

Distributed economic control of dynamically coupled networks

Yang Lu and Minghui Zhu

Abstract—This paper investigates the synthesis of distributed economic control algorithms under which dynamically coupled physical systems are regulated to a variational equilibrium of a constrained convex game. We study two complementary cases: (i) each subsystem is linear and controllable; and (ii) each subsystem is nonlinear and in the strict-feedback form. The convergence of the proposed algorithms is guaranteed using Lyapunov analysis. Their performance is verified by two case studies on a multi-zone building temperature regulation problem and an optimal power flow problem, respectively.

Index Terms—Distributed control, game-theoretic learning, multi-agent networks, cyber-physical systems.

I. INTRODUCTION

Control systems have been experiencing dramatic changes where advanced information and communication technologies are integrated to improve system performance and produce new functions. This class of new-generation control systems is referred to as cyber-physical systems (CPSs), e.g., mobile robotic networks, the smart grid, smart buildings and intelligent transportation systems. The entities of CPSs are spatially distributed and thus distributed coordination becomes necessary to achieve network-wide goals [7, 29, 50].

Currently, many large-scale CPSs, e.g., power systems, adopt top-down hierarchical control. The decision-making layer first determines an optimal operating point via solving, e.g., an optimization problem. The physical layer waits for the convergence of the decision-making layer and then regulates physical dynamics to the desired operating point. For example, in optimal power flow (OPF) problems [16, 47] the decision-making layer solves an economic dispatch problem to schedule the nominal operating levels of active generators and inter-area power flows. Once the economic dispatch problem is solved, the physical layer performs frequency control to adjust the set-points of the generators to drive their frequencies back to their nominal values and drive the inter-area power flows to the scheduled values.

One potential issue of the hierarchical approach is that, in an iterative seeking of an optimal operating point, the decision-making layer needs to evaluate quality of intermediate estimates so as to determine whether the seeking process terminates or not. The quality evaluation could be challenging, especially in a distributed setting, in which individual agents may lack of information to verify solution quality for a network-wide problem.

As pointed out in the literature of economic model predictive control (MPC) [11, 38], another potential issue of hierarchical control is efficiency loss. A general reason for the issue is that optimal operating points change more frequent and the time scales on which physical dynamics react to the changes shrink. The issue motivates recent studies of economic MPC as a complement of hierarchical control. In economic MPC, the controller directly optimizes in real time the economic performance of physical dynamics. However, the design of economic MPC still requires to decide the optimal steady state of physical dynamics in advance.

Alternatively, there have been recent efforts on the approach where the physical layer keeps track of intermediate results of the decision-making layer all the time. In this paper, the approach is referred to as economic control. Since the decision-making layer and the physical layer operate in a single time scale, solution evaluation is resolved and physical dynamics are more responsive to dynamic changes of optimal operating points. In the smart grid, [28] proposed a strategy for linear power systems which, by using virtual flows to constrain real flows without altering the primal-dual interpretation of the network dynamics, can simultaneously address frequency control and economic dispatch. In multi-zone building systems, [17, 18] proposed an integrated design such that the optimization of the decision-making layer is formulated as a dynamical system and the physical layer keeps track of the dynamic feedback from the decision-making layer. The papers aforementioned study specific applications. On the other hand, recent papers [15, 44] provide general theories to integrate physical dynamics into game-theoretic learning for dynamically decoupled networks, e.g., mobile robotic networks. In [44], the agents' actions are filtered through decoupled stable linear time-invariant filters before affecting objective functions. In [15], the agents' actions act as inputs to a stable nonlinear dynamic system whose outputs are the agents' costs. In contrast, this paper studies dynamically coupled networked systems which are unstable without controls and need to be stabilized in a distributed manner. Moreover, in [15, 44], no constraint was included in the games of interest.

This paper investigates a class of convex games, which were first introduced in [4] and have received substantial attentions [13]. A number of algorithms have been proposed to compute Nash equilibria of convex games, including, to name a few, ODE-based methods [40], nonlinear Gauss-Seidel-type approaches [34], iterative primal-dual Tikhonov schemes [46], consensus-based methods [22], best-response dynamics [33] and finite difference approximation [48]. The

Y. Lu and M. Zhu are with the School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Pennsylvania State University, 201 Old Main, University Park, PA, 16802, yml5046@psu.edu, muz16@psu.edu. This work was partially supported by NSF grant ECCS-1710859.

learning algorithms of game theory have been applied to, e.g., networking [3], transportation [6], multi-robot systems [49], power systems [41] and multi-zone building systems [1]. In all these papers, the game-theoretic learning algorithms ignore real-time physical dynamics which feature CPSs.

Contribution. In this paper, we consider the synthesis of distributed economic control algorithms under which dynamically coupled physical systems are regulated to a variational equilibrium (VE), a special type of Nash equilibrium (NE), of a constrained convex game. The game includes distributed separable optimization as a special case. We investigate two complementary cases where the physical dynamics are linear and nonlinear, respectively.

For linear dynamics with controllable subsystems, we propose an indirect approach for the distributed economic control algorithm design. We synthesize distributed update rules for auxiliary variables such that they asymptotically converge to a VE of the game of interest, but their evolution is not restricted by the inherent physical dynamics. The distributed decision-making update rule extends the projected discontinuous dynamics in [9] from convex optimization to convex games. We then design a novel distributed control law such that the states and inputs of the physical dynamics keep track of the auxiliary variables and thus asymptotically converge to the same VE of the game. The designed algorithm is verified by a multi-zone building temperature regulation problem. The simulation demonstrates that, compared with the hierarchical control scheme, the proposed economic control scheme can significantly reduce efficiency loss.

For nonlinear dynamics in the strict-feedback form, we develop a direct approach without introducing auxiliary variables. In particular, we perform a sequence of coordinate transformations such that each subsystem is converted into the one where its first state is driven by a primal-dual dynamics and it is followed by a chain of integrators. We then design a distributed control law such that the integrators are stabilized and the primal-dual dynamics asymptotically converges to a VE of the game of interest. The algorithm and its analysis developed for this case are novel. The proposed algorithm is verified by an optimal power flow problem.

Preliminary results of this paper were published in [25], where the case of nonlinear dynamics was not investigated, no case study was included, and the proofs were omitted.

Notations and notions. Let $(x_i)_{i=1}^N = [x_1^T, \dots, x_N^T]^T$ and $x_{-i} = [x_1^T, \dots, x_{i-1}^T, x_{i+1}^T, \dots, x_N^T]^T$. Let $\|\cdot\|_1$ and $\|\cdot\|$ denote the 1-norm and 2-norm of a vector or a matrix, respectively. Denote the zero column vector of size n by 0_n and the identity matrix of size $n \times n$ by I_n . Let \mathbb{R}_+^n denote the set of nonnegative real column vectors of size n . Denote by $\text{diag}(A_i)_{i=1}^M$ the block-diagonal matrix composed by submatrices A_1, \dots, A_M , such that the j -th diagonal block is A_j and all the off-diagonal blocks are zero matrices. Given a function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of $x = (x_i)_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}^n$, for a nonnegative integer ℓ , we say that f is of class C^ℓ if for all possible combinations of $\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots, \ell_n$, where each of $\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots, \ell_n$ is an integer between 0 and ℓ such that $\ell_1 + \ell_2 + \dots + \ell_n = \ell$, the partial derivative $\frac{\partial^\ell f}{\partial x_1^{\ell_1} \partial x_2^{\ell_2} \dots \partial x_n^{\ell_n}}$ exists and is continuous.

Given a function $V : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\delta > 0$, denote the sublevel set of V by $V^{-1}(\leq \delta) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : V(x) \leq \delta\}$.

Let $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a closed and convex set. Denote the boundary, interior and closure of K by $\text{bd}(K)$, $\text{int}(K)$ and $\text{cl}(K)$, respectively. Given $x \in \text{bd}(K)$, define the normal cone of K at x by $N_K(x) = \{\gamma : \|\gamma\| = 1, \text{ and } \gamma^T(x - y) \leq 0, \forall y \in K\}$. Given $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the point projection of x onto K is $\text{Proj}_K(x) = \arg\min_{z \in K} \|z - x\|$. Given $x \in K$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the vector projection of v at x with respect to K is $\Pi_K(x, v) = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\text{Proj}_K(x + \delta v) - x}{\delta}$. The following lemma is adopted from Lemma 2.1 of [31].

Lemma 1.1: If $x \in \text{int}(K)$, then $\Pi_K(x, v) = v$; if $x \in \text{bd}(K)$, then $\Pi_K(x, v) = v + \beta(x)\gamma^*(x)$, where $\gamma^*(x) = \arg\min_{\gamma \in N_K(x)} v^T \gamma$ and $\beta(x) = \max\{0, -v^T \gamma^*(x)\}$; and $\|\Pi_K(x, v)\| \leq \|v\|$ for any $x \in K$ and any $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$. ■

We next review some necessary concepts on projected discontinuous dynamical systems. Given a set $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and a map $F : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, consider the projected differential equation

$$\dot{x} = \Pi_K(x, F(x)). \quad (1)$$

Given $x^0 \in K$, a solution of (1) on the interval $[0, T) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is a map $\Gamma : [0, T) \rightarrow K$ with $\Gamma(0) = x^0$ that is absolutely continuous on $[0, T)$ and satisfies $\dot{\Gamma}(t) = \Pi_K(\Gamma(t), F(\Gamma(t)))$ almost everywhere on $[0, T)$. A set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is invariant under (1) if every solution starting from any point in S remains in S . For a solution Γ of (1) defined on $[0, \infty)$, the omega-limit set $\Omega(\Gamma)$ is defined by $\Omega(\Gamma) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : \exists \{t_k\}_{k=1}^\infty \subseteq [0, \infty) \text{ with } \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} t_k = \infty \text{ and } \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \Gamma(t_k) = y\}$. Given a continuously differentiable function $V : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the Lie derivative of V along (1) at $x \in K$ is $\mathcal{L}_{K,F}V(x) = \nabla V(x)^T \Pi_K(x, F(x))$. The next result adopted from [5] provides an invariance principle for (1).

Lemma 1.2: Let $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be compact and invariant under (1). Assume that for any $x^0 \in S$ there exists a unique solution of (1) starting at x^0 and that its omega-limit set is invariant under (1). Suppose that there exists a continuously differentiable function $V : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that V is positive definite and $\mathcal{L}_{K,F}V(x) \leq 0$ for all $x \in S$. Then any solution of (1) starting from S converges to the largest invariant set contained in $\text{cl}(\{x \in S : \mathcal{L}_{K,F}V(x) = 0\})$. ■

We adopt the following notions of strictly and strongly monotone maps from [14].

Definition 1.1: A map $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^r \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^r$ is strictly monotone on $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^r$ if $(w - w')^T(\Phi(w) - \Phi(w')) > 0$ for all $w, w' \in W$ with $w \neq w'$. The map Φ is strongly monotone on W if there exists $M > 0$ such that $(w - w')^T(\Phi(w) - \Phi(w')) \geq M\|w - w'\|^2$ for all $w, w' \in W$. ■

II. MOTIVATING EXAMPLES

In this section, we use a multi-zone building temperature regulation problem and an optimal power flow (OPF) problem to motivate our problem formulation.

A. Multi-zone building temperature regulation

Consider a set of zones $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, N\}$ and an air handling unit (AHU). The meanings of the parameters and variables are listed in Table I. For each $i \in \mathcal{V}$, let $\mathcal{N}_i^{PH} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ be the set of

neighboring zones of zone i . For each zone i , the following dynamic model is adopted from [27]:

$$\begin{aligned}
C_{i1}\dot{T}_{i1}(t) &= m_i^s(t)c_p(T_i^s(t) - T_{i1}(t)) + \frac{T_{i2}(t) - T_{i1}(t)}{R_i} \\
&+ \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{PH}} \frac{T_{j1}(t) - T_{i1}(t)}{R_{ji}} + \frac{T^{oa}(t) - T_{i1}(t)}{R_i^{oa}} + P_i^d(t), \\
C_{i2}\dot{T}_{i2}(t) &= \frac{T_{i1}(t) - T_{i2}(t)}{R_i}, \\
T_i^s(t) &= \delta(t) \frac{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} m_j^s(t) T_{j1}(t)}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} m_j^s(t)} + (1 - \delta(t)) T^{oa}(t) \\
&- \Delta T^c(t) + \Delta T_i^h(t). \tag{2}
\end{aligned}$$

TABLE I
PARAMETERS/VARIABLES OF THE MULTI-ZONE BUILDING PROBLEM

C_{i1}/C_{i2}	thermal capacitance of fast/slow-dynamic mass at zone i
T_{i1}/T_{i2}	temperature of fast/slow dynamic mass at zone i
T_i^r	reference temperature of zone i
T_i^s	temperature of air supplied to zone i
m_i^s	mass flow rate of air supplied to zone i
T^{oa}	outside air temperature
ΔT^c	temperature difference across AHU cooling coil
ΔT_i^h	temperature difference across reheat coil at zone i
δ	AHU recirculation damper position
P_i^d	external load
R_i	heat resistance between C_{i1} and C_{i2}
R_{ji}	thermal resistance between zone i and zone j
R_i^{oa}	thermal resistance between zone i and outside air
c_p	specific heat capacity of zone air
$\underline{T}_i/\bar{T}_i$	lower/upper limit of the temperature of zone i
$\underline{\Delta T}_i^h/\bar{\Delta T}_i^h$	lower/upper limit of ΔT_i^h

The agents aim to minimize the deviations between the zone temperatures and their references with minimum control efforts. Meanwhile, the zone temperatures and controls are subject to some hard limits and the coupled constraints on thermal balance. All these objectives are encapsulated in the following optimization problem which is adopted from [18]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\min_{T_1, T_2, \Delta T^h} & \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} (c_{i1}^x (T_{i1} - T_i^r)^2 + c_{i2}^x (T_{i2} - T_i^r)^2 + c_i^u (\Delta T_i^h)^2) \\
\text{s.t. } & m_i^s c_p (T_i^s - T_{i1}) + \frac{T_{i2} - T_{i1}}{R_i} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{PH}} \frac{T_{j1} - T_{i1}}{R_{ji}} \\
& + \frac{T^{oa} - T_{i1}}{R_i^{oa}} + P_i^d = 0, \forall i \in \mathcal{V} \\
& T_{i1} - T_{i2} = 0, \forall i \in \mathcal{V}, \\
& \underline{\Delta T}_i^h \leq \Delta T_i^h \leq \bar{\Delta T}_i^h, \underline{T}_i \leq T_{i1}, T_{i2} \leq \bar{T}_i, \forall i \in \mathcal{V} \tag{3}
\end{aligned}$$

where c_{i1}^x , c_{i2}^x and c_i^u are constant positive weights associated with T_{i1} , T_{i2} and ΔT_i^h , respectively.

In traditional hierarchical control, the decision-making layer first solves problem (3) to obtain an optimal operating point $(T_1^*, T_2^*, \Delta T^{h*})$. After the decision-making layer converges, the physical layer performs temperature regulation to steer the physical dynamics (2) to the desired operating point [36]. To address the issues of hierarchical control, we aim to design an economic control algorithm such that the temperature regulation in the physical dynamics (2) could keep track of the intermediate solutions of problem (3).

TABLE II
PARAMETERS/VARIABLES OF THE OPF PROBLEM

a, b, c	cost parameters	P_C	power control input
T_H	inertia constant	u_i	$P_{C_i} - P_{m_i0}$
D	damping coefficient	ω	relative speed
T_M	turbine time constant	ω_0	sync. machine speed
K_M	turbine gain	θ	rotor angle
T_E	governor time constant	t_{ij}	tie-line stiffness
R	regulation constant	P_E	steam valve position
P_m	mechanical power	K_E	speed governor gain

B. Optimal power flow

Consider a power network comprising a set of power generators $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, N\}$. The meanings of the parameters and variables are listed in Table II. For each $i \in \mathcal{V}$, let $\mathcal{N}_i^{PH} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ identify the set of neighboring generators of generator i . For convenience of notation, for any pair (i, j) , let $\theta_{ij}(t) = \theta_i(t) - \theta_j(t)$. The following inherent physical dynamics of generator i is adopted from [45]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\theta}_i(t) &= \omega_i(t) - \tilde{\omega}, \\
\dot{\omega}_i(t) &= -\frac{D_i}{2T_{H_i}} \omega_i(t) + \frac{\omega_0}{2T_{H_i}} (P_{m_i}(t) - P_{m_i0}) \\
&- \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{PH}} \frac{\omega_0 t_{ij}}{2T_{H_i}} (\sin \theta_{ij}(t) - \sin \theta_{ij}(0)), \\
\dot{P}_{m_i}(t) &= -\frac{1}{T_{M_i}} (P_{m_i}(t) - P_{m_i0}) + \frac{K_{M_i}}{T_{M_i}} (P_{E_i}(t) - P_{E_i0}), \\
\dot{P}_{E_i}(t) &= -\frac{K_{E_i} \omega_i(t)}{T_{E_i} R_i \omega_0} - \frac{1}{T_{E_i}} (P_{E_i}(t) - P_{E_i0} - u_i(t)) \tag{4}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\omega} = 50\text{Hz}$ is the desirable relative speed.

The agents aim to find the optimal mechanical power P_m and rotor angle θ that minimize their operating cost, and at the same time, satisfy the coupled constraints on load balance. All these objectives are encoded by the following OPF problem which is adopted from Section 8.3.1 of [47]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\min_{(P_m, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^{2N}} & \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} (a_i P_{m_i}^2 + b_i P_{m_i} + c_i \theta_i^2) \\
\text{s.t. } & \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{PH}} \frac{\omega_0 t_{ij}}{2T_{H_i}} (\theta_{ij} - \sin \theta_{ij}(0)) \\
& = -\frac{D_i}{2T_{H_i}} \tilde{\omega}_i + \frac{\omega_0}{2T_{H_i}} (P_{m_i} - P_{m_i0}), \forall i \in \mathcal{V}. \tag{5}
\end{aligned}$$

In problem (5), the constraint uses the linearization $\sin \theta_{ij} \approx \theta_{ij}$ around the equilibrium.

In traditional hierarchical control, the decision-making layer first solves problem (5) to obtain an optimal operating point (P_m^*, θ^*) . After the convergence of the decision-making layer, the physical layer performs frequency control to regulate the physical dynamics (4) to the desired operating point [16]. To address the issues of hierarchical control, we aim to design an economic control algorithm such that the frequency control in the physical dynamics (4) dynamically keeps track of the intermediate solutions of problem (5).

III. PROBLEM STATEMENT

This section provides the general formulation of the distributed economic control problem for dynamically coupled networks considered in this paper.

A. Physical dynamics

Consider a set of agents $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, N\}$. The inherent physical dynamics is given by

$$\dot{x}_i(t) = \Xi_i(x(t), u_i(t)) \quad (6)$$

where $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ and $u_i \in \mathbb{R}$ are the state and control of agent i , respectively, with n_i the dimension of x_i . Let $x = (x_i)_{i=1}^N$, $u = (u_i)_{i=1}^N$ and $n = \sum_{i=1}^N n_i$. The correspondence between (6) and (2) (resp. (4)) is given in Section VII-A (resp. Section VII-B).

B. Game formulation

The control objective is formulated by a generalized Nash equilibrium problem. For each $i \in \mathcal{V}$, $w_i = [x_i^T, u_i^T]^T$ is agent i 's decision variable and is subject to a local constraint $W_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{r_i}$ with $r_i = n_i + 1$. Let $w = (w_i)_{i=1}^N$, $r = \sum_{i=1}^N r_i$ and $W = \prod_{i=1}^N W_i$. Given $w_{-i} \in W_{-i} = \prod_{j \neq i} W_j$, each agent $i \in \mathcal{V}$ aims to solve the following optimization problem:

$$\min_{w_i \in W_i} f_i(w) \quad \text{s.t. } H(w) = 0_m, G(w) \leq 0_l \quad (7)$$

where $f_i : W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the objective function of agent i , $H : W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ and $G : W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$ are the functions of the coupled equality and inequality constraints shared by the agents. The correspondence between (7) and (3) (resp. (5)) is given in Section VII-A (resp. Section VII-B).

Given any $w_{-i} \in W_{-i}$, the feasible set of w_i is depicted by a set-valued map $\mathcal{D}_i : W_{-i} \rightarrow 2^{W_i}$ defined as $\mathcal{D}_i(w_{-i}) = \{w_i \in W_i : H(w) = 0_m, G(w) \leq 0_l\}$. With the map \mathcal{D}_i , problem (7) can be equivalently expressed as follows:

$$\min_{w_i \in \mathcal{D}_i(w_{-i})} f_i(w_i, w_{-i}). \quad (8)$$

Let $F = (f_i)_{i=1}^N$, $\mathcal{D}(w) = \prod_{i=1}^N \mathcal{D}_i(w_{-i})$ and $\hat{\mathcal{D}} = \{w \in W : H(w) = 0_m, G(w) \leq 0_l\}$. Notice that $\mathcal{D}(\cdot)$ is a set-valued map while $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ is a constant set that represents the overall feasible set of w . The collection of (8) for all $i \in \mathcal{V}$ is a generalized Nash equilibrium problem with shared constraints [13], denoted by $\text{GNEP}(\mathcal{D}, F)$. In particular, the players of the GNEP are the agents in \mathcal{V} , and the action profile of each player $i \in \mathcal{V}$ is $w_i \in \mathcal{D}_i(w_{-i})$. The solution concept of the GNEP is given by the following notion of Nash equilibrium (NE), at which no player can benefit from unilateral deviation.

Definition 3.1: A joint state $\tilde{w} = (\tilde{w}_i)_{i=1}^N \in W$ is an NE of the $\text{GNEP}(\mathcal{D}, F)$ if, for all $i \in \mathcal{V}$, $\tilde{w}_i \in \mathcal{D}_i(\tilde{w}_{-i})$ and $f_i(\tilde{w}) \leq f_i(w_i, \tilde{w}_{-i})$ for any $w_i \in \mathcal{D}_i(\tilde{w}_{-i})$. ■

Let $\nabla F(w) = (\nabla_{w_i} f_i(w))_{i=1}^N$, $\nabla H(w) = (\nabla_w H_j(w))_{j=1}^m$ and $\nabla G(w) = (\nabla_w G_j(w))_{j=1}^l$. The following assumptions on the GNEP are supposed to hold throughout the paper.

Assumption 3.1: For all $i \in \mathcal{V}$, for any $w_{-i} \in W_{-i}$, $f_i(\cdot, w_{-i})$ is of class C^1 and convex in W_i ; $H(\cdot)$ is affine in W ; $G(\cdot)$ is of class C^1 and convex in W . ■

Assumption 3.2: $\forall i \in \mathcal{V}$, W_i is closed and convex. ■

Assumption 3.3: The Slater condition holds for $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$, i.e., $\exists \bar{w} \in \text{int}(W)$ such that $H(\bar{w}) = 0_m$ and $G(\bar{w}) < 0_l$. ■

Assumption 3.4: The maps ∇G and ∇F are locally Lipschitz on W . ■

Assumption 3.5: ∇F is strictly monotone over W . ■

Remark 3.1: Assumptions 3.1–3.5 are standard in game analysis [24, 37, 48]. When $N = 1$, i.e., there is a single agent, the GNEP reduces to an optimization problem. Assumptions 3.1–3.4 are standard to establish convergence for optimization problems. In particular, Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2 lead to a convex optimization problem; Assumption 3.3 implies that strong duality holds, i.e., the duality gap is zero; Assumption 3.4 implies that ∇G and ∇F are regular and is needed to establish the existence and uniqueness of the evolution of certain projected dynamics. When extending optimization problems to games, Assumption 3.5 is further needed to restrict the coupling between the agents. ■

C. From GNEP to variational inequality

A GNEP with shared constraints is in general difficult to solve, because it is defined over the joint set-valued map $\mathcal{D} = \{w \in \mathbb{R}^r : w_i \in \mathcal{D}_i(w_{-i}), \forall i \in \mathcal{V}\}$, which is in general non-convex in w . However, certain types of solutions can be calculated relatively easily by using the variational inequality (VI) approach [42]. This subsection reviews relevant results of VI in the literature. We refer to [14, 33] for a comprehensive discussion on VI.

Given a set $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^r$ and a map $\Phi : \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^r$, the generalized variational inequality, denoted by $\text{GVI}(\mathcal{Q}, \Phi)$, is the problem of finding $\tilde{w} \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that $(w - \tilde{w})^T \Phi(\tilde{w}) \geq 0$ for all $w \in \mathcal{Q}$. We next introduce another solution concept of the $\text{GNEP}(\mathcal{D}, F)$, termed as variational equilibrium (VE).

Definition 3.2: A joint state \tilde{w} is a VE of the $\text{GNEP}(\mathcal{D}, F)$ if it is a solution of the $\text{GVI}(\hat{\mathcal{D}}, \nabla F)$. ■

Remark 3.2: If Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2 hold, then any VE is an NE of the $\text{GNEP}(\mathcal{D}, F)$, but not vice versa ([33], Proposition 12.4). There are two major motivations for considering VEs instead of NEs. First, the GVI is defined over the constant set $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ which is convex in w . Hence, in general, the GVI is easier to solve than the GNEP. Second, in terms of optimality, VEs are in general more efficient than NEs. Specifically, an NE of a game is in general not optimal in terms of social welfare [10], except for some special cases, e.g., potential games [30]. Consider the following distributed separable optimization problem (DSOP): $\min_{w \in W} \sum_{i=1}^N f_i(w_i)$, s.t. $H(w) = 0_m$ and $G(w) \leq 0_l$. In general, an arbitrary NE of the $\text{GNEP}(\mathcal{D}, F)$ with \mathcal{D} and F defined as above may not be an optimal solution of the DSOP. However, since the objective function is separable, the DSOP is equivalent to the $\text{GVI}(\hat{\mathcal{D}}, \nabla F)$ (they share the same KKT conditions), and thus, by Definition 3.2, the set of global optima of the DSOP is identical with the set of VEs of the $\text{GNEP}(\mathcal{D}, F)$. The motivating problems in Section II are two instances of the DSOP. ■

In this paper, we focus on identifying VEs of the $\text{GNEP}(\mathcal{D}, F)$, rather than general NEs. The issue of VE existence has been extensively studied. We refer to [33] for a thorough review of the existence issue. At this moment, we assume that the $\text{GNEP}(\mathcal{D}, F)$ admits at least one VE. We will verify this assumption using suitable conditions when we consider specific GNEPs in the next two sections. With Assumptions 3.1, 3.2 and 3.5, the $\text{GNEP}(\mathcal{D}, F)$ has at most one VE ([33], Proposition 12.9). Then given the existence assumption, the $\text{GNEP}(\mathcal{D}, F)$ has a unique VE.

D. Communication graph

Denote by $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ the communication graph of the agents, where $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ is the set of communication links such that $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$ if and only if agent i can receive messages from agent j . Denote by $\mathcal{N}_i \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ the set of neighbors of agent i in \mathcal{G} , i.e., $\mathcal{N}_i = \{j \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{i\} : (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}\}$.

E. Objective

This paper aims to design distributed economic control algorithms such that (x, u) of system (6) keep track of the intermediate results of the GNEP(\mathcal{D}, F) all the time and globally asymptotically converge to the VE of the GNEP(\mathcal{D}, F).

IV. CASE I: LINEAR DYNAMICS

A. Physical dynamics

In this section, we consider the case where system (6) is in the following linear form:

$$\dot{x}_i(t) = A_{ii}x_i(t) + \sum_{j \neq i} A_{ij}x_j(t) + B_i u_i(t). \quad (9)$$

If (9) does not depend on some x_j , then A_{ij} is a zero matrix. Let $A_i = [A_{i1}, \dots, A_{iN}]$, $A = (A_i)_{i=1}^N$ and $B = \text{diag}(B_i)_{i=1}^N$. As stated in the last section, we aim to steer system (9) to the VE of the GNEP(\mathcal{D}, F), a steady state but unknown *a priori*. Thus stabilizability is insufficient as it requires to know the steady state in advance. Instead, this section imposes the following controllability assumption.

Assumption 4.1: $\forall i \in \mathcal{V}$, (A_{ii}, B_i) is controllable. ■

B. Communication graph

For each $i \in \mathcal{V}$, let $\text{index}_H^i = \{\ell : H_\ell \text{ depends on } w_i\}$, $\text{index}_G^i = \{\ell : G_\ell \text{ depends on } w_i\}$, $H^i = (H_\ell)_{\ell \in \text{index}_H^i}$ and $G^i = (G_\ell)_{\ell \in \text{index}_G^i}$. That is, H^i (resp. G^i) is the sub-vector of H (resp. G) that depends on w_i . Denote the dimensions of H^i and G^i by m_i and l_i , respectively. Notice that agent i can drop those constraints $H_\ell(w) = 0$ (resp. $G_\ell(w) \leq 0$) such that $\ell \notin \text{index}_H^i$ (resp. $\ell \notin \text{index}_G^i$) from its optimization problem (8), since these constraints do not affect w_i . In this section, we have the following assumption on the communication graph \mathcal{G} , which states that \mathcal{G} includes the dependency graph defined by (8) and (9) as a subgraph. That is, agent i needs to receive messages from agent j whose w_j affects the optimization problem (8) and/or the physical dynamics (9) of agent i .

Assumption 4.2: For all $i \in \mathcal{V}$, if $[(A_i x)^T, f_i, H^{iT}, G^{iT}]$ depends on w_j for any $j \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{i\}$, then $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$. ■

C. Algorithm design

In this section, we achieve the objective claimed in Section III-E by an indirect approach. Roughly speaking: 1) we design an update rule for auxiliary variables such that they globally asymptotically converge to the VE, however, their evolution is not restricted by system (9); 2) for the physical variables (x, u) , we design a distributed control law for u such that, governed by system (9), (x, u) globally asymptotically keep track of the auxiliary variables and thus also asymptotically

converge to the VE. In this section, we impose the following assumptions on the GNEP.

Assumption 4.3: For all $i \in \mathcal{V}$, W_i is bounded. ■

Assumption 4.4: The equality constraint $Ax + Bu = 0_n$ is included in $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$. ■

Remark 4.1: Assumption 4.3 establishes the existence of VE. Specifically, by Assumption 4.3, the set $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ is bounded. Together with Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2, by Claim (8) of [42], the GNEP (8) admits a VE. Assumption 4.4 guarantees that the VE of the GNEP satisfies the steady state condition of system (9) so that the VE tracking problem is feasible. If $Ax + Bu = 0_n$ is not originally included in $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$, one can deliberately add it into $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$. This assumption is also necessary for hierarchical control [18, 35]. ■

Algorithm 1: Distributed update rule and control law for linear system dynamics

- 1 All the agents agree on any $\varepsilon > 0$ s.t.
 $1/\varepsilon > 2\sqrt{n}(N-1) \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \{\sigma_i \|P_{0i}\|_1\} + 2$;
- 2 Each agent i picks any $(\bar{w}_i(0), u_i(0)) \in W_i \times \mathbb{R}$;
- 3 For any $\ell \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ (resp. $\ell \in \{1, \dots, l\}$), all agent j 's s.t. $\ell \in \text{index}_H^j$ (resp. $\ell \in \text{index}_G^j$) agree on any $\lambda_\ell(0) \in \mathbb{R}$ (resp. $\mu_\ell(0) \in \mathbb{R}_+$); each agent i forms $\lambda^i(0) = (\lambda_\ell(0))_{\ell \in \text{index}_H^i}$ and $\mu^i(0) = (\mu_\ell(0))_{\ell \in \text{index}_G^i}$;
- 4 **while** $t \geq 0$ **do**
- 5 Each agent i sends $\bar{w}_i(t)$ to all j 's s.t. $i \in \mathcal{N}_j$;
- 6 Each agent i updates its auxiliary variables by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\bar{w}}_i(t) &= \Pi_{W_i}(\bar{w}_i(t), -\nabla_{\bar{w}_i} L_i(\bar{w}(t), \lambda^i(t), \mu^i(t))), \\ \dot{\lambda}^i(t) &= H^i(\bar{w}(t)), \dot{\mu}^i(t) = \Pi_{\mathbb{R}_+^{l_i}}(\mu^i(t), G^i(\bar{w}(t))), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$
- 7 and executes the control law

$$u_i(t) = (K_i(\varepsilon) + a_i)\mathcal{T}_i(x_i(t) - \bar{x}_i(t)) + \bar{u}_i(t). \quad (11)$$

The algorithm is presented by Algorithm 1 and detailed next. First we illustrate the design of the update rule (10) for auxiliary variables. For each $i \in \mathcal{V}$, define auxiliary variables $\bar{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ and $\bar{u}_i \in \mathbb{R}$, and let $\bar{w}_i = [\bar{x}_i^T, \bar{u}_i]^T$. Let $\bar{x} = (\bar{x}_i)_{i=1}^N$, $\bar{u} = (\bar{u}_i)_{i=1}^N$ and $\bar{w} = (\bar{w}_i)_{i=1}^N$. To handle constraints, for each $i \in \mathcal{V}$, define Lagrangian $L_i : W \times \mathbb{R}^{m_i} \times \mathbb{R}_+^{l_i} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as $L_i(\bar{w}, \lambda^i, \mu^i) = f_i(\bar{w}) + \lambda^{iT} H^i(\bar{w}) + \mu^{iT} G^i(\bar{w})$, where $\lambda^i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$ and $\mu^i \in \mathbb{R}_+^{l_i}$ are agent i 's local copies of Lagrange multipliers $(\lambda_\ell)_{\ell \in \text{index}_H^i}$ and $(\mu_\ell)_{\ell \in \text{index}_G^i}$ associated with H^i and G^i , respectively. Each agent i sends its real-time auxiliary variable $\bar{w}_i(t)$ to all agent j 's such that $i \in \mathcal{N}_j$. This enables the agents to implement the update rule (10) for the auxiliary variables. For each $i \in \mathcal{V}$, the primal state $\bar{w}_i(t)$ moves along the direction of $-\nabla_{\bar{w}_i} L_i(\bar{w}, \lambda^i, \mu^i)$ so as to minimize L_i , and the projection Π_{W_i} guarantees $\bar{w}_i(t) \in W_i$ for all t . The dynamics of the dual states (λ^i, μ^i) are defined by the positive gradients of L_i so as to maximize L_i . The projection $\Pi_{\mathbb{R}_+^{l_i}}$ on μ^i is to guarantee $\mu^i(t) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{l_i}$ for all t .

We next illustrate the design of the control law (11) for the physical variables. The following preliminaries are needed to introduce the controller design. By Theorem 8.2 of [8], for each $i \in \mathcal{V}$, since (A_{ii}, B_i) is controllable, there exists a nonsingular matrix $\mathcal{T}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}$ such that $(\bar{A}_{ii}, \bar{B}_i)$ with $\bar{A}_{ii} = \mathcal{T}_i A_{ii} \mathcal{T}_i^{-1}$ and $\bar{B}_i = \mathcal{T}_i B_i$ is in the controllable canonical form, i.e., $\bar{A}_{ii} = [[0_{n_i-1}, I_{n_i-1}]^T, -a_i^T]^T$ with $a_i = [a_{i1}, \dots, a_{in_i}]$ a constant row vector, and $\bar{B}_i = [0_{n_i-1}^T, 1]^T$. Let $\hat{x}_i = \mathcal{T}_i x_i$, $v_i = u_i - a_i \hat{x}_i$, $\hat{A}_{ij} = \mathcal{T}_i A_{ij} \mathcal{T}_j^{-1}$ for all $j \neq i$, and $\hat{A}_{ii} = [[0_{n_i-1}, I_{n_i-1}]^T, 0_{n_i}^T]^T$. We then have $\hat{x}_i(t) = \mathcal{T}_i x_i(t) = \mathcal{T}_i (A_{ii} x_i(t) + \sum_{j \neq i} A_{ij} x_j(t) + B_i u_i(t)) = \bar{A}_{ii} \hat{x}_i(t) + \sum_{j \neq i} \hat{A}_{ij} \hat{x}_j(t) + \bar{B}_i u_i(t) = \hat{A}_{ii} \hat{x}_i(t) + \sum_{j \neq i} \hat{A}_{ij} \hat{x}_j(t) + \bar{B}_i v_i(t)$. For each $i \in \mathcal{V}$, notice that $(\hat{A}_{ii}, \bar{B}_i)$ is controllable. Then there exists $K_{0i} \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n_i}$ such that $\hat{A}_{ii} + \bar{B}_i K_{0i}$ is Hurwitz ([8], Theorem 8.3). We further have that there exists a symmetric positive definite matrix $P_{0i} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}$ such that $P_{0i}(\hat{A}_{ii} + \bar{B}_i K_{0i}) + (\hat{A}_{ii} + \bar{B}_i K_{0i})^T P_{0i} = -I_{n_i}$ ([8], Theorem 5.5). For each $i \in \mathcal{V}$, let $S_i(\varepsilon) \triangleq \text{diag}(\varepsilon^{j-1})_{j=1}^{n_i}$ and $\bar{S}_i(\varepsilon) \triangleq \text{diag}(\varepsilon^{j-n_i})_{j=1}^{n_i}$, where $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$ is a constant scalar such that $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. The introduction of ε is to enable arbitrarily fast tracking (by choosing ε arbitrarily small). Let $S(\varepsilon) = \text{diag}(S_i(\varepsilon))_{i=1}^N$, $K_i(\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} K_{0i} \bar{S}_i(\varepsilon)$, $P_0 = \text{diag}(P_{0i})_{i=1}^N$ and $K(\varepsilon) = \text{diag}(K_i(\varepsilon))_{i=1}^N$.

The distributed control law is given by (11). Each agent i takes (\bar{x}_i, \bar{u}_i) as an intermediate estimate of the VE and aims to drive x_i by u_i to asymptotically keep track of \bar{x}_i and u_i itself asymptotically keep track of \bar{u}_i . Notice that (11) does not require inter-agent communications. We next informally explain how (11) achieves asymptotic tracking. The formal proof is provided in Section VI-A using Lyapunov analysis.

For each $i \in \mathcal{V}$, let $e_i = \mathcal{T}_i(x_i - \bar{x}_i)$ and $\hat{e}_i = S_i(\varepsilon)e_i$. To achieve asymptotic tracking, we aim that the error signal \hat{e}_i converges to zero. By the controller (11), one can derive that the error dynamics is $\dot{\hat{e}}_i = \frac{1}{\varepsilon}(\hat{A}_{ii} + \bar{B}_i K_{0i})\hat{e}_i + S_i(\varepsilon) \sum_{j \neq i} \hat{A}_{ij} S_j^{-1}(\varepsilon) \hat{e}_j + S_i(\varepsilon) c_i$, where $c_i = \hat{A}_i \mathcal{T}_i \bar{x}_i + \bar{B}_i(\bar{u}_i - a_i \mathcal{T}_i \bar{x}_i) - \mathcal{T}_i \dot{\bar{x}}_i$ is free of ε . Recall that $\hat{A}_{ii} + \bar{B}_i K_{0i}$ is Hurwitz. Intuitively, by choosing arbitrarily small $\varepsilon > 0$, the stability margin provided by the first term $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}(\hat{A}_{ii} + \bar{B}_i K_{0i})\hat{e}_i$ can be arbitrarily large, and the magnitude of the third term $S_i(\varepsilon)c_i$ can be arbitrarily small and thus dominated by the first term. In this section, we have the following assumption on the physical dynamics.

Assumption 4.5: For all $i \in \mathcal{V}$, there exists a constant scalar $\sigma_i > 0$ such that $\|S_i(\varepsilon)\hat{A}_{ij}S_j^{-1}(\varepsilon)\|_1 < \sigma_i$ for any $j \in \mathcal{V}$ with $j \neq i$ and any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. ■

Remark 4.2: Notice that the second term of the error dynamics $\dot{\hat{e}}_i$, $S_i(\varepsilon) \sum_{j \neq i} \hat{A}_{ij} S_j^{-1}(\varepsilon) \hat{e}_j$, includes $S_j^{-1}(\varepsilon)$, which tends to infinity when ε tends to zero. Assumption 4.5 states that the coupling effects of $S_i(\varepsilon) \sum_{j \neq i} \hat{A}_{ij} S_j^{-1}(\varepsilon)$ is bounded for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and is needed to achieve arbitrarily large stability margin. For any $i, j \in \mathcal{V}$, the entry \bar{a}_{sc} of $S_i(\varepsilon)\hat{A}_{ij}S_j^{-1}(\varepsilon)$ at the s -th row and c -th column is $\varepsilon^{s-c}a_{sc}$, where a_{sc} is the corresponding entry of \hat{A}_{ij} . A sufficient condition for Assumption 4.5 is that $a_{sc} = 0$ for all $s < c$. Under this condition, $\bar{a}_{sc} = 0$ for all $s < c$. For the entries with $s \geq c$, since $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, $|\bar{a}_{sc}| \leq |a_{sc}|$. Thus, $\|S_i(\varepsilon)\hat{A}_{ij}S_j^{-1}(\varepsilon)\|_1 \leq \|\hat{A}_{ij}\|_1$ for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. If $n_i = n_j$, this condition means that \hat{A}_{ij} is a lower triangular matrix. If $n_i > n_j$, \hat{A}_{ij} is denser than lower triangular; if $n_i < n_j$, it is sparser. ■

In lines 1 and 3 of Algorithm 1, the agreement of ε and $\lambda(0)$ between the agents can be distributively carried out by the max-consensus scheme [32].

D. Convergence results

Theorem 4.1 states that Algorithm 1 drives the true states and inputs $(x(t), u(t))$ of system (9) to globally asymptotically converge to the unique VE of problem (8). The proof of Theorem 4.1 is given in Section VI-A. In Section VII-A, we will verify that the multi-zone building temperature regulation problem in Section II-A satisfies all the assumptions of Theorem 4.1.

Theorem 4.1: Suppose Assumptions 3.1–3.5 and 4.1–4.5 hold. By Algorithm 1, $(x(t), u(t))$ of linear system (9) globally asymptotically converge to the unique VE of problem (8). ■

V. CASE II: NONLINEAR DYNAMICS

A. Physical dynamics

Notice that Algorithm 1 is inapplicable when system (6) is nonlinear. First, the steady state conditions of a nonlinear system introduce nonlinear functions into the equality constraints, making problem (8) non-convex. Second, the distributed controller (11) cannot be applied to nonlinear systems. If a linear system is stabilizable, there are many systematic ways to find its stabilizing controllers, e.g., cyclic design, Lyapunov-equation method and canonical-form method [8]. However, such general methods do not exist for nonlinear systems. In the literature of nonlinear control, researchers have studied stabilization of several classes of nonlinear systems with certain special structures. Notable examples include strict-feedback systems (or systems in lower triangular form) which can be stabilized by the technique of backstepping, and strict-feedforward systems (or systems in upper triangular form) which can be stabilized by the technique of nested saturation or forwarding [20, 21]. In this section, we assume that system (6) is nonlinear and in the following strict-feedback or lower-triangular form:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_{i\ell} &= \Gamma_{i\ell}(x^{[1 \sim \ell]}) + \Theta_{i\ell}(x^{[1 \sim \ell]})x_{i(\ell+1)}, \quad \ell = 1, \dots, \bar{n} - 1, \\ \dot{x}_{i\bar{n}} &= \Gamma_{i\bar{n}}(x) + \Theta_{i\bar{n}}(x)u_i \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $x^{[1 \sim \ell]} = [x^{[1]T}, \dots, x^{[\ell]T}]^T$ with $x^{[\ell]} = (x_{i\ell})_{i=1}^N$, and $\Gamma_{i\ell}$ and $\Theta_{i\ell}$ are in general nonlinear in $x^{[1 \sim \ell]}$. System (12) covers broad applications, e.g., multi-zone building systems [43] and unmanned autonomous vehicles [2].

B. Game reformulation

Notice that the VE of the GNEP needs to satisfy the steady state condition of system (12) so that the VE tracking problem is feasible. Since system (12) is nonlinear, we cannot include its steady state condition into the equality constraints of GNEP. Otherwise, the affinity assumption on the equality constraints is violated. As illustrated next, this challenge can be overcome

via a coordinate transformation which explicitly leverages the strict-feedback form of system (12).

For each $i \in \mathcal{V}$, the steady state condition of x_{i1} is $\Gamma_{i1}(x^{[1]}) + \Theta_{i1}(x^{[1]})x_{i2} = 0$, by which we obtain the steady state of x_{i2} as a function of $x^{[1]}$ as $\bar{x}_{i2} = -\Gamma_{i1}(x^{[1]})/\Theta_{i1}(x^{[1]})$. The steady state condition of x_{i2} is $\Gamma_{i2}(x^{[1 \sim 2]}) + \Theta_{i2}(x^{[1 \sim 2]})x_{i3} = 0$, by which we can obtain the steady state of x_{i3} as $\bar{x}_{i3} = -\Gamma_{i2}(x^{[1 \sim 2]})/\Theta_{i2}(x^{[1 \sim 2]})$, which can be expressed as a function of $x^{[1]}$ by plugging in $\bar{x}_{j2} = -\Gamma_{j1}(x^{[1]})/\Theta_{j1}(x^{[1]})$ for all $j \in \mathcal{V}$. Go on with this procedure of change of variables in the order of $x_{i2} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow x_{i\bar{n}} \rightarrow u_i$ to obtain the steady state of each $x_{i\ell}$ and u_i as a function of only $x^{[1]}$, denoted by $\bar{x}_{i\ell}$ and \bar{u}_i , respectively. We then replace $(x_{i2}, \dots, x_{i\bar{n}}, u_i)$ by $(\bar{x}_{i2}, \dots, \bar{x}_{i\bar{n}}, \bar{u}_i)$ for all $i \in \mathcal{V}$ in the GNEP. The transformed GNEP then only depends on $x^{[1]}$. To slightly abuse the notations, we keep f_i , W_i , H and G as the functions associated with the transformed GNEP, which can be written as

$$\min_{x_{i1} \in \mathcal{D}_i(x_{-i}^{[1]})} f_i(x_{i1}, x_{-i}^{[1]}) \quad (13)$$

with $\mathcal{D}_i(x_{-i}^{[1]}) = \{x_{i1} \in W_i : H^i(x_{i1}, x_{-i}^{[1]}) = 0_{m_i}, G^i(x_{i1}, x_{-i}^{[1]}) \leq 0_{l_i}\}$, where H^i and G^i are defined in Section IV-B.

For the transformed GNEP (13), given the VE $\tilde{x}^{[1]}$, for each i , one can uniquely determine the steady states of $x_{i2}, \dots, x_{i\bar{n}}, u_i$ by plugging $\tilde{x}^{[1]}$ into $\bar{x}_{i2}, \dots, \bar{x}_{i\bar{n}}, \bar{u}_i$. Hence, it is guaranteed that the VE tracking problem is feasible.

C. Algorithm design

Different from the indirect method of Algorithm 1, in this section, we directly work on the physical variables (x, u) of system (12) without introducing auxiliary variables, and design a controller u that stabilizes system (12) and meanwhile the steady state of $x^{[1]}$ is the VE of the GNEP (13). Inspired by backstepping [23], we introduce a coordinate transformation to covert system (12) into a primal-dual dynamics perturbed by a chain of stable integrators. Similar to backstepping (Section 14.3 of [21]), the coordinate transformation requires the following assumption, which guarantees that all the derivatives in (15) and (16) are well-defined and is necessary for the implementation of Algorithm 2 introduced later in this subsection.

Assumption 5.1: For all $i \in \mathcal{V}$, $W_i = \mathbb{R}$, f_i is of class $C^{\bar{n}}$, $\Theta_{i\ell}$ and $\Gamma_{i\ell}$ are of class C^ℓ , and $\Theta_{i\ell}(y) \neq 0$ for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, for all $\ell = 1, \dots, \bar{n}$; there are no coupled inequality constraints. ■

In the rest of this section, to simplify notations, we omit the time index t and the arguments of the component functions.

For each $i \in \mathcal{V}$, define Lagrangian $L_i(x^{[1]}, \lambda^i) = f_i(x^{[1]}) + \lambda^i T H^i(x^{[1]})$, where $\lambda^i \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$ is agent i 's local copy of Lagrange multiplier $(\lambda_\ell)_{\ell \in \text{index}_H^i}$ associated with H^i . To illustrate the idea, let us first consider the special case where $\bar{n} = 3$. To achieve the VE, we aim that each \dot{x}_{i1} converges to $-k_1 \nabla_{x_{i1}} L_i$ for some $k_1 > 0$ so as to minimize L_i . However, \dot{x}_{i1} is governed by (12). We then aim that the error between \dot{x}_{i1} and $-k_1 \nabla_{x_{i1}} L_i$ asymptotically diminishes. For each $i \in \mathcal{V}$, let $z_{i1} = x_{i1}$. We have $\dot{z}_{i1} = \Gamma_{i1} + \Theta_{i1}x_{i2} = -k_1 \nabla_{z_{i1}} L_i + z_{i2}$, where $z_{i2} = k_1 \nabla_{z_{i1}} L_i + \Gamma_{i1} + \Theta_{i1}x_{i2}$.

Notice that z_{i2} is the error between \dot{x}_{i1} and $-k_1 \nabla_{x_{i1}} L_i$. Hence, we aim that z_{i2} asymptotically diminishes. We have $\dot{z}_{i2} = \frac{d}{dt}(k_1 \nabla_{z_{i1}} L_i + \Gamma_{i1} + \Theta_{i1}x_{i2}) = \frac{d}{dt}(k_1 \nabla_{z_{i1}} L_i + \Gamma_{i1}) + x_{i2} \frac{d}{dt} \Theta_{i1} + \Theta_{i1}(\Gamma_{i2} + \Theta_{i2}x_{i3}) = -k_{i2}z_{i2} + z_{i3}$, where $z_{i3} = k_{i2}z_{i2} + \frac{d}{dt}(k_1 \nabla_{z_{i1}} L_i + \Gamma_{i1}) + x_{i2} \frac{d}{dt} \Theta_{i1} + \Theta_{i1}(\Gamma_{i2} + \Theta_{i2}x_{i3})$ with constant $k_{i2} > 0$. Intuitively, if z_{i3} asymptotically diminishes, then \dot{z}_{i2} asymptotically converges to $-k_{i2}z_{i2}$, which implies that z_{i2} asymptotically diminishes. Hence, we further aim that z_{i3} asymptotically diminishes. We can obtain $\dot{z}_{i3} = \frac{d}{dt}(k_{i2}z_{i2} + \frac{d}{dt}(k_1 \nabla_{z_{i1}} L_i + \Gamma_{i1}) + x_{i2} \frac{d}{dt} \Theta_{i1} + \Theta_{i1}(\Gamma_{i2} + \Theta_{i2}x_{i3})) = -k_{i2}^2 z_{i2} + k_{i2}z_{i3} + \frac{d^2}{dt^2}(k_1 \nabla_{z_{i1}} L_i + \Gamma_{i1}) + \frac{d}{dt}(x_{i2} \frac{d}{dt} \Theta_{i1} + \Theta_{i1} \Gamma_{i2}) + x_{i3} \frac{d}{dt} \Theta_{i1} \Theta_{i2} + \Theta_{i1} \Theta_{i2} \Gamma_{i3} + \Theta_{i1} \Theta_{i2} \Theta_{i3} u_i$. To have z_{i3} asymptotically diminishing, we aim that $\dot{z}_{i3} = -k_{i3}z_{i3}$ with constant $k_{i3} > 0$. We then have $u_i = -\frac{1}{\Theta_{i1} \Theta_{i2} \Theta_{i3}} [-k_{i2}^2 z_{i2} + (k_{i2} + k_{i3})z_{i3} + \frac{d^2}{dt^2}(k_1 \nabla_{z_{i1}} L_i + \Gamma_{i1}) + \frac{d}{dt}(x_{i2} \frac{d}{dt} \Theta_{i1} + \Theta_{i1} \Gamma_{i2}) + x_{i3} \frac{d}{dt} \Theta_{i1} \Theta_{i2} + \Theta_{i1} \Theta_{i2} \Gamma_{i3}]$.

Following the above procedure, for the general case, sequentially define a coordinate transformation for $z_{i2}, \dots, z_{i\bar{n}}$ and design a controller u_i such that system (12) is converted into the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z}_{i1} &= -k_1 \nabla_{z_{i1}} L_i + z_{i2}, \\ \dot{z}_{i\ell} &= -k_{i\ell} z_{i\ell} + z_{i(\ell+1)}, \quad \forall \ell = 2, \dots, \bar{n} - 1, \\ \dot{z}_{i\bar{n}} &= -k_{i\bar{n}} z_{i\bar{n}} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where $k_1, k_{i\ell}, \dots, k_{i\bar{n}} > 0$. In this section, we have the following assumption.

Assumption 5.2: The map ∇F is strongly monotone on \mathbb{R}^N with constant $M > 0$. ■

Remark 5.1: In system (14), the dynamics of $z_{i2}, \dots, z_{i\bar{n}}$ is a sequence of stable, cascading and single integrators. Thus, $z_{i2}, \dots, z_{i\bar{n}}$ are diminishing. Notice that the dynamics of \dot{z}_{i1} is the primal-dual dynamics perturbed by z_{i2} . Strict monotonicity of ∇F is not sufficient to ensure convergence because it provides zero stability margin for the primal-dual dynamics. Instead, the stronger property of strong monotonicity is needed to ensure nonzero stability margin, and then the convergence of Algorithm 2. Meanwhile, a byproduct of Assumption 5.2 is the existence and uniqueness of VE. Specifically, with Assumptions 3.1, 3.2 and 5.2, by Theorem 2.3.3 of [14], the GNEP (13) has a unique VE. ■

We have illustrated the idea of controller design for system (12) via a backstepping-inspired coordinate transformation. We next provide their closed forms, which are derived from (14) by expanding $\dot{z}_{i1}, \dots, \dot{z}_{i\bar{n}}$ on its left-hand side. For convenience of demonstration, we define the following notations. For any $\alpha, \beta \in \{1, \dots, \bar{n} - 1\}$, let $T_{\alpha, \beta}^i$ be the sum of all the α -th order products of the first β elements of $\{k_{i2}, \dots, k_{i\bar{n}}\}$ with repeat. For example, $T_{1,2}^i = k_{i2} + k_{i3}$ and $T_{2,3}^i = k_{i2}^2 + k_{i3}^2 + k_{i4}^2 + k_{i2}k_{i3} + k_{i2}k_{i4} + k_{i3}k_{i4}$. Let $T_{\alpha, \beta}^i = 0$ for any $\alpha \leq 0$. For each $i \in \mathcal{V}$, for each $\ell \in \{1, \dots, \bar{n}\}$, let $\Theta_i^{[\ell]} = \Theta_{i1} \Theta_{i2} \dots \Theta_{i\ell}$. For each $i \in \mathcal{V}$, agent i performs the following coordinate transformation:

$$\begin{aligned} z_{i1} &= x_{i1}, \quad z_{i2} = k_1 \nabla_{z_{i1}} L_i + \Theta_{i1}x_{i2} + \Gamma_{i1}, \\ z_{i\ell} &= (-1)^{\ell-1} T_{\ell-2,1}^i z_{i2} + (-1)^{\ell-2} T_{\ell-3,2}^i z_{i3} + \dots \\ &\quad + (-1)^2 T_{1,\ell-2}^i z_{i(\ell-1)} + \frac{d^{\ell-2}}{dt^{\ell-2}} (k_1 \nabla_{z_{i1}} L_i + \Gamma_{i1}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{d^{\ell-3}}{dt^{\ell-3}}(x_{i2} \frac{d}{dt} \Theta_{i1} + \Theta_{i1} \Gamma_{i2}) + \cdots + \frac{d}{dt}(x_{i(\ell-2)} \frac{d}{dt} \Theta_i^{[\ell-3]} \\
& + \Theta_i^{[\ell-3]} \Gamma_{i(\ell-2)}) + x_{i(\ell-1)} \frac{d}{dt} \Theta_i^{[\ell-2]} + \Theta_i^{[\ell-2]} \Gamma_{i(\ell-1)} \\
& + \Theta_i^{[\ell-1]} x_{i\ell}, \quad \forall \ell = 3, 4, \dots, \bar{n}. \tag{15}
\end{aligned}$$

For each $i \in \mathcal{V}$, agent i 's control u_i is designed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
u_i = & -\frac{1}{\Theta_i^{[\bar{n}]}} [(-1)^{\bar{n}} T_{\bar{n}-1,1}^i z_{i2} + (-1)^{\bar{n}-1} T_{\bar{n}-2,2}^i z_{i3} + \cdots \\
& + (-1)^2 T_{1,\bar{n}-1}^i z_{i\bar{n}} + \frac{d^{\bar{n}-1}}{dt^{\bar{n}-1}}(k_1 \nabla_{z_{i1}} L_i + \Gamma_{i1}) + \frac{d^{\bar{n}-2}}{dt^{\bar{n}-2}} \\
& (x_{i2} \frac{d}{dt} \Theta_{i1} + \Theta_{i1} \Gamma_{i2}) + \cdots + \frac{d}{dt}(x_{i(\bar{n}-1)} \frac{d}{dt} \Theta_i^{[\bar{n}-2]} \\
& + \Theta_i^{[\bar{n}-2]} \Gamma_{i(\bar{n}-1)}) + x_{i\bar{n}} \frac{d}{dt} \Theta_i^{[\bar{n}-1]} + \Theta_i^{[\bar{n}-1]} \Gamma_{i\bar{n}}]. \tag{16}
\end{aligned}$$

With the strict-feedback form of (12), for each $i \in \mathcal{V}$ and each $\ell = 1, \dots, \bar{n}$, $z_{i\ell}$ only depends on $z^{[1 \sim (\ell-1)]}$ but does not depend on $z^{[\ell']}$ for any $\ell' \geq \ell$, and u_i only depends on z but does not depend on any other u_j . Hence, (15) and (16) can be sequentially computed in the order of $z_{i1} \rightarrow z_{i2} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow z_{i\bar{n}} \rightarrow u_i$. The coordinate transformation (15) and controller (16) impose the following assumption on the communication graph \mathcal{G} , which guarantees that \mathcal{G} includes the dependency graph defined by (15) and (16) as a subgraph and is necessary for the implementation of Algorithm 2.

Assumption 5.3: For all $i \in \mathcal{V}$, if there exists $q \in \{0, 1, \dots, \bar{n}-1\}$ such that $\frac{d^q}{dt^q}[\Gamma_i^T, \Theta_i^T, f_i, H^{iT}]$ depends on x_j for any $j \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{i\}$, then $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$. ■

The following lemma formally verifies the dynamics of the transformed system derived by (15) and (16).

Lemma 5.1: Under Assumption 5.1, by (15) and (16), the dynamics of the transformed system follows (14). ■

The algorithm is summarized by Algorithm 2. Each agent i executes the control law (16) and updates the transformed state z_i by (14). The update rule for the dual variable λ^i is similar to that in Algorithm 1. In lines 1 and 5 of Algorithm 2, the agreement of k_1 and $\lambda(0)$ between the agents can be distributively carried out by the max-consensus scheme [32].

Algorithm 2: Distributed control law for nonlinear system dynamics

- 1 All the agents agree on any $k_1 > 0$ s.t. $k_1 M > 1$;
- 2 Each agent i picks any $(x_i(0), u_i(0)) \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{n}} \times \mathbb{R}$, and any $k_{i\ell} > 1$ for all $\ell = 2, \dots, \bar{n}$;
- 3 Each agent i sends $x_i(0)$ to all j 's s.t. $i \in \mathcal{N}_j$;
- 4 Each agent i computes $z_i(0)$ by (15);
- 5 For any $\ell \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, all agent j 's s.t. $\ell \in \text{index}_H^j$ agree on any $\lambda_\ell(0) \in \mathbb{R}$; each agent i forms $\lambda^i(0) = (\lambda_\ell(0))_{\ell \in \text{index}_H^i}$;
- 6 **while** $t \geq 0$ **do**
- 7 Each agent i sends $x_i(t)$ to all j 's s.t. $i \in \mathcal{N}_j$;
- 8 Each agent i executes the control law (16), updates z_i by (14), and updates λ^i by
$$\dot{\lambda}^i = k_1 H^i(z^{[1]}). \tag{17}$$

D. Convergence results

Theorem 5.1 states that Algorithm 2 drives the states and inputs $(x(t), u(t))$ to globally asymptotically converge to a steady state of system (12) such that the limiting steady state of $x^{[1]}$ is the unique VE of problem (13). The proof of Theorem 5.1 is given in Section VI-C. In Section VII-B, we will verify that the OPF problem in Section II-B satisfies all the assumptions of Theorem 5.1.

Theorem 5.1: Suppose Assumptions 3.1–3.4 and 5.1–5.3 hold. By Algorithm 2, $(x(t), u(t))$ globally asymptotically converge to a steady state of system (12), denoted by (\tilde{x}, \tilde{u}) , with $\tilde{x}^{[1]}$ being the unique VE of problem (13). ■

E. Discussion

The two problems in Section IV and Section V are complementary to each other, rather than one is a special case of the other. In Section V-A, we have illustrated that Algorithm 1 may not be applicable to the problem in Section V. Here, we further clarify that Algorithm 2 may not be applicable to the problem in Section IV. First, in Section V, it requires that the physical dynamics (12) is in the strict-feedback form. However, the physical dynamics (9) in Section IV is not necessarily strict-feedback. Second, for the GNEP of Section V, it requires that $W_i = \mathbb{R}$ and f_i is of class $C^{\bar{n}}$ (please refer to Assumption 5.1). This assumption may not hold for the GNEP of Section IV, where W_i is only assumed to be closed and convex (please refer to Assumption 3.2) and f_i is only assumed to be of class C^1 (please refer to Assumption 3.1). Third, for the GNEP of Section V, it requires that ∇F is strongly monotone (please refer to Assumption 5.2), while for the GNEP of Section IV, it only requires that ∇F is strictly monotone (please refer to Assumption 3.5).

A major difference between Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 is that the former needs auxiliary variables for the decision-making process, while the latter does not. The reason why Algorithm 1 needs auxiliary variables is that the decision making dynamics (10) cannot be included in the physical dynamics (9). Hence, the intermediate estimates of the decision making dynamics (10) may not be equilibria of the physical dynamics (9). The auxiliary variables are introduced such that (9) and (10) are cascaded. For the problem of Section V, thanks to the strict-feedback form of the physical dynamics (12), one can perform a coordinate transformation using the steady state conditions of (12) such that the GNEP only depends on $x^{[1]}$ (please refer to Section V-B). Once $x^{[1]}$ is derived by the decision-making process, one can then sequentially determine the rest states and control inputs by reversing the coordinate transformation, which exactly follows the physical dynamics (12). In other words, for the nonlinear system case in Section V, the decision making dynamics is embedded in the physical dynamics, and the intermediate decision making estimates are always feasible to the physical dynamics. Hence, Algorithm 2 does not need auxiliary variables.

VI. PROOFS

This section proves the results of Sections IV and V.

A. Proof of Theorem 4.1

This subsection is devoted to proving Theorem 4.1.

Proof: We first prove the convergence of the auxiliary variables (\bar{w}, λ, μ) in the following theorem.

Theorem 6.1: Any solution of the primal-dual dynamics (10) starting from any point $(w(0), \lambda(0), \mu(0)) \in W \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}_+^l$ asymptotically converges to a point $(\tilde{w}, \tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\mu})$ where \tilde{w} is the VE of problem (8). ■

Proof: Let $\nabla_{\bar{w}} L(\bar{w}, \lambda, \mu) = (\nabla_{\bar{w}_i} L_i(\bar{w}, \lambda, \mu))_{i=1}^N$. Under Assumptions 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3, by Section 12.2.3 of [33] and problem 5 on page 266 of [26], $\tilde{w} \in W$ is the VE of the GNEP (\mathcal{D}, F) if and only if there exist $(\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\mu}) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}_+^l$ such that the KKT conditions hold

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\bar{w}} L(\tilde{w}, \tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\mu}) &\in N_W(\tilde{w}), \quad H(\tilde{w}) = 0_m, \\ G(\tilde{w}) &\leq 0_l \text{ and } \tilde{\mu}^T G(\tilde{w}) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

We note that the above KKT conditions only characterize VEs, rather than arbitrary NEs. For differences between the KKT conditions for VE and NE, please refer to Section 3 of [12].

A triple $(\tilde{w}, \tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\mu})$ satisfying (18) is called a primal-dual optimizer of (8). Denote by Q the set of primal-dual optimizers of (8). The update rule (10) can be written compactly as

$$\begin{aligned} (\dot{\bar{w}}, \dot{\lambda}, \dot{\mu}) &= \Pi_{W \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}_+^l}((\bar{w}, \lambda, \mu), \\ &(-\nabla_{\bar{w}} L(\bar{w}, \lambda, \mu), H(\bar{w}), G(\bar{w}))). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Define the Lyapunov function as $V(\bar{w}, \lambda, \mu) = \frac{1}{2}(\|\bar{w} - \tilde{w}\|^2 + \|\lambda - \tilde{\lambda}\|^2 + \|\mu - \tilde{\mu}\|^2)$, where $(\tilde{w}, \tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\mu})$ is any point of Q . For convenience of notation, denote by $\mathcal{L}V(\bar{w}, \lambda, \mu)$ the Lie derivative of V along (19) at $(\bar{w}, \lambda, \mu) \in W \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}_+^l$. We next show that system (19) satisfies all the hypotheses of Lemma 1.2 by proving the following series of claims. First, the following claim establishes the result that V is non-increasing.

Claim 6.1: It holds that $\mathcal{L}V(\bar{w}, \lambda, \mu) \leq 0$ for all $(\bar{w}, \lambda, \mu) \in W \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}_+^l$. ■

Proof: We first show for all $(\bar{w}, \lambda, \mu) \in W \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}_+^l$, $(\bar{w} - \tilde{w})^T \Pi_W(\bar{w}, -\nabla_{\bar{w}} L(\bar{w}, \lambda, \mu)) \leq -(\bar{w} - \tilde{w})^T \nabla_{\bar{w}} L(\bar{w}, \lambda, \mu)$. Let $y = -\nabla_{\bar{w}} L(\bar{w}, \lambda, \mu)$. By Lemma 1.1, we only have to consider the case where $\bar{w} \in \text{bd}(W)$ and $y^T \gamma^*(\bar{w}) < 0$ with $\gamma^*(\bar{w}) = \arg\min_{\gamma \in N_W(\bar{w})} y^T \gamma$. By Lemma 1.1, we have $\Pi_W(\bar{w}, y) = y - (y^T \gamma^*(\bar{w})) \gamma^*(\bar{w})$. Then we have $(\bar{w} - \tilde{w})^T \Pi_W(\bar{w}, y) = (\bar{w} - \tilde{w})^T (y - (y^T \gamma^*(\bar{w})) \gamma^*(\bar{w})) = (\bar{w} - \tilde{w})^T y - (y^T \gamma^*(\bar{w})) (\bar{w} - \tilde{w})^T \gamma^*(\bar{w})$. Since $\bar{w}, \tilde{w} \in W$ and $\gamma^*(\bar{w}) \in N_W(\bar{w})$, by the definition of normal cone N_W , we have $(\bar{w} - \tilde{w})^T \gamma^*(\bar{w}) \leq 0$. Since $y^T \gamma^*(\bar{w}) < 0$, we have $(y^T \gamma^*(\bar{w})) (\bar{w} - \tilde{w})^T \gamma^*(\bar{w}) \geq 0$ and thus $(\bar{w} - \tilde{w})^T \Pi_W(\bar{w}, y) \leq (\bar{w} - \tilde{w})^T y$. Following the similar argument, we can obtain $(\mu - \tilde{\mu})^T \Pi_{\mathbb{R}_+^l}(\mu, G(\bar{w})) \leq (\mu - \tilde{\mu})^T G(\bar{w})$. By the definition of N_W and the first equation of (18), we have $(\tilde{w} - \bar{w})^T \nabla_{\bar{w}} L(\tilde{w}, \tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\mu}) \leq 0$ for any $\bar{w} \in W$. By the affinity of H and the convexity of G (see Assumption 3.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &-(\bar{w} - \tilde{w})^T \nabla_{\bar{w}} L(\bar{w}, \lambda, \mu) \leq -(\bar{w} - \tilde{w})^T (\nabla F(\bar{w})) \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \nabla H_j(\bar{w}) + \sum_{j=1}^l \mu_j \nabla G_j(\bar{w}) - \nabla F(\tilde{w}) \\ &- \sum_{j=1}^m \tilde{\lambda}_j \nabla H_j(\tilde{w}) - \sum_{j=1}^l \tilde{\mu}_j \nabla G_j(\tilde{w}) \\ &\leq -(\bar{w} - \tilde{w})^T (\nabla F(\bar{w}) - \nabla F(\tilde{w})) - (\lambda - \tilde{\lambda})^T \end{aligned}$$

$$(H(\bar{w}) - H(\tilde{w})) - (\mu - \tilde{\mu})^T (G(\bar{w}) - G(\tilde{w})). \quad (20)$$

By (18), $H(\tilde{w}) = 0_m$, $G(\tilde{w}) \leq 0_l$ and $\tilde{\mu}^T G(\tilde{w}) = 0$. Since $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_+^l$, $\mu^T G(\tilde{w}) \leq 0$. By (20), $-(\bar{w} - \tilde{w})^T \nabla_{\bar{w}} L(\bar{w}, \lambda, \mu) \leq -(\bar{w} - \tilde{w})^T (\nabla F(\bar{w}) - \nabla F(\tilde{w})) - (\lambda - \tilde{\lambda})^T H(\bar{w}) - (\mu - \tilde{\mu})^T G(\bar{w})$. Then, by strict monotonicity of ∇F , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}V(\bar{w}, \lambda, \mu) &= (\bar{w} - \tilde{w})^T \Pi_W(\bar{w}, -\nabla_{\bar{w}} L(\bar{w}, \lambda, \mu)) \\ &+ (\lambda - \tilde{\lambda})^T H(\bar{w}) + (\mu - \tilde{\mu})^T \Pi_{\mathbb{R}_+^l}(\mu, G(\bar{w})) \\ &\leq -(\bar{w} - \tilde{w})^T \nabla_{\bar{w}} L(\bar{w}, \lambda, \mu) + (\lambda - \tilde{\lambda})^T H(\bar{w}) + (\mu - \tilde{\mu})^T \\ &G(\bar{w}) \leq -(\bar{w} - \tilde{w})^T (\nabla F(\bar{w}) - \nabla F(\tilde{w})) \leq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

By strict monotonicity of ∇F , the equality sign of the last equation of (21) holds if and only if $\bar{w} = \tilde{w}$. Since (\bar{w}, λ, μ) is an arbitrary triple in $W \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}_+^l$, we have $\mathcal{L}V(\bar{w}, \lambda, \mu) \leq 0$ for all $(\bar{w}, \lambda, \mu) \in W \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}_+^l$. ■

The following claim establishes the existence and uniqueness of the solution of (10). Moreover, the solution remains in a bounded set.

Claim 6.2: For any starting point $(\bar{w}(0), \lambda(0), \mu(0)) \in W \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}_+^l$, a unique solution $\Gamma : [0, \infty) \rightarrow W \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}_+^l$ of (10) exists and $\Gamma(t) \in (W \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}_+^l) \cap V^{-1}(\leq V(\bar{w}(0), \lambda(0), \mu(0)))$ for any $t \geq 0$. ■

Proof: By Assumption 3.1, ∇F and ∇G are all locally Lipschitz on W . Since H is affine in w , ∇H is Lipschitz on W . The proof of Claim 6.2 then follows the same argument of the proof of Lemma 4.3 of [9]. ■

The following claim establishes the invariance of the omega-limit set of any solution of (19).

Claim 6.3: The omega-limit set of any solution of (19) is invariant under (19). ■

Proof: The proof of Claim 6.3 follows the same argument of the proof of Lemma 4.1 of [21]. ■

For any $\delta > 0$, consider the compact set $S = V^{-1}(\leq \delta) \cap (W \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}_+^l)$. By Claim 6.2, starting from any point in S , there exists a unique solution of (19) and S is invariant under (19). Furthermore, by Claim 6.3, the omega-limit set of each solution starting from any point in S is invariant. Finally, by Claim 6.1, $\mathcal{L}V(\bar{w}, \lambda, \mu) \leq 0$ for all $(\bar{w}, \lambda, \mu) \in S$. By Lemma 1.2, starting from any point in S , the solution of (19) converges to the largest invariant set M contained in $\text{cl}(Z)$, where $Z = \{(\bar{w}, \lambda, \mu) \in S : \mathcal{L}V(\bar{w}, \lambda, \mu) = 0\}$. By the proof of Claim 6.1, $\mathcal{L}V(\bar{w}, \lambda, \mu) = 0$ if and only if $\bar{w} = \tilde{w}$ and $\mu^T G(\bar{w}) = 0$. Hence, we have $Z = \{(\bar{w}, \lambda, \mu) \in S : \bar{w} = \tilde{w}, \mu^T G(\bar{w}) = 0\}$. It is clear that Z is closed. Let $(\tilde{w}, \lambda, \mu) \in M \subseteq Z$. The solution of (19) starting from $(\tilde{w}, \lambda, \mu)$ remains in M only if $\nabla_{\bar{w}} L(\tilde{w}, \lambda, \mu) \in N_W(\tilde{w})$. Together with $H(\tilde{w}) = 0_m$, $G(\tilde{w}) \leq 0_l$ and $\mu^T G(\tilde{w}) = 0$, we have that the triple $(\tilde{w}, \lambda, \mu)$ satisfies the KKT conditions (18). Hence, we have $M \subseteq Q$. Since δ is arbitrary, we have that Q is globally asymptotically stable on $W \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}_+^l$. Finally, by the definition of omega-limit set and Claim 6.1, the omega-limit set of any solution of (19) is a singleton. This implies that any solution of (19) converges to a point in Q . This completes the proof of Theorem 6.1. ■

Next we prove the convergence of the physical variables (x, u) . For each $i \in \mathcal{V}$, let $\bar{x}_i = \mathcal{T}_i \bar{x}_i$, $\bar{v}_i = \bar{u}_i - a_i \bar{x}_i$, $e_i = \hat{x}_i - \bar{x}_i = \mathcal{T}_i(x_i - \bar{x}_i)$, $\hat{e}_i = S_i(\varepsilon)e_i$ and $e_i^v =$

$v_i - \bar{v}_i = K_i(\varepsilon)e_i$. By (11), we have $e_i^v = K_i(\varepsilon)e_i$. Let $(e, \hat{e}, e^v) = (e_i, \hat{e}_i, e_i^v)_{i=1}^N$. By the definition of $S_i(\varepsilon)$ and $\bar{S}_i(\varepsilon)$, we can obtain $\varepsilon S_i(\varepsilon)\hat{A}_{ii} = \hat{A}_{ii}S_i(\varepsilon)$, $S_i(\varepsilon)\hat{B}_i = \varepsilon^{n_i-1}\hat{B}_i$ and $\varepsilon^{n_i-1}\bar{S}_i(\varepsilon) = S_i(\varepsilon)$. Choose the Lyapunov function as $V(\hat{e}) = \hat{e}^T P_0 \hat{e}$. We then have $\dot{V}(\hat{e}) = 2\hat{e}^T P_0 \dot{\hat{e}} = 2\hat{e}^T P_0 S(\varepsilon)\dot{\hat{e}} = 2\hat{e}^T P_0 S(\varepsilon)(\hat{A}e + \hat{B}e^v + \hat{A}\bar{x} + \hat{B}\bar{v} - \hat{x})$. Let $c = \hat{A}\bar{x} + \hat{B}\bar{v} - \hat{x}$. Then we have $\dot{V}(\hat{e}) = 2\hat{e}^T P_0 S(\varepsilon)(\hat{A}e + \hat{B}e^v) + 2\hat{e}^T P_0 S(\varepsilon)c$. First consider $2\hat{e}^T P_0 S(\varepsilon)(\hat{A}e + \hat{B}e^v)$. Recall that $S(\varepsilon) = \text{diag}(S_i(\varepsilon))_{i=1}^N$ and $P_0 = \text{diag}(P_{0i})_{i=1}^N$ are both block diagonal matrices. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} 2\hat{e}^T P_0 S(\varepsilon)(\hat{A}e + \hat{B}e^v) &= \sum_{i=1}^N [2\hat{e}_i^T P_{0i} S_i(\varepsilon)(\hat{A}_{ii} \\ &+ \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\hat{B}_i K_{0i} \bar{S}_i(\varepsilon)e_i) + \sum_{i=1}^N [2\hat{e}_i^T P_{0i} S_i(\varepsilon) \sum_{j \neq i} \hat{A}_{ij} e_j] \\ &= \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \sum_{i=1}^N [\hat{e}_i^T P_{0i}(\hat{A}_{ii} + \hat{B}_i K_{0i})\hat{e}_i] + \sum_{i=1}^N [2\hat{e}_i^T P_{0i} S_i(\varepsilon) \\ &\sum_{j \neq i} \hat{A}_{ij} e_j] = 2\hat{e}^T P_0 S(\varepsilon)\hat{A}_{-ii} S^{-1}(\varepsilon)\hat{e} - \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \|\hat{e}\|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where $\hat{A}_{-ii} = \hat{A} - \text{diag}(\hat{A}_{ii})_{i=1}^N$. For $P_0 S(\varepsilon)\hat{A}_{-ii} S^{-1}(\varepsilon)$, the blocks at the diagonal positions are zero matrices and the block at the i -th row and j -th column position with $i \neq j$ is $P_{0i} S_i(\varepsilon)\hat{A}_{ij} S_j^{-1}(\varepsilon)$. By Assumption 4.5, for each $i, j \in \mathcal{V}$, $i \neq j$, $\|P_{0i} S_i(\varepsilon)\hat{A}_{ij} S_j^{-1}(\varepsilon)\|_1 < \sigma_i \|P_{0i}\|_1$, which implies that the maximum absolute column sum for $P_{0i} S_i(\varepsilon)\hat{A}_{ij} S_j^{-1}(\varepsilon)$ is upper bounded by $\sigma_i \|P_{0i}\|_1$. Each column of $P_0 S(\varepsilon)\hat{A}_{-ii} S^{-1}(\varepsilon)$ is composed of columns of $N-1$ blocks $P_{0i} S_i(\varepsilon)\hat{A}_{ij} S_j^{-1}(\varepsilon)$ at the off-diagonal position and one column of the zero matrix at the diagonal position. Thus, we have $\|P_0 S(\varepsilon)\hat{A}_{-ii} S^{-1}(\varepsilon)\|_1 \leq (N-1) \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \{\sigma_i \|P_{0i}\|_1\}$. By 5.6.P5 of [19], the 2-norm of a matrix with n columns is upper bounded by \sqrt{n} times of its 1-norm. Hence, $\|P_0 S(\varepsilon)\hat{A}_{-ii} S^{-1}(\varepsilon)\| \leq \sqrt{n} \|P_0 S(\varepsilon)\hat{A}_{-ii} S^{-1}(\varepsilon)\|_1 \leq \sqrt{n}(N-1) \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \{\sigma_i \|P_{0i}\|_1\}$. By (22), we have $2\hat{e}^T P_0 S(\varepsilon)(\hat{A}e + \hat{B}e^v) \leq -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \|\hat{e}\|^2 + 2\sqrt{n}(N-1) \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \{\sigma_i \|P_{0i}\|_1\} \|\hat{e}\|^2 = -(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} - 2\sqrt{n}(N-1) \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \{\sigma_i \|P_{0i}\|_1\}) \|\hat{e}\|^2$. For any $\|\hat{e}\| \geq \|P_0\| \|c\|$, given $\|S(\varepsilon)\| = 1$ for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2\hat{e}^T P_0 S(\varepsilon)(\hat{A}e + \hat{B}e^v) + 2\hat{e}^T P_0 S(\varepsilon)c &\leq 2\|\hat{e}\| \|P_0\| \|c\| - (\frac{1}{\varepsilon} - 2\sqrt{n}(N-1) \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \{\sigma_i \|P_{0i}\|_1\}) \|\hat{e}\|^2 \\ &\leq -(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} - 2\sqrt{n}(N-1) \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \{\sigma_i \|P_{0i}\|_1\} - 2) \|\hat{e}\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

By (23), by choosing ε such that $\frac{1}{\varepsilon} > 2\sqrt{n}(N-1) \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \{\sigma_i \|P_{0i}\|_1\} + 2$, we have that, for any $\|\hat{e}\| \geq \|P_0\| \|c\|$, $\dot{V}(\hat{e}) \leq -(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} - 2\sqrt{n}(N-1) \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \{\sigma_i \|P_{0i}\|_1\} - 2) \|\hat{e}\|^2 < 0$ for any $\|\hat{e}\| \neq 0$. Since P_0 is symmetric, we have $\lambda_{\min}(P_0) \|\hat{e}\|^2 \leq V(\hat{e}) \leq \lambda_{\max}(P_0) \|\hat{e}\|^2$, where $\lambda_{\min}(P_0)$ and $\lambda_{\max}(P_0)$ are the smallest and largest eigenvalues of P_0 , respectively. Because P_0 is positive definite, $\lambda_{\min}(P_0)$ and $\lambda_{\max}(P_0)$ are both positive. View \hat{e} as state and c as input. Then, by Theorem 10.4.1 of [20], the system is input-to-state stable. By Theorem 10.4.5 of [20], we then have $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|\hat{e}(t)\| \leq \gamma(\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|c(t)\|)$, where $\gamma(\cdot)$ is a class \mathcal{K} function ([20], Definition 10.1.1). By Theorem 6.1, we have that $(\bar{x}(t), \bar{u}(t))$ asymptotically converges to the VE (\bar{x}, \bar{u}) which satisfies $A\bar{x} + B\bar{u} = 0_n$. Thus, as

$t \rightarrow \infty$, we have $A\bar{x}(t) + B\bar{u}(t) \rightarrow 0_n$ and $\dot{\bar{x}}(t) \rightarrow 0_n$, by which we can obtain $\hat{A}\bar{x} + \hat{B}\bar{v} \rightarrow 0_n$ and $\dot{\bar{x}}(t) \rightarrow 0_n$. Therefore, we have $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|c(t)\| = 0$, which implies that $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|\hat{e}(t)\| = 0$. Hence, $\hat{e}(t)$ asymptotically converges to zero which implies that $x(t)$ keeps track of $\bar{x}(t)$ asymptotically. Thus, $e^v(t)$ diminishes asymptotically which implies that $v(t)$ asymptotically keeps track of $\bar{v}(t)$, which further implies that $u(t)$ asymptotically keeps track of $\bar{u}(t)$. Hence, $(x(t), u(t))$ also asymptotically converge to the VE (\bar{x}, \bar{u}) . This completes the proof of Theorem 4.1. ■

B. Proof of Lemma 5.1

In this subsection, we provide the proof of Lemma 5.1.

Proof: By the construction of z_{i1}, z_{i2}, z_{i3} in Section V-C, the dynamics of z_{i1} and z_{i2} satisfy (14). Assume that the dynamics of $z_{i1}, \dots, z_{i(\ell-1)}$ satisfy (14) for some $\ell \in \{3, \dots, \bar{n}-1\}$. By (15), we then have

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z}_{i\ell} &= (-1)^{\ell-1} T_{\ell-2,1}^i (z_{i3} - k_{i2} z_{i2}) + (-1)^{\ell-2} T_{\ell-3,2}^i (z_{i4} - k_{i3} \\ &z_{i3}) + \dots + (-1)^2 T_{1,\ell-2}^i (z_{i\ell} - k_{i(\ell-1)} z_{i(\ell-1)}) + \frac{d^{\ell-1}}{dt^{\ell-1}} \\ &(k_1 \nabla_{z_{i1}} L_i + \Gamma_{i1}) + \frac{d^{\ell-2}}{dt^{\ell-2}} (x_{i2} \frac{d}{dt} \Theta_{i1} + \Theta_{i1} \Gamma_{i2}) + \dots + \\ &\frac{d^2}{dt^2} (x_{i(\ell-2)} \frac{d}{dt} \Theta_i^{[\ell-3]} + \Theta_i^{[\ell-3]} \Gamma_{i(\ell-2)}) + \frac{d}{dt} (x_{i(\ell-1)} \frac{d}{dt} \Theta_i^{[\ell-2]} \\ &+ \Theta_i^{[\ell-2]} \Gamma_{i(\ell-1)}) + x_{i\ell} \frac{d}{dt} \Theta_i^{[\ell-1]} + \Theta_i^{[\ell-1]} (\Gamma_{i\ell} + \Theta_{i\ell} x_{i(\ell+1)}) \\ &= -k_{i\ell} z_{i\ell} + z_{i(\ell+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the dynamics of $z_{i\ell}$ also satisfies (14). By induction, the dynamics of $z_{i\ell}$ satisfies (14) for all $\ell = 1, \dots, \bar{n}-1$. Finally, one can expand the dynamics of $z_{i\bar{n}}$ as above and, by (16), obtain $\dot{z}_{i\bar{n}} = -k_{i\bar{n}} z_{i\bar{n}}$. ■

C. Proof of Theorem 5.1

This subsection proves Theorem 5.1.

Proof: First we show the convergence of the transformed system in the following theorem.

Theorem 6.2: For any solution of (12), (15), (16) and (17) starting from any $(x(0), u(0), \lambda(0)) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^m$, (z, λ) asymptotically converges to a point $(\tilde{z}, \tilde{\lambda})$ where $\tilde{z}^{[1]}$ is the VE of problem (13) and $\tilde{z}^{[\ell]} = 0_N$ for all $\ell = 2, \dots, \bar{n}$. ■

Proof: Let $\nabla_{z^{[1]}} L(z^{[1]}, \lambda) = (\nabla_{z_{i1}} L_i(z^{[1]}, \lambda))_{i=1}^N$. Under Assumptions 3.1–3.3, by Section 12.2.3 of [33], $\tilde{x}^{[1]} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is the VE of the GNEP (\mathcal{D}, F) if and only if there exist $\tilde{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that the KKT conditions hold: $\nabla_{z^{[1]}} L(\tilde{x}^{[1]}, \tilde{\lambda}) = 0_N$ and $H(\tilde{x}^{[1]}) = 0_m$. Denote by Q the set of $(\tilde{x}^{[1]}, \tilde{\lambda})$ satisfying the KKT conditions. Let $\tilde{z}_{i1} = \tilde{x}_{i1}$, $\tilde{z}_{i\ell} = 0$ for all $\ell = 2, \dots, \bar{n}$, $y = [z^T, \lambda^T]^T$ and $\tilde{y} = [\tilde{z}^T, \tilde{\lambda}^T]^T$ with $(\tilde{x}^{[1]}, \tilde{\lambda})$ being any point of Q . Choose the Lyapunov function as $V(y) = \frac{1}{2} \|y - \tilde{y}\|^2$. Let $\mathcal{L}V(y)$ be the Lie derivative of V along (12), (15), (16) and (17) at $y \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$. We next show that V is non-increasing along any solution of (12), (15), (16) and (17). By Lemma 5.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}V(y) &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} [(z_{i1} - \tilde{z}_{i1}) \dot{z}_{i1} + z_{i2} \dot{z}_{i2} + \dots + z_{i\bar{n}} \dot{z}_{i\bar{n}}] \\ &+ (\lambda - \tilde{\lambda})^T \dot{\lambda} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} [(z_{i1} - \tilde{z}_{i1})(z_{i2} - k_1 \nabla_{z_{i1}} L_i(y)) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + z_{i2}(z_{i3} - k_{i2}z_{i2}) + \cdots + z_{i(\bar{n}-1)}(z_{i\bar{n}} - k_{i(\bar{n}-1)}z_{i(\bar{n}-1)}) \\
& - z_{i\bar{n}}k_{i\bar{n}}z_{i\bar{n}}] + (\lambda - \tilde{\lambda})^T k_1 H(z^{[1]}) = - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} k_1 (z_{i1} - \tilde{z}_{i1}) \\
& \nabla_{z_{i1}} L_i(y) + k_1 (\lambda - \tilde{\lambda})^T H(z^{[1]}) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} [-k_{i2}z_{i2}^2 - \cdots - \\
& k_{i\bar{n}}z_{i\bar{n}}^2 + (z_{i1} - \tilde{z}_{i1})z_{i2} + z_{i2}z_{i3} + \cdots + z_{i(\bar{n}-1)}z_{i\bar{n}}]. \quad (24)
\end{aligned}$$

By the affinity of H and the KKT condition $\nabla_{z^{[1]}} L(\tilde{x}^{[1]}, \tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\mu}) = 0_N$, we can derive

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} (z_{i1} - \tilde{z}_{i1}) \nabla_{z_{i1}} L_i(y) = -(z^{[1]} - \tilde{z}^{[1]})^T (\nabla F(z^{[1]}) \\
& - \nabla F(\tilde{z}^{[1]})) - (\lambda - \tilde{\lambda})^T (H(z^{[1]}) - H(\tilde{z}^{[1]})).
\end{aligned}$$

Then, by strong monotonicity of ∇F , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} k_1 (z_{i1} - \tilde{z}_{i1}) \nabla_{z_{i1}} L_i(y) + k_1 (\lambda - \tilde{\lambda})^T H(z^{[1]}) \\
& = -k_1 (z^{[1]} - \tilde{z}^{[1]})^T (\nabla F(z^{[1]}) - \nabla F(\tilde{z}^{[1]})) \\
& \leq -k_1 M \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} (z_{i1} - \tilde{z}_{i1})^2. \quad (25)
\end{aligned}$$

For each $i \in \mathcal{V}$, let $\hat{z}_{i1} = z_{i1} - \tilde{z}_{i1}$. Given that $k_1, k_{i2}, \dots, k_{i\bar{n}}$ are chosen such that $k_1 M > 1, k_{i2} > 1, \dots, k_{i\bar{n}} > 1$, plugging (25) into (24) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{LV}(y) & \leq -k_1 M \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \hat{z}_{i1}^2 + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} [-k_{i2}z_{i2}^2 - \cdots - k_{i\bar{n}}z_{i\bar{n}}^2 \\
& + \hat{z}_{i1}z_{i2} + z_{i2}z_{i3} + \cdots + z_{i(\bar{n}-1)}z_{i\bar{n}}] \leq - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} [(k_1 M - 1) \\
& \hat{z}_{i1}^2 + (k_{i2} - 1)z_{i2}^2 + \cdots + (k_{i\bar{n}} - 1)z_{i\bar{n}}^2] \leq 0. \quad (26)
\end{aligned}$$

This proves a counterpart result of Claim 6.1. Following the same arguments, one can show that counterparts of Claim 6.2 and Claim 6.3 hold for (12), (15), (16) and (17). We are ready to apply Lemma 1.2. For any $\delta > 0$, consider the compact set $S = V^{-1}(\leq \delta) \cap (\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m)$. By Lemma 1.2, starting from any point in S , the solution of (14) and (17) converges to the largest invariant set M contained in $\text{cl}(Z)$, where $Z = \{(z, \lambda) \in S : \mathcal{LV}(z, \lambda) = 0\}$. By the above proof, we have $\mathcal{LV}(z, \lambda) = 0$ if and only if $z = \tilde{z}$. Hence, $Z = \{(z, \lambda) \in S : z = \tilde{z}\}$. It is clear that Z is closed. Let $(\tilde{z}, \lambda) \in M \subseteq Z$. The solution of (14) and (17) starting from (\tilde{z}, λ) remains in M only if $\nabla_{z^{[1]}} L(\tilde{z}^{[1]}, \lambda) = 0_N$. Together with $H(\tilde{z}^{[1]}) = 0_m$, we have that the pair $(\tilde{z}^{[1]}, \lambda)$ satisfies the KKT conditions. Hence, we have $M \subseteq Q$. By the definition of omega-limit set and (26), the omega-limit set of any solution of (14) and (17) is a singleton. Since δ is arbitrary, we have that, starting from any point in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m$, the solution of (14) and (17) converges to a point $(\tilde{z}, \tilde{\lambda})$ with $(\tilde{z}^{[1]}, \tilde{\lambda})$ being a point in Q and $\tilde{z}^{[\ell]} = 0_N$ for all $\ell = 2, \dots, \bar{n}$. ■

We next show the convergence of the original system. Since $z_{i1} = x_{i1}$, $x^{[1]}$ asymptotically converges to the VE $\tilde{x}^{[1]}$. Since $\tilde{z}_{i2} = 0$ and $\nabla_{z_{i1}} L_i(\tilde{y}) = 0$, by the coordinate transformation of z_{i2} , $\Theta_{i1}(\tilde{x}^{[1]})\tilde{x}_{i2} + \Gamma_{i1}(\tilde{x}^{[1]}) = 0$. This is the steady state condition for \tilde{x}_{i1} . We next show by induction that, for each $\ell = 2, \dots, \bar{n}$, $x_{i\ell}$ asymptotically converges to $\tilde{x}_{i\ell}$, the steady state of $x_{i\ell}$ given $\tilde{x}^{[1]}$. We have proved the case of $\ell = 2$. Assume that this argument holds for all ℓ up some $k \in \{2, \dots, \bar{n}-2\}$. For $\ell = k+1$, we check the coordinate transformation of $z_{i(\ell+1)}$ given by (15). Notice that $\tilde{z}_{i2} = \cdots = \tilde{z}_{i(k+1)} = 0$. Also notice that on the right-hand-side of the equation, all the terms with the derivative operation $\frac{d}{dt}$ only depend on $x^{[1 \sim k]}$,

which, by assumption, asymptotically converge to fixed values $\tilde{x}^{[1 \sim k]}$. Thus, the derivatives asymptotically converge to zero. Therefore, as $t \rightarrow \infty$, $\Theta_i^{[\ell-1]} \Gamma_{i\ell} + \Theta_i^{[\ell]} x_{i(\ell+1)} \rightarrow 0$, which implies $\Gamma_{i\ell} + \Theta_i x_{i(\ell+1)} \rightarrow 0$. This is the steady state condition for $\tilde{x}_{i\ell}$. Thus, the argument holds for $\ell = k+1$. By induction, the argument holds for all $\ell = 2, \dots, \bar{n}-1$. Similarly, for (16), as $t \rightarrow \infty$, since $\tilde{z}_{i2} = \cdots = \tilde{z}_{i\bar{n}} = 0$ and all the derivative terms diminish, we have $u_i \rightarrow -\frac{\Gamma_{i\bar{n}}}{\Theta_{i\bar{n}}}$, which is the steady state condition for $\tilde{x}_{i\bar{n}}$. Thus, for all $i \in \mathcal{V}$, $x_{i2}, \dots, x_{i\bar{n}}, u_i$ asymptotically converge to $\tilde{x}_{i2}, \dots, \tilde{x}_{i\bar{n}}, \tilde{u}_i$ such that, together with $\tilde{x}^{[1]}$, (\tilde{x}, \tilde{u}) is a steady state of system (12). ■

VII. CASE STUDY

In this section, we validate Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 5.1 by the multi-zone building temperature regulation problem and the OPF problem introduced in Section II, respectively.

A. Simulation for Algorithm 1

We simulate Algorithm 1 by the multi-zone building temperature regulation problem introduced in Section II-A. Assume that the communication graph satisfies Assumption 4.2.

System dynamics. In (2), the states of zone i are (T_{i1}, T_{i2}) ; the control inputs of zone i are $(m_i^s, \Delta T_i^h)$; the control inputs of the AHU are $(\Delta T^c, \delta)$; the terms (P_i^d, T^{oa}) are disturbances which are assumed to be perfectly measured. We make the following simplifications so that the states of each zone i are controlled by a single control input: 1) $\delta(t) \equiv 0$, i.e., the return air is not recirculated; 2) $\Delta T^c(t) \equiv 0$, i.e., the cooling power of the AHU is not used, instead, we assume that zone i 's control ΔT_i^h could generate both heating and cooling powers; 3) $m_i^s(t) \equiv \bar{m}_i^s$ where \bar{m}_i^s is a constant known to zone i , i.e., the mass flow rate of the air supplied to zone i is constant and known. We also assume that $P_i^d(t) \equiv \bar{P}_i^d$ and $T^{oa}(t) \equiv \bar{T}^{oa}$ where \bar{P}_i^d and \bar{T}^{oa} are constants known to zone i and all the zones, respectively, i.e., the external load and the outside air temperature are both constant and known. For each $i \in \mathcal{V}$, let $x_{i1} = T_{i2}$, $x_{i2} = T_{i1}$, and $u_i = \bar{m}_i^s c_p \Delta T_i^h + \bar{m}_i^s c_p \bar{T}^{oa} + \frac{\bar{T}^{oa}}{\bar{R}^{oa}} + \bar{P}_i^d$. Under the above simplifications, we can obtain the following dynamic model from (2):

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{x}_{i1}(t) & = -\frac{1}{C_{i2}R_i}x_{i1}(t) + \frac{1}{C_{i2}R_i}x_{i2}(t), \\
\dot{x}_{i2}(t) & = \frac{1}{C_{i1}}\left(\frac{x_{i1}(t) - x_{i2}(t)}{R_i} - \bar{m}_i^s c_p x_{i2}(t) - \frac{x_{i2}(t)}{R_i^{oa}}\right) \\
& + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{PH}} \frac{x_{j2}(t) - x_{i2}(t)}{R_{ji}} + \frac{1}{C_{i1}}u_i(t). \quad (27)
\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to check that (27) satisfies Assumption 4.1. We next transform (27) into controllable canonical form. For each $i \in \mathcal{V}$, let $\mathcal{T}_i = \begin{bmatrix} C_{i1}C_{i2}R_i & 0 \\ -C_{i1} & C_{i1} \end{bmatrix}$, $\bar{A}_{ii} = \mathcal{T}_i A_{ii} \mathcal{T}_i^{-1}$, $\hat{B}_i = \mathcal{T}_i B_i$, and $\hat{A}_{ij} = \mathcal{T}_i A_{ij} \mathcal{T}_i^{-1}$. It can be checked that $\hat{A}_{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{C_{i2}R_i R_{ji}} & \frac{1}{R_{ji}} \end{bmatrix}$ for any $j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{PH}$, and $(\bar{A}_{ii}, \hat{B}_i)$ is in the controllable canonical form such that $\bar{A}_{ii} = [[0, 1]^T, -a_i^T]^T$ with $a_i = [\frac{1}{C_{i1}C_{i2}R_i}(\bar{m}_i^s c_p + \frac{1}{R_i^{oa}} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{PH}} \frac{1}{R_{ji}}), \frac{1}{C_{i1}}(\frac{C_{i1}+C_{i2}}{C_{i2}R_i} + \bar{m}_i^s c_p + \frac{1}{R_i^{oa}} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{PH}} \frac{1}{R_{ji}})]$

and $\hat{B}_i = [0, 1]^T$. For any $j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{PH}$, given any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, it can be checked that $S_i(\varepsilon)\hat{A}_{ij}S_j^{-1}(\varepsilon) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \frac{\varepsilon^2}{C_{i2}R_iR_{ji}} & \frac{\varepsilon}{R_{ji}} \end{bmatrix}$.

Hence, for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, we have $\|S_i(\varepsilon)\hat{A}_{ij}S_j^{-1}(\varepsilon)\|_1 = \max\{\frac{\varepsilon^2}{C_{i2}R_iR_{ji}}, \frac{\varepsilon}{R_{ji}}\} < \max\{\frac{1}{C_{i2}R_iR_{ji}}, \frac{1}{R_{ji}}\} < \frac{1}{C_{i2}R_iR_{ji}} + \frac{1}{R_{ji}} = \frac{1+C_{i2}R_i}{C_{i2}R_iR_{ji}} \leq \frac{1+C_{i2}R_i}{C_{i2}R_i \min_{\ell \in \mathcal{N}_i^{PH}} \{R_{\ell i}\}}$, which is a constant independent of j . Hence, Assumption 4.5 is satisfied.

GNEP. We formulate (3) into a GNEP. Let $\bar{c}_{i1}^x = c_{i2}^x$, $\bar{c}_{i2}^x = c_{i1}^x$, $\bar{c}_{i1}^u = \frac{c_{i1}^u}{(\bar{m}_i^s c_p)^2}$, $u_i^r = \bar{m}_i^s c_p \bar{T}^{oa} + \frac{\bar{T}^{oa}}{R_i^{oa}} + \bar{P}_i^d$, $\underline{u}_i = \bar{m}_i^s c_p \underline{\Delta T}_i^h + \bar{m}_i^s c_p \bar{T}^{oa} + \frac{\bar{T}^{oa}}{R_i^{oa}} + \bar{P}_i^d$, and $\bar{u}_i = \bar{m}_i^s c_p \bar{\Delta T}_i^h + \bar{m}_i^s c_p \bar{T}^{oa} + \frac{\bar{T}^{oa}}{R_i^{oa}} + \bar{P}_i^d$. Given (x_{-i}, u_{-i}) , agent i solves the following optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x_{i1}, x_{i2} \in [\underline{T}_i, \bar{T}_i], u_i \in [\underline{u}_i, \bar{u}_i]} & \bar{c}_{i1}^x (x_{i1} - T_i^r)^2 + \bar{c}_{i2}^x (x_{i2} - T_i^r)^2 \\ & + \bar{c}_{i1}^u (u_i - u_i^r)^2 \\ \text{s.t. } & u_i - \bar{m}_i^s c_p x_{i2} - \frac{x_{i2}}{R_i^{oa}} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{PH}} \frac{x_{j2} - x_{i2}}{R_{ji}} = 0, \\ & x_{i1} - x_{i2} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

It is easy to check that problem (28) satisfies Assumptions 3.1–3.5 and Assumptions 4.3–4.4. In the above, we have verified that all the assumptions needed by Theorem 4.1 are satisfied.

Simulation results. We consider the case where $N = 10$. The undirected graph describing the physical topology of the zone network is denoted by $\mathcal{G}^{PH} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}^{PH})$, where $\mathcal{V} = \{1, 2, \dots, 10\}$ and $\mathcal{E}^{PH} = \{(1, 2), (2, 3), \dots, (8, 9), (9, 10)\}$. The floor plan is depicted by Fig. 1. This adjacency topology is widely used for case studies in the literature, e.g., [27]. The values of the parameters are adopted from [27]: for all $i \in \mathcal{V}$, $C_{i1} = 9163 \text{ kJ/K}$, $C_{i2} = 169400 \text{ kJ/K}$, $m_i^s = 0.01 \text{ kg/s}$, $T^{oa} = 25^\circ\text{C}$, $R_i = 1.7 \text{ K/kW}$, $R_{ji} = 2 \text{ K/kW}$, $R_i^{oa} = 57 \text{ K/kW}$, $c_p = 1012 \text{ J/kg} \cdot \text{K}$, $T_i^{ref} = 21.6^\circ\text{C}$, $\underline{T}_i = 20.6^\circ\text{C}$, $\bar{T}_i = 21.7^\circ\text{C}$, $\underline{\Delta T}_i^h = -30^\circ\text{C}$, $\bar{\Delta T}_i^h = 8^\circ\text{C}$ and $P_i^d = 0.1 \text{ kW}$. We choose $c_{i1}^x = c_{i2}^x = 10$, and $c_{i1}^u = 0.1$. Let (\bar{x}, \bar{u}) be the auxiliary variables, $Y_{DM} = [\bar{x}_{11}, \bar{x}_{12}, \bar{u}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_{N1}, \bar{x}_{N2}, \bar{u}_N]^T$ and Y_{DM}^* be the VE of problem (28). For the true variables (x, u) , let $Y_{PH} = [x_{11}, x_{12}, u_1, \dots, x_{N1}, x_{N2}, u_N]^T$ and Y_{PH}^* be the steady state of Y_{PH} . We use $Y_{PH}^e(t)$ and $Y_{PH}^h(t)$ to denote the trajectories of Y_{PH} obtained by our economic control scheme and the hierarchical control scheme, respectively. In Fig. 2, the 2-norm errors $\|Y_{DM}(t) - Y_{DM}^*\|$, $\|Y_{PH}^e(t) - Y_{PH}^*\|$ and $\|Y_{PH}^h(t) - Y_{PH}^*\|$ are shown by the blue solid line, the red dashed line and the green dot line, respectively. This verifies the convergence of the algorithm. The areas under the trajectories of $\|Y_{PH}^e(t) - Y_{PH}^*\|$ and $\|Y_{PH}^h(t) - Y_{PH}^*\|$, denoted by S_e and S_h , represent efficiency loss of economic control and hierarchical control in reaching convergence, respectively. In the simulation, we have $S_e = 158.5730$ and $S_h = 207.6105$. This verifies that the proposed economic control scheme can significantly reduce efficiency loss.

B. Simulation for Algorithm 2

We simulate Algorithm 2 by the OPF problem in Section II-B and use the IEEE 37-bus Test System [39] for the agents'



Fig. 1. Floor plan for the temperature regulation simulation




Fig. 2. 2-norm error of the auxiliary variables and the true variables

physical couplings; see Fig. 3. Assume that the communication graph satisfies Assumption 5.3. The parameter values are adopted from [45]: $D_i = 5 \text{ MW/Hz}$, $T_{Hi} = 4 \text{ s}$, $T_{Mi} = 0.35$, $K_{Mi} = 1$, $K_{Ei} = 1$, $T_{Ei} = 0.1 \text{ s}$, $R_i = 0.05 \text{ Hz/MW}$, $t_{ij} = 1.5 \text{ MW/rad}$, and $\tilde{\omega}_i = 50 \text{ deg/s}$. We choose $a_i = a = 1$, $b_i = b = 10$ and $c_i = c = 50$ for all $i \in \mathcal{V}$.

System dynamics. In (4), agent i 's state is $x_i = [\theta_i, \omega_i, P_{m_i}, P_{E_i}]^T$ and control input is u_i . It is clear that (4) is in the form of (12) and satisfies Assumptions 5.1 and 3.2.

GNEP. We formulate (5) into a GNEP. Given $(P_{m_{-i}}, \theta_{-i})$, agent i solves the following optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{(P_{m_i}, \theta_i) \in \mathbb{R}^2} & a P_{m_i}^2 + b P_{m_i} + c \theta_i^2 \\ \text{s.t. } & \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{PH}} t_{ij} (\theta_{ij} - \sin \theta_{ij}(0)) = P_{m_i} - P_{m_{i0}} - \frac{D_i \tilde{\omega}_i}{\omega_0}. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

We next transform the GNEP (29) into the one that only




Fig. 3. IEEE 37-bus Test System

depends on $x^{[1]} = (\theta_{j1})_{j=1}^N$. We use the steady state condition of $\omega_i(t)$ in (4) to obtain the manifold of P_{m_i} as a function of $(\theta_{j1})_{j=1}^N$ and substitute the manifold into (29). To maintain convexity in the game formulation, we use the linearization $\sin \theta_{ij} \approx \theta_{ij}$. Let $o_i = D_i \frac{\omega_i}{\omega_0} + P_{m_i0} - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{PH}} t_{ij} \sin \theta_{ij}(0)$. By the dynamics of $\omega_i(t)$ in (4) with linearization, the manifold of P_{m_i} is $P_{m_i} = o_i + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{PH}} t_{ij} \theta_{ij}$. Notice that the first constraint of (29) coincides with this manifold and thus can be removed. Replacing P_{m_i} in (29) by its manifold yields

$$\min_{\theta_i \in \mathbb{R}} a(o_i + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{PH}} t_{ij} \theta_{ij})^2 + b(o_i + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{PH}} t_{ij} \theta_{ij}) + c\theta_i^2. \quad (30)$$

It is clear that the GNEP (30) satisfies Assumptions 3.1, 3.3, 3.4 and 5.1. We next verify Assumption 5.2. Denote by f_i the objective function of (30) and $\nabla F = (\nabla \theta_i f_i)_{i=1}^N$. Let $t_i = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{PH}} t_{ij}$. For any $\theta, \theta' \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we then have

$$\begin{aligned} (\theta - \theta')^T (\nabla F(\theta) - \nabla F(\theta')) &= 2a \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} [t_i^2 (\theta_i - \theta'_i)^2 \\ &\quad - t_i \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{PH}} t_{ij} (\theta_i - \theta'_i) (\theta_j - \theta'_j)] + 2c \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} (\theta_i - \theta'_i)^2 \\ &= a \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{PH}} t_i t_{ij} [(\theta_i - \theta'_i) - (\theta_j - \theta'_j)]^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} (2c + a(t_i^2 - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{PH}} t_j t_{ji})) (\theta_i - \theta'_i)^2 \\ &\geq \min_{i \in \mathcal{V}} (2c + a(t_i^2 - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{PH}} t_j t_{ji})) \|\theta - \theta'\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

By the choice of a, b, c and t_{ij} , it can be easily checked that $2c + a(t_i^2 - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{PH}} t_j t_{ji}) > 0$ for all $i \in \mathcal{V}$. By Definition 1.1, ∇F is strongly monotone on \mathbb{R}^N . In the above, we have verified that all the assumptions of Theorem 5.1 are satisfied.




Fig. 4. Trajectories of the state variables

Simulation results. We choose $P_{m_i0} = 20\text{MW}$, $P_{E_i0} = 20\text{MW}$, $\theta_{i0} = 20\text{rad}$, $\omega_{i0} = 49.95\text{Hz}$, $k_1 = 0.1$, and $k_{i2} = k_{i3} = k_{i4} = 1.2$ for all $i \in \mathcal{V}$. Let θ^* be the VE of problem (30). The trajectories of $\|\theta(t) - \theta^*\|$, $\omega(t)$, $P_m(t)$ and $P_E(t)$ are given in Fig. 4. This verifies that the physical variables converge to a set of steady states of system (4) and the converging steady state of θ is the VE of problem (30).

VIII. CONCLUSION

We study two complementary cases of distributed economic control problems: linear systems with controllable subsystems

and nonlinear systems in the strict-feedback form. The proposed algorithms are verified by two case studies on a multi-zone building temperature regulation problem and an optimal power flow problem, respectively.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. A. Abobakr, W. H. Sadid, and G. Zhu. A game-theoretic decentralized model predictive control of thermal applications in discrete-event systems framework. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, 65(8):6446–6456, 2018.
- [2] B. Ahmed, H. R. Pota, and M. Garratt. Flight control of a rotary wing UAV using backstepping. *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, 20(6):639–658, 2010.
- [3] E. Altman and T. Başar. Multi-user rate-based flow control. *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, 46(7):940–949, 1998.
- [4] K.J. Arrow and G. Debreu. Existence of an equilibrium for a competitive economy. *Econometrica*, 22:265–290, 1954.
- [5] A. Bacciotti and F. Ceragioli. Nonpathological Lyapunov functions and discontinuous Caratheodory systems. *Automatica*, 42(3):453–458, 2006.
- [6] L. Bianco, M. Caramia, and S. Giordani. A game-theoretic approach for regulating hazmat transportation. *Transportation Science*, 50(2):424–438, 2016.
- [7] F. Bullo, J. Cortés, and S. Martínez. *Distributed Control of Robotic Networks*. Princeton University Press, 2009.
- [8] C.-T. Chen. *Linear System Theory and Design*. Oxford University Press, 1999.
- [9] A. Cherukuri, E. Mallada, and J. Cortes. Asymptotic convergence of constrained primal-dual dynamics. *Systems and Control Letters*, 87:10–15, 2016.
- [10] P. Dubey. Inefficiency of Nash equilibria. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 11(1):1–8, 1986.
- [11] M. Ellis, J. Liu, and P. D. Christofides. *Economic Model Predictive Control: Theory, Formulations and Chemical Process Applications*. Springer, 2017.
- [12] F. Facchinei, A. Fischer, and V. Piccialli. On generalized Nash games and variational inequalities. *Operations Research Letters*, 35(2):159–164, 2007.
- [13] F. Facchinei and C. Kanzow. Generalized Nash equilibrium problems. *Journal of Operations Research*, 5(3):173–210, 2007.
- [14] F. Facchinei and J.-S. Pang. *Finite-dimensional variational inequalities and complementarity problems*. Springer-Verlag, 2003.
- [15] P. Frihauf, M. Krstic, and T. Basar. Nash equilibrium seeking in non-cooperative games. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 57(5):1192–1207, 2012.
- [16] M. Han, D. Xu, and L. Wan. Hierarchical optimal power flow control for loss minimization in hybrid multi-terminal HVDC transmission system. *CSEE Journal of Power and Energy Systems*, 2(1):40–46, 2016.
- [17] T. Hatanaka, X. Zhang, W. Shi, M. Zhu, and N. Li. An integrated design of optimization and physical dynamics

- for energy efficient buildings: A passivity approach. In *IEEE Conference on Control Technology and Applications*, pages 1050–1057, 2017.
- [18] T. Hatanaka, X. Zhang, W. Shi, M. Zhu, and N. Li. Physics-integrated hierarchical/distributed HVAC optimization for multiple buildings with robustness against time delays. In *56th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 6573–6579, 2017.
- [19] R. A. Horn and C. A. Johnson. *Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- [20] A. Isidori. *Nonlinear Control Systems II*. Springer Verlag, 1999.
- [21] H.K. Khalil. *Nonlinear Systems*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice hall, 2002.
- [22] J. Koshal, A. Nedić, and U. V. Shanbhag. Distributed algorithms for aggregative games on graphs. *Operations Research*, 64(3):680–704, 2016.
- [23] M. Krstic, I. Kanellakopoulos, and P. Kokotovic. *Nonlinear and Adaptive Control Design*. John Wiley and Sons, 1995.
- [24] S. Lee and A. Nedić. Distributed random projection algorithm for convex optimization. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Signal Processing*, 7(2):221–229, 2013.
- [25] Y. Lu and M. Zhu. Game-theoretic distributed control with information-theoretic security guarantees. *5th IFAC Workshop on Distributed Estimation and Control in Networked Systems*, 48(22):264–269, September 2015.
- [26] D. G. Luenberger. *Optimization by vector space methods*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc, 1969.
- [27] Y. Ma, G. Anderson, and F. Borrelli. A distributed predictive control approach to building temperature regulation. In *American Control Conference*, pages 2089–2094, 2011.
- [28] E. Mallada, C. Zhao, and S. Low. Optimal load-side control for frequency regulation in smart grids. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 62(12):6294–6309, 2017.
- [29] M. Mesbahi and M. Egerstedt. *Graph Theoretic Methods in Multiagent Networks*. Princeton Series in Applied Mathematics. Princeton, 2010.
- [30] D. Monderer and L.S. Shapley. Potential games. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 14:124 – 143, 1996.
- [31] A. Nagurney and D. Zhang. *Projected Dynamical Systems and Variational Inequalities with Applications*. International Series in Operations Research and Management Science, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1996.
- [32] R. Olfati-Saber, J.A. Fax, and R.M. Murray. Consensus and cooperation in multi-agent networked systems. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 95(1):215–233, 2007.
- [33] D.P. Palomar and Y.C. Eldar. *Convex optimization in signal processing and communications*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [34] J.-S. Pang, G. Scutari, F. Facchinei, and C. Wang. Distributed power allocation with rate constraints in Gaussian parallel interference channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 54(8):3471–3489, 2008.
- [35] B. Picasso, X. Zhang, and R. Scattolini. Hierarchical model predictive control of independent systems with joint constraints. *Automatica*, 74(12):99–106, 2016.
- [36] F. A. Qureshi and C. N. Jones. Hierarchical control of building HVAC system for ancillary services provision. *Energy and Buildings*, 169(6):216–227, 2018.
- [37] U. Ravat and U. V. Shanbhag. On the characterization of solution sets of smooth and nonsmooth convex stochastic Nash games. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 21(3):1168–1199, 2011.
- [38] J. B. Rawlings, D. Angeli, and C. N. Bates. Fundamentals of economic model predictive control. In *51st IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pages 3851–3861, 2012.
- [39] IEEE Distribution Planning Working Group Report. Radial distribution test feeders. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 6(3):975–985, 1991.
- [40] J.B. Rosen. Existence and uniqueness of equilibrium points for concave N-person games. *Econometrica*, 33(3):520–534, 1965.
- [41] W. Saad, Z. Han, H. V. Poor, and T. Başar. Game-theoretic methods for the smart grid: An overview of microgrid systems, demand-side management, and smart grid communications. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 29(5):86–105, 2012.
- [42] G. Scutari, D. Palomar, F. Facchinei, and J.-S. Pang. Convex optimization, game theory, and variational inequality theory. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 27(3):35–49, 2010.
- [43] E. Semsar-Kazerooni, M. J. Yazdanpanah, and C. Lucas. Nonlinear control and disturbance decoupling of HVAC systems using feedback linearization and backstepping with load estimation. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, 16(5):918–929, 2008.
- [44] M. S. Stankovic, K. H. Johansson, and D. M. Stipanovic. Distributed seeking of Nash equilibria with applications to mobile sensor networks. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 57(4):904–919, 2012.
- [45] Y. Wang, D. J. Hill, and G. Guo. Robust decentralized control for multimachine power systems. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems-I: Fundamental Theory and Applications*, 45(3):271–279, 1998.
- [46] H. Yin, U.V. Shanbhag, and P.G. Mehta. Nash equilibrium problems with scaled congestion costs and shared constraints. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 56(7):1702–1708, 2011.
- [47] J. Zhu. *Optimization of Power System Operation*. Wiley-IEEE Press, 2015.
- [48] M. Zhu and E. Frazzoli. Distributed robust adaptive equilibrium computation for generalized convex games. *Automatica*, 63(1):82–91, January 2016.
- [49] M. Zhu and S. Martínez. Distributed coverage games for energy-aware mobile sensor networks. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 51(1):1–27, 2013.
- [50] M. Zhu and S. Martínez. *Distributed Optimization-Based Control of Multi-Agent Networks in Complex Environments*. Springer, 2015.