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Abstract—We consider the problem of distributed analysis and control synthesis to verify and ensure properties like stability and dissipativity of a large-scale networked system comprised of linear subsystems interconnected in an arbitrary topology. In particular, we design systematic networked system analysis and control synthesis processes that can be executed in a distributed manner at the subsystem level with minimal information sharing among the subsystems. Compared to a recent work on the same topic, we consider a substantially more generalized problem setup and develop distributed processes to verify and ensure a broader range of networked system properties. We also show that optimizing subsystems’ indexing scheme used in such distributed processes can substantially reduce the required information-sharing sessions between subsystems. Moreover, the proposed networked system analysis and control synthesis processes are compositional and thus allow them to conveniently and efficiently handle situations where new subsystems are being added to an existing network. We also provide significant insights into our approach so that it can be quickly adopted to verify and ensure properties beyond the stability and dissipativity of networked systems. Finally, we provide several simulation results to demonstrate the proposed distributed analysis and control synthesis processes.

I. INTRODUCTION

Emerging applications in infrastructure networks have renewed the attention towards analysis and control of large-scale networked systems comprised of dynamically coupled subsystems [1], [2]. For example, in vehicular networks, a group of autonomous vehicles can co-ordinate with each other to maintain a particular formation that leads to saving energy as well as reducing congestion and improving safety in the transportation infrastructure [3], [4]. A similar application of networked systems is in power-grids where the network should be constantly analyzed and controlled with the penetration of highly varying renewable energy sources and smart loads [5], [6].

Many distributed control solutions have already been proposed in the literature concerning such large-scale networked dynamical systems to enforce stability and optimize various performance objectives of interest [7]–[9]. These solutions synthesize local (subsystem-level) controllers that only require the state information of a subset of other subsystems in the network to operate. However, many of such distributed control solutions assume the existence of a central entity with the knowledge of the entire networked system to execute the control synthesis process in a centralized manner. Inherently, such a centralized setup has several disadvantages: (i) feasibility, privacy and security concerns related to collecting all subsystem information at a centralized entity, and (ii) having to re-evaluate the entire control synthesis when new subsystems are added (or removed) from the network.

To address these limitations, several distributed control synthesis approaches have also been proposed in the literature. In such methods, controllers are derived locally at subsystems without explicit knowledge of the dynamics of the other subsystems. As pointed out in [1], distributed control synthesis approaches can be categorized into three groups: (i) Approaches that exploit/induce weak coupling between subsystems [10], [11]; (ii) Hierarchical approaches that compute (in a centralized manner) and enforce additional conditions on local control synthesis [12], [13]; (iii) Approaches that decompose the control synthesis process using numerical techniques such as methods of multipliers and Sylvester’s criterion [1], [2], [14], [15]. In many networked systems of interest, assuming or enforcing weak coupling among subsystems is not practical [2]. Moreover, existing hierarchical approaches are computationally intensive and still involve a considerable centralized component. Taking these limitations into account, the recent work in [1], [2] have developed a distributed analysis and control synthesis framework for networked dynamical systems inspired by Sylvester’s criterion.

In particular, both [1], [2] assume each subsystem dynamics to be linear and coupled with a subset of neighboring subsystems (determined by the network topology) through their state values. In [2], the network topology is assumed to be cascaded bi-directional, and distributed analysis and control synthesis techniques have been developed to verify and ensure the passivity of the networked system. This approach is then further extended in [1] for arbitrary bi-directional network topologies to verify and ensure a general quadratic dissipativity property of the networked system.

a) Contributions: In this paper, we continue the above line of research and further generalize the distributed analysis and control synthesis approaches proposed in [1]. Compared to [1], our main contributions are as follows: (i) In the networked system, we now allow each subsystem to be coupled with its neighbors not only through the state values but also through the input and disturbance values; (ii) We relax the bi-directionality assumption made on the network topology; (iii) The proposed distributed analysis and control synthesis techniques can verify and ensure an even more general quadratic dissipativity property as well as the global exponential stability property of a networked system; (iv) We
consider the effect of indexing (i.e., the sequence in which a distributed process is to be executed) on the required total communications among the subsystems, and derive a cost function that can be optimized to avoid some costly inter-subsystem communications; (V) We also provide significant insights into our approach so that it may be quickly adopted to verify and ensure properties beyond the stability and dissipativity of networked systems.

**b) Organization:** This paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we summarize some useful preliminary theoretical results related to stability and dissipativity. The construction of the considered networked system and the problem formulation are provided in Section III. In Section IV, we define the concept of “network matrices” and discuss several related theoretical results along with a systematic algorithm to analyze their positive-definiteness. Subsequently, in Section V, we provide the details of the proposed distributed analysis and local control synthesis processes for networked systems. Finally, Section VI discusses several simulation formulation are provided in Section III. In Section IV, we consider the effect of indexing (i.e., the sequence in which a distributed process is to be executed) on the required total communications among the subsystems, and derive a cost function that can be optimized to avoid some costly inter-subsystem communications; (V) We also provide significant insights into our approach so that it may be quickly adopted to verify and ensure properties beyond the stability and dissipativity of networked systems.

In this paper, we mainly focus on analyzing stability and dissipativity properties of a large-scale networked system and enforcing such properties (when they are lacking) via state and output feedback. Therefore, in this section, we briefly introduce several related stability and dissipativity concepts.

Consider the standard continuous-time linear time invariant (LTI) system given by

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{x}(t) &= Ax(t) + Bu(t), \\
y(t) &= Cx(t) + Du(t),
\end{align*}
\]

where \( x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n, u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^p \) and \( y(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m \) respectively represents the state, input and output at time \( t \in \mathbb{R}_0^+ \).

**a) Stability:** A well-known sufficient condition for the stability of system (1) is given in the following proposition in the form of a linear matrix inequality (LMI).

**Proposition 1:** [16] The dynamical system (1) is globally uniformly (exponentially) stable if there exists a matrix \( P = P^\top > 0 \) such that

\[
-A^\top P - PA \geq 0 \quad (-A^\top P - PA > 0).
\]

In the interest of brevity, we omit providing standard definitions of uniform and exponential stability which can be found in [16], [17]. In the remainder of this paper, by “stability,” we simply refer to the global exponential stability.

**b) \((Q,S,R)\)-Dissipativity:** Similar to the stability, dissipativity is also an important property of dynamic systems that has many uses [18]. In this paper, we particularly consider the quadratic dissipativity property called \((Q,S,R)\)-dissipativity [19] defined below.

**Definition 1:** [19] The dynamical system (1) is said to be \((Q,S,R)\)-dissipative from \( u(t) \) to \( y(t) \), if there exists a positive definite function \( V(x) : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \) called the storage function, such that for all \( t_1 \geq t_0 \geq 0, x(t_0) \in \mathbb{R}^n \) and \( u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m \), the inequality

\[
V(x(t_1)) - V(x(t_0)) \leq \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \begin{bmatrix} y(t) \\ u(t) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} Q & S \\ S^\top & R \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y(t) \\ u(t) \end{bmatrix} dt,
\]

holds, where \( Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}, S \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \) and \( R \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p} \) are given matrices.

Analyzing and enforcing (if requires) this \((Q,S,R)\)-dissipativity property on large-scale networked systems is a main objective in this paper because through appropriate choices of \( Q, S \) and \( R \) matrices, it can capture a wide range of dynamical properties of interest as summarized in the following remark.

**Remark 1:** [19] The dynamical system (1) satisfying Def.1 is

1) is passive iff \( Q = 0, S = \frac{1}{2}I, R = 0; \)
2) is strictly input passive iff \( Q = 0, S = \frac{1}{2}I, R = -\nu I \)
3) where \( \nu > 0 \) (\( \nu \) is an input feedforward passivity index);
4) is strictly output passive iff \( Q = -\rho I, S = \frac{1}{2}I, R = 0 \)
5) is strictly passive iff \( Q = -\rho I, S = \frac{1}{2}I, R = -\nu I \)
6) is sector bounded iff \( Q = -\frac{1}{2}I, S = 0, R = -\gamma I \)

where \( \gamma \geq 0 \) (\( \gamma \) is an \( L_2\)-gain of the system);

where \( a, b \in \mathbb{R} \) (\( a, b \) are sector bound parameters).

In parallel to Prop. 1, a necessary and sufficient condition for the \((Q,S,R)\)-dissipativity of system (1) is given in the following proposition, again in the form of an LMI.

**Proposition 2:** [19] The dynamical system (1) is \((Q,S,R)\)-dissipative iff there exists a matrix \( P = P^\top > 0 \) such that

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
-A^\top P - PA + \hat{Q} \\
-PB + \hat{S}
\end{bmatrix}^\top R \geq 0,
\]

where \( \hat{Q} = C^\top QC, \hat{S} = C^\top S + C^\top QD, R = D^\top QD + (D^\top S + S^\top D) + R \).

It is important to point out that LMIs in (2) and (3) are called “linear” as they contain linear terms with respect to the design variable (matrix) \( P \). As pointed out in [20], such LMIs can be solved using standard convex optimization techniques.

**III. THE NETWORKED SYSTEM**

In this section, we provide the details of the considered networked system and the problem formulation.
a) **Subsystems:** We consider a networked dynamical system $\mathcal{G}_N$ comprised of $N$ interconnected subsystems denoted as $\{\Sigma_i : i \in \mathbb{N}_N\}$. The dynamics of the $i$th subsystem $\Sigma_i, i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ are given by

$$\dot{x}_i(t) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}_i} A_{ij} x_j(t) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}_i} B_{ij} u_j(t) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}_i} E_{ij} w_j(t),$$

$$y_i(t) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}_i} C_{ij} x_j(t) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}_i} D_{ij} u_j(t) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{E}_i} F_{ij} w_j(t), \quad (4a)$$

where $x_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}, u_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^p, w_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $y_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{m_i}$ respectively represents the state, input, disturbance and output specific to the subsystems $\Sigma_i$ at time $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.

b) **Neighbors:** In $[1]$, note that $\mathcal{E}_i \triangleq \mathcal{E}_i \cup \{i\}$ where $\mathcal{E}_i \subset \mathbb{N}_N$ is the set of “in-neighbors” of the subsystem $\Sigma_i$. Formally, any subsystem $\Sigma_j$ is an “in-neighbor” of subsystem $\Sigma_i$ (i.e., $j \in \mathcal{E}_i$) if and only if $j \neq i$ and matrices $A_{ij}, B_{ij}, C_{ij}, D_{ij}, E_{ij}, F_{ij}$ in $[4]$ are not all zero matrices.

As opposed to the said set of in-neighbors, we also define a set of “out-neighbors” for the subsystem $\Sigma_i$ as $\mathcal{F}_i \triangleq \{j : j \in \mathbb{N}_N, \mathcal{E}_j \ni i\}$. In other words, any subsystem $\Sigma_j$ is an “out-neighbor” of subsystem $\Sigma_i$ (i.e., $j \in \mathcal{F}_i$) if and only if $j \neq i$ and matrices $A_{ij}, B_{ji}, C_{ji}, D_{ji}, E_{ji}, F_{ji}$ (in $[4]$ written for subsystem $\Sigma_j$) are not all zero matrices. Similar to before, we also denote $\mathcal{F}_i \triangleq \mathcal{F}_i \cup \{i\}$.

It is worth pointing out that here we do not constrain ourselves to bi-directional network topologies where $\mathcal{E}_i \equiv \mathcal{F}_i, \forall i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ as in $[1]$ or to cascaded network topologies where $\mathcal{E}_i \equiv \mathcal{F}_i = \{i-1, i+1\} \cap \mathbb{N}_N, \forall i \in \mathbb{N}_N$ as in $[2]$. Moreover, it is evident from $[4]$ that here we consider a more general form of a networked dynamical system as opposed to $[1]$ and $[2]$ where coupling between any two subsystems $\Sigma_i$ and $\Sigma_j$ was enabled only through the state variables $x_i, x_j$ (i.e., via matrices $A_{ij}, A_{ji}$ in $[4]$).

c) **Networked System:** By stating $[4]$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$, we can get the dynamics of the networked system $\mathcal{G}_N$ as

$$\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Bu(t) + Ew(t),$$

$$y(t) = Cx(t) + Du(t) + Fw(t), \quad (5a)$$

where $A = [A_{ij}]_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}_N}, B = [B_{ij}]_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}_N}, E = [E_{ij}]_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}_N}, C = [C_{ij}]_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}_N}, D = [D_{ij}]_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}_N}$ and $F = [F_{ij}]_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}_N}$ are all $N \times N$ block matrices, and $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n, u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^p, w(t) \in \mathbb{R}^q$ and $y(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ (with $n = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}_N} n_i, p = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}_N} p_i, q = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}_N} q_i$ and $m = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}_N} m_i$) are all $N \times 1$ block matrices respectively representing the networked system’s state, input, disturbance and output at time $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.

d) **Objective:** Note that the form of the networked system $[5]$ is similar to the general LTI system $[1]$ considered in Sec. II. Therefore, the LMI conditions discussed for the stability and $(Q,S,R)$-dissipativity in Props. $[1]$ and $[2]$ are directly applicable for the networked system $[5]$. For example, based on Prop. $[1]$ the networked system $[5]$ is globally exponentially stable if there exists a matrix $P = P^\top > 0$ such that $-A^TP - PA > 0$, where now $A = [A_{ij}]_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}_N}$ is a block matrix with a particular structure determined by the network topology (e.g., $A_{ij} = 0$ if $j \notin \mathcal{E}_i$).

Intuitively, verifying/enforcing such LMI conditions requires the knowledge of the complete networked system and thus calls for a centralized entity. Moreover, if we introduce new subsystems into the networked system, the complete verification/enforcement process may have to be repeated. To address these challenges, we make the objective of this paper to design a systematic decentralized and compositional approach to verify/enforce different LMI conditions of interest (corresponding to different properties of interest and possibly not limiting to $[2]$ and $[3]$), for the networked system $[5]$.

Towards this goal, a critical feature that we will exploit is that LMI conditions of interest now involve matrices of a particular structure determined by the network topology (as also pointed out earlier). The next section of the paper focuses on such network-related matrices (which we will define as “network matrices”) and derives a decentralized and compositional test criterion to evaluate their positive definiteness. As we will see in the subsequent section (Sec. IV), such a test criterion can effortlessly be adopted to verify/enforce LMI conditions for networked systems in a decentralized and compositional manner.

IV. **Positive Definiteness in Networked Systems**

As mentioned above, in this section, we establish several theoretical and algorithmic results regarding evaluating positive definiteness of matrices of interest.

da) **Network Matrices:** We start by defining a class of matrices we named “network matrices,” that corresponds to a given networked system topology (e.g., $\mathcal{G}_N$ in Fig. $1$).

**Definition 2:** Given a networked dynamical system $\mathcal{G}_n, n \in \mathbb{N}$, any $n \times n$ block matrix $\Theta = [\Theta_{ij}]_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}_n}$ is a network matrix if: (i) any information specific to the subsystem $i$ is embedded only in its $i$th row or column, and (ii) $j \notin \mathcal{E}_i$ and $j \notin \mathcal{F}_i$ imply $\Theta_{ij} = \Theta_{ji} = 0$ for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}_n$.

According to this definition, note that all the $N \times N$ block matrices $A, B, C, D, E$ and $F$ in $[5]$ are network matrices of the considered networked dynamical system $\mathcal{G}_N$. Note also that any $n \times n$ block diagonal matrix will be a network matrix of any arbitrary network with $n \in \mathbb{N}$ subsystems. Several more interesting and useful properties of such network matrices are given in the following lemma.

**Lemma 1:** Given a networked dynamical system $\mathcal{G}_n, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and a few corresponding block network matrices $\Theta, \Phi, \Psi$ and $\Gamma$ (with appropriate block structures):

1) $\Theta^\top, \alpha \Theta + \beta \Phi$ are network matrices for any $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$. Fig. 1: An example networked dynamical system $\mathcal{G}_N$
2) $\Phi \Theta$, $\Theta \Phi$ are network matrices whenever $\Phi$ or $\Theta$ is a block diagonal network matrix.
3) $\Phi \Theta P^T$ is a network matrix that corresponds to a re-indexed version of the original networked system $G_n$ if $P$ is a permutation matrix.
4) $A = [A_{ij}]_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a network matrix if $A_{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} \phi_{ij} & \psi_{ij} \\ \psi_{ij} & \gamma_{ij} \end{bmatrix}$.

Proof: Note that each of these results directly follows from Def. 2. Therefore, we omit giving an explicit proof.

The above lemma allows us to analyze composite block matrices and claim them to be network matrices under some additional conditions, e.g., $W = -A^T P - P A$ is a network matrix if $A, P$ are network matrices and $P$ is block diagonal.

b) Positive Definiteness: We next provide a few valuable lemmas on the positive definiteness of matrices.

Lemma 2: (Cholesky decomposition [21]) A symmetric matrix $W$ is positive definite (or positive semi-definite) if and only if there exists a lower-triangular matrix $L$ with positive (or non-negative) diagonal entries such that $W = LL^T$.

Lemma 3: (Schur’s complement [21]) Let $W = \begin{bmatrix} \Phi & \Psi \\ \Psi^T & \Gamma \end{bmatrix}$ be a symmetric $2 \times 2$ block matrix. Then:
1. $\Theta$ is invertible, $W > 0 \iff \Theta > 0, \Gamma - \Phi^T \Theta^{-1} \Phi > 0$,
2. $\Gamma$ is invertible, $W > 0 \iff \Gamma > 0, \Theta - \Phi^T \Gamma^{-1} \Phi > 0$.

Lemma 4: (Congruence principle [21]) A matrix $W > 0$ if and only if $P WP^T > 0$ where $P$ is a full-rank matrix.

Lemma 5: Let $W = \begin{bmatrix} \Phi & \Psi \\ \Psi^T & \Gamma \end{bmatrix}$ be a $2 \times 2$ block matrix where each matrix $\Phi, \Psi, \Gamma$ are also $N \times N$ block matrices (with appropriate dimensions). Then $W > 0$ if and only if $\bar{W} = [W_{ij}]_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}} > 0$ where $\bar{W}_{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} \phi_{ij} & \psi_{ij} \\ \psi_{ij} & \gamma_{ij} \end{bmatrix}$.

Proof: Notice that $\bar{W}$ can be constructed from $W$ by executing a series of simultaneous row swap and column swap operations on $W$. In other words, we can find a permutation matrix $P$ so that $W = WP WP^T$. Note that this permutation matrix $P$ will be symmetric as all the required row/column operations are simple independent row/column swap operations. Therefore, $W = WP WP^T$. Since all permutation matrices are full-rank, we can apply Lm. 2 to arrive at result: $W > 0 \iff W = WP WP^T > 0$.

c) Main Theoretical Result: We are now ready to establish the main theoretical result that will be exploited throughout this paper. However, we point out that different versions of this lemma have already appeared in [1] and [22], yet, without rigorous proofs. Therefore, here we provide a concise version of it along with a complete proof.

Lemma 6: A symmetric $N \times N$ block matrix $W = [W_{ij}]_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}} > 0$ if and only if $W_{ii} > 0, \forall i \in \mathbb{N}$ where
$$W_{ij} = W_{ij} - \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{i-1}} W_{ik} W_{kk}^{-1} W_{jk}, \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (6)$$

Proof: Aiming to use Lm. 2, we first determine a lower-triangular block matrix $L$ such that $W = LL^T$. Note that
$$W = LL^T \iff W_{ij} = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_i} L_{ik} L_{jk}^\top = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{\min(i,j)}} L_{ik} L_{jk}^\top, \quad (7)$$
for any $i,j \in \mathbb{N}$ (note that the last step is due to $L_{ik} = 0, \forall k > i$ and $L_{jk} = 0, \forall k > j$). In [1], to make $L_{ij}$ the subject, we consider the case $i \geq j$:
$$W_{ij} = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_i} L_{ik} L_{jk}^\top = L_{ij} L_{jj}^\top + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{i-1}} L_{ik} L_{jk}^\top, \quad (8)$$
which gives (also using the fact that $L_{ij} = 0$, for $i < j$)
$$L_{ij} = (W_{ij} - \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{i-1}} L_{ik} L_{jk}^\top L_{jj}^\top \mathbf{1}_{i \geq j}). \quad (9)$$
With $L = [L_{ij}]_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$ derived in (9) we get $W = LL^\top$.

Therefore, according to Lm. 2, $W > 0$ if and only if the diagonal elements of $L$ are positive (i.e., if and only if the diagonal element of lower-triangular matrices $L_{ii} : i \in \mathbb{N})$ are positive). Re-using Lm. 2, it is easy to see that this will occur if and only if $L_{ii} > 0, \forall i \in \mathbb{N}$. In all,
$$W > 0 \iff L_{ii} > 0, \forall i \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (10)$$
Now, for the case $j \leq i$ (i.e., $j \in \mathbb{N}_i$), we can state (9) as
$$L_{ij} = \tilde{W}_{ij} L_{jj}^\top, \quad j \in \mathbb{N}_i \quad (11)$$
where we define $\tilde{W}_{ij}$ as
$$\tilde{W}_{ij} \triangleq W_{ij} - \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{i-1}} L_{ik} L_{jk}^\top, \quad j \leq i. \quad (12)$$
From (11), when $j = i$, we get the relationship
$$L_{ii} L_{ii}^\top = \tilde{W}_{ii}. \quad (13)$$
From (13) and (10), it is clear that $W > 0 \iff \tilde{W}_{ii} > 0, \forall i \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, we now only need to prove that (12) \iff (6). For this purpose, we first simplify the $L_{ik} L_{jk}^\top$ term in (12) using (11) as
$$L_{ik} L_{jk}^\top = \tilde{W}_{ik} L_{kk}^\top (\tilde{W}_{jk} L_{kk}^\top)^\top = \tilde{W}_{ik} L_{kk}^\top L_{kk}^\top \tilde{W}_{jk}^\top = \tilde{W}_{ik} L_{jk}^\top \tilde{W}_{jk}. \quad (14)$$
Finally, applying (14) in (12), we can obtain (6).

According to the above lemma, testing positive definiteness of an $N \times N$ block matrix $W = [W_{ij}]_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}}$ can be broken down to $N$ separate smaller tests. In particular, at the $i^{th}$ iteration, we now only need to test whether $W_{ii} > 0$. Since $W_{ii} = W_{ii} - \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{i-1}} W_{ik} W_{kk}^{-1} W_{jk}$ (computed $\tilde{W}_{ii}$ only requires the following sets of matrices:
1) $\{W_{ij} : j \in \mathbb{N}_i\}$ (extracted from $W$ in iteration $i$);
2) $\{W_{ij} : j \in \mathbb{N}_{i-1}\}$ (computed using (6) in iteration $i$);
3) $\{W_{jk} : k \in \mathbb{N}_i\} : j \in \mathbb{N}_{i-1}\}$ (computed in previous $(i-1)$ iterations).

d) Distributedness and Compositionality: If the block matrix $W$ considered in Lm. 6 is a network matrix (see Def. 2) corresponding to the networked system $G_N$ (5), according to the aforementioned view of Lm. 6 testing/enforcing $W > 0$ can be achieved in a distributed manner by testing/enforcing $W_{ii} > 0$ at each subsystems $\Sigma_i, i \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, during such a process, at a subsystem $\Sigma_i$, it only requires to execute some local computations using some information obtained from the subsystems that came before it $(\Sigma_j : j \in \mathbb{N}_{i-1})$. Therefore, testing/enforcing $W > 0$ can be achieved in a compositional manner, i.e., adding a
new subsystem while ensuring the positive definiteness of an overall network matrix can be efficiently and conveniently achieved without making changes to the existing subsystems.

The following corollary of Lm. 6 sheds some light on how the information computed in previous \((i-1)\) iterations affects the testing positive definiteness at the \(i\)th iteration.

**Corollary 1:** A symmetric \(N \times N\) block matrix \(W = [W_{ij}]_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}_N} > 0\) if and only if \(W_{ii} > 0, \forall i \in \mathbb{N}_N\) where
\[
\tilde{W}_{ii} = W_{ii} - W_i D_i \tilde{W}_i^T, \quad \text{where } \tilde{W}_i \triangleq W_i (D_i A_i)^{-1}, \quad (15)
\]

with \(W_i, A_i, D_i\) and \(\tilde{W}_i\) respectively defined as
\[
W_i \triangleq [W_{i1}, \ldots, W_{ii-1}, 0], \quad \tilde{W}_i \triangleq [W_{i1}, \ldots, W_{ii-1}, 0], \quad (16a)
\]
\[
A_i \triangleq \begin{bmatrix}
W_{ii} & \tilde{W}_{i1}^T & \cdots & \tilde{W}_{i1,1}^T \\
0 & W_{22} & \cdots & \tilde{W}_{i2,1}^T \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & W_{ii-1,1}^T \\
\end{bmatrix}, \quad (16b)
\]
\[
D_i \triangleq \text{diag}([W_{i1}^{-1}, W_{i2}^{-1}, \ldots, W_{ii-1}^{-1}]), \quad (16c)
\]
\[
\text{Proof: By simplifying (6) for each } j \in \mathbb{N}_{i-1} \text{ and re-arranging its terms to make } \tilde{W}_{ij} \text{ the subject gives a system of } (i-1)\text{ equations that can be jointly represented by } W_i = W_i D_i A_i, \text{ with help of block matrices defined in (16). Thus, } \tilde{W}_i = W_i (D_i A_i)^{-1}. \text{ Finally, by writing (6)} \text{ for } j = i, \text{ we get } W_{ii} = W_{ii} - \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{i-1}} W_{ik} \tilde{W}_{kk}^{-1} W_{ik}^T = W_{ii} - W_i D_i \tilde{W}_i^T. \quad \blacksquare
\]

Note that the \(j\)th column of the block matrix \(A_i\) defined in (16) is to be constructed from the information seen in the \(j\)th iteration \(j \in \mathbb{N}_{i-1}\) (where \(\tilde{W}_{jj} > 0\) was tested). In a networked system setting, this matrix \(A_i\) can be seen as a compilation of messages received at the subsystem \(i\) from previous/existing \((i-1)\) subsystems in the network.

Note also that some components of \(W_{ij}\) may still be unknown to the subsystem \(i\) if the network is asymmetric. However, such unknown components can be obtained by requesting them from previous/existing \((i-1)\) subsystems in the network. Therefore, additional communications may be required to create the matrix \(W_i\). Finally, note that \(W_{ii}\) is known at (in fact, is intrinsic to) the subsystem \(i\). Therefore, it is now clear how \(W_{ii}\) (of which the positive definiteness needs to be tested) can be obtained using (15).

e) **The Algorithm:** The compositional and computationally distributed algorithm that we propose to test/enforce the positive-definiteness of a symmetric block network matrix \(W\) (based on Co. 1) is given in the following Alg. 1.

f) **Optimizing Communication Cost:** Even though the proposed testing/enforcing criterion for positive definiteness of a symmetric block network matrix (i.e., Alg. 1) is compositional and computationally distributed, it is not communicationally distributed. This limitation is evident from the fact that subsystem \(\Sigma_i\) having to communicate with all the subsystems that came before it (i.e., with \(\Sigma_j, \forall j \in \mathbb{N}_{i-1}\)) so as to construct the matrices \(A_i\) and \(D_i\) required in (16).

Nevertheless, we prove the following corollary of Lm. 6 to show that some communication sessions between subsystems are redundant and thus can be avoided - depending on the network topology and the used indexing scheme.

**Algorithm 1 Testing/Enforcing \(W > 0\) in a Network Setting**

\[
\begin{align*}
1: & \quad \text{Input: } W = [W_{ij}]_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}_N} \\
2: & \quad \text{At each subsystem } i \in \mathbb{N}_N \text{ execute:} \\
3: & \quad \text{if } i = 1 \text{ then} \\
4: & \quad \quad \text{Test/Enforce: } W_{11} > 0 \\
5: & \quad \quad \text{Store: } W_1 \triangleq [W_{11}] \quad \triangleright \text{To be sent to others.} \\
6: & \quad \text{else} \\
7: & \quad \quad \text{From each subsystem } j \in \mathbb{N}_{i-1}: \\
8: & \quad \quad \quad \text{Receive: } W_j \triangleq [W_{j1}, W_{j2}, \ldots, W_{jj}] \\
9: & \quad \quad \quad \text{Receive: Required info. to compute } W_{ij} \\
10: & \quad \quad \text{End receiving} \\
11: & \quad \quad \text{Construct: } A_i, D_i \text{ and } W_i. \quad \triangleright \text{Using: (16).} \\
12: & \quad \quad \text{Compute: } W_i \triangleq W_i (D_i A_i)^{-1} \quad \triangleright \text{From (15).} \\
13: & \quad \quad \text{Compute: } W_{ii} \triangleq W_{ii} - W_i D_i \tilde{W}_i^T \quad \triangleright \text{From (15).} \\
14: & \quad \quad \text{Test/Enforce: } W_{ii} > 0 \\
15: & \quad \quad \text{Store: } W_i \triangleq [W_{ii}, W_{ii}] \quad \triangleright \text{To be sent to others} \\
16: & \quad \text{end if} \\
17: & \quad \text{End execution}
\end{align*}
\]

**Corollary 2:** A symmetric \(N \times N\) block network matrix \(W = [W_{ij}]_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}_N} > 0\) iff \(W_{ii} > 0, \forall i \in \mathbb{N}_N\) where
\[
\tilde{W}_{ij} = W_{ij} - \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_{j-1} \setminus \mathbb{N}_{k-1}} \tilde{W}_{ik} \tilde{W}_{kk}^{-1} \tilde{W}_{jk}^T, \quad \forall j \in \mathbb{N}_N, \quad (17)
\]
with \(L_{ij} \triangleq \max\{\min\{\Gamma_i, \Delta_i\}, \min\{\Gamma_j, \Delta_j\}\} \text{ or } L_{ij} \triangleq \max\{\Gamma_i, \Gamma_j\}, \text{ if the network is bi-directional}\), \(\Gamma_i \triangleq \min\{E_i\}\) and \(\Delta_i = \min\{F_i\} .
\]
\[
\text{Proof: Here we use the relationship } \tilde{W}_i = W_i (D_i A_i)^{-1} \text{ established in Co. 1}. \text{ Note that } (D_i A_i)^{-1} \text{ is upper-triangular and } D_i A_i \text{ is upper-triangular (16). Consequently, if the first } n \in \mathbb{N}_{i-1} \text{ blocks of } W_i \text{ (16) are zero blocks, so will be the first } n \in \mathbb{N}_{i-1} \text{ blocks of } W_{ii}. \text{ }
\]

Since \(W\) is a network matrix (see Def. 2), \(W_{ij} = 0\) for all \(i,j \in \mathbb{N}_N\) such that \(j \notin E_i\) and \(j \notin F_i\). Hence the first \(\min\{\Gamma_i, \Delta_i\} - 1\) blocks of \(W_i\) will be zero blocks - making the first \(\min\{\Gamma_i, \Delta_i\} - 1\) blocks of \(\tilde{W}_i\) are also zero blocks. Simply, for \(i \in \mathbb{N}_N, W_{ij} = 0, \forall j < \min\{\Gamma_i, \Delta_i\}\). Similarly, for \(i \in \mathbb{N}_N, W_{ik} = 0, \forall k < \min\{\Gamma_i, \Delta_i\}\) and for \(j \in \mathbb{N}_N, W_{jk} = 0, \forall k < \min\{\Gamma_j, \Delta_j\}\).

Therefore, \(W_{ik} \tilde{W}_{kk}^{-1} \tilde{W}_{jk}^T = 0, \forall k < L_{ij}\) where \(L_{ij} \triangleq \max\{\min\{\Gamma_i, \Delta_i\}, \min\{\Gamma_j, \Delta_j\}\}\). Applying this result in (6), we can directly obtain (17). For the bi-directional case, the proof follows from applying the fact that \(\Gamma_j = \Delta_i\) and \(\Gamma_j = \Delta_j\) in the definition of \(L_{ij}\).

Compared to (6), in (17), there may be less number of terms in the summation as \(L_{ij} \geq 1\). This implies a possible reduction in the communications required at the subsystem \(\Sigma_i\) compared to what is required in (6). For example, in a bi-directional network, if a subsystem \(\Sigma_j, j \in \mathbb{N}_{i-1}\) is such that \(\Gamma_j \geq j - 1\) (i.e., \(\Sigma_j\) is the least indexed subsystem among its neighbors in \(E_j\), which also implies \(L_{ij} \geq j - 1\)), then the subsystem \(\Sigma_i\) only need to get \(\tilde{W}_{ij}\) value from subsystem \(\Sigma_j\) as \(W_{jk} = 0, \forall k \in \mathbb{N}_{j-1}\) under \(L_{ij} < j - 1\). At this point, it should be clear that even though the proposed testing/enforcing criterion (i.e., Alg. 1) is not
communicationally distributed in general, depending on the
network topology and the used indexing scheme, some
communication sessions can be avoided. We next propose
a communication cost function to find an optimum indexing
scheme for a given network topology.

Consider a subsystem $\Sigma_i, i \in \mathbb{N}_N$. According Co. 2 to
locally analyze/enforce $\bar{W}_{iij} > 0$, it requires each subsystem
$\Sigma_j, j \in \mathbb{N}_{i-1}$ to send the information \{ $\bar{W}_{ijk}$ : $k \in \mathbb{N}_j$ \} and
out of these block matrices, $L_{ij} - 1$ (at most $j - 1$) number
of block matrices will be $0$, making them redundant. Let us
assume the communication cost associated with a such
block matrix $\bar{W}_{ijk}$ as $\gamma_{ijk}$. On the other hand, the subsystem
$\Sigma_i$ might also require additional information from each
subsystem $\Sigma_j, j \in \mathbb{N}_{i-1}$ just to compute \{ $W_{ij}$ : $j \in \mathbb{N}_{i-1}$ \} -
if there are unknown components in these block matrices.

Note that this requirement arises only if $j \in \mathbb{J}_i$. Let us
assume the communication cost associated with the block
matrix $W_{ij}$ as $\beta_{ij}$. Taking these costs into account, we can
formulate a communication cost function as:

$$J(X) = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}_N} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}_{i-1}} \alpha_{ij} (\beta_{ij} \mathbf{1}(i \in \mathbb{E}_j) + \gamma_{ij}) + \sum_{k = \mathbb{L}_{ij}} \gamma_{ijk}$$

(18)

for the considered network topology, under the used indexing
scheme $X$. In (18), $\alpha_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$ represents the unit cost of
communication from subsystem $j$ to $i$. Simply, we can set
$\alpha_{ij} = 1(j \in \mathbb{E}_j)$ to penalize the communications that happen
over subsystems that are not neighbors. Here, the indexing
scheme $X$ can be any permutation of $\mathbb{N}_N$ and it determines
the $\mathbb{E}_i, \mathbb{F}_i$ sets and $\Gamma_i, \Delta_i, \mathbb{L}_{ij}$ values for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}_N$. Therefore,
the objective function $J(X)$ formulated above (18) can be used
to determine an optimal subsystem indexing scheme that
minimizes costly inter-subsystem communications.

V. DISTRIBUTED STABILITY AND DISSIPATIVITY
ANALYSIS AND CONTROL SYNTHESIS

In this section, we exploit the theoretical results estab-
lished in Sec. IV (particularly Co. 1 and Alg. 1) to propose
compositional and computationally distributed techniques to:
(i) analyze stability and dissipativity properties, and if
requires, (ii) synthesize local controllers at subsystems to
ensure desired stability and dissipativity properties, of a
networked dynamical system of the form (5).

a) Stability Analysis: According to Prop. 1 the global
exponential stability of (5) is guaranteed if we can find
a matrix $P = P^T > 0$ such that $-A^T P - PA > 0$.
The following theorem provides details of how this stability
analysis problem can be addressed using Co. 1 and Alg. 1.

Theorem 1: (Stability analysis) The networked system (5) is
globally exponentially stable if at each subsystem $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$, there
exists a matrix $P_i = P_i^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}_1 : \text{Find } P_i \text{ such that } P_i > 0, \_BAR{W}_{ii} > 0, \tag{19}$$

is feasible, where $\_BAR{W}_{ii}$ is constructed from the procedure
given in Alg. 1 (Steps: 3-15) under $W = [W_{ij}]_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}_N}$ and $W = [W_{ij}]_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}_N} \triangleq -A^T P - PA$. According to Prop. 1 we need to
find $P = P^T > 0$ such that $W > 0$ to prove the global
exponential stability. Under the above definitions, $W$ is
symmetric, and it is easy to see that $W_{ij} = -A^T_{ij} P_j - P_i A_{ij}$
(i.e., (20)). This confirms that $W$ is a network matrix (Def. 2).

Hence, $W > 0$ can be tested in a distributed manner
by applying Alg. 1 and testing $W_{ii} > 0$ at each subsystem
$i \in \mathbb{N}_N$. Note also that $P_i > 0, \forall i \in \mathbb{N}_N \implies P > 0$.
Therefore, the existence of a matrix $P = P^T > 0$ such that
$W > 0$ can be evaluated in a distributed manner by solving
$\mathbb{P}_1$ at each subsystem $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$.

We also highlight that problem $\mathbb{P}_1$ is an LMI that can
be solved using readily available software toolboxes [20].

b) Control Synthesis for Stability: If the networked
system is unstable (or found that its stability cannot be
verified), naturally, we are required to develop control strate-
gies to make the closed-loop networked system stable. In
this paper, we mainly focus on designing a distributed state
feedback control strategy, where each subsystem $\Sigma_i, i \in \mathbb{N}_N$
selects its control input $u_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{p_i}$ as:

$$u_i(t) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{E}_i} K_{ij} x_j(t). \tag{21}$$

Writing (21) for all $i \in \mathbb{N}_N$, we get its network form: $u(t) = Kx(t)$, where $K = [K_{ij}]_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}_N}$ is an $N \times N$ block
network matrix containing all the tunable feedback controller
gains. Now, by applying this state feedback control law in (5), we
get the closed loop networked system dynamics as

$$\dot{x}(t) = (A + BK)x(t) + Eu(t). \tag{22}$$

Therefore, according to Prop. 1 (22) is stable if there exist
a matrix $P = P^T > 0$ such that $- (A + BK)^T P - P(A + BK) > 0$. To address this problem using Co. 1 and Alg. 1
here we require the following assumption (which has also been
used in [1], [2]).

Assumption 1: The network matrix $B$ in the networked
dynamical system (5) is such that $B = \text{diag}(B_i : i \in \mathbb{N})$.

Theorem 2: (Control synthesis for stability) Under As. 1
and control (21) $u(t) = Kx(t)$, the networked dynamical
system (5) is globally exponentially stable if at each subsystem
$i \in \mathbb{N}_N$, there exists a matrix $P_i = P_i^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}$
and controller gains $K_i \triangleq [K_{ii} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_i \times n_i}, K_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_i \times n_j}, \forall j \in \mathbb{N}_{i-1} \cap \mathbb{E}_i, K_{ji} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_j \times n_i}, \forall j \in \mathbb{N}_{i-1} \cap \mathbb{F}_i]$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}_2 : \text{Find } P_i, \ K_i \text{ such that } P_i > 0, \ \BAR{W}_{ii} > 0, \tag{23}$$

is feasible, where $\_BAR{W}_{ii}$ is computed from the procedure
given in Alg. 1 (Steps: 3-15) under $W = [W_{ij}]_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}_N}$ with

$$W_{ij} = -A^T_{ij} P_j - P_i A_{ij} - K^T_{ij} B_j^T P_j - P_i B_j K_{ij}. \tag{24}$$

Proof: Let us define $P \triangleq \text{diag}(P_i : i \in \mathbb{N}_N)$ and $W = [W_{ij}]_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}_N} \triangleq - (A + BK)^T P - P(A + BK)$. To ensure the
global exponential stability, we need to find $P = P^T > 0$ such that $W > 0$. From the above definitions and As. 1 we
get $W = -A^T P - PA - K^T B^T P - PBK$ which gives
$W_{ij}$ as $W_{ij} = -A^T_{ij} P_j - P_i A_{ij} - K^T_{ij} B_j^T P_j - P_i B_j K_{ij}$. This confirms that $W$ is a symmetric block network matrix. Note
also that controller gains $K_{ij}, \forall j \notin E_i$ and $K_{ji}, \forall j \notin F_i$ are not required here as they, by definition \[21\], are zero matrices. The remainder of the proof is identical to that of Th. \[1\].

We point out that the problem $\mathbb{P}_2$ \[23\], even though it contains bilinear terms, can easily be converted to an LMI using Lm. \[3\] and appropriate variable changes.

Intuitively, the same approach can be followed to design a distributed output feedback control strategy of the form $u(t) = Ky(t)$ to stabilize the networked system.

c) Dissipativity Analysis: To analyze the $(Q,S,R)$-dissipativity of the networked system \[5\], we can use Prop. \[2\]. However, we provide the following lemma as a much simpler approach to analyze the $(Q,S,R)$-dissipativity of the networked system \[5\], we can use Prop. \[2\].

**Lemma 7:** The dynamical system \[1\] is $(Q,S,R)$-dissipative from $u(t)$ to $y(t)$ if and only if there exists a matrix $P = P^T > 0$ such that $W = [W_{ij}]_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}} > 0$ where

$$W_{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} W_{ij}^{(1)} & W_{ij}^{(2)} \\ W_{ij}^{(3)} & W_{ij}^{(4)} \end{bmatrix}, \quad W_{ij}^{(k)} = \begin{cases} -A_{ij}^T P - PA_{ij} + \hat{Q}, & k = 1 \\ -PB_{ij} + \hat{S}, & k = 2 \\ -PB_{ij} + \hat{S}^T, & k = 3 \\ \hat{R}, & k = 4 \end{cases}$$

with $\hat{Q} = C^T QC, \hat{S} = C^T S + C^T QD, \hat{R} = D^T QD + (D^T S + S^T D) + R$.

**Proof:** The proof directly follows from applying Lm. \[5\] to the LMI condition given in Prop. \[2\].

According to Lm. \[7\] to analyze the $(Q,S,R)$-dissipativity of the networked dynamical system \[5\] from $u(t)$ to $y(t)$, we need to show the existence of a matrix $P = P^T > 0$ such that the positive-definiteness condition given in \[25\] (i.e., $W > 0$), with its $B, D$ replaced by $E, F$, is satisfied. To address this problem using Co. \[1\] and Alg. \[4\] we require the following assumptions.

**Assumption 2:** The given $Q,S,R$ matrices (of $(Q,S,R)$-dissipativity) are $N \times N$ block network matrices, where $Q$ and $R$ are also symmetric.

**Assumption 3:** The networked dynamical system \[5\] is such that $C = \text{diag}(C_i : i \in \mathbb{N}), F = \text{diag}(F_i : i \in \mathbb{N})$.

It is important to highlight that unlike in \[1\], in this paper, we do not constrain the matrices $Q, S, R$ to be block diagonal. Moreover, we now allow the system matrices $A$ and $E$ to be any arbitrary $N \times N$ block network matrices.

**Theorem 3:** (Dissipativity analysis) Under Assumptions \[3\] and \[2\] the networked dynamical system \[5\] is $(Q,S,R)$-dissipative from $w(t)$ to $y(t)$, if at each subsystem $i \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a matrix $P_i = P_i^T$, $F_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}$ and controller gains $K_i \triangleq \{K_{ij} : j \in \mathbb{N}_i \cap E_i, j \notin F_i \}$ such that

$$P_i = P_i^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}, K_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}, \forall j \in \mathbb{N}_i \cap E_i, K_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_j \times n_j}, \forall j \in \mathbb{N}_i \cap F_i$$

$$P_i = P_i^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}, K_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}, \forall j \in \mathbb{N}_i \cap E_i, K_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_j \times n_j}, \forall j \in \mathbb{N}_i \cap F_i$$

**Proof:** The proof follows similar steps as that of Th. \[1\].

Finally we point out that similar to $\mathbb{P}_1$ \[19\] and $\mathbb{P}_2$ \[23\], both $\mathbb{P}_3$ \[26\] and $\mathbb{P}_4$ \[29\] can be formulated as standard LMIs (using Lm. \[3\] and appropriate variable changes), and thus can be efficiently solved using existing software packages \[20\].
Consider the networked dynamical system $G_3$ comprised of the three subsystems described in (31) interconnected according to the directed network topology shown in Fig. 2. Note that here we have used the indexing scheme $1-2-3$ to execute different proposed distributed processes. When the distributed stability analysis proposed in Th. 1 was executed for $G_3$, it returned infeasible - which implied the possibility of $G_3$ being unstable. Therefore, we next executed the distributed stabilizing control synthesis proposed in Th. 2 to obtain the stabilizing state feedback controller gains as in (32). On the other hand, we used Th. 3 with $(Q, S, R)$ matrices given in Rm. 1 to conduct a distributed passivity analysis of $G_3$. This also returned infeasible, implying that $G_3$ is not passive. Therefore, we next executed the distributed dissipative control synthesis proposed in Th. 3 to obtain the passivating state feedback controller gains as in (33). Moreover, using Th. 3 we found that even though $G_3$ is not passive, it is $(Q_0, S_0, R_0)$-dissipative with $Q_0, S_0, R_0$ matrices as in (34). It is important to point out that each of these findings from the proposed distributed processes was independently verified using a centralized analysis of $G_3$. Moreover, note that these findings cannot be reached using distributed techniques proposed in [1], [2] as they do not apply for arbitrary directed network topologies and when subsystems are coupled in terms of their disturbances (see Fig. 2 and (31)).

Finally, to show the impact of finding an optimal indexing scheme, we optimized the communication cost function derived in (18) using a brute-force method. Note that, in (18), we have selected the coefficients as: $\alpha_{ij} = 1_{ij \notin \mathcal{E}_i}$ to penalize communications among non-neighboring subsystems, and $\beta_{ij} = 3n_i^n$, $\gamma_{ij} = n_i^n$ and $\gamma_{ijk} = n_{ij}n_k$ to approximately reflect the number of data values to be exchanged (in a proposed distributed process such as in Th. 1). The optimal indexing scheme turns out to be $2-3-1$ with a communication cost of 0. This result is intuitive as $\Sigma_2$ does not have any in-neighbors, while $\Sigma_3$ has $\Sigma_2$ as its only in-neighbor, and $\Sigma_1$ has both $\Sigma_1$ and $\Sigma_3$ as its in-neighbors (see Fig. 1). Therefore, executing any proposed distributed process following the indexing scheme $2-3-1$ in this case renders the processes not only computationally, but also communicationally distributed. Note also that this conclusion can easily be generalized for directed cascaded networks with arbitrary number of subsystems.

VI. Simulation Results

In this section, we use a numerical example to demonstrate the applicability of the proposed distributed analysis and control synthesis techniques (Theorems 1-4) in verifying and ensuring stability and dissipativity properties of a networked dynamical system. Moreover, we show the impact of finding an optimal indexing scheme via optimizing the proposed communication cost function (18).

Consider the networked dynamical system $G_3$ comprising of the three subsystems described in (31) interconnected according to the directed network topology shown in Fig. 2. On the other hand, we used Th. 3 with $(Q, S, R)$ matrices given in Rm. 1 to conduct a distributed passivity analysis of $G_3$. This also returned infeasible, implying that $G_3$ is not passive. Therefore, we next executed the distributed dissipative control synthesis proposed in Th. 3 to obtain the passivating state feedback controller gains as in (33). Moreover, using Th. 3 we found that even though $G_3$ is not passive, it is $(Q_0, S_0, R_0)$-dissipative with $Q_0, S_0, R_0$ matrices as in (34). It is important to point out that each of these findings from the proposed distributed processes was independently verified using a centralized analysis of $G_3$. Moreover, note that these findings cannot be reached using distributed techniques proposed in [1], [2] as they do not apply for arbitrary directed network topologies and when subsystems are coupled in terms of their disturbances (see Fig. 2 and (31)).

Finally, to show the impact of finding an optimal indexing scheme, we optimized the communication cost function derived in (18) using a brute-force method. Note that, in (18), we have selected the coefficients as: $\alpha_{ij} = 1_{ij \notin \mathcal{E}_i}$ to penalize communications among non-neighboring subsystems, and $\beta_{ij} = 3n_i^n$, $\gamma_{ij} = n_i^n$ and $\gamma_{ijk} = n_{ij}n_k$ to approximately reflect the number of data values to be exchanged (in a proposed distributed process such as in Th. 1). The optimal indexing scheme turns out to be $2-3-1$ with a communication cost of 0. This result is intuitive as $\Sigma_2$ does not have any in-neighbors, while $\Sigma_3$ has $\Sigma_2$ as its only in-neighbor, and $\Sigma_1$ has both $\Sigma_1$ and $\Sigma_3$ as its in-neighbors (see Fig. 1). Therefore, executing any proposed distributed process following the indexing scheme $2-3-1$ in this case renders the processes not only computationally, but also communicationally distributed. Note also that this conclusion can easily be generalized for directed cascaded networks with arbitrary number of subsystems.

VII. Conclusion

We presented several distributed analysis and control synthesis approaches to verify and ensure properties like stability and dissipativity of large-scale networked systems. Compared to state of the art, we considered a substantially more general problem setup and developed distributed processes to cover a far broader range of properties of interest. The synthesized control laws are distributed, and the proposed analysis and control synthesis processes themselves are computationally distributed. We also showed that optimizing the indexing scheme used in such distributed processes can reduce the required information-sharing sessions between subsystems and, in some cases, can even make the overall process communicationally distributed. Future work aims to study the effect of erroneous and failed information sharing sessions among subsystems and develop robust distributed analysis and control synthesis approaches for such scenarios.
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