

# Group Consensus of Linear Multi-agent Systems under Nonnegative Directed Graphs

Zhongchang Liu, *Member, IEEE*, Wing Shing Wong, *Life Fellow, IEEE*

**Abstract**—Group consensus implies reaching multiple groups where agents belonging to the same cluster reach state consensus. This paper focuses on linear multi-agent systems under nonnegative directed graphs. A new necessary and sufficient condition for ensuring group consensus is derived, which requires the spanning forest of the underlying directed graph and that of its quotient graph induced with respect to a clustering partition to contain equal minimum number of directed trees. This condition is further shown to be equivalent to containing cluster spanning trees, a commonly used topology for the underlying graph in the literature. Under a designed controller gain, lower bound of the overall coupling strength for achieving group consensus is specified. Moreover, the pattern of the multiple consensus states formed by all clusters is characterized when the overall coupling strength is large enough.

**Index Terms**—Group consensus; coupled linear systems; directed spanning trees; graph topology

## I. INTRODUCTION

Multi-agent systems (MASs) have been continually attracting research attentions and have found wide applications [1]. While prevalent works concentrate on reaching global consensus/synchronization for all agents, there arises increasing interest in the problem of group consensus (or cluster consensus, group/cluster synchronization), where coupled systems converge to multiple synchronous groups instead of one. This research topic is mainly motivated from multi-modal opinion dynamics in social networks [2] and clustering of oscillatory networks [3], and have potential applications in power grids and multiple interconnected formations [4].

For the problem of reaching global consensus, comprehensive understandings about the underlying graph topologies and control algorithms subject to various agent dynamics have been established [5], [6]. In contrast, the mechanisms for achieving group consensus have not been fully understood yet. Early works such as [7]–[9] presented sufficient algebraic conditions on the graph Laplacian for achieving a prescribed cluster consensus pattern by assuming balanced positive and negative weights for inter-cluster links. Subsequent works under this framework mainly designed distributed control algorithms for different types of agent dynamics [10]–[15] and provided lower bounds for intra-cluster coupling strengths, in which the underlying topology of each cluster is required to contain a spanning tree. On the other hand, for MASs that have all edge weights being positive, the in-degrees of all nodes in the same cluster from any other cluster should be equal (i.e., the so-called *inter-cluster common influence condition*) so as to maintain the group consensus manifolds invariant [16]. Under this framework, the underlying topology that contains *cluster spanning trees* was proved to be necessary and sufficient under undirected graphs for chaotic oscillators in [16], and under

balanced digraphs for discrete-time single integrators in [19]. For general nonnegatively weighted digraphs, this topology was taken as a sufficient condition when enforcing cluster consensus for coupled single integrators [17], [18]. It is also necessary when the structure of inter-cluster connections does not form any cycle [20], [21]. However, the necessity for general nonnegative digraphs remains unconfirmed to the best knowledge of the authors. Other relevant works considered the group consensus patterns that may emerge in undirected networks or unweighted digraphs from perspectives including group theory [22]–[24] and graph partitions [25] without specifying connectivities of the underlying graph topology. In summary, although remarkable results have been reported, there still lacks a unified knowledge about the necessary features of underlying digraphs for ensuring group consensus. In addition, the characteristics of the consensus states in the clusters are rarely specified except for MASs with simple individual dynamics [25].

In undirected and unweighted networks, the quotient graph associated with an external equitable partition (which is equivalent to the inter-cluster common influence condition) of the underlying full graph is shown to govern motions of the group consensus manifold [26], [27]. In [28], [29], sufficient conditions in terms of eigenvalues of the quotient graph Laplacian and the full graph Laplacian are presented to ensure stabilities of group consensus manifolds. This paper will generalize the definition of quotient graph to weighted digraphs, and show how its connectivity and its Laplacian can actually determine group consensusability. Unlike the quotient graph of a connected undirected graph which is inherently strongly connected [27], the quotient graph of a weakly connected digraph can contain multiple branches, resulting in multiple zero eigenvalues in its Laplacian. Hence, graph theories established in [30] and [31] for such topologies will be introduced to lay partial foundations of this work.

Focusing on reaching group consensus for generic linear MASs under nonnegatively weighted digraphs, this paper presents the following main results: a) A new necessary and sufficient graph topology is derived, which requires the spanning forest of the underlying digraph and that of its quotient graph to contain equal minimum number of directed trees. This condition is verifiable without examining the connection details inside any cluster compared with the existing condition of containing cluster spanning trees. b) The Laplacian of the quotient graph is shown to be decomposable from the full graph Laplacian, while the eigenvalues of the remaining part determines group consensusability and specifies the overall coupling strength for ensuring group consensus under a separately designed controller gain. This result strengthens and generalizes partial conclusions for MASs under undirected or unweighted graphs in [28], [29]. c) The final group consensus states are characterized, which will be consistent with the pattern of MASs with single integrator dynamics in [25] if the overall coupling strength is large enough, while may not otherwise.

**Notation:**  $\mathbf{1}_n = [1, 1, \dots, 1]^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .  $I_n$  is the identity matrix of dimension  $n$ .  $\text{blkdg}\{M_1, \dots, M_n\}$  represents the block diagonal matrix constructed by matrices  $M_1, \dots, M_n$ . The symbol “ $\otimes$ ” stands for the Kronecker product. For a square matrix  $M$ , its spectrum is denoted by  $\sigma(M)$ , and the real part of its eigenvalue is denoted by  $\text{Re}\lambda(M)$ .

\*This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (61703445), Natural Science Foundation of Liaoning Province (20180540064), Innovation Support Program for Dalian High-level Talents (2019RQ057), Dalian Science and Technology Innovation Fund (2019J12GX040), and the Hong Kong Innovation and Technology Fund (ITS/066/17FP) under the HKUST-MIT Research Alliance Consortium.

Z. Liu is with College of Marine Electrical Engineering, Dalian Maritime University, Dalian, 116026, P. R. China (Email: zcliu@foxmail.com).

W. S. Wong is with Department of Information Engineering, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, N.T., Hong Kong (Email: ws-wong@ie.cuhk.edu.hk).

## II. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Consider a multi-agent system (MAS) consisting of  $L$  agents indexed by the set  $\mathcal{I} = \{1, \dots, L\}$ . The individual dynamics of each agent is described by the following generic linear system model

$$\dot{x}_l(t) = Ax_l + Bu_l(t), \quad l \in \mathcal{I}, \quad (1)$$

where  $x_l(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is the state of agent  $l$  with initial value  $x_l(0)$ ,  $u_l(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$  is the control input,  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ ,  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n_u}$ , and  $(A, B)$  is a stabilizable pair.

These  $L$  agents belong to  $N$  distinct clusters denoted by the index sets  $\mathcal{C}_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . Assume without loss of generality that each cluster  $\mathcal{C}_i$  contains  $l_i \geq 1$  agents ( $\sum_{i=1}^N l_i = L$ ), and the indices are arranged such that  $\mathcal{C}_1 = \{1, \dots, l_1\}, \dots, \mathcal{C}_i = \{\rho_i + 1, \dots, \rho_i + l_i\}, \dots, \mathcal{C}_N = \{\rho_N + 1, \dots, \rho_N + l_N\}$ , where  $\rho_1 = 0$  and  $\rho_i = \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} l_j$ ,  $i = 2, \dots, N$ . Hence, the set  $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_N\}$  is a nontrivial partition of the index set  $\mathcal{I}$ , and is called a *clustering* of the above multi-agent system. Two distinct agents,  $l$  and  $k$  in  $\mathcal{I}$ , are said to belong to the same cluster  $\mathcal{C}_i$  if  $l \in \mathcal{C}_i$  and  $k \in \mathcal{C}_i$ .

### A. The Group Consensus Problem

In this study, the agents are supposed to be linearly coupled through their control inputs:

$$u_l(t) = \delta K \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}} w_{lk} [x_k(t) - x_l(t)], \quad l \in \mathcal{C}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, N \quad (2)$$

where  $\delta > 0$  is the overall coupling strength used to compensate for the underlying topology,  $K$  is the controller gain matrix to be determined, and  $w_{lk} \geq 0$  is the weight of the link from agent  $k$  to agent  $l$ . Then the closed-loop equations for (1) are described by

$$\dot{x}_l(t) = Ax_l - \delta BK \sum_{k=1}^L \ell_{lk} x_k(t), \quad l \in \mathcal{C}_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, N \quad (3)$$

where  $\ell_{ll} = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}} w_{lk}$  and  $\ell_{lk} = -w_{lk}$  for any  $k \neq l$ . Concatenating variables in  $x(t) = [x_1^T(t), \dots, x_L^T(t)]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{nL}$ , we can write (3) into the following compact form:

$$\dot{x}(t) = (I_L \otimes A - \delta \mathcal{L} \otimes BK)x(t), \quad x(0) \in \mathbb{R}^{nL} \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathcal{L} = [\ell_{lk}]$ .

The group consensus problem is defined below [8], [13].

*Definition 1:* The multi-agent system in (4) achieves *group consensus* with respect to (w.r.t.) the clustering  $\mathcal{C}$  if for any  $x_l(0) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $l \in \mathcal{I}$ ,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|x_l(t) - x_k(t)\| = 0$ ,  $\forall k, l \in \mathcal{C}_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$ .

Note that group consensus do not require the consensus states in different clusters to be distinct [8], [13], which are equivalent to the definition of intra-cluster consensus in cluster consensus problems [16]–[18]. Considering that group consensus is the prerequisite of reaching cluster consensus while state separations for different clusters can be enforced by some extra techniques as in [17], [18], our work will focus on the fundamental problem of group consensus only.

It is trivial to see that the group consensus problem can be solved if the MAS can achieve global consensus for their states, i.e.,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|x_l(t) - x_k(t)\| = 0$ ,  $\forall k, l \in \mathcal{I}$ . However, global consensus is only a special case of group consensus. The goals of this paper are to reveal general graph topologies that can ensure group consensus for the MAS (4), and to further shed some light on the patterns of the achieved multiple consensus states.

### B. Useful Graph Theory

A directed graph (digraph)  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{A})$  is associated with the MAS (1) such that each agent is considered as a node in the node set  $\mathcal{V}$ , while connections among agents correspond to directed edges




Fig. 1. Interaction graph and its quotient graph.

in  $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ . The adjacency matrix  $\mathcal{A} = [w_{lk}]$  is defined such that  $w_{lk} > 0$  if there is a directed edge from agent  $k$  to agent  $l$ , and  $w_{lk} = 0$ , otherwise. The in-degree of a node  $l$  is the quantity  $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}} w_{lk}$ . The Laplacian matrix of  $\mathcal{G}$  is  $\mathcal{L} = [\ell_{lk}]$  with each entry  $\ell_{lk}$  being defined in (3). The digraph  $\mathcal{G}$  is weakly connected if the graph derived via replacing all directed edges of  $\mathcal{G}$  with undirected edges is connected. A *directed spanning tree* of  $\mathcal{G}$  is a directed tree that contains all the nodes through directed paths in  $\mathcal{G}$ . A *directed spanning forest* of  $\mathcal{G}$  is a digraph consisting of one or more directed trees that together contain all the nodes of  $\mathcal{G}$ , but no two of which have a node in common.  $\mathcal{G}$  is said to contain *cluster spanning trees* w.r.t. the clustering  $\mathcal{C}$  if for each cluster  $\mathcal{C}_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , there exists a node in  $\mathcal{V}$  which can reach all nodes with indices in  $\mathcal{C}_i$  through directed paths in  $\mathcal{G}$ . Note that the paths used to span a cluster of nodes may contain nodes belonging to other clusters, and of course can also follow inter-cluster edges.

It is well-known that a strongly connected graph has an irreducible Laplacian matrix. For graph topologies that are not strongly connected, its Laplacian is reducible. Hence, the following conclusions about an  $m$ -reducible Laplacian matrix from [31] will be useful.

*Lemma 1 ([31]):* Let  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$  be a reducible Laplacian matrix of a nonnegative digraph. The following statements are equivalent for any  $m \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ :

- (a)  $M$  is  $m$ -reducible.
- (b) The zero eigenvalue of  $M$  has multiplicity  $m$ , and all the other eigenvalues have positive real parts.
- (c)  $m$  is the minimum number of directed trees which together span the digraph.

By this lemma, a 1-reducible Laplacian corresponds to a graph that is not strongly connected but contains a directed spanning tree.

### C. Assumptions

Corresponding to the clustering  $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_N\}$ , let the subgraph of  $\mathcal{G}$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{G}_i$ , contain all the nodes with indices in  $\mathcal{C}_i$  and the edges connecting them directly (all inter-cluster links are excluded from  $\mathcal{G}_i$ , and see Fig. 1(a) for an illustration). Then, the Laplacian matrix  $\mathcal{L}$  of  $\mathcal{G}$  can be partitioned into the following block-matrix form:

$$\mathcal{L} = \begin{bmatrix} L_{11} & L_{12} & \cdots & L_{1N} \\ L_{21} & L_{22} & \cdots & L_{2N} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ L_{N1} & L_{N2} & \cdots & L_{NN} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (5)$$

where each diagonal block  $L_{ii} \in \mathbb{R}^{l_i \times l_i}$  specifies *intra-cluster* interactions, and each off-diagonal block  $L_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^{l_i \times l_j}$  with  $i \neq j$ ,  $i, j = 1, \dots, N$  specifies *inter-cluster* interactions from nodes in cluster  $\mathcal{C}_j$  to nodes in  $\mathcal{C}_i$ .

To ensure group consensus, the Laplacian  $\mathcal{L}$  is assumed to satisfy the following condition.

*Assumption 1:* Every block  $L_{ij}$  of the Laplacian  $\mathcal{L}$  defined in (5) has a constant row sum  $\beta_{ij}$ , i.e.  $L_{ij}\mathbf{1}_{l_j} = \beta_{ij}\mathbf{1}_{l_j}$ , for  $i, j = 1, \dots, N$ .

The above assumption implies that  $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}_j} w_{lk} = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}_j} w_{l'k}$  for any  $l \neq l'$  in  $\mathcal{C}_i$ , and  $i \neq j$ , i.e., the in-degrees of all nodes in a cluster with respect to another cluster are equivalent. Any clustering  $\mathcal{C}$  that renders the graph Laplacian  $\mathcal{L}$  satisfying Assumption 1 is also called an external equitable partition (EEP) of  $\mathcal{G}$  [26], [27]. It has been shown in the literature (such as [16], [17], [26]) that Assumption 1 is necessary for the *group consensus manifold*  $\{x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{nL} : x_l(t) = x_k(t), \forall l, k \in \mathcal{C}_i, i = 1, \dots, N\}$  to be invariant. An intuitive reasoning is that under this condition different agents in the same cluster will receive equivalent influence from another cluster in the group consensus manifold. Hence, Assumption 1 is also called the *inter-cluster common influence* condition in [16]–[18].

In the following presentation, two more basic assumptions are made to exclude trivial cases. One is that  $\mathcal{G}$  is at least weakly connected (i.e. contains no isolated component) so as to exclude the apparently infeasible graph topologies where agents belonging to the same cluster happen to reside in different isolated components of the network. The other assumption is that the system matrix  $A$  has at least one eigenvalue located in the closed right half-plane so as to avoid reaching trivial global consensus all the time.

### III. ACHIEVING GROUP CONSENSUS

This section will establish the conditions for ensuring group consensus for MAS (4) by bridging the connectivity of  $\mathcal{G}$ , which describes inter-agent connections, with the connectivity of its induced quotient graph  $\mathbb{G}$  w.r.t.  $\mathcal{C}$ , which describes inter-cluster interactions. The nomenclature of quotient graph follows from [26], [27] for EEPs of unweighted graphs. In the following, we give an intuitive definition for weighted graphs through construction.

*Definition 2:* Given a graph  $\mathcal{G}$  and its partition  $\{\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_N\}$  w.r.t. the clustering  $\mathcal{C}$ , the *quotient graph  $\mathbb{G}$  induced from  $\mathcal{G}$*  is constructed through the following steps:

- 1) collapsing each subgraph  $\mathcal{G}_i$  into a single node with index  $i$ ;
- 2) defining a directed edge from node  $i$  to node  $j$  in  $\mathbb{G}$  if and only if there exists at least one directed edge in  $\mathcal{G}$  pointing from a node in  $\mathcal{G}_i$  to a node in  $\mathcal{G}_j$ ;
- 3) defining the edge weight from node  $j$  to node  $i$  in  $\mathbb{G}$  as

$$\alpha_{ij} = \frac{1}{l_i} \sum_{l \in \mathcal{C}_i} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}_j} w_{lk}, i, j = 1, 2, \dots, N. \quad (6)$$

Under Assumption 1, each edge weight of  $\mathbb{G}$  will reduce to  $\alpha_{ij} = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}_j} w_{ik}$  for any  $l \in \mathcal{C}_i$  (see Fig. 1(b)). Also, each constant row sum  $\beta_{ij}$  defined in Assumption 1 can be computed by  $\beta_{ij} = -\alpha_{ij}$  for  $i \neq j$ , and  $\beta_{ii} = \sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_{ij}$ . It follows that under Assumption 1 the Laplacian of the quotient graph  $\mathbb{G}$  can be defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{G}} = [\beta_{ij}]_{i,j=1,\dots,N}. \quad (7)$$

#### A. Necessary And Sufficient Graph Topologies

For each  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ , define  $e_l(t) = x_l(t) - x_{\rho_i+1}(t)$  as the state difference between the agent  $\rho_i + 1$  in cluster  $\mathcal{C}_i$  and any other agent  $l \in \mathcal{C}_i \setminus \{\rho_i + 1\}$ . It follows from (3) that

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{e}_l(t) &= Ae_l - \delta BK \sum_{k=1}^L (\ell_{lk} - \ell_{\rho_i+1,k}) x_k(t), \\ &= Ae_l - \delta BK \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}_j} (\ell_{lk} - \ell_{\rho_i+1,k}) [x_k(t) - x_{\rho_j+1}(t)] \\ &= Ae_l - \delta BK \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}_j} (\ell_{lk} - \ell_{\rho_i+1,k}) e_k(t) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where the second equality is valid since for any  $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  and any  $x_{\rho_j+1} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}_j} (\ell_{lk} - \ell_{\rho_i+1,k}) x_{\rho_j+1} = (\sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}_j} \ell_{lk} - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}_j} \ell_{\rho_i+1,k}) x_{\rho_j+1} = 0$  due to Assumption 1. Stacking the state difference vectors  $e_l(t)$ ,  $l \in \mathcal{C}_i \setminus \{\rho_i + 1\}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$  in

$$e(t) = [e_{\rho_1+2}^T(t), \dots, e_{\rho_1+l_1}^T(t), \dots, e_{\rho_N+2}^T(t), \dots, e_{\rho_N+l_N}^T(t)]^T,$$

one can get from (8) that

$$\dot{e}(t) = (I_{L-N} \otimes A - \delta \hat{\mathcal{L}} \otimes BK)e(t), \quad (9)$$

where  $\hat{\mathcal{L}} \in \mathbb{R}^{(L-N) \times (L-N)}$  is in the following block-matrix form

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}} = [\hat{L}_{ij}]_{i,j=1,\dots,N}, \quad (10)$$

with each block  $\hat{L}_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^{(l_i-1) \times (l_j-1)}$  being defined by

$$\hat{L}_{ij} = \tilde{L}_{ij} - \mathbf{1}_{l_i-1} \gamma_{ij}^T, i, j = 1, \dots, N, \quad (11)$$

where

$$\gamma_{ij} = [\ell_{\rho_i+1, \rho_j+2}, \dots, \ell_{\rho_i+1, \rho_j+l_j}]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{l_j-1}, \quad (12)$$

$$\tilde{L}_{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} \ell_{\rho_i+2, \rho_j+2} & \cdots & \ell_{\rho_i+2, \rho_j+l_j} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \ell_{\rho_i+l_i, \rho_j+2} & \cdots & \ell_{\rho_i+l_i, \rho_j+l_j} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(l_i-1) \times (l_j-1)}. \quad (13)$$

It is clear from (9) that group consensus can be achieved for any initial state  $x(0) \in \mathbb{R}^{nL}$  if and only if  $I_{L-N} \otimes A - \delta \hat{\mathcal{L}} \otimes BK$  is Hurwitz, i.e., the state motions transversal to the group consensus manifold are stable. By using properties of Kronecker products, the stability of  $I_{L-N} \otimes A - \delta \hat{\mathcal{L}} \otimes BK$  can be ensured by the stabilities of  $A - \delta \lambda_i(\hat{\mathcal{L}})BK$  for all  $\lambda_i(\hat{\mathcal{L}}) \in \sigma(\hat{\mathcal{L}})$ . It follows that  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$  plays a key role in rendering group consensus. In the following lemma, we will show that  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$  can be decomposed from the full graph Laplacian  $\mathcal{L}$ , and its stability can be specified in terms of graph topologies.

*Lemma 2:* Under Assumption 1, all eigenvalues of  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$  have positive real parts if and only if the spanning forest of  $\mathcal{G}$  and that of the quotient graph  $\mathbb{G}$  contains equal minimum number of directed trees.

*Proof:* Defining  $\eta_{ij} = [\ell_{\rho_i+2, \rho_j+1}, \dots, \ell_{\rho_i+l_i, \rho_j+1}]^T$ , and using (12) and (13), we can represent each  $L_{ij} = [\ell_{kl}]_{k=\rho_i+1, \dots, \rho_i+l_i, l=\rho_j+1, \dots, \rho_j+l_j}$  in the following block form  $L_{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} \ell_{\rho_i+1, \rho_j+1} & \gamma_{ij}^T \\ \eta_{ij} & \tilde{L}_{ij} \end{bmatrix}$ . Define  $S_i = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \mathbf{1}_{l_i-1} & I_{l_i-1} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{l_i \times l_i}$  with inverse  $S_i^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -\mathbf{1}_{l_i-1} & I_{l_i-1} \end{bmatrix}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . Further invoking  $L_{ij}\mathbf{1}_{l_j} = \beta_{ij}\mathbf{1}_{l_j}$  from Assumption 1, one can get that  $S_i^{-1}L_{ij}S_j = \begin{bmatrix} \beta_{ij} & \gamma_{ij} \\ 0 & \hat{L}_{ij} \end{bmatrix}$ . Let  $S = \text{blkdiag}\{S_1, \dots, S_N\}$ . Then, one has the following nonsingular transformation

$$S^{-1}\mathcal{L}S = \begin{bmatrix} \beta_{11} & \gamma_{11} & \cdots & \beta_{1N} & \gamma_{1N} \\ 0 & \hat{L}_{11} & \cdots & 0 & \hat{L}_{1N} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \beta_{N1} & \gamma_{N1} & \cdots & \beta_{NN} & \gamma_{NN} \\ 0 & \hat{L}_{N1} & \cdots & 0 & \hat{L}_{NN} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (14)$$

By permutating the columns and rows of  $S^{-1}\mathcal{L}S$  in (14), one can get the following block upper-triangular matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{G}} & [\gamma_{ij}]_{i,j=1,\dots,N} \\ 0_{(L-N) \times N} & \hat{\mathcal{L}} \end{bmatrix} \quad (15)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{G}}$  is the Laplacian of the quotient graph as defined in (7), and  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$  is defined in (10). It follows that the matrix  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$  is nonsingular with all eigenvalues having positive real parts if and only if the two Laplacians  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{G}}$  have equal number of zero eigenvalues. Further using Lemma 1 (b) and (c) yields the conclusion of this lemma. ■



the corresponding Laplacian  $\mathcal{L}$  of digraph  $\mathcal{G}$  can be written into the following form:

$$\mathcal{L} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{L}_1 & & & \\ & \ddots & & \\ \mathbf{0} & & \mathbf{L}_m & \\ \mathbf{L}_{m+1,1} & \cdots & \mathbf{L}_{m+1,m} & \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}} \end{bmatrix} \quad (20)$$

where each  $\mathbf{L}_p$ ,  $p = 1, \dots, m$ , is the Laplacian associated with nodes in  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_p = \cup_{i \in \mathbb{V}_p} \mathcal{C}_i$ , and  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}$  is a square matrix associated with nodes in  $\mathcal{F} = \cup_{i \in \mathbb{F}} \mathcal{C}_i$ .

*Lemma 4:* If  $\mathcal{G}$  contains cluster spanning trees, then each  $\mathbf{L}_p$  for  $p = 1, \dots, m$  contains exactly one zero eigenvalue, and the matrix  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}$  is nonsingular with all eigenvalues having positive real parts.

*Proof:* The first half part follows immediately from Lemma 3 and Lemma 1. Since  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}$  is  $m$ -reducible,  $\mathcal{L}$  is also  $m$ -reducible and has  $m$  zero eigenvalues totally according to Proposition 1 and Lemma 1. Therefore,  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}$  must be nonsingular. ■

#### A. Consensus States with Strong Coupling Strengths

Denote  $\mathcal{R} = \cup_{p=1}^m \bar{\mathcal{C}}_p$ , and let  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{R}} = \text{blkdg}\{\mathbf{L}_1, \dots, \mathbf{L}_m\}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{R}} = [\mathbf{L}_{m+1,1}, \dots, \mathbf{L}_{m+1,m}]$ . Then (20) can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{L} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{R}} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{R}} & \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (21)$$

Similarly, the state vector  $x(t)$  is also represented as follows

$$x(t) = [x_{\mathcal{R}}^T(t), x_{\mathcal{F}}^T(t)]^T. \quad (22)$$

Then, we can derive the final states in each cluster when the overall coupling strength  $\delta$  is large enough.

*Theorem 3:* Under Assumption 1, if the underlying graph  $\mathcal{G}$  of the MAS (4) contains cluster spanning trees w.r.t.  $\mathcal{C}$ , by selecting  $K = B^T P$  and

$$\delta \geq \frac{1}{2\lambda}, \quad \lambda := \min\{\text{Re}\lambda_l(\mathcal{L}) : \lambda_l(\mathcal{L}) \neq 0, \forall l \in \mathcal{I}\}, \quad (23)$$

the state  $x(t)$  will asymptotically approach the following

$$\begin{cases} (\mathbf{1}_L \nu^T \otimes e^{At})x(0), & \text{if } \mathcal{L} \text{ is irreducible or 1-reducible} & (24a) \\ \begin{bmatrix} \Xi \otimes e^{At} \\ -\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{R}} \Xi \otimes e^{At} \end{bmatrix} x(0), & \text{if } \mathcal{L} \text{ has the form (20)} & (24b) \end{cases}$$

as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $\Xi = \text{blkdg}\{\mu_1 \nu_1^T, \dots, \mu_m \nu_m^T\}$  with  $\mu_p$  and  $\nu_p$  satisfying  $\nu_p^T \mu_p = 1$  being the right and left eigenvector of  $\mathbf{L}_p$  associated with the zero eigenvalue, respectively. In the special case that  $A = 0, B = 1, K = 1$ , i.e., single integrators,  $x(t)$  will reach (24) with  $A = 0$  for any  $\delta > 0$ .

*Proof:* We only need to prove the case that  $\mathcal{L}$  is reducible and takes the form of (20) for some  $m > 1$ . For each  $p = 1, \dots, m$ , denote  $\bar{x}_p$  as the stacked states of all agents in the union of clusters  $\bar{\mathcal{C}}_p = \cup_{i \in \mathbb{V}_p} \mathcal{C}_i$ . It follows from (4) and (20) that

$$\dot{\bar{x}}_p(t) = (I_{n_p} \otimes A - \delta \mathbf{L}_p \otimes BK) \bar{x}_p(t), \quad p = 1, \dots, m \quad (25)$$

where  $n_p$  is the dimension of  $\mathbf{L}_p$ . If  $\mathcal{G}$  contains cluster spanning trees w.r.t.  $\mathcal{C}$ , by Lemma 4,  $\mathbf{L}_p$  has a unique zero eigenvalue  $\lambda_1(\mathbf{L}_p) = 0$ , and other eigenvalues satisfy  $\min_{l_p \neq 1} \text{Re}\lambda_{l_p}(\mathbf{L}_p) \geq \lambda$ . By (23), there holds  $\delta \geq 1/\min_{l_p \neq 1} 2\text{Re}\lambda_{l_p}(\mathbf{L}_p)$ . Going through a similar algebra as in (18) yields that each  $A - \lambda_{l_p}(\mathbf{L}_p)BK, l_p \neq 1$  is Hurwitz. Hence, one can use methods in Theorem 2 of [6] to solve (25) and get that for  $p = 1, \dots, m$ ,

$$\bar{x}_p(t) \rightarrow (\mu_p \nu_p^T \otimes e^{At}) \bar{x}_p(0), \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty. \quad (26)$$

It then follows from the definition of  $\mathcal{R}$  and (22) that

$$x_{\mathcal{R}}(t) \rightarrow (\Xi \otimes e^{At}) x_{\mathcal{R}}(0), \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty. \quad (27)$$

To derive the state of  $x_{\mathcal{F}}(t)$  when  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , we define the following two variables following (21) and (22):

$$\begin{bmatrix} \zeta \\ \xi \end{bmatrix} = (\mathcal{L} \otimes I_n) x = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{R}} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{R}} & \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_{\mathcal{R}} \\ x_{\mathcal{F}} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (28)$$

By (27) and using the fact  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{R}} \Xi = 0$ , one has that

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta(t) &= (\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{R}} \otimes I_n) x_{\mathcal{R}} \\ &\rightarrow (\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{R}} \otimes I_n) (\Xi \otimes e^{At}) x_{\mathcal{R}}(0) = (\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{R}} \Xi \otimes e^{At}) x_{\mathcal{R}}(0) \\ &= 0, \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Using (4) and (28), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} \dot{\zeta} \\ \dot{\xi} \end{bmatrix} &= (\mathcal{L} \otimes I_n) \dot{x} = (\mathcal{L} \otimes I_n) (I_L \otimes A - \delta \mathcal{L} \otimes BK) x(t) \\ &= (I_L \otimes A - \delta \mathcal{L} \otimes BK) \begin{bmatrix} \zeta \\ \xi \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

It follows from (21) and (22) that

$$\dot{\xi} = (I \otimes A - \delta \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}} \otimes BK) \xi - (\delta \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{R}} \otimes BK) \zeta. \quad (31)$$

By Lemma 4, there holds  $\text{Re}\lambda_l(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}) > 0, \forall l$ . It follows that  $\lambda \leq \min_l \text{Re}\lambda_l(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}})$ , which combining (23) implies that  $\delta \geq 1/\min_l 2\text{Re}\lambda_l(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}})$ . Then, through a similar algebra as in (18), one can get that  $A - \delta \lambda_l(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}})BK = A - \delta \lambda_l(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}})BB^T P$  is Hurwitz for each  $\lambda_l(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}) \in \sigma(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}})$ . That is,  $I \otimes A - \delta \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}} \otimes BK$  is Hurwitz. Next, solving (31) with (29), one can obtain that  $\xi(t)$  approaches zero asymptotically. Since  $\xi = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{R}} x_{\mathcal{R}} + \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}} x_{\mathcal{F}}$  by (28), it then follows from (27) that

$$\begin{aligned} x_{\mathcal{F}}(t) &\rightarrow -(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{R}} \otimes I_n) x_{\mathcal{R}}(t) \\ &\rightarrow -(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{R}} \Xi \otimes e^{At}) x_{\mathcal{R}}(0), \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Combining (27) and (32) yields the state of  $x(t)$  in (24b) when  $\mathcal{L}$  takes the form (20). For the case that  $A = 0, B = 1, K = 1$ , it is straightforward to check that the above proofs are valid for any  $\delta > 0$ . This completes the proof. ■

*Remark 5:* As seen from (26), the clusters  $\mathcal{C}_i$ 's with  $i \in \mathbb{V}_p$  eventually achieve a common consensus state; for clusters in  $\mathcal{F}$ , note from (32) that their states  $x_{\mathcal{F}}(t)$  eventually enter into the convex hull of  $x_{\mathcal{R}}(t)$ . To see this, by  $[\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{R}} \ \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}] \mathbf{1}_L = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{R}} \mathbf{1}_{|\mathcal{R}|} + \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}} \mathbf{1}_{|\mathcal{F}|} = \mathbf{0}$ , one has  $-\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{R}} \mathbf{1}_{|\mathcal{R}|} = \mathbf{1}_{|\mathcal{F}|}$  where  $-\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{R}}$  is a nonnegative matrix and  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1}$  is also a nonnegative matrix since  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}$  is a nonsingular  $M$ -matrix [32]. Hence,  $-\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}}^{-1} \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{F}\mathcal{R}}$  is row stochastic. This group consensus pattern is consistent with that of MASs described by single integrators (i.e.,  $A = 0, B = 1$ ) under unweighted digraphs [25]. However, for a nontrivial system matrix  $A$ , the occurrence of the pattern (24) also relies on a large enough coupling strength  $\delta$ , e.g., that satisfying (23). A counterexample is when  $\delta$  is decreased such that  $\frac{1}{\min 2\text{Re}\lambda(\mathcal{L})} \leq \delta < \frac{1}{2\lambda}$ , the generic MAS (4) can still achieve group consensus by Theorem 1 but there is no guarantee for  $x_{\mathcal{F}}(t)$  to enter the convex hull of  $x_{\mathcal{R}}(t)$  as illustrated by a simulation example in the next subsection. This is because the achieved multiple consensus states don't converge due to unstable modes of  $A$ , and inter-cluster coupling strengths are not strong enough to further synchronize them.

Further notice that (24) contains the minimum number of distinct consensus states that can persist under a directed graph, i.e., the consensus states of different clusters won't be merged further by increasing the overall coupling strength  $\delta$ . Particularly if the underlying graph can be spanned by one directed tree, all systems' states will merge into one consensus state when  $\delta$  is large enough, i.e., reach global consensus, as seen from (24a). This phenomenon also appears in connected undirected networks [26]–[28]. Hence, it is trivial to see that Theorem 3 includes global consensus as a special case.

## B. Simulation Example

To illustrate the consensus states, we present a simulation example for an MAS consisting of 10 agents that belong to 5 clusters  $\mathcal{C}_1 = \{1, 2\}$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_2 = \{3, 4\}$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_3 = \{5, 6\}$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_4 = \{7, 8\}$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_5 = \{9, 10\}$ . The underlying graph  $\mathcal{G}$  is given in Fig. 2, which contains cluster spanning trees w.r.t. the clustering  $\mathcal{C} = \{\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2, \mathcal{C}_3, \mathcal{C}_4, \mathcal{C}_5\}$ , and its Laplacian  $\mathcal{L}$  satisfies Assumption 1. The dynamics of the agents are described by harmonic oscillators, that is, for  $i = 1, \dots, 10$ ,

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_{1l}(t) = x_{2l}(t) & (33a) \\ \dot{x}_{2l}(t) = -x_{1l}(t) + u_l(t). & (33b) \end{cases}$$

Selecting  $Q = I$ , and solving the algebraic Riccati equation (16), we obtain the controller gain  $K = B^T P = [0.4142, 1.3522]$ .

It is computed that  $\min \operatorname{Re} \lambda(\hat{\mathcal{L}}) = 1.09 > 0$  and  $\lambda = 0.2$ . Hence, we first set  $\delta = 1/(2\lambda) = 2.5$  according to (23) in Theorem 3. With randomly generated initial states, the simulated trajectories of the 10 agents are shown in Fig. 3, in which the states of agents form three groups in such a way that clusters  $\mathcal{C}_1$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_2$ , and  $\mathcal{C}_4$  merge into one state, while  $\mathcal{C}_3$  and  $\mathcal{C}_5$  each achieves a distinct consensus state. Note also that the consensus states of  $\mathcal{C}_5$  lie in between the states of clusters  $\mathcal{C}_1$  and  $\mathcal{C}_3$  when  $t$  is large enough. Next, we use a smaller value for  $\delta$  by setting  $\delta = 1/\min 2\operatorname{Re} \lambda(\hat{\mathcal{L}}) = 0.4587$  according to (17). Simulation results in Fig. 4 show that five groups of distinct states are formed eventually complying with the partition  $\mathcal{C}$ , i.e., the success of achieving group consensus, but no evident relations can be observed for the consensus states in different clusters.




Fig. 2. The graph  $\mathcal{G}$  (on the left) and its quotient graph  $\mathbb{G}$  (on the right).  $\mathcal{G}$  consists of five clusters of nodes with all intra-cluster edge weights equal to 1 and all inter-cluster edge weights equal to 0.1.




Fig. 3. The 10 agents achieve group consensus and form 3 distinct consensus states when  $\delta = 1/2\lambda$ .

## V. CONCLUSIONS

We have investigated the group consensus problem for generic linear multi-agent systems under nonnegative directed graphs. A




Fig. 4. The 10 agents achieve group consensus and form 5 distinct consensus states when  $\delta = 1/\min 2\operatorname{Re} \lambda(\hat{\mathcal{L}}) < 1/2\lambda$ .

necessary and sufficient condition in terms of the topologies of the underlying digraph and its quotient graph is presented. This condition is shown to be equivalent to an existing condition commonly used for undirected graph. Thus, a unified understanding of the graph topologies for ensuring group consensus is established. The consensus states in different clusters are also presented explicitly when the overall coupling of the underlying graph is strong enough, thanks to the identical individual linear system models. It is shown by both theoretical analysis and simulation examples that the coupling strengths for achieving group consensus and for realizing the minimum number of distinct consensus states could be different. Generally, the final group consensus pattern is an outcome of the interplay of the agents' individual dynamics, the underlying graph topology and the overall coupling strength  $\delta$ , and thus is hard if not impossible to allow an accurate or explicit specification. For example, the group consensus pattern in (24) or [25] for identical linear systems may not appear at all in MASs with nonidentical linear dynamics in different clusters as observed in the simulation results of our previous work [21]. Although existing works such as [22]–[24], [26] have exemplified the occurrence of different patterns in coupled nonlinear oscillators via simulations, a specific characterization remains a challenging task that needs further efforts. Another interesting future work is to cope with noncooperative agents with generic linear dynamics or nonlinear dynamics by using resilient cluster censoring strategies as proposed in a recent paper [33] for scalar systems, in which the inter-cluster common influence condition is released.

## APPENDIX A

In order to prove Lemma 3 and Proposition 1, we need the following preliminary results.

*Lemma 5:* If  $\mathcal{G}$  contains a directed spanning tree (is strongly connected), then  $\mathbb{G}$  also contains one (is strongly connected).

*Lemma 6:* Under Assumption 1, if  $\mathbb{G}$  has a directed spanning tree and its root node is associated with a subgraph  $\mathcal{G}_i$  of  $\mathcal{G}$  that has a directed spanning tree, then  $\mathcal{G}$  has a directed spanning tree.

*Proof:* For the spanning tree of  $\mathbb{G}$ , suppose without loss of generality that its root node is associated with subgraph  $\mathcal{G}_1$  in  $\mathcal{G}$ . Note that each directed link of the spanning tree of  $\mathbb{G}$  is associated with inter-cluster links in  $\mathcal{G}$  pointing from one subgraph to another. Hence, every subgraph  $\mathcal{G}_i$ ,  $i \neq 1$  is pointed by inter-cluster links originating from some other subgraph. Moreover, every node in each  $\mathcal{G}_i$ ,  $i \neq 1$  is pointed by at least one inter-cluster link due to Assumption 1. Hence,



there exists a path from the subgraph  $\mathcal{G}_1$  to all nodes outside  $\mathcal{G}_1$  via inter-cluster links that are associated with the links of the spanning tree of  $\mathbb{G}$ . Note that this path can be an extension of a path in the spanning tree of  $\mathcal{G}_1$ . It follows that  $\mathcal{G}$  contains a directed spanning tree with its root being the root of the spanning tree of  $\mathcal{G}_1$ . ■

*Lemma 7:* Under Assumption 1, if  $\mathbb{G}$  is strongly connected and there exists a subgraph  $\mathcal{G}_i$  of  $\mathcal{G}$  whose nodes can be spanned by a directed tree in  $\mathcal{G}$ , then  $\mathcal{G}$  contains a directed spanning tree.

*Proof:* The strong connectivity of  $\mathbb{G}$  implies that every node in each subgraph  $\mathcal{G}_j$ ,  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  of  $\mathcal{G}$  is pointed by inter-cluster links originating from at least one other subgraph  $\mathcal{G}_{j'}$ ,  $j' \neq j$ . Using similar arguments as those in the proof of Lemma 6, one sees that the directed tree that spans  $\mathcal{G}_i$  can be expanded to reach all nodes in  $\mathcal{G}$  through inter-cluster links. ■

### A. Proof of Lemma 3

*Proof:* The necessity part follows from Lemma 6 by using the definitions of cluster spanning trees and the set  $\mathbb{V}_p$ . For the sufficiency part, denote by  $\mathcal{T}_p$  for  $p = 1, \dots, m$  the directed spanning tree that contains all nodes in  $\{\mathcal{G}_i | i \in \mathbb{V}_p\}$ . Note that  $\mathbb{V}_p$  shares the same root node with the reach  $\mathbb{R}_p$ . The if part of this lemma implies that the subgraph  $\mathcal{G}_i$  associated with this root node of  $\mathbb{R}_p$  is spanned by a component of the directed tree  $\mathcal{T}_p$ . It follows from Lemma 6 that any cluster of nodes  $\mathcal{C}_i$  with  $i \in \mathbb{R}_p$  can be spanned by a directed tree (which contains  $\mathcal{T}_p$ ). The proof is completed when noting that the reaches  $\mathbb{R}_1, \dots, \mathbb{R}_m$  contain the labels of all clusters. ■

### B. Proof of Proposition 1

*Proof:* Suppose the minimum number of directed trees which together span  $\mathbb{G}$  is  $m$ . Then the proof of this proposition is converted to showing the equivalence of the following two statements:

- (a)  $\mathcal{G}$  contains cluster spanning trees w.r.t.  $\mathcal{C}$ .
- (b) the minimum number of directed trees which together span  $\mathcal{G}$  is  $m$ .

For  $m = 1$ , this equivalence has been established by combing Lemma 5 to Lemma 7. For  $1 < m < N$ , considering the subset of subgraphs in  $\{\mathcal{G}_i | i \in \cup_{p=1}^m \mathbb{V}_p\}$ , one needs at least  $m$  directed trees in order to span all of the nodes therein (at least one directed spanning tree for each set of subgraphs  $\{\mathcal{G}_i | i \in \mathbb{V}_p\}$ ).

(a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b): By the necessity part of Lemma 3 and its proof,  $m$  is a feasible number of directed spanning trees that together span  $\mathcal{G}$ . Hence, statement (b) holds.

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (a): If (a) does not hold, then according to Lemma 3 there exists a  $p^* \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  such that the nodes of  $\{\mathcal{G}_i | i \in \mathbb{V}_{p^*}\}$  cannot be spanned by any single tree. It follows that more than  $m$  directed trees are needed in order to span all of the nodes in  $\{\mathcal{G}_i | i \in \cup_{p=1}^m \mathbb{V}_p\}$ , i.e., the negation of statement (b) is true. Hence, (b)  $\Rightarrow$  (a) holds. ■

## REFERENCES

- [1] F. Chen and W. Ren, "On the control of multi-agent systems: A survey," *Found. Trends Inf. Retr.*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 339–499, 2019.
- [2] L. Li, A. Scaglione, A. Swami, and Q. Zhao, "Consensus, polarization and clustering of opinions in social networks," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 31, no. 6, pp. 1072–1083, 2013.
- [3] W.-X. Qin and G. Chen, "Coupling schemes for cluster synchronization in coupled Josephson equations," *Phys. D*, vol. 197, no. 3, pp. 375–391, 2004.
- [4] X. Ge, Q. L. Han, and X. M. Zhang, "Achieving cluster formation of multi-agent systems under aperiodic sampling and communication delays," *IEEE Ind. Electron. Mag.*, vol. 65, no. 4, pp. 3417–3426, 2018.
- [5] C.-Q. Ma and J.-F. Zhang, "Necessary and sufficient conditions for consensusability of linear multi-agent systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 55, no. 5, pp. 1263–1268, May 2010.
- [6] Z. Li, Z. Duan, G. Chen, and L. Huang, "Consensus of multiagent systems and synchronization of complex networks: a unified viewpoint," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. I, Reg. Papers*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 213–224, 2010.
- [7] W. Wu, W. Zhou, and T. Chen, "Cluster synchronization of linearly coupled complex networks under pinning control," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. I, Reg. Papers*, vol. 56, no. 4, pp. 829–839, 2009.
- [8] J. Yu and L. Wang, "Group consensus in multi-agent systems with switching topologies and communication delays," *Syst. Control Lett.*, vol. 59, no. 6, pp. 340–348, 2010.
- [9] W. Xia and M. Cao, "Clustering in diffusively coupled networks," *Automatica*, vol. 47, no. 11, pp. 2395–2405, 2011.
- [10] J. Qin and C. Yu, "Cluster consensus control of generic linear multi-agent systems under directed topology with acyclic partition," *Automatica*, vol. 49, no. 9, pp. 2898 – 2905, 2013.
- [11] C. Yu, J. Qin, and H. Gao, "Cluster synchronization in directed networks of partial-state coupled linear systems under pinning control," *Automatica*, vol. 50, no. 9, pp. 2341 – 2349, 2014.
- [12] J. Qin, C. Yu, and B. D. Anderson, "On leaderless and leader-following consensus for interacting clusters of second-order multi-agent systems," *Automatica*, vol. 74, pp. 214 – 221, 2016.
- [13] J. Qin, Q. Ma, H. Gao, Y. Shi, and Y. Kang, "On group synchronization for interacting clusters of heterogeneous systems," *IEEE Trans. Cybern.*, vol. 47, no. 12, pp. 4122–4133, 2017.
- [14] Q. Ma, J. Qin, W. X. Zheng, and Y. Kang, "Output group synchronization for heterogeneous linear systems under internal model principle," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst. I, Reg. Papers*, vol. 65, no. 5, pp. 1684–1695, 2018.
- [15] Z. Liu, W. S. Wong, and H. Cheng, "Cluster synchronization of coupled systems with nonidentical linear dynamics," *Int. J. Robust Nonlinear Control*, vol. 27, no. 9, pp. 1462–1479, 2017.
- [16] W. Lu, B. Liu, and T. Chen, "Cluster synchronization in networks of coupled nonidentical dynamical systems," *Chaos*, vol. 20, no. 1, p. 013120, 2010.
- [17] Y. Han, W. Lu, and T. Chen, "Cluster consensus in discrete-time networks of multiagents with inter-cluster nonidentical inputs," *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 566–578, 2013.
- [18] —, "Achieving cluster consensus in continuous-time networks of multi-agents with inter-cluster non-identical inputs," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 60, no. 3, pp. 793–798, 2015.
- [19] Y. Shang, "A combinatorial necessary and sufficient condition for cluster consensus," *Neurocomputing*, vol. 216, pp. 611–616, 2016.
- [20] Z. Liu, W. S. Wong, and H. Cheng, "Cluster synchronization of coupled linear systems under directed nonnegative graphs," in *Proc. Chin. Control Conf. (CCC)*, Chengdu, China, Jul. 27–29, 2016, pp. 8259–8263.
- [21] —, "Cluster synchronization of inter-cluster nonidentical linear systems under directed nonnegative graphs," in *Proc. IEEE Conf. Decis. Control (CDC)*, Las Vegas, USA, Dec. 12–14, 2016, pp. 2626–2631.
- [22] L. M. Pecora, F. Sorrentino, A. M. Hagerstrom, et al., "Cluster synchronization and isolated desynchronization in complex networks with symmetries," *Nat. Commun.*, vol. 5, no. 4079, pp. 1767–1773, 2014.
- [23] F. Sorrentino, L. M. Pecora, A. M. Hagerstrom, et al., "Complete characterization of the stability of cluster synchronization in complex dynamical networks," *Sci. Adv.*, vol. 2, p. e1501737, 2016.
- [24] I. Klickstein, L. M. Pecora, and F. Sorrentino, "Symmetry induced group consensus," *Chaos*, vol. 29, no. 7, p. 073101, 2019.
- [25] S. Monaco and L. R. Celis, "On multi-consensus and almost equitable graph partitions," *Automatica*, vol. 103, pp. 53–61, 2019.
- [26] M. Schaub, N. O'Clery, Y. Billeh, J.-C. Delvenne, R. Lambiotte, and M. Barahona, "Graph partitions and cluster synchronization in networks of oscillators," *Chaos*, vol. 26, no. 9, p. 094821, 2016.
- [27] N. O'Clery, Y. Yuan, G.-B. Stan, and M. Barahona, "Observability and coarse graining of consensus dynamics through the external equitable partition," *Phys. Rev. E*, vol. 88, no. 4, p. 042805, 2013.
- [28] L. V. Gambuzza and M. Frasca, "A criterion for stability of cluster synchronization in networks with external equitable partitions" *Automatica*, vol. 100, pp. 212–218, 2019.
- [29] —, "Distributed control of multi-consensus," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, doi: 10.1109/TAC.2020.3006820.
- [30] J. S. Caughman, and J. J. P. Veerman, "Kernels of directed graph Laplacians," *Electron. J. Comb.*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 1–8, 2006.
- [31] C. W. Wu, *Synchronization in complex networks of nonlinear dynamical systems*. Singapore: World Scientific, 2007.
- [32] R. J. Plemmons, "M-matrix characterizations. I – nonsingular M-matrices," *Linear Algebra Appl.*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 175–188, 1977.
- [33] Y. Shang, "Resilient cluster consensus of multiagent systems," *IEEE Trans. Syst., Man, Cybern., Syst.*, doi: 10.1109/TSMC.2020.2997855