

# Flocking in the Cucker-Smale model with self-delay and nonsymmetric interaction weights

Jan Haskovec\*

## Abstract

We derive a sufficient condition for asymptotic flocking in the Cucker-Smale model with self-delay (also called reaction delay) and with non-symmetric interaction weights. The condition prescribes smallness of the delay length relative to the decay rate of the inter-agent communication weight. The proof is carried out by a bootstrapping argument combining a decay estimate for the group velocity diameter with a variant of the Gronwall-Halanay inequality.

**Keywords:** Cucker-Smale model, flocking, self-delay, nonsymmetric interaction weights.

**2010 MR Subject Classification:** 34K05, 82C22, 34D05, 92D50.

## 1 Introduction

In this paper we study the asymptotic behavior of the Cucker-Smale model [7, 8] with self-delay, also called reaction-type delay in the previous works [13, 14]. The Cucker-Smale flocking model is a prototypical model of collective behavior [17, 25], describing the dynamics of a group of  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  agents, characterized by their positions  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and velocities  $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ , with  $d \geq 1$ . The agents align their velocities to the average velocity of their conspecifics. Motivated by applications in biology and social sciences [1, 3, 22] or engineering problems (for instance, swarm robotics [11, 23, 24]), we introduce a fixed time span  $\tau > 0$  for the agents to process the information received from their surroundings and take appropriate action. This leads to the system of delay (functional) differential equations [22],

$$\dot{x}_i(t) = v_i(t), \quad (1)$$

$$\dot{v}_i(t) = \sum_{j=1}^N \psi_{ij}(t - \tau)(v_j(t - \tau) - v_i(t - \tau)), \quad (2)$$

for  $i \in [N]$ , where here and in the sequel we denote  $[N] := \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ . The system is equipped with the initial datum

$$x_i(t) = x_i^0(t), \quad v_i(t) = v_i^0(t), \quad i \in [N], \quad t \in [-\tau, 0], \quad (3)$$

---

\*Computer, Electrical and Mathematical Sciences & Engineering, King Abdullah University of Science and Technology, 23955 Thuwal, KSA. jan.haskovec@kaust.edu.sa

with prescribed continuous spatial and velocity trajectories  $(x_i^0, v_i^0) \in C([-\tau, 0])$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . We note that we do not require (1) to hold for the initial datum.

The communication weights  $\psi_{ij}$  in (2) measure the intensity of the influence between agents depending on their physical (Euclidean) distance  $|x_i - x_j|$ . In the classical setting [7, 8] the communication weights are given by

$$\psi_{ij}(t) := \frac{1}{N} \psi(|x_j(t) - x_i(t)|), \quad (4)$$

with the nonnegative, bounded and continuous *influence function*  $\psi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ . We adopt the assumption that  $\psi(s) \leq 1$  for all  $s \geq 0$ . This, in fact, can always be achieved by an eventual rescaling of time, and, therefore, is without loss of generality.

Another form of the communication weights was introduced in [16], where the scaling by  $1/N$  is replaced by a normalization relative to the influence of all other agents,

$$\psi_{ij}(t) := \frac{\psi(|x_j(t) - x_i(t)|)}{\sum_{\ell=1}^N \psi(|x_\ell(t) - x_i(t)|)}. \quad (5)$$

Again, the influence function  $\psi$  is assumed to be nonnegative and continuous, and verify  $\psi \leq 1$  globally. Note that the normalization in (5) leads to nonsymmetric weights, i.e., in general,  $\psi_{ij} \neq \psi_{ji}$ .

A generic choice for  $\psi$ , introduced in [7, 8], is  $\psi(s) = \frac{1}{(1+s^2)^\beta}$  with  $\beta > 0$ . However, we do not restrict ourselves to this particular form in this paper. Moreover, let us stress that we do *not* impose any symmetry assumptions on the communication weights  $\psi_{ij}$ , i.e., we admit  $\psi_{ij} \neq \psi_{ji}$  for all  $i, j \in [N]$ .

As customary in the context of the Cucker-Smale system [7, 8], we define (*asymptotic flocking*) for solutions of (1)–(2) as the property

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} d_x(t) < \infty, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} d_v(t) = 0, \quad (6)$$

where the position and, resp., velocity diameters of the agent group  $d_x = d_x(t)$  and, resp.,  $d_v = d_v(t)$  are defined as

$$d_x(t) := \max_{i,j \in [N]} |x_i(t) - x_j(t)|, \quad d_v(t) := \max_{i,j \in [N]} |v_i(t) - v_j(t)|. \quad (7)$$

Several previous works focused on derivation of sufficient conditions for flocking in the Cucker-Smale system with delay. The papers [2, 4, 5, 6, 15, 18, 19, 20] focus on variants of the model *without* self-delay (also called propagation- or communication-type delay), where  $v_i$  in (2) is evaluated at time  $t$  instead of  $t - \tau$ . This leads to qualitatively different dynamics compared to the system (1)–(2). In particular, one has an a-priori bound on the velocity radius  $R_v(t) := \max_{i \in [N]} |v_i(t)|$  in terms of the initial datum, independently of the delay length  $\tau > 0$ . In contrast, the model (1)–(2) with self-delay exhibits, for large enough values of  $\tau > 0$ , oscillation of the velocities  $v_i = v_i(t)$  with increasing, unbounded amplitude (see Remark 1 below). In other words, the presence of self-delay fundamentally destabilizes the dynamics of the system and flocking can only be expected for small enough values of  $\tau$ .

The Cucker-Smale model with self-delay was studied in [13, 14], but under the assumption of symmetric communication weights  $\psi_{ij}$ . The symmetry leads to conservation of the total momentum  $\sum_{i=1}^N v_i$ , and the analysis carried out in [13, 14] is utilizes this fact in a

fundamental way. Finally, [9] studies a variant of the model with self-delay and multiplicative noise. However, the authors impose the assumption of a-priori uniform positivity of the communication weights  $\psi_{ij}$ , which goes against the substance of the Cucker-Smale model (its analysis is interesting precisely for the fact that the communication weight vanishes at infinity).

The main novelty of this paper is that it provides a sufficient condition for flocking in the Cucker-Smale system *with* self-delay, *without* the assumption of symmetric communication weights. To our best knowledge, no such result exists in the literature. Our flocking condition is formulated in terms of the delay length  $\tau$ , the influence function  $\psi$  and the position and velocity diameters of the initial datum. It is not explicit, however, can be easily inspected numerically. It will be presented in Section 2 below.

The main difficulties for the analysis stem from the following two properties of system (1)–(2): non-conservation of the total momentum  $\sum_{i=1}^N v_i$  due to the possible nonsymmetry of the communication weights, so that the asymptotic flocking vector is not known a-priori; and, the instability (possible occurrence of unbounded oscillations) induced by the presence of the self-delay, so that the velocities cannot be bounded a-priori. These difficulties are overcome by a bootstrapping argument combining a decay estimate for the group velocity diameter with a variant of the Gronwall-Halanay inequality, and will be given in Section 3.

## 2 Sufficient condition for asymptotic flocking

For the case the influence function  $\psi$  was not monotone, let us define its nonincreasing rearrangement

$$\Psi(u) := \min_{s \in [0, u]} \psi(s) \quad \text{for } u \geq 0. \quad (8)$$

Moreover, let us denote the initial spatial and velocity diameters

$$d_x^0 := \max_{t \in [-\tau, 0]} d_x(t), \quad d_v^0 := \max_{t \in [-\tau, 0]} d_v(t), \quad (9)$$

with  $d_x$  and  $d_v$  defined in (7).

**Theorem 1.** *Let the communication weights  $\psi_{ij}$  be given by (4) or (5) with a nonnegative, bounded and continuous influence function  $\psi \leq 1$ . Assume that there exists  $C \in (0, 1)$  such that*

$$\Psi \left( d_x^0 + (1 + 2\tau) \left( \tau + \frac{1}{C} \right) d_v^0 \right) - C \geq 4\tau e^{C\tau} \frac{e^{C\tau} - 1}{C\tau}, \quad (10)$$

with  $\Psi$  defined in (8) and  $d_x^0, d_v^0$  given by (9).

Then the system (1)–(3) exhibits flocking in the sense of definition (6). Moreover, the decay of the velocity diameter is exponential with rate  $C$ ,

$$d_v(t) \leq (1 + 2\tau) d_v^0 e^{-C(t-\tau)} \quad \text{for all } t \geq \tau. \quad (11)$$

Condition (10) is highly nonlinear and, obviously, not verifiable analytically, apart from trivial cases like  $\Psi \equiv 1$ . However, observe that the right-hand side in (10) is, for a fixed  $C > 0$ , an increasing function of  $\tau$ , and vanishing for  $\tau \rightarrow 0+$ . On the other hand, the left-hand side is, for fixed  $d_x^0$  and  $d_v^0$ , decreasing in  $\tau$ , and strictly positive for  $\tau \rightarrow 0+$  if

$C > 0$  is small enough and  $\Psi$  is globally positive (but does *not* need to be uniformly bounded away from zero). Consequently, (10) is to be interpreted, for fixed  $d_x^0$  and  $d_v^0$ , as a smallness condition for  $\tau$ , relative to the decay rate of  $\Psi$ . Clearly, since  $\Psi \leq 1$  by assumption, the necessary condition for (10) to be verified is  $\tau < 1/4$ . In the special case  $\Psi \equiv 1$ , (10) is equivalent to  $\tau < 1/4$ .

A slightly simpler version of (10) is obtained for the case when the initial velocities  $v_i^0$  are all constant on  $[-\tau, 0]$ . Then, by obvious modifications of the steps carried out in Section 3, one obtains the following simplified version of Theorem 1.

**Theorem 2.** *Let the initial velocities  $v_i^0$  be all constant on  $[-\tau, 0]$ . Let the assumptions of Theorem 1 be verified, with (10) replaced by*

$$\Psi\left(d_x^0 + \frac{d_v^0}{C}\right) - C \geq 4\tau e^{C\tau} \frac{e^{C\tau} - 1}{C\tau}.$$

*Then the system (1)–(3) exhibits flocking in the sense of definition (6). Moreover, the decay of the velocity diameter is exponential with rate  $C$ ,*

$$d_v(t) \leq d_v^0 e^{-Ct} \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0.$$

**Remark 1.** *Before we proceed with the proof of Theorem 1 let us give a short explanation why we cannot expect flocking to take place in (1)–(2) for arbitrary delay lengths  $\tau > 0$ , even for small initial data. Indeed, considering the simple case of two agents,  $N = 2$ , in one spatial dimension  $d = 1$ , with  $\psi_{12} \equiv \psi_{21} \equiv 1$ , the system (2) reduces to*

$$\dot{w}(t) = -2w(t - \tau)$$

*for  $w := v_1 - v_2$ . Nontrivial solutions of this equation exhibit oscillations whenever  $2\tau > e^{-1}$  and their amplitude diverges in time if  $2\tau > \pi/2$ , see, e.g., [22]. In other words, the system never reaches flocking if  $2\tau > \pi/2$ , apart from the trivial case  $w \equiv 0$ .*

### 3 Proof of Theorem 1

Let us start by making two simple observations about the communication weights  $\psi_{ij}$ . First, due to the assumption  $\psi \leq 1$ , we have for both the classical (4) and normalized (5) weights the upper bound

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \psi_{ij}(t) \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } i \in [N] \text{ and } t \geq 0. \quad (12)$$

In fact, for the normalized weights (5) the above holds even with equality, but we do not make use of this property in our proof. Second, due to the assumed continuity of  $\psi$ , we have the lower bound

$$\psi_{ij}(t) \geq \frac{\Psi(d_x(t))}{N} \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0 \text{ and all } i, j \in [N], \quad (13)$$

with  $\Psi$  given by (8). Indeed, for (4) we have

$$\psi_{ij}(t) = \frac{1}{N} \psi(|x_i(t) - x_j(t)|) \geq \frac{1}{N} \Psi(|x_i(t) - x_j(t)|) \geq \frac{\Psi(d_x(t))}{N}.$$

For (5) the same follows due to the assumption  $\psi \leq 1$ ,

$$\psi_{ij}(t) \geq \frac{\psi(|x_j(t) - x_i(t)|)}{N} \geq \frac{\Psi(d_x(t))}{N}.$$

We first prove a result on the decay of the velocity diameter  $d_v = d_v(t)$ .

**Lemma 1.** *Let the communication weights  $\psi_{ij}$  satisfy (12) and for a fixed  $T > \tau$  denote*

$$\bar{\psi} := N \min_{t \in [\tau, T]} \min_{i \neq j \in [N]} \psi_{ij}(t - \tau). \quad (14)$$

Then, along the solutions of (1)–(2),

$$\frac{d}{dt} d_v(t) \leq 4 \int_{t-\tau}^t d_v(s - \tau) ds - \bar{\psi} d_v(t) \quad (15)$$

for almost all  $t \in (\tau, T)$ .

*Proof.* For the sake of legibility, in this section we shall use the shorthand notation  $\tilde{v}_j := v_j(t - \tau)$ , while  $v_j$  stands for  $v_j(t)$ .

Due to the continuity of the velocity trajectories  $v_i = v_i(t)$ , there is an at most countable system of open, mutually disjoint intervals  $\{\mathcal{I}_\sigma\}_{\sigma \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that

$$\bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathbb{N}} \overline{\mathcal{I}_\sigma} = [\tau, \infty)$$

and for each  $\sigma \in \mathbb{N}$  there exist indices  $i(\sigma), k(\sigma)$  such that

$$d_v(t) = |v_{i(\sigma)}(t) - v_{k(\sigma)}(t)| \quad \text{for } t \in \mathcal{I}_\sigma.$$

Then, using the abbreviated notation  $i := i(\sigma), k := k(\sigma)$ , we have for every  $t \in \mathcal{I}_\sigma$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} d_v(t)^2 &= (\dot{v}_i - \dot{v}_k) \cdot (v_i - v_k) \\ &= \left( \sum_{j=1}^N \psi_{ij}(t) (\tilde{v}_j - \tilde{v}_i) - \sum_{j=1}^N \psi_{kj}(t) (\tilde{v}_j - \tilde{v}_k) \right) \cdot (v_i - v_k). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

We process the first term of the right-hand side as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^N \psi_{ij}(t) (\tilde{v}_j - \tilde{v}_i) \cdot (v_i - v_k) &= \sum_{j=1}^N \psi_{ij}(t) (\tilde{v}_j - v_j + v_i - \tilde{v}_i) \cdot (v_i - v_k) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^N \psi_{ij}(t) (v_j - v_i) \cdot (v_i - v_k). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Noting that  $t \geq \tau$ , we estimate the difference  $|\tilde{v}_j - v_j|$  by

$$\begin{aligned}
|\tilde{v}_j - v_j| &\leq \int_{t-\tau}^t |\dot{v}_j(s)| \, ds \\
&\leq \int_{t-\tau}^t \sum_{\ell=1}^N \psi_{j\ell}(s) |v_\ell(s-\tau) - v_j(s-\tau)| \, ds \\
&\leq \int_{t-\tau}^t \sum_{\ell=1}^N \psi_{j\ell}(s) d_v(s-\tau) \, ds \\
&\leq \int_{t-\tau}^t d_v(s-\tau) \, ds,
\end{aligned}$$

where for the last equality we used the property (12).

Performing an analogous estimate for the term  $|\tilde{v}_i - v_i|$  and using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and, again, (12), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=1}^N \psi_{ij}(t) (\tilde{v}_j - v_j + v_i - \tilde{v}_i) \cdot (v_i - v_k) &\leq \sum_{j=1}^N \psi_{ij}(t) (|\tilde{v}_j - v_j| + |\tilde{v}_i - v_i|) |v_i - v_k| \\
&\leq 2 d_v(t) \int_{t-\tau}^t d_v(s-\tau) \, ds.
\end{aligned}$$

To estimate the second term of the right-hand side of (17), observe that, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(v_j - v_i) \cdot (v_i - v_k) &= (v_j - v_k) \cdot (v_i - v_k) - |v_i - v_k|^2 \\
&\leq |v_i - v_k| (|v_j - v_k| - |v_i - v_k|) \leq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

since, by definition,  $|v_j - v_k| \leq d_v = |v_i - v_k|$ . Then, with (14), we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \psi_{ij}(t) (v_j - v_i) \cdot (v_i - v_k) \leq \frac{\bar{\psi}}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N (v_j - v_i) \cdot (v_i - v_k).$$

Repeating the same steps for the second term of the right-hand side of (16), we finally arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} d_v(t)^2 &\leq 4 d_v(t) \int_{t-\tau}^t d_v(s-\tau) \, ds + \frac{\bar{\psi}}{N} \left( \sum_{j=1}^N (v_j - v_i) \cdot (v_i - v_k) - \sum_{j=1}^N (v_j - v_k) \cdot (v_i - v_k) \right) \\
&= 4 d_v(t) \int_{t-\tau}^t d_v(s-\tau) \, ds - |v_i - v_k|^2 \\
&\leq 4 d_v(t) \int_{t-\tau}^t d_v(s-\tau) \, ds - \bar{\psi} d_v(t)^2,
\end{aligned}$$

from which (15) directly follows, for almost all  $t \in (\tau, T)$ .  $\square$

The proof of Theorem 1 shall be based on the decay estimate of Lemma 1, combined with the following variant of the Gronwall-Halanay lemma [10].

**Lemma 2.** Fix  $\tau > 0$  and let  $u \in C([- \tau, \infty))$  be a nonnegative continuous function with piecewise continuous derivative on  $(\tau, \infty)$ , such that for almost all  $t > \tau$  the integro-differential inequality is satisfied,

$$\frac{d}{dt}u(t) \leq \frac{\alpha}{\tau} \int_{t-\tau}^t u(s-\tau) ds - \beta u(t), \quad (18)$$

with constants  $0 < \alpha < \beta$ . Then there exists a unique  $\gamma \in (0, \beta - \alpha)$  such that

$$\beta - \gamma = \alpha e^{\gamma\tau} \frac{e^{\gamma\tau} - 1}{\gamma\tau}, \quad (19)$$

and the estimate holds

$$u(t) \leq \left( \max_{s \in [-\tau, \tau]} u(s) \right) e^{-\gamma(t-\tau)} \quad \text{for all } t \geq \tau. \quad (20)$$

*Proof.* The proof is obtained as a slight generalization of [4, Lemma 2.5] and [12, Lemma 3.3].  $\square$

**Lemma 3.** Along the solutions of (1)–(2), we have

$$\max_{s \in [-\tau, \tau]} d_v(s) \leq (1 + 2\tau)d_v^0, \quad (21)$$

with  $d_v^0$  defined in (9).

*Proof.* From (2) we have for all  $t \in (0, \tau]$  and  $i \in [N]$ ,

$$|\dot{v}_i(t)| \leq \sum_{j=1}^N \psi_{ij}(t-\tau) |v_j(t-\tau) - v_i(t-\tau)| \leq \sum_{j=1}^N \psi_{ij}(t-\tau) d_v(t-\tau) \leq d_v^0,$$

where the last inequality follows from (12). Therefore, still for  $t \in (0, \tau]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |v_i(t) - v_j(t)| &\leq |v_i(0) - v_j(0)| + \int_0^t (|\dot{v}_i(s)| + |\dot{v}_j(s)|) ds \\ &\leq d_v(0) + 2\tau d_v^0 \\ &\leq (1 + 2\tau)d_v^0, \end{aligned}$$

and taking a maximum over  $i, j \in [N]$  yields (21)  $\square$

We are now ready to carry out the proof of Theorem 1.

*Proof.* Let  $C \in (0, 1)$  be given by (10). Due to (21) and the continuity of  $d_v = d_v(t)$ , there exists some  $T > \tau$  such that

$$\int_{\tau}^t d_v(s) ds < \frac{(1 + 2\tau)d_v^0}{C} \quad \text{for all } t \in (\tau, T). \quad (22)$$

We claim that  $T = \infty$ . For contradiction, assume that (22) holds only until some finite  $T > \tau$ . Then we have

$$\int_{\tau}^T d_v(s) ds = \frac{(1 + 2\tau)d_v^0}{C}. \quad (23)$$

By (1) we readily have

$$d_x(t - \tau) \leq d_x^0 + \int_0^{t-\tau} d_v(s) ds. \quad (24)$$

The bounds (21) and (22) imply for all  $t \in (\tau, T)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{t-\tau} d_v(s) ds &= \int_0^{\min\{\tau, t-\tau\}} d_v(s) ds + \int_{\min\{\tau, t-\tau\}}^{t-\tau} d_v(s) ds \\ &\leq (1 + 2\tau) \min\{\tau, t - \tau\} d_v^0 + \frac{(1 + 2\tau) d_v^0}{C} \\ &\leq (1 + 2\tau) \left( \tau + \frac{1}{C} \right) d_v^0. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$d_x(t - \tau) \leq d_x^0 + (1 + 2\tau) \left( \tau + \frac{1}{C} \right) d_v^0. \quad (25)$$

Then, using (25) in (13) and recalling that, by definition,  $\Psi$  is a nonincreasing function, gives

$$\psi_{ij}(t - \tau) \geq \frac{1}{N} \Psi \left( d_x^0 + (1 + 2\tau) \left( \tau + \frac{1}{C} \right) d_v^0 \right) \quad (26)$$

for all  $i, j \in [N]$  and  $t \in (\tau, T)$ . Therefore, denoting  $\bar{\Psi}_C := \Psi \left( d_x^0 + (1 + 2\tau) \left( \tau + \frac{1}{C} \right) d_v^0 \right)$ , we have

$$N \min_{t \in [\tau, T]} \min_{i \neq j \in [N]} \psi_{ij}(t - \tau) \geq \bar{\Psi}_C$$

and Lemma 1 gives

$$\frac{d}{dt} d_v(t) \leq 4 \int_{t-\tau}^t d_v(s - \tau) ds - \bar{\Psi}_C d_v(t) \quad \text{for } t \in (\tau, T).$$

Noting that assumption (10) with  $C \in (0, 1)$  implies  $\bar{\Psi}_C > 4\tau$ , we apply Lemma 2 with  $\alpha := 4\tau$  and  $\beta := \bar{\Psi}_C$ . This leads to

$$d_v(t) \leq \left( \max_{s \in [-\tau, \tau]} d_v(s) \right) e^{-\gamma(t-\tau)} \leq (1 + 2\tau) d_v^0 e^{-\gamma(t-\tau)} \quad \text{for } t \in [\tau, T], \quad (27)$$

with  $\gamma \in (0, \bar{\Psi}_C - 4\tau)$  the unique solution of

$$\bar{\Psi}_C - \gamma = 4\tau e^{\gamma\tau} \frac{e^{\gamma\tau} - 1}{\gamma\tau}.$$

Comparing with (10), we have

$$4\tau e^{C\tau} \frac{e^{C\tau} - 1}{C\tau} + C \leq 4\tau e^{\gamma\tau} \frac{e^{\gamma\tau} - 1}{\gamma\tau} + \gamma,$$



and the monotonicity of the above expression implies  $C \leq \gamma$ . But then (27) gives

$$\int_{\tau}^T d_v(t)dt \leq (1 + 2\tau)d_v^0 \int_{\tau}^T e^{-C(t-\tau)}dt = \frac{(1 + 2\tau)d_v^0}{C} (1 - e^{-C(T-\tau)}) < \frac{(1 + 2\tau)d_v^0}{C},$$

which is a contradiction to (23). Thus, we conclude that  $T = \infty$ , i.e., that (22) holds for all  $t > 0$ . Consequently, by (24) we have

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} d_x(t) \leq d_x^0 + \int_0^{\infty} d_v(s)ds < d_x^0 + (1 + 2\tau) \left( \tau + \frac{1}{C} \right) d_v^0,$$

and so the first condition in the definition 6 of flocking is verified. Moreover, since (26) holds for all  $t \geq 0$ , Lemma 1 with  $\bar{\psi} := \bar{\psi}_C$  can be applied globally, and a subsequent application of Lemma 2 gives the exponential decay of  $d_v = d_v(t)$  as claimed by (11).  $\square$

**Remark 2.** *In fact, for our analysis we do not need to restrict the form of the interaction weights  $\psi_{ij}$  to either (4) or (5). Instead, the proof of Theorem 1 is only based on the lower (12) and upper (13) bounds on  $\psi_{ij}$ . Consequently, its statement remains valid for any form of  $\psi_{ij}$ , as long as they verify (12) and (13).*

## References

- [1] S. Camazine, J. L. Deneubourg, N.R. Franks, J. Sneyd, G. Theraulaz and E. Bonabeau: *Self-Organization in Biological Systems*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2001.
- [2] M. R. Cartabia: *The Cucker-Smale model with time delay*. [arxiv.org/abs/2008.09530](https://arxiv.org/abs/2008.09530) (2020).
- [3] C. Castellano, S. Fortunato and V. Loreto: *Statistical physics of social dynamics*. Rev. Mod. Phys., 81, (2009), 591–646.
- [4] Y.-P. Choi, J. Haskovec: *Cucker-Smale model with normalized communication weights and time delay*. Kinetic and Related Models 10 (2017), 1011-1033.
- [5] Y.-P. Choi, J. Haskovec: *Hydrodynamic Cucker-Smale model with normalized communication weights and time delay..* SIAM J. Math. Anal., Vol. 51, No. 3 (2019), 2660–2685.
- [6] Y.-P. Choi and C. Pignotti: *Emergent behavior of Cucker-Smale model with normalized weights and distributed time delays*. Networks and Heterogeneous Media, Vol. 14 (2019), pp. 789–804.
- [7] F. Cucker and S. Smale, Emergent behaviour in flocks, *IEEE T. on Automat. Contr.*, **52** (2007), 852–862.
- [8] F. Cucker and S. Smale, On the mathematics of emergence, *Jap. J. Math.*, **2** (2007), 197–227.
- [9] R. Erban, J. Haskovec and Y. Sun, A Cucker-Smale model with noise and delay, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, **76** (2016), 1535–1557.

- [10] A. Halanay, *Differential Equations: Stability, Oscillations, Time Lags*. Academic Press, New York London, 1966.
- [11] H. Hamman: *Swarm Robotics: A Formal Approach*. Springer, 2018.
- [12] J. Haskovec, *A simple proof of asymptotic consensus in the Hegselmann-Krause and Cucker-Smale models with normalization and delay*. SIAM J. on Applied Dynamical Systems, 20:1 (2021), pp. 130–148.
- [13] J. Haskovec and I. Markou, *Asymptotic flocking in the Cucker-Smale model with reaction-type delays in the non-oscillatory regime*. Kinetic and Related Models 13 (2020), 795–813.
- [14] J. Haskovec and I. Markou, *Exponential asymptotic flocking in the Cucker-Smale model with distributed reaction delays*. Mathematical Biosciences and Engineering 17:5 (2020), pp. 5651–5671.
- [15] Y. Liu, and J. Wu, *Flocking and asymptotic velocity of the Cucker-Smale model with processing delay*, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **415** (2014), 53–61.
- [16] S. Motsch and E. Tadmor: *A New Model for Self-organized Dynamics and Its Flocking Behavior*. J. Stat. Phys. 144 (2011).
- [17] G. Naldi, L. Pareschi and G. Toscani (eds.): *Mathematical Modeling of Collective behaviour in Socio-Economic and Life Sciences*, Series: Modelling and Simulation in Science and Technology, Birkhäuser, 2010.
- [18] C. Pignotti and I. Reche Vallejo: *Asymptotic analysis of a Cucker-Smale system with leadership and distributed delay*. In: Trends in Control Theory and Partial Differential Equations, Springer Indam Series, Vol. 32 (2019), pp. 233–253.
- [19] C. Pignotti and I. Reche Vallejo: *Flocking estimates for the Cucker-Smale model with time lag and hierarchical leadership*. Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications, Vol. 464 (2018), pp. 1313–1332.
- [20] C. Pignotti and E. Trelat: *Convergence to consensus of the general finite-dimensional Cucker-Smale model with time-varying delays*. Comm. Math. Sci. 16 (2018), 2053–2076.
- [21] A. Seuret, V. Dimos, V. Dimarogonas and K.H. Johansson: *Consensus under Communication Delays*. Proceedings of the 47th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, Cancun, Mexico, Dec. 9–11, 2008.
- [22] H. Smith: *An Introduction to Delay Differential Equations with Applications to the Life Sciences*. Springer New York Dordrecht Heidelberg London, 2011.
- [23] C. Somarakis and J. Baras: *Delay-independent convergence for linear consensus networks with applications to non-linear flocking systems*. In Proceedings of the 12th IFAC Workshop on Time Delay Systems, pp. 159–164, Ann Arbor (2015).
- [24] K. Szwajkowska, I.B. Schwartz, L.M. Romero, C.R. Heckman, D. Mox and M. Ani Hsieh: *Collective motion patterns of swarms with delay coupling: theory and experiment*. Phys. Rev. E 93, 032307.
- [25] T. Vicsek and A. Zafeiris: *Collective motion*. Phys. Rep., 517 (2012), 71–140.