authors of [6], [11], [14], [15] used IL and RL to reproduce and outperform the maneuvers of human drivers in simulation settings. Their results are relevant; however, they needed expert demonstrations to train their models.

Although the combination of time minimization and exit speed maximization has been studied for race driving style modeling [7], [8], [10], the existing literature is limited by at least by one of the following aspects:

- High computational cost of the MPC problems, unsuited for online planning [8], [10].
- Tracking of pre-computed racelines and analysis of short track segments, rather than a full lap [7].
- MPC maneuver times higher than a minimum-lap-time optimal control problem (MLT-OCP) [7], or no comparison with it [8], [10].
- An MPC terminal cost was set to penalize the final states' deviations from an MLT-OCP, solved offline on a full lap [3], [16]–[19]. However, this makes the MPC dependent on the full-lap knowledge, requires to solve an MLT-OCP before the online MPC, and does not easily allow to change the driving style online.

D. Contribution

Our contributions are as follows:

- We develop an MPC-based artificial race driver that biases its driving style from early to late apex maneuvers, with low replan times for online operation and a long planning horizon.
- We devise a new MPC terminal cost based on the previous planned trajectory: our new terminal cost removes the need to solve offline a minimum-lap-time OCP and enables ARD to change its driving style online. This allows ARD to race in real-time without the need for a priori knowledge of the full track.
- We compare the results obtained with our approach against an offline minimum-lap-time optimal control problem and online pure minimum-time MPC solutions.

II. BIASING THE DRIVING STYLE

Most of the MPC-based racing trajectory planners in the literature aim to minimize the time to reach the end of the planning horizon [3], [16], [17], [20], [21]. This typically results in a driving style that prefers early apexes, maximizing the use of combined lateral-longitudinal accelerations [3] while minimizing the travelled distance whenever possible. However, such maneuvers often exploit regions of the combined lateral-longitudinal envelope where the vehicle exhibits major instabilities (*i.e.*, lower stability margins) that are unforgiving for driver errors. In contrast, recent analyses [9], [12], [22] suggest that some professional drivers tend to prefer late apex maneuvers, which may be locally more stable

and easier to execute. As we have seen in [3], [16], artificial drivers also suffer from executions errors, which make them replan new time-optimal trajectories with locally wider paths, that can be executed without losing too much time. This suggests that, by biasing the driving style of an artificial driver towards late apexes, we may get more repeatable and human-like lap times.

In this work, we aim to bias the driving style of our MPC-based artificial race driver (ARD) by leveraging the maximization of the vehicle speed at the end of the horizon, and a new terminal cost formulation. We will show that our approach allows us to bias ARD's driving style from early to late apex, paving the way to a better understanding of the reasons behind the human driver's choice of early or late apex maneuvers.

Let us now describe our method, starting from the MPC problem formulation.

A. Online Nonlinear Model Predictive Control

The nonlinear MPC problem we use is adapted from our previous work [16], and is defined as follows:

$$\min_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}} J \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{u}(t)) \\ \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x}(0)) = 0 \\ \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{u}(t)) \geq 0 \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where the cost function J is:

$$J = \overbrace{W_{n_f} (n(T) - n_f)^2 + W_{\xi_f} (\xi(T) - \xi_f)^2}^{\text{terminal cost}} + \underbrace{-W_{v_x} v_x(T)}_{\text{exit speed}} + \overbrace{\int_0^T W_t dt}_{\text{maneuver time}} \quad (2)$$

The state vector \mathbf{x} is defined as $\mathbf{x} = [n, \xi, v_x, v_y, \Omega, a_x]^T$. n and ξ are the lateral deviation and the relative yaw angle between the vehicle and the centerline, v_x and v_y are the longitudinal and lateral velocities, Ω is the yaw rate, and a_x is the longitudinal acceleration. The control vector \mathbf{u} is defined as $\mathbf{u} = [\Omega_0, a_{x_0}]^T$, where Ω_0 is the desired yaw rate and a_{x_0} is the desired longitudinal acceleration. The function \mathbf{f} is a kineto-dynamical vehicle model, which is described in our previous work [16]. Strict boundary conditions \mathbf{b} are imposed on the initial states. The inequality constraints \mathbf{c} impose the racetrack limits and the vehicle performance constraints, using a generalized polytopic formulation of the g-g-v diagram¹ [3], [23]. Given that the final travel time T is not known a priori, we reformulate the problem to use the path curvilinear abscissa ζ as the independent variable [24], instead of the time t . This allows us to solve the problem over a fixed horizon length L .

It is worth mentioning that the kineto-dynamical vehicle model \mathbf{f} employed in our MPC is learned from experimental data, and does not rely on the prior knowledge of the vehicle dynamics or parameters. This allows us to reproduce

¹The g-g-v diagram is a 3D map of a_y , a_x , and v_x , which encodes the maximum vehicle performance.

real vehicle/road characteristics at low computational costs, enabling real-time use. We describe the learning framework in [3], [16].

The main novelties of our formulation are in the cost function (2), particularly in the exit speed maximization and the terminal cost. Let us describe these terms in detail.

1) *Maximizing the Exit Speed:* The maximization of the longitudinal speed at the end of the horizon is obtained through the following term in the cost function (2):

$$-W_{v_x} v_x(L) \quad (3)$$

where L is the length of the horizon. The weight W_{v_x} is a positive scalar that determines the importance of the final longitudinal speed. By increasing the value of W_{v_x} , we can bias the driving style of our ARD from early to late apexes. To find a sensible range of values for W_{v_x} , we need to make sure that the value of (3) is comparable to the maneuver time term in (2). A suitable value of W_{v_x} can be estimated by assuming that the maximum speed $v_{x_{\max}}$ is constant over a straight horizon. With this assumption, the maneuver time term in (2) is at its minimum:

$$\int_0^T W_t dt = W_t \int_0^L \frac{d\zeta}{v_{x_{\max}}} = W_t \frac{L}{v_{x_{\max}}} \quad (4)$$

and a suitable value of W_{v_x} can be computed by equating the exit speed term in (3) with (4):

$$W_{v_x} v_{x_{\max}} = W_t \frac{L}{v_{x_{\max}}} \implies W_{v_x} = W_t \frac{L}{v_{x_{\max}}^2} \quad (5)$$

Therefore, a sensible range of values for W_{v_x} can be chosen around the guess given by (5). We will discuss how the value in (5) produces the best compromise, yielding the lowest MPC lap time.

2) *New Terminal Cost:* In the literature of minimum-time trajectory planning with MPC, a terminal cost is typically set to penalize the deviation of the final states from an MLT-OCF, solved on a full lap [3], [16]–[19]. This improves the MPC stability [25] and decreases the MPC computational times. However, solving an MLT is computationally expensive, and makes the MPC dependent on the full-lap knowledge, which may be a limitation. For example, if the maneuver execution error is too high, the terminal conditions from the MLT could be infeasible, which may yield MPC convergence issues. Also, the MLT terminal cost would shadow the driving style bias we are trying to introduce with the maximization of the exit speed.

To overcome these limitations, we propose a new terminal cost formulation, based on the trajectory planned by the MPC in the previous step. Specifically, the terminal cost is imposed on the final states n and ξ (lateral displacement and relative yaw angle) in the cost function (2) through the following term:

$$W_{n_f} (n(L) - n_f)^2 + W_{\xi_f} (\xi(L) - \xi_f)^2 \quad (6)$$

where L is the horizon length. n_f and ξ_f are estimated by extrapolating over the new horizon the last planned trajectory, with the following logic.

Let us consider the n and ξ dynamics expressed in curvilinear coordinates [16], [24]:

$$\frac{dn}{d\zeta} = \frac{(v_x \sin \xi + v_y \cos \xi) (1 - n \kappa)}{v_x \cos \xi - v_y \sin \xi} \quad (7a)$$

$$\frac{d\xi}{d\zeta} = \frac{\Omega (1 - n \kappa)}{v_x \cos \xi - v_y \sin \xi} - \kappa \quad (7b)$$

where the dependency of all the variables on the curvilinear abscissa ζ is omitted, and κ is the local road curvature. To estimate the terminal cost on n and ξ , let us look at Fig. 1. Between MPC steps, the previous solution needs to be shifted forward by L_{ext} to estimate the terminal conditions and state guess for the next MPC step. L is the end of the previous horizon, and L_{ext} is the forward shift applied to the last planned trajectory. We assume that v_x , v_y , and Ω remain constant over the extrapolation horizon L_{ext} , and are equal to their values at the end of the previous horizon (*i.e.*, $v_x(L)$, $v_y(L)$, and $\Omega(L)$). To extrapolate n and ξ , we start from their last values, $n(L)$ and $\xi(L)$, and integrate forward the dynamics (7) using an explicit Euler scheme with a step of 1 m until we reach $n(L + L_{\text{ext}})$ and $\xi(L + L_{\text{ext}})$. This allows us to estimate their values at the end of the new horizon, which will be the terminal conditions for the next MPC step. In addition, their extrapolation over the new part of the horizon also proves useful as a state guess for the next MPC step, reducing the computational time of the MPC solver.




Fig. 1. Extrapolation of the last planned trajectory to estimate the terminal conditions and state guess for the next MPC step. Between MPC steps, the previous solution needs to be shifted forward by L_{ext} to estimate the terminal conditions and state guess for the next MPC step. L is the end of the previous horizon, and L_{ext} is the forward shift applied to the last planned trajectory. The extrapolation is performed from L to $L + L_{\text{ext}}$. We can see that v_x , v_y , and Ω are assumed constant over the extrapolation horizon, while n and ξ are integrated forward using the dynamics (7) at 1 m steps.

This terminal cost also has a physical meaning, which corresponds to estimating the knowledge of a human driver about the future track geometry, beyond the planning horizon. Compared with the MLT-based terminal cost discussed at the beginning of this section, our approach allows the MPC to be independent of the full track knowledge and to change its driving style online. Thus, our MPC planner can start to

operate without previously solving an MLT-OCP on the full track, which is an advantage over the existing literature [3], [16]–[19]. Table I shows that the lap time and the mean solve time of MPC with the traditional MLT-based and the proposed terminal cost are almost identical, differing by only 5 ms and 3.953 ms, respectively. This indicates that our approach is computationally efficient and can be used for real-time trajectory planning.

TABLE I
LAP AND MEAN SOLVE TIMES OF MPC WITH DIFFERENT TERMINAL COSTS. UNLIKE THE MLT-BASED TERMINAL COST, OUR COST DOES NOT REQUIRE THE FULL TRACK KNOWLEDGE, AND ENABLES THE MPC TO CHANGE ITS DRIVING STYLE ONLINE, WITHOUT SIGNIFICANTLY AFFECTING THE PERFORMANCE.

	MPC lap time	MPC mean solve time
MLT-based terminal cost	113.551 s	24.970 ms
Proposed terminal cost	113.556 s	28.923 ms

B. Minimum-Lap-Time (MLT) on a Full Lap

As a baseline for our comparisons, we solve a minimum-lap-time (MLT) optimal control problem on a full circuit lap. The MLT problem has a similar formulation as the MPC problem (1), with the following differences. First, the cost function is only the maneuver time: we set $W_{v_x} = 0$ and $W_t = 2.0$. Then, we impose the initial and final states to be cyclic, *i.e.*, the vehicle states at the beginning and end of the lap must be the same. Lastly, we solve the MLT over one circuit lap. This yields the theoretical minimum-lap-time, given our problem formulation. We will use the MLT solution as a benchmark for our online MPC, whose cost function (2) combines minimum-time and maximum exit speed.

III. RESULTS

The Catalunya racetrack, depicted in Fig. 2, is the chosen track for our tests. The MPC planning horizon is set to $L = 300$ m, while the MPC trajectory is replanned every 50 ms. In the MPC cost function (2), the minimum-time weight is set to $W_t = 2.0$, while the maximum-speed weight W_{v_x} is varied from 0.0 to 0.1 in steps of 0.01. Table II summarizes the MPC test parameters.

The entire software stack is implemented in C++, where we use the Pins software [26] to formulate and solve the MPC and MLT problems. Pins is based on the indirect optimal control method, and was recently used for online minimum-time trajectory planning by [16], [21], [27]. All tests are run on an M2 Max Apple Silicon chip.

In the next sections, we will show the drastic importance that a single weight (W_{v_x}) can have on the planned maneuvers, and the advantage of not using offline full-lap information in the MPC planning problem.

A. Corner Analysis

The MPC problem is solved online over the entire circuit, with different values of W_{v_x} , to analyze the differences in the planned maneuvers. In this section, the MPC solutions will be

TABLE II
MPC PARAMETERS.

Parameter	Value
Planning horizon (L)	300 m
Replan time	50 ms
Minimum-time weight (W_t)	2.0
Maximum-speed weight (W_{v_x})	[0.00, 0.01, ..., 0.09, 0.10]

referred to as $\text{MPC}_{W_{v_x}}$, where W_{v_x} will be substituted with the value of the weight used in the cost function. For example, $\text{MPC}_{0.00}$ corresponds to the pure minimum-time MPC solution ($W_{v_x} = 0.00$).

We will focus on the results obtained with $W_{v_x} = [0.00, 0.06, 0.10]$, as they are the most interesting configurations representing pure minimum-time planning, the best MPC lap time, and the maximum exit speed solutions, respectively. Section III-C will analyze the sensitivity of the MPC solutions for more values of W_{v_x} . Let us now analyze the most interesting corners of the Catalunya racetrack.

Fig. 3 and 4 plot several corners of the Catalunya racetrack, to analyze how the planned trajectories differ due to the maximization of the exit speed. Each of the figures is structured as follows. On the left, it shows a zoom of the track segment used for the analysis, with four splits (A through D). On the right, it plots the longitudinal velocity and the lateral acceleration profiles over the four splits. In each figure, a table reports the travel time difference between the $\text{MPC}_{W_{v_x}}$ and the MLT solutions at the split points, where positive values indicate that the $\text{MPC}_{W_{v_x}}$ solution is locally slower than the MLT (the time counter starts at the beginning of the first split).

Corner n.4: Let us analyze the corner n.4 of the Catalunya racetrack, depicted in Fig. 3a. In the corner entry (sector A-B), the $\text{MPC}_{W_{v_x}}$ solutions carry more and more speed inside the turn and keep a progressively wider path as W_{v_x} increases. Also, the $\text{MPC}_{W_{v_x}}$ keep a higher minimum speed, and their apexes (*i.e.*, the points of minimum speed) move towards the exit of the corner as W_{v_x} increases (*late apex*). This behavior is consistent with the maximization of the exit speed: for higher W_{v_x} , the $\text{MPC}_{W_{v_x}}$ keep a larger speed and a wider path in the corner exit. Also, the lateral acceleration a_y is lower at the turn exit for higher W_{v_x} , which may suggest that these maneuvers are easier to execute. Conversely, the MLT stays closer to the inner track margin and keeps a lower speed throughout the corner, accelerating earlier (*early apex*).

We will see how this behavior remains consistent over most corners.

The $\text{MPC}_{0.06}$ and $\text{MPC}_{0.10}$ solutions are quicker than the MLT in the A-B and C-D sectors, but they lose time along B-C, due to the locally wider paths.

Corner n.12: Corner n.12 (Fig. 3b) is another example of late apex biasing. Here, similar considerations hold as for corner n.4. The $\text{MPC}_{W_{v_x}}$ solutions with $W_{v_x} > 0$ keep a higher speed and a wider path up to their apexes. The minimum speed is lower for higher W_{v_x} , and the apexes move




Fig. 2. Difference between the lateral coordinates of MPC_{0.00} and the best performing maximum-speed MPC, MPC_{0.06} on the Catalunya Racetrack.




Fig. 3. Corner n.4 (left) and Corner n.12 (right) of the Catalunya racetrack. Each figure, on the left, shows a zoom of the track segment used for the analysis, with four splits (A through D). On the right, it plots the longitudinal velocity and the lateral acceleration profiles over the four splits. In each figure, a table reports the travel time difference between the MPC_{W_{v_x}} and the MLT solutions at the split points, where positive values indicate that the MPC_{W_{v_x}} solution is locally slower than the MLT (the time counter starts at the beginning of the first split).

towards the turn exit. At the end of the corner (point D), the speed of the MPC_{0.06} and MPC_{0.10} solutions are higher than the MLT, due to the different cost functions. Once again, using $W_{v_x} > 0$ brings a reduction in a_y at both the entry and exit of the corner, possibly easing the maneuver execution.

Corner n.3: Fig. 4b shows the corner n.3. Before looking at the corner itself, we need to analyze the straight before it, depicted in Fig. 4a. Along this short straight (segment B-C), the MPC_{W_{v_x}} solutions choose a trajectory that gets wider and wider (towards the left track margin) as W_{v_x} increases. By doing so, in corner entry (point A in Fig. 4b) the MPC_{W_{v_x}} brake later and from a higher speed, as W_{v_x} increases. All maneuvers, including the MLT, have two clipping points, but the apex (*i.e.*, the point of minimum speed) moves towards the exit of the corner as W_{v_x} increases (*late apex*). Conversely,

the MLT trajectory is closer to the right track margin in the corner entry (Fig. 4a), but then brakes earlier and keeps a lower speed up to the acceleration point, which is reached before the MPC_{W_{v_x}} (early apex).

Interestingly, the MLT is quicker than the MPC_{W_{v_x}} in the corner entry (see the table in Fig. 4a), while the MPC_{0.10} is the quickest through the corner (sector A-D in Fig. 4b). This shows how a late apex trajectory can be the time-optimal trajectory for a specific corner. Such a behavior is not possible with traditional minimum-time MPC, and shows the advantage of our approach, which allows a bias of the driving style.

B. Summary and Lap Times

The corner analysis shows that the trajectories planned by the MPC_{W_{v_x}} are locally different from the MLT solution. The




Fig. 4. Straight segment (left) before Corner n.3 (right) of the Catalunya racetrack. For a detailed explanation, see the caption of Fig. 3.

$MPC_{W_{v_x}}$ maneuvers follow a trend towards late apexes as W_{v_x} increases. In corners, this yields wider trajectories with higher v_x and lower a_y in the entry and exit phases, possibly avoiding unstable regions of the performance envelope without sacrificing the travel time. Losing time over one corner may not be suboptimal: the MLT solution itself shows how sometimes trading off a few milliseconds on a corner may improve the overall lap time by allowing faster segments afterwards.

Table III compares the overall lap times of the different configurations of the $MPC_{W_{v_x}}$ problem and of the MLT. The MPC solution with $W_{v_x} = 0.06$ achieves the fastest lap time among the MPC configurations, confirming that our choice for the W_{v_x} weight in (5) results is the best compromise between the minimum-time and maximum-speed terms. Notably, the $MPC_{0.06}$ solution is faster than the pure minimum-time $MPC_{0.00}$, which confirms the findings of [8]. The reason behind the $MPC_{0.06}$ being the fastest $MPC_{W_{v_x}}$ solution will be further discussed in the next section. Moreover, the lap time of the $MPC_{0.06}$ is only 7 ms slower than the MLT, which is a negligible difference on a 4.5 km racetrack. This is an improvement of the results in [7], and opens promising perspectives for local adaptations of the MPC weights, for example with a reinforcement learning method [28], [29].

C. Sensitivity Analyses of the $MPC_{W_{v_x}}$ Solutions

To understand the reason the $MPC_{0.06}$ is the fastest $MPC_{W_{v_x}}$ solution, let us perform a sensitivity analysis on the $MPC_{W_{v_x}}$ solutions.

Fig. 5 plots the lap time differences between the $MPC_{W_{v_x}}$ and the MLT solution. We can see the time difference has a parabolic trend with a minimum at $W_{v_x} = 0.06$: this indicates

TABLE III
COMPARISON OF THE LAP AND MEAN SOLVE TIMES OF THE MLT AND $MPC_{W_{v_x}}$ PROBLEMS.

	Lap time	MPC mean solve time
MLT	113.535 s	-
$MPC_{0.00}$	113.556 s	28.923 ms
$MPC_{0.06}$	113.542 s	27.682 ms
$MPC_{0.10}$	113.552 s	27.552 ms

that maximizing the exit speed initially gives a performance boost, but then it starts to worsen the lap time.

Fig. 6 shows the mean deviation of the $MPC_{W_{v_x}}$'s lateral coordinates n and longitudinal velocities v_x with respect to the MLT solution: these mean deviations are weighted by the centerline curvature and normalized over the maximum curvature (MDK). The MDK metric is computed as:

$$MDK = \text{mean} \left(\left(x_{MPC_{W_{v_x}}} - x_{MLT} \right) \cdot \frac{\kappa}{\kappa_{\max}} \right) \quad (8)$$

where x is the state of interest and κ the centerline curvature. Positive values of n deviation indicate wider paths in the corners, while positive values of v_x deviation indicate higher speeds. As W_{v_x} increases, both the lateral deviation and the longitudinal velocity deviation increase. This trend highlights the impact of the W_{v_x} weight in the cost function, and how it can bias the driving style of our ARD. We remark that our MPC is *not* tracking the MLT solution, but rather re-planning online new trajectories with different driving styles.

Lastly, Fig. 7 plots the root-mean-square deviation (RMSD) of v_x and a_x from the MLT solution. Lower values of RMSD indicate a profile closer to the MLT solution. The $MPC_{0.06}$ has the lowest RMSD for both v_x and a_x , which suggests that the $MPC_{0.06}$ is the fastest solution because it is the closest

to the MLT solution, while still preferring late apexes and maximizing speed in corners.




Fig. 5. Difference between the lap times of the MPC $_{W_{v_x}}$ against the MLT solution. The MPC $_{0.06}$ is the fastest MPC $_{W_{v_x}}$ solution.




Fig. 6. Mean deviation of the MPC $_{W_{v_x}}$'s lateral coordinates n and longitudinal velocities v_x with respect to the MLT solution: these mean deviations are weighted by the centerline curvature and normalized over the maximum curvature (MDK) (see eq. (8)). Positive values of n deviation indicate wider paths in the corners, while positive values of v_x deviation indicate higher speeds. As W_{v_x} increases, both the lateral deviation and the longitudinal velocity deviation increase.

D. Computational Performance

Table III shows the mean computational time to solve a single MPC $_{W_{v_x}}$ problem. We can see that the mean time stays well below the replan-time of 50 ms, ensuring real-time feasibility. It is worth noting that, compared to the related works [8], [10], with our approach we can easily solve the different configurations of the MPC $_{W_{v_x}}$ problem over the entire circuit in a handful of minutes. This allows us to quickly test different configurations and find the best compromise between the minimum-time and maximum-speed terms.




Fig. 7. RMS deviation (RMSD) of v_x and a_x of the MPC $_{W_{v_x}}$ solutions from the MLT solution. Lower values of RMSD indicate a profile closer to the MLT solution. We can see that the MPC $_{0.06}$ has the lowest RMSD for both v_x and a_x .

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we presented a novel approach to bias the driving style of an artificial race driver (ARD) and to avoid the use of full-lap knowledge in the MPC. We showed how the maximization of the final longitudinal velocity, through a single parameter in the MPC cost function, can drastically change the driving styles. This final speed maximization leads to a driving style that prefers late apexes, which is more in line with the driving style of professional drivers. We compared the results obtained with our approach against both a minimum-lap-time optimal control solution and a minimum-time MPC solution. Our results suggest that maximizing the final longitudinal velocity not only drastically changes the planned trajectories, but also can lead to faster lap times. Additionally, we proved that we can avoid the use of full-lap knowledge in the MPC, without sacrificing lap performance nor computational time. Lastly, we showed that our approach is capable of real-time execution, allowing for quick testing of different configurations and real-world applications.

In future work, we plan to use reinforcement learning to dynamically adapt the weight W_{v_x} corner by corner, to achieve faster lap times and/or mimic specific driving styles. Also, we will test our approach on different racetracks to evaluate its generalization capabilities.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. C. Kegelmann, L. K. Harbott, and J. C. Gerdes, "Insights into vehicle trajectories at the handling limits: analysing open data from race car drivers," *Vehicle System Dynamics*, vol. 55, no. 2, pp. 191–207, 2017.
- [2] J. Betz, H. Zheng, A. Liniger, U. Rosolia, P. Karle, M. Behl, V. Krovi, and R. Mangharam, "Autonomous vehicles on the edge: A survey on autonomous vehicle racing," *IEEE Open Journal of Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 3, pp. 458–488, 2022.
- [3] M. Piccinini, S. Taddei, E. Pagot, E. Bertolazzi, and F. Biral, "How optimal is the minimum-time manoeuvre of an artificial race driver?" *Vehicle System Dynamics*, vol. 0, no. 0, pp. 1–28, 2024.

- [4] L. Ögretmen, M. Rowold, A. Langmann, and B. Lohmann, "Sampling-based motion planning with online racing line generation for autonomous driving on three-dimensional race tracks," in *2024 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, 2024, pp. 811–818.
- [5] M. Piccinini, S. Gottschalk, M. Gerdts, and F. Biral, "Computationally efficient minimum-time motion primitives for vehicle trajectory planning," *IEEE Open Journal of Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 5, pp. 642–655, 2024.
- [6] S. Ju, P. van Vliet, O. Arenz, and J. Peters, "Digital twin of a driver-in-the-loop race car simulation with contextual reinforcement learning," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 8, no. 7, pp. 4107–4114, 2023.
- [7] J. R. Anderson, B. Ayalew, and T. Weiskircher, "Modeling a professional driver in ultra-high performance maneuvers with a hybrid cost mpc," in *2016 American Control Conference (ACC)*, 2016, pp. 1981–1986.
- [8] J. R. Anderson and B. Ayalew, "Modelling minimum-time manoeuvring with global optimisation of local receding horizon control," *Vehicle System Dynamics*, vol. 56, pp. 1508–1531, Oct. 2018.
- [9] E. Pagot, "A study of a robust and accurate framework for minimum-time optimal control of high-performance cars: from coaching professional drivers to autonomous racing," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Trento, Italy, 2023.
- [10] J. R. Anderson and B. Ayalew, "A Cascaded Optimization Approach for Modeling a Professional Driver's Driving Style," *Journal of Dynamic Systems, Measurement, and Control*, vol. 142, no. 9, p. 091004, 05 2020.
- [11] S. Löckel, S. Ju, M. Schaller, P. van Vliet, and J. Peters, "An adaptive human driver model for realistic race car simulations," *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, vol. 53, no. 11, pp. 6718–6730, 2023.
- [12] F. Werner, R. Oberhuber, and J. Betz, "Accelerating autonomy: Insights from pro racers in the era of autonomous racing - an expert interview study," in *2024 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, 2024, pp. 329–336.
- [13] F. Doubek, F. Salzmann, and J. de Winter, "What makes a good driver on public roads and race tracks? an interview study," *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour*, vol. 80, pp. 399–423, 2021.
- [14] S. Löckel, J. Peters, and P. van Vliet, "A probabilistic framework for imitating human race driver behavior," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 2086–2093, 2020.
- [15] P. v. V. Stefan Löckel, André Kretsch, and J. Peters, "Identification and modelling of race driving styles," *Vehicle System Dynamics*, vol. 60, no. 8, pp. 2890–2918, 2022.
- [16] M. Piccinini, S. Taddei, M. Larcher, M. Piazza, and F. Biral, "A physics-driven artificial agent for online time-optimal vehicle motion planning and control," *IEEE Access*, vol. 11, pp. 46 344–46 372, 2023.
- [17] J. L. Vázquez, M. Brühlmeier, A. Liniger, A. Rupenyan, and J. Lygeros, "Optimization-based hierarchical motion planning for autonomous racing," in *2020 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, 2020, pp. 2397–2403.
- [18] M. Piccinini, M. Larcher, E. Pagot, D. Piscini, L. Pasquato, and F. Biral, "A predictive neural hierarchical framework for on-line time-optimal motion planning and control of black-box vehicle models," *Vehicle System Dynamics*, vol. 61, no. 1, pp. 83–110, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00423114.2022.2035776>
- [19] J. K. Subosits and J. C. Gerdes, "From the racetrack to the road: Real-time trajectory replanning for autonomous driving," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 309–320, 2019.
- [20] T. Novi, A. Liniger, R. Capitani, and C. Annicchiarico, "Real-time control for at-limit handling driving on a predefined path," *Vehicle System Dynamics*, vol. 58, no. 7, pp. 1007–1036, 2020.
- [21] E. Pagot, M. Piccinini, and F. Biral, "Real-time optimal control of an autonomous rc car with minimum-time maneuvers and a novel kineto-dynamical model," in *2020 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, 2020, pp. 2390–2396.
- [22] P. v. V. Stefan Löckel, André Kretsch, and J. Peters, "Identification and modelling of race driving styles," *Vehicle System Dynamics*, vol. 60, no. 8, pp. 2890–2918, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00423114.2021.1930070>
- [23] M. Piccinini, S. Taddei, M. Piazza, and F. Biral, "Impacts of g-g-v constraints formulations on online minimum-time vehicle trajectory planning," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 58, no. 10, pp. 87–93, 2024, 17th IFAC Symposium on Control of Transportation Systems CTS 2024.
- [24] R. Lot and F. Biral, "A curvilinear abscissa approach for the lap time optimization of racing vehicles," *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 7559 – 7565, 2014.
- [25] L. Grüne and J. Pannek, *Nonlinear Model Predictive Control: Theory and Algorithms*. Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 2013.
- [26] F. Biral, E. Bertolazzi, and P. Bosetti, "Notes on numerical methods for solving optimal control problems," *IEEJ Journal of Industry Applications*, vol. 5, pp. 154–166, 03 2016.
- [27] E. Pagot, M. Piccinini, E. Bertolazzi, and F. Biral, "Fast planning and tracking of complex autonomous parking maneuvers with optimal control and pseudo-neural networks," *IEEE Access*, vol. 11, pp. 124 163–124 180, 2023.
- [28] B. Zarrouki, V. Klös, N. Heppner, S. Schwan, R. Ritschel, and R. Voßwinkel, "Weights-varying mpc for autonomous vehicle guidance: a deep reinforcement learning approach," in *2021 European Control Conference (ECC)*, 2021, pp. 119–125.
- [29] S. Gottschalk, M. Gerdts, and M. Piccinini, "Reinforcement learning and optimal control: A hybrid collision avoidance approach," in *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Vehicle Technology and Intelligent Transport Systems*, 2024, pp. 76–87.