

Regulated State Synchronization for Homogeneous Networks of Non-introspective Agents in Presence of Input Delays: A Scale-Free Protocol Design

Zhenwei Liu¹, Donya Nojavanzadeh², Dmitri Saberi³, Ali Saberi², Anton A. Stoorvogel⁴

1. College of Information Science and Engineering, Northeastern University, Shenyang 110819, China
E-mail: liuzhenwei@ise.neu.edu.cn

2. School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Washington State University, Pullman, WA 99164, USA
E-mail: donya.nojavanzadeh@wsu.edu; saberi@eecs.wsu.edu

3. Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, USA
E-mail: dsaberi@stanford.edu

4. Department of Electrical Engineering, Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Twente, Enschede, The Netherlands
E-mail: A.A.Stoorvogel@utwente.nl

Abstract: This paper studies regulated state synchronization of homogeneous networks of non-introspective agents in presence of unknown nonuniform input delays. A scale free protocol is designed based on additional information exchange, which does not need any knowledge of the directed network topology and the spectrum of the associated Laplacian matrix. The proposed protocol is scalable and achieves state synchronization for any arbitrary number of agents. Meanwhile, an upper bound for the input delay tolerance is obtained, which explicitly depends on the agent dynamics.

Key Words: Multi-agent systems, Regulated state synchronization, Input delays

1 Introduction

The synchronization problem of multi-agent systems (MAS) has attracted substantial attention during the past decade, due to the wide potential for applications in several areas such as automotive vehicle control, satellites/robots formation, sensor networks, and so on. See for instance the books [12] and [25] or the survey paper [8].

State synchronization inherently requires homogeneous networks (i.e. agents which have identical dynamics). Therefore, in this paper we focus on homogeneous networks. So far, most work has focused on state synchronization based on diffusive full-state coupling, where the agent dynamics progress from single- and double-integrator dynamics (e.g. [9], [10], [11]) to more general dynamics (e.g. [13], [20], [24]). State synchronization based on diffusive partial-state coupling has also been considered, including static design ([6] and [7]), dynamic design ([4], [14], [15], [17], [21]), and the design with additional communication ([2] and [13]).

Meanwhile, time-delay effects are ubiquitous in any communication scheme. As clarified in [1], we can identify two kinds of delays. Firstly, there is the notion of a *communication delay*, which results from limitations on the communication between agents. Secondly, we have the *input delay*,

which is due to computational limitations of an individual agent. Many works have focused on dealing with input delay, progressing from single- and double-integrator agent dynamics (see e.g. [9], [18], [19], [26]) to more general agent dynamics (see e.g. [16], [22], [23], [27], [5]). Its objective is to derive an upper bound on the input delay such that agents can still achieve synchronization. Moreover, such an upper bound always depends on the agent dynamics and the network properties.

In this paper, we deal with regulated state synchronization problem for MAS in presence of unknown nonuniform input delays by tracking the trajectory of an exosystem. Meanwhile, we can obtain an upper bound for the input delay tolerance, which only depends on the agent dynamics. We design dynamic protocols by using additional information exchange for MAS with both full- and partial-state coupling. The protocol design is scalefree, namely

- The design is independent of information about communication networks. That is to say, the dynamical protocol can work for any communication network such that all of its nodes have path to the exosystem.
- The dynamic protocols are designed for networks with input delays where the admissible upper bound on delays only depends on agent model and does not depend on communication network and the number of agents.

This work is supported by Nature Science Foundation of Liaoning Province under Grant 2019-MS-116.

- The proposed protocols archive regulated state synchronization for any MAS with any number of agents, any admissible non uniform input delays, and any communication network.

Notations and definitions

Given a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, A^\top denotes its conjugate transpose and $\|A\|$ is the induced 2-norm. Let j indicate $\sqrt{-1}$. A square matrix A is said to be Hurwitz stable if all its eigenvalues are in the open left half complex plane. We denote by $\text{diag}\{A_1, \dots, A_N\}$, a block-diagonal matrix with A_1, \dots, A_N as the diagonal elements. $A \otimes B$ depicts the Kronecker product between A and B . I_n denotes the n -dimensional identity matrix and 0_n denotes $n \times n$ zero matrix; sometimes we drop the subscript if the dimension is clear from the context. Moreover let $\mathcal{C}_\tau^n = C([- \tau, 0], \mathbb{R}^n)$ denote the Banach space of all continues functions from $[- \tau, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ with norm

$$\|x\|_C = \sup_{t \in [-\tau, 0]} \|x(t)\|.$$

To describe the information flow among the agents we associate a *weighted graph* \mathcal{G} to the communication network. The weighted graph \mathcal{G} is defined by a triple $(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{A})$ where $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, N\}$ is a node set, \mathcal{E} is a set of pairs of nodes indicating connections among nodes, and $\mathcal{A} = [a_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ is the weighted adjacency matrix with non negative elements a_{ij} . Each pair in \mathcal{E} is called an *edge*, where $a_{ij} > 0$ denotes an edge $(j, i) \in \mathcal{E}$ from node j to node i with weight a_{ij} . Moreover, $a_{ij} = 0$ if there is no edge from node j to node i . We assume there are no self-loops, i.e. we have $a_{ii} = 0$. A *path* from node i_1 to i_k is a sequence of nodes $\{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ such that $(i_j, i_{j+1}) \in \mathcal{E}$ for $j = 1, \dots, k-1$. A *directed tree* is a subgraph (subset of nodes and edges) in which every node has exactly one parent node except for one node, called the *root*, which has no parent node. The *root set* is the set of root nodes. A *directed spanning tree* is a subgraph which is a directed tree containing all the nodes of the original graph. If a directed spanning tree exists, the root has a directed path to every other node in the tree.

For a weighted graph \mathcal{G} , the matrix $L = [\ell_{ij}]$ with

$$\ell_{ij} = \begin{cases} \sum_{k=1}^N a_{ik}, & i = j, \\ -a_{ij}, & i \neq j, \end{cases}$$

is called the *Laplacian matrix* associated with the graph \mathcal{G} . The Laplacian matrix L has all its eigenvalues in the closed right half plane and at least one eigenvalue at zero associated with right eigenvector $\mathbf{1}$ [3]. Moreover, if the graph contains a directed spanning tree, the Laplacian matrix L has a single eigenvalue at the origin and all other eigenvalues are located in the open right-half complex plane [12].

2 Problem formulation

Consider a MAS consisting of N identical linear dynamic agents with input delays:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_i(t) = Ax_i(t) + Bu_i(t - \tau_i), \\ y_i(t) = Cx_i(t), \\ x_i(\delta) = \phi_i(\delta), \quad \delta \in [-\bar{\tau}, 0] \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where $x_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $y_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^q$ and $u_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are the state, output, and the input of agent $i = 1, \dots, N$, respectively. τ_i represent the input delays with $\tau_i \in [0, \bar{\tau}]$, where $\bar{\tau} = \max_i \tau_i$ and $\phi_i \in \mathcal{C}_{\bar{\tau}}^n$.

Assumption 1 We assume that:

- (i) (A, B) are stabilizable and (C, A) are detectable.
- (ii) All eigenvalues of A are in the closed left half plane.

The network provides agent i with the following information,

$$\zeta_i(t) = \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij}(y_i(t) - y_j(t)), \quad (2)$$

where $a_{ij} \geq 0$ and $a_{ii} = 0$. This communication topology of the network can be described by a weighted graph \mathcal{G} associated with (2), with the a_{ij} being the coefficients of the weighting matrix \mathcal{A} not of the dynamics matrix A introduced in (1)). In terms of the coefficients of the associated Laplacian matrix L , ζ_i can be rewritten as

$$\zeta_i(t) = \sum_{j=1}^N \ell_{ij} y_j(t). \quad (3)$$

We refer to this as *partial-state coupling* since only part of the states are communicated over the network. When $C = I$, it means all states are communicated over the network, we call it *full-state coupling*. Then, the original agents are expressed as

$$\dot{x}_i(t) = Ax_i(t) + Bu_i(t - \tau_i) \quad (4)$$

and ζ_i is rewritten as

$$\zeta_i(t) = \sum_{j=1}^N \ell_{ij} x_j(t).$$

Obviously, state synchronization is achieved if

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (x_i(t) - x_j(t)) = 0. \quad (5)$$

for all $i, j \in 1, \dots, N$.

In this paper, we consider regulated state synchronization. The reference trajectory is generated by the following exosystem

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_r(t) = Ax_r(t) \\ y_r(t) = Cx_r(t). \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

with $x_r \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Our objective is that the agents achieve regulated state synchronization, that is

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (x_i(t) - x_r(t)) = 0, \quad (7)$$

for all $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. Clearly, we need some level of communication between the exosystem and the agents. We assume that a nonempty subset \mathcal{C} of the agents have access to their own output relative to the output of the exosystem. Specially, each agent i has access to the quantity

$$\psi_i = \iota_i(y_i(t) - y_r(t)), \quad \iota_i = \begin{cases} 1, & i \in \mathcal{C}, \\ 0, & i \notin \mathcal{C}. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

By combining this with (3), we have the following information exchange

$$\bar{\xi}_i(t) = \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij}(y_i(t) - y_j(t)) + \iota_i(y_i(t) - y_r(t)). \quad (9)$$

Meanwhile, (9) will change as

$$\bar{\xi}_i(t) = \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij}(x_i(t) - x_j(t)) + \iota_i(x_i(t) - x_r(t)) \quad (10)$$

for full-state coupling case.

To guarantee that each agent can achieve the required regulation, we need to make sure that there exists a path to each node starting with node from the set \mathcal{C} . Motivated by this requirement, we define the following set of graphs.

Definition 1 Given a node set \mathcal{C} , we denote by $\mathbb{G}_{\mathcal{C}}^N$ the set of all graphs with N nodes containing the node set \mathcal{C} , such that every node of the network graph $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{G}_{\mathcal{C}}^N$ is a member of a directed tree which has its root contained in the node set \mathcal{C} .

Remark 1 Note that Definition 1 does not require necessarily the existence of directed spanning tree.

From now on, we will refer to the node set \mathcal{C} as the *root set* in view of Definition 1. For any graph $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{G}_{\mathcal{C}}^N$, with Laplacian matrix L , we define the expanded Laplacian matrix as:

$$\bar{L} = L + \text{diag}\{\iota_i\} = [\bar{l}_{ij}]_{N \times N}$$

which is not a regular Laplacian matrix associated to the graph, since the sum of its rows need not be zero. We observe that Definition 1 guarantees that all the eigenvalues of \bar{L} have positive real parts. In particular, we have that \bar{L} is invertible.

In this paper, we introduce an additional information exchange among protocols. In particular, each agent $i = 1, \dots, N$ has access to additional information, denoted by $\hat{\xi}_i$, of the form

$$\hat{\xi}_i(t) = \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij}(\xi_i(t) - \xi_j(t)) \quad (11)$$

where $\xi_j \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a variable produced internally by agent j and to be defined in next sections.

We formulate the problem for regulated state synchronization of a MAS with full- and partial-state coupling.

Problem 1 Consider a MAS described by (1) satisfying Assumption 1, with a given $\bar{\tau}$ and the associated exosystem (6). Let a set of nodes \mathcal{C} be given which defines the set $\mathbb{G}_{\mathcal{C}}^N$ and let the associated network communication graph $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{G}_{\mathcal{C}}^N$ be given by (9).

The **scalable regulated state synchronization problem with additional information exchange** of a MAS is to find, if possible, a linear dynamic protocol for each agent $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, using only knowledge of agent model, i.e., (A, B, C) , and upper bound of delays $\bar{\tau}$, of the form:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_{c,i}(t) = A_{c,i}x_{c,i}(t) + B_{c,i}u_i(t - \tau_i) + C_{c,i}\bar{\xi}_i(t) + D_{c,i}\hat{\xi}_i(t), \\ u_i(t) = F_{c,i}x_{c,i}(t), \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

where $\hat{\xi}_i(t)$ is defined in (11) with $\xi_i(t) = H_c x_{i,c}(t)$, and $x_{c,i}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$, such that regulated state synchronization (7) is achieved for any N and any graph $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{G}_{\mathcal{C}}^N$.

3 Protocol Design

In this section, we will consider the regulated state synchronization problem for a MAS with input delays. In particular, we cover separately systems with full-state coupling and those with partial-state coupling.

3.1 Full-state coupling

Firstly, we define

$$\omega_{\max} = \begin{cases} 0, & A \text{ is Hurwitz,} \\ \max\{\omega \in \mathbb{R} \mid \det(j\omega I - A) = 0\}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, we design a dynamic protocol with additional information exchanges for agent $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ as follows.

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\chi}_i(t) = A\chi_i(t) + Bu_i(t - \tau_i) + \bar{\xi}_i(t) - \hat{\xi}_i(t) - \iota_i\chi_i(t) \\ u_i(t) = -\rho B^T P_{\varepsilon} \chi_i(t), \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

where $\rho > 0$ and ε is a parameter satisfying $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, P_{ε} satisfies

$$A^T P_{\varepsilon} + P_{\varepsilon} A - P_{\varepsilon} B B^T P_{\varepsilon} + \varepsilon I = 0 \quad (14)$$

Note that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a unique solution of (14). The agents communicate ξ_i , which are chosen as $\xi_i(t) = \chi_i(t)$, therefore each agent has access to the following information:

$$\bar{\xi}_i(t) = \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij}(\chi_i(t) - \chi_j(t)). \quad (15)$$

while $\bar{\xi}_i(t)$ is defined by (10).

Our formal result is stated in the following theorem.

Theorem 1 Consider a MAS described by (4) satisfying Assumption 1, with a given $\bar{\tau}$ and the associated exosystem (6). Let a set of nodes \mathcal{C} be given which defines the set $\mathbb{G}_{\mathcal{C}}^N$ and let the associated network communication graph $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{G}_{\mathcal{C}}^N$ be given by (10).

Then the scalable regulated state synchronization problem as stated in Problem 1 is solvable if

$$\bar{\tau}\omega_{\max} < \frac{\pi}{2}. \quad (16)$$

In particular, there exist $\rho > 1$ and $\varepsilon^* > 0$ that depend only on $\bar{\tau}$ and the agent models such that, for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon^*]$, the dynamic protocol given by (13) and (14) solves the scalable regulated state synchronization problem for any N and any graph $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{G}_{\mathcal{C}}^N$.

To obtain this result, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 1 ([23]) Consider a linear time-delay system

$$\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + \sum_{i=1}^m A_i x(t - \tau_i), \quad (17)$$

where $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\tau_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Assume that $A + \sum_{i=1}^m A_i$ is Hurwitz stable. Then, (17) is asymptotically stable for $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_N \in [0, \bar{\tau}]$ if

$$\det[j\omega I - A - \sum_{i=1}^m e^{-j\omega\tau_i} A_i] \neq 0,$$

for all $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$, and for all $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_N \in [0, \bar{\tau}]$.

Proof of Theorem 1: Firstly, let $\tilde{x}_i(t) = x_i(t) - x_r(t)$, we have

$$\dot{\tilde{x}}_i(t) = A\tilde{x}_i(t) + Bu_i(t - \tau_i)$$

We define

$$\tilde{x}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{x}_1(t) \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{x}_N(t) \end{pmatrix}, \chi(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \chi_1(t) \\ \vdots \\ \chi_N(t) \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\tilde{x}^\tau(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{x}_1(t - \tau_1) \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{x}_N(t - \tau_N) \end{pmatrix}, \text{ and } \chi^\tau(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \chi_1(t - \tau_1) \\ \vdots \\ \chi_N(t - \tau_N) \end{pmatrix}$$

then we have the following closed-loop system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\tilde{x}}(t) &= (I \otimes A)\tilde{x}(t) - \rho(I \otimes BB^T P_\varepsilon)\chi^\tau(t) \\ \dot{\chi}(t) &= (I \otimes A)\chi(t) - \rho(I \otimes BB^T P_\varepsilon)\chi^\tau(t) \\ &\quad + (\bar{L} \otimes I)(\tilde{x}(t) - \chi(t)). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Let $e(t) = \tilde{x}(t) - \chi(t)$, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\tilde{x}}(t) &= (I \otimes A)\tilde{x}(t) - \rho(I \otimes BB^T P_\varepsilon)\tilde{x}^\tau(t) + \rho(I \otimes BB^T P_\varepsilon)e^\tau(t) \\ \dot{e}(t) &= (I \otimes A - \bar{L} \otimes I)e(t) \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where $e^\tau(t) = \tilde{x}^\tau(t) - \chi^\tau(t)$.

The proof proceeds in two steps.

Step 1: First, we prove the stability of system (19) without delays, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\tilde{x}} &= (I \otimes A)\tilde{x} - \rho(I \otimes BB^T P_\varepsilon)\tilde{x} + \rho(I \otimes BB^T P_\varepsilon)e \\ \dot{e} &= (I \otimes A - \bar{L} \otimes I)e \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Since all eigenvalues of \bar{L} are positive, we have

$$(T \otimes I)(I \otimes A - \bar{L} \otimes I)(T^{-1} \otimes I) = I \otimes A - \bar{J} \otimes I \quad (21)$$

for a non-singular transformation matrix T , where (21) is upper triangular Jordan form with $A - \lambda_i I$ for $i = 1, \dots, N-1$ on the diagonal. Since all eigenvalues of A are in the closed left half plane, $A - \lambda_i I$ is stable. Therefore, all eigenvalues of $I \otimes A - \bar{L} \otimes I$ have negative real part. Therefore, we have that the dynamics for e is asymptotically stable.

According to the above result, for (20) we just need to prove the stability of

$$\dot{\tilde{x}} = [I \otimes (A - \rho BB^T P_\varepsilon)]\tilde{x}$$

or the stability of

$$A - \rho BB^T P_\varepsilon$$

Based on the ARE (14), for a positive definite matrix P_ε , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &P_\varepsilon(A - \rho BB^T P_\varepsilon) + (A - \rho BB^T P_\varepsilon)^T P_\varepsilon \\ &\leq -\varepsilon I - (2\rho - 1)P_\varepsilon BB^T P_\varepsilon \\ &< 0 \end{aligned}$$

for $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\rho > 1$.

Step2: In this step, since we have that e_i is asymptotically stable, we just need to prove the stability of

$$\dot{\tilde{x}}_i(t) = A\tilde{x}_i(t) - \rho BB^T P_\varepsilon \tilde{x}_i(t - \tau_i)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, N$. Following Lemma 1 we need to prove

$$\det[j\omega I - A + \rho e^{-j\omega\tau_i} BB^T P_\varepsilon] \neq 0 \quad (22)$$

for $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\tau_i \in [0, \bar{\tau}]$. We choose ρ , such that

$$\rho > \frac{1}{\cos(\bar{\tau}\omega_{\max})}. \quad (23)$$

Let ρ be fixed. Meanwhile, we note that there exists a θ such that

$$\rho > \frac{1}{\cos(\bar{\tau}\omega)}, \forall |\omega| < \omega_{\max} + \theta$$

Then, we split the proof of (22) into two cases where $|\omega| \geq \omega_{\max} + \theta$ and $|\omega| < \omega_{\max} + \theta$ respectively.

If $|\omega| \geq \omega_{\max} + \theta$, we have $\det(j\omega I - A) \neq 0$, which yields $\sigma_{\min}(j\omega I - A) > 0$. Hence, we can state that there exists a $\mu > 0$ such that

$$\sigma_{\min}(j\omega I - A) > \mu, \quad \forall \omega \text{ such that } |\omega| \geq \omega_{\max} + \theta.$$

The above bound always exists by observing that for $|\omega| > \bar{\omega} := \max\{\|A\| + 1, \omega_{\max} + \theta\}$, we have $\sigma_{\min}(j\omega I - A) > |\omega| - \|A\| > 1$. However, for $\omega_{\max} + \theta < |\omega| < \bar{\omega}$, there exist a $\mu \in (0, 1]$, such that $\sigma_{\min}(j\omega I - A) \geq \mu$ since $\sigma_{\min}(j\omega I - A)$ depends continuously on ω .

Given ρ , there exists $\varepsilon^* > 0$ such that $\|\rho BB^T P_\varepsilon\| \leq \mu/2$. Then, we obtain

$$\sigma_{\min}(j\omega I - A + \rho e^{-j\omega\tau_i} BB^T P_\varepsilon) \geq \mu - \frac{\mu}{2} \geq \frac{\mu}{2}.$$

Therefore, condition (22) holds for $|\omega| \geq \omega_{\max} + \theta$.

Now, it remains to show that condition (22) holds for $|\omega| < \omega_{\max} + \theta$. We find that

$$-\omega\tau_i < |\omega|\bar{\tau} \leq \frac{\pi}{2},$$

and hence

$$\rho \cos(-\omega\tau_i) > \rho \cos(|\omega|\bar{\tau}) > 1.$$

It implies that we have

$$A - \rho e^{-j\omega\tau_i} BB^T P_\varepsilon$$

is Hurwitz stable for a positive definite matrix P_ε (see [23, Lemma C.1]). Therefore, (22) holds for $|\omega| < \omega_{\max} + \theta$. Thus, we can obtain the regulated state synchronization result based on Lemma 1 by choosing

$$\rho > \frac{1}{\cos(\bar{\tau}\omega_{\max})}.$$

■

3.2 Partial-state coupling

In this subsection, we will consider the case via partial-state coupling. We design the following dynamic protocol with additional information exchanges as follows.

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\hat{x}}_i(t) = A\hat{x}_i(t) + B\Phi_i^\tau(t) + K(\bar{\zeta}_i(t) - C\hat{x}_i(t)) + \iota_i Bu_i(t - \tau_i) \\ \dot{\chi}_i(t) = A\chi_i(t) + Bu_i(t - \tau_i) + \hat{x}_i(t) - \zeta_i(t) - \iota_i \chi_i(t) \\ u_i(t) = -\rho B^T P_\varepsilon \chi_i(t), \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, N$ where K is a pre-design matrix such that $A - KC$ is Hurwitz stable and $\rho > 0$. ε is a parameter satisfying $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, P_ε satisfies (14) and is the unique solution of (14) for any $\varepsilon > 0$. ρ and ω_{\max} are defined in (13). In this protocol, the agents communicate χ_i and $u_i(t - \tau_i)$, i.e. each agent has access to the following additional information:

$$\check{\zeta}_i(t) = \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij}(\chi_i(t) - \chi_j(t)), \quad (25)$$

and

$$\Phi_i^\tau(t) = \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij}(u_i(t - \tau_i) - u_j(t - \tau_j)). \quad (26)$$

$\bar{\zeta}_i(t)$ is also defined as (9). Then we have the following theorem for MAS via partial-state coupling.

Theorem 2 Consider a MAS described by (1) satisfying Assumption 1, with a given $\bar{\tau}$ and the associated exosystem (6). Let a set of nodes \mathcal{C} be given which defines the set $\mathbb{G}_{\mathcal{C}}^N$ and let the associated network communication graph $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{G}_{\mathcal{C}}^N$ be given by (9).

Then the scalable regulated state synchronization problem as stated in Problem 1 is solvable if (16) holds. In particular, there exist $\rho > 1$ and $\varepsilon^* > 0$ that depend only on $\bar{\tau}$ and the agent models such that, for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon^*]$, the dynamic protocol given by (24) and (14) solves the scalable regulated state synchronization problem for any N and any graph $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{G}_{\mathcal{C}}^N$.

Proof of Theorem 2: Similar to Theorem 1, let $\tilde{x}_i(t) = x_i(t) - x_r(t)$, we have

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\tilde{x}}_i(t) = A\tilde{x}_i(t) + Bu_i(t - \tau_i) \\ \dot{\hat{x}}_i(t) = A\hat{x}_i(t) + B\Phi_i^\tau(t) + K(\bar{\zeta}_i(t) - C\hat{x}_i(t)) + \iota_i Bu_i(t - \tau_i) \\ \dot{\chi}_i(t) = A\chi_i(t) + Bu_i(t - \tau_i) + \hat{x}_i(t) - \zeta_i(t) - \iota_i \chi_i(t) \end{cases}$$

Then we have the following closed-loop system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\tilde{x}}(t) &= (I \otimes A)\tilde{x}(t) - \rho(I \otimes BB^T P_\varepsilon)\chi^\tau(t) \\ \dot{\hat{x}}(t) &= I \otimes (A - KC)\hat{x}(t) - \rho(\bar{L} \otimes BB^T P_\varepsilon)\chi^\tau(t) + (\bar{L} \otimes KC)\tilde{x}(t) \\ \dot{\chi}(t) &= (I \otimes A - \bar{L} \otimes I)\chi(t) - \rho(I \otimes BB^T P_\varepsilon)\chi^\tau(t) + \hat{x}(t) \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

By defining $e(t) = \tilde{x}(t) - \chi(t)$ and $\bar{e}(t) = (\bar{L} \otimes I)\tilde{x}(t) - \hat{x}(t)$, we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\tilde{x}}(t) &= (I \otimes A)\tilde{x}(t) - \rho(I \otimes BB^T P_\varepsilon)\tilde{x}^\tau(t) + \rho(I \otimes BB^T P_\varepsilon)e^\tau(t) \\ \dot{\bar{e}}(t) &= I \otimes (A - KC)\bar{e}(t) \\ \dot{e}(t) &= (I \otimes A - \bar{L} \otimes I)e(t) + \bar{e}(t) \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Similar to Theorem 1, we prove the stability of (28) without delays first,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\tilde{x}}(t) &= (I \otimes A)\tilde{x}(t) - \rho(I \otimes BB^T P_\varepsilon)\tilde{x}(t) + \rho(I \otimes BB^T P_\varepsilon)e(t) \\ \dot{\bar{e}}(t) &= I \otimes (A - KC)\bar{e}(t) \\ \dot{e}(t) &= (I \otimes A - \bar{L} \otimes I)e(t) + \bar{e}(t) \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Since we have $A - KC$ and $I \otimes A - \bar{L} \otimes I$ are Hurwitz stable, one can obtain

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \bar{e}(t) \rightarrow 0 \text{ and } \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e(t) \rightarrow 0$$

i.e. we just need to prove the stability of

$$\dot{\tilde{x}}_i(t) = (A - \rho BB^T P_\varepsilon)\tilde{x}_i(t).$$

Similarly to Theorem 1, we can obtain the result about the stability of the above system directly.

Then, since $e_i(t)$ and $\bar{e}_i(t)$ are all asymptotically stable, we just need to prove the stability

$$\dot{\tilde{x}}_i(t) = A\tilde{x}_i(t) - \rho BB^T P_\varepsilon \tilde{x}_i(t - \tau_i)$$

or prove (22) for $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\tau_i \in [0, \bar{\tau}]$ based on Lemma 1.

Similar to the proof of Theorem 1, we can obtain the synchronization result. ■

4 MATLAB Implementation and Example

4.1 Implementation

In this subsection, we present and discuss our implementation of the problem at hand, allowing us to visualize and put to use the theory that we have developed. We discuss two main files that we include in our source code folder, along with one helper file, all implemented with MATLAB. Please see <https://github.com/wsucontrolgroup/scale-free-input-delay.git>.

The file `protocol_design.m` designs the central product of this paper, the protocol, setting it up for use. It accepts *only* the agent model (A, B, C) and an upper bound on the delays $(\bar{\tau})$. Recall that in the full-state coupling case, the protocol is given by (13) and (14) and in the partial-state coupling case by (24) and (14). In view of these equations, the function `protocol_design` returns the relevant data necessary to define them. Namely, ε^* , ρ , P_ε , and K . Note that the selection of K is arbitrary, and we welcome the user to change our code to pick any value as far as $A - KC$ is Hurwitz stable.

We describe briefly how this function operates. The proof of Theorem 1, particularly the definitions of ε^* and ρ , reveal that there is a large degree of freedom in choosing the pair (ε^*, ρ) . Furthermore, different choices can lead to drastically different speeds of convergence (i.e., how quickly x_i converges to x_r for $i = 1, \dots, N$). For fixed ρ , among valid choices of ε^* , faster convergence is typically obtained by larger ε^* . In this vein, our algorithm seeks to obtain a less conservative ε^* , given a fixed ρ . This is done by first choosing θ based on ρ , from which we make a non-conservative estimate of μ , finally choosing ε^* based on its definition (which involves μ). Moreover, we comment that this file in no way chooses the best (ε^*, ρ) pair that optimizes convergence. We simply guarantee that our parameters satisfy the solvability conditions laid out in this paper. The existence of an algorithm that chooses optimal (ε^*, ρ) in all generality remains an open question, and will be the subject of future research.

The second and final main file we include is the `input_delay_solver.m` file, which is a complete simulation package. This file defines a function of the same name that accepts an agent model, the delays, the adjacency matrix of the communication network, the set of leader nodes, and the initial conditions (in addition to the period of integration T_{\max} , which specifies the time interval $(0, T_{\max})$ that the user wants the solution over). From here, the function uses `protocol_design` to choose acceptable protocol parameters to achieve regulated state synchronization as stated in (5) through the use of protocols (13) and (14) in the case of full-state coupling and (24) and (14) for partial-state coupling. If matrix C passed to the function is the identity, the protocol for full-state coupling will be enacted, otherwise, partial state coupling protocol will be utilized. We make implicit use of the MATLAB `dde23` solver. Finally, a time series, along with the values




Figure 1: Directed communication network with 3 nodes




Figure 2: Directed communication network with 6 nodes




Figure 3: Directed communication network with 10 nodes




Figure 4: Directed communication network with 5 nodes

of the states, exosystem, and the input at each time step, are all extracted from the resulting structure and returned. This gives data which can be easily plotted or used for a variety of purposes.

We also include a file `initial_conditions.m` that allows the user to format their initial conditions in a particular way that will be accepted by our solver. We hope the inclusion of these files will allow the reader to illustrate our results for themselves if so desired, and more importantly, that those who have use for a product of this form will profit from them in their own endeavors.

4.2 Numerical example

Consider the agents model (1) with full-state coupling as

$$\dot{x}_i(t) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} x_i(t) + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} u_i(t - \tau_i),$$




Figure 5: Regulated state synchronization of MAS with full-state coupling with $N = 3$




Figure 7: Regulated state synchronization of MAS with full-state coupling with $N = 6$




Figure 6: Regulated state synchronization of MAS with partial-state coupling with $N = 3$




Figure 8: Regulated state synchronization of MAS with partial-state coupling with $N = 6$

and the agent models with partial-state coupling are as:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_i(t) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} x_i(t) + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} u_i(t - \tau_i), \\ y_i(t) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} x_i(t) \end{cases}$$

In the following four cases, we simulate the regulated state synchronization via protocols (13) and (24) for MAS with full- and partial-state coupling respectively. Matrix K in all the four cases with partial-state coupling is chosen as $K^T = \begin{pmatrix} 6 & 11 & 6 \end{pmatrix}$. Parameter ρ is chosen as $\rho = 1$ in all protocols of full- and partial-state coupling cases. Moreover, with the

choice of $\varepsilon = 10^{-5}$ matrix P_ε is obtained by solving ARE (14) as

$$P_\varepsilon = \begin{pmatrix} 0.0001 & 0.0009 & 0.0032 \\ 0.0009 & 0.0096 & 0.0432 \\ 0.0032 & 0.0432 & 0.2941 \end{pmatrix}.$$

1. Firstly, we consider a MAS with 3 agents, $N = 3$ and communication graph shown in Figure 1. In this example, delays are as $\tau_1 = 1\text{sec}$, $\tau_2 = 2\text{sec}$, and $\tau_3 = 3\text{sec}$ for both networks with full- and partial-state coupling. The results of state synchronization of MAS with full-state coupling via protocol (13) and partial-state coupling via protocol (24) are presented in Figure 5 and 6, respectively.




Figure 9: Regulated state synchronization of MAS with full-state coupling with $N = 10$




Figure 11: Regulated state synchronization of MAS with full-state coupling with $N = 5$




Figure 10: Regulated state synchronization of MAS with partial-state coupling with $N = 10$




Figure 12: Regulated state synchronization of MAS with partial-state coupling with $N = 5$

2. Next, we consider a MAS with 6 agents, $N = 6$, and communication topology with the associated graph shown in figure 2. The delays are chosen as $\tau_1 = 1\text{sec}$, $\tau_2 = \tau_4 = 2\text{sec}$, $\tau_3 = \tau_5 = 3\text{sec}$ and $\tau_6 = 1.5\text{sec}$ for both networks with full- and partial-state coupling. The simulation results for regulated state synchronization of MAS with full-state coupling and partial-state coupling are presented in Figure 7 and 8, respectively.
3. In this case, we consider a MAS with 10 agents, $N = 10$, and communication topology with the associated graph shown in figure 3. The delays in both networks with full- and partial-state coupling are chosen as $\tau_1 = 1\text{sec}$, $\tau_2 = \tau_4 = 2\text{sec}$, $\tau_3 = \tau_5 = 3\text{sec}$, $\tau_6 = 1.5\text{sec}$, $\tau_7 = 0.5\text{sec}$,

$\tau_8 = 0.7\text{sec}$, $\tau_9 = 4\text{sec}$, and $\tau_{10} = 2.5\text{sec}$. The simulation results for these networks are illustrated in Figure 9 and 10.

4. Finally, the simulation results for state synchronization of a MAS with 5 agents and communication topology shown in Figure 4, are illustrated in Figure 11 and 12 where the values of delays are as $\tau_1 = 1\text{sec}$, $\tau_2 = \tau_4 = 2\text{sec}$, $\tau_3 = \tau_5 = 3\text{sec}$.

The simulation results show that our one-shot protocol designs do not need any knowledge of the communication network and achieve regulated state synchronization for any network with any number of agents. Moreover, we observe that

upper bounds on the input delay tolerance only depends on the agent dynamics.

References

- [1] Y. Cao, W. Yu, W. Ren, and G. Chen. An overview of recent progress in the study of distributed multi-agent coordination. *IEEE Trans. on Industrial Informatics*, 9(1):427–438, 2013.
- [2] D. Chowdhury and H. K. Khalil. Synchronization in networks of identical linear systems with reduced information. In *American Control Conference*, pages 5706–5711, Milwaukee, WI, 2018.
- [3] C. Godsil and G. Royle. *Algebraic graph theory*, volume 207 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001.
- [4] H. Kim, H. Shim, J. Back, and J. Seo. Consensus of output-coupled linear multi-agent systems under fast switching network: averaging approach. *Automatica*, 49(1):267–272, 2013.
- [5] Z. Liu, A. A. Stoorvogel, A. Saberi, and M. Zhang. State synchronization of homogeneous continuous-time multi-agent systems with time-varying communication topology in presence of input delay. In *American Control Conference*, pages 2273–2278, Seattle, WA, 2017.
- [6] Z. Liu, M. Zhang, A. Saberi, and A. A. Stoorvogel. State synchronization of multi-agent systems via static or adaptive nonlinear dynamic protocols. *Automatica*, 95:316–327, 2018.
- [7] Z. Liu, M. Zhang, A. Saberi, and A.A. Stoorvogel. Passivity based state synchronization of homogeneous discrete-time multi-agent systems via static protocol in the presence of input delay. *European Journal of Control*, 41:16–24, 2018.
- [8] R. Olfati-Saber, J.A. Fax, and R.M. Murray. Consensus and cooperation in networked multi-agent systems. *Proc. of the IEEE*, 95(1):215–233, 2007.
- [9] R. Olfati-Saber and R.M. Murray. Consensus problems in networks of agents with switching topology and time-delays. *IEEE Trans. Aut. Contr.*, 49(9):1520–1533, 2004.
- [10] W. Ren. On consensus algorithms for double-integrator dynamics. *IEEE Trans. Aut. Contr.*, 53(6):1503–1509, 2008.
- [11] W. Ren and R.W. Beard. Consensus seeking in multiagent systems under dynamically changing interaction topologies. *IEEE Trans. Aut. Contr.*, 50(5):655–661, 2005.
- [12] W. Ren and Y.C. Cao. *Distributed coordination of multi-agent networks*. Communications and Control Engineering. Springer-Verlag, London, 2011.
- [13] L. Scardovi and R. Sepulchre. Synchronization in networks of identical linear systems. *Automatica*, 45(11):2557–2562, 2009.
- [14] J.H. Seo, J. Back, H. Kim, and H. Shim. Output feedback consensus for high-order linear systems having uniform ranks under switching topology. *IET Control Theory and Applications*, 6(8):1118–1124, 2012.
- [15] J.H. Seo, H. Shim, and J. Back. Consensus of high-order linear systems using dynamic output feedback compensator: low gain approach. *Automatica*, 45(11):2659–2664, 2009.
- [16] A.A. Stoorvogel and A. Saberi. Consensus in the network with nonuniform constant input delay. In *American Control Conference*, pages 4106–4111, Chicago, IL, 2015.
- [17] Y. Su and J. Huang. Stability of a class of linear switching systems with applications to two consensus problem. *IEEE Trans. Aut. Contr.*, 57(6):1420–1430, 2012.
- [18] Y.-P. Tian and C.-L. Liu. Consensus of multi-agent systems with diverse input and communication delays. *IEEE Trans. Aut. Contr.*, 53(9):2122–2128, 2008.
- [19] Y.-P. Tian and C.-L. Liu. Robust consensus of multi-agent systems with diverse input delays and asymmetric interconnection perturbations. *Automatica*, 45(5):1347–1353, 2009.
- [20] S.E. Tuna. LQR-based coupling gain for synchronization of linear systems. Available: arXiv:0801.3390v1, 2008.
- [21] S.E. Tuna. Conditions for synchronizability in arrays of coupled linear systems. *IEEE Trans. Aut. Contr.*, 55(10):2416–2420, 2009.
- [22] X. Wang, A. Saberi, A. A. Stoorvogel, H.F. Grip, and T. Yang. Synchronization for heterogeneous networks of introspective right-invertible agents with uniform constant communication delay. In *Proc. 52nd CDC*, pages 5198–5203, Firenze, Italy, 2012.
- [23] X. Wang, A. Saberi, A.A. Stoorvogel, H.F. Grip, and T. Yang. Consensus in the network with uniform constant communication delay. *Automatica*, 49(8):2461–2467, 2013.
- [24] P. Wieland, J.S. Kim, and F. Allgöwer. On topology and dynamics of consensus among linear high-order agents. *International Journal of Systems Science*, 42(10):1831–1842, 2011.
- [25] C.W. Wu. *Synchronization in complex networks of nonlinear dynamical systems*. World Scientific Publishing Company, Singapore, 2007.
- [26] F. Xiao and L. Wang. Consensus protocols for discrete-time multi-agent systems with time-varying delays. *Automatica*, 44(10):2577–2582, 2008.
- [27] M. Zhang, A. Saberi, and A.A. Stoorvogel. Synchronization in a network of identical discrete-time agents with unknown, nonuniform constant input delay. In *Proc. 54th CDC*, pages 7054–7059, Osaka, Japan, 2015.