



Brief paper

Global consensus for discrete-time multi-agent systems with input saturation constraints[☆]Tao Yang¹, Ziyang Meng, Dimos V. Dimarogonas, Karl H. Johansson

ACCESS Linnaeus Centre, Royal Institute of Technology, SE 100-44 Stockholm, Sweden

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 14 November 2012

Received in revised form

9 May 2013

Accepted 7 October 2013

Available online 2 December 2013

Keywords:

Global consensus

Input saturation constraints

Multi-agent systems

ABSTRACT

In this paper, we consider the global consensus problem for discrete-time multi-agent systems with input saturation constraints under fixed undirected topologies. We first give necessary conditions for achieving global consensus via a distributed protocol based on relative state measurements of the agent itself and its neighboring agents. We then focus on two special cases, where the agent model is either neutrally stable or a double integrator. For the neutrally stable case, any linear protocol of a particular form, which solves the consensus problem for the case without input saturation constraints, also solves the global consensus problem for the case with input saturation constraints. For the double integrator case, we show that a subset of linear protocols, which solve the consensus problem for the case without saturation constraints, also solve the global consensus problem for the case with input saturation constraints. The results are illustrated by numerical simulations.

© 2013 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

In recent years, the distributed coordination of a multi-agent system (MAS) has received substantial attention due to its wide application areas, including consensus computation (Bai, Arcak, & Wen, 2011; Jadbabaie, Lin, & Morse, 2003; Olfati-Saber & Murray, 2004; Tsitsiklis, 1984), synchronization (Wu & Chua, 1995), distributed processing (Lynch, 1996), and network flow control (Low, Paganini, & Doyle, 2002; Wen & Arcak, 2004). When it comes to the consensus problem, each agent has to implement a distributed protocol based on the limited information about itself and its neighboring agents.

The design of consensus protocols can be generally divided into two categories depending on whether the agent models are continuous-time or discrete-time. Much attention has been devoted to the continuous-time case. The existing works here can be categorized into two directions depending whether the agent models are identical or not. The consensus problem for homogeneous networks (i.e., networks where the agent models are identical) has been considered (e.g., Li, Du, & Lin, 2011; Li, Duan, Chen,

& Huang, 2010; Olfati-Saber & Murray, 2004; Ren & Beard, 2005; Scardovi & Sepulchre, 2009; Seo, Shim, & Back, 2009; Seyboth, Dimarogonas, & Johansson, 2013; Shi & Hong, 2009; Xiao & Wang, 2008; Yang, Roy, Wan, & Saberi, 2011; Yu, Chen, & Cao, 2010), while the consensus problem for heterogeneous networks (i.e., networks where the agent models are non-identical) has been a recent focus (e.g., Grip, Yang, Saberi, & Stoorvogel, 2012; Wieland, Sepulchre, & Allgöwer, 2011; Zhao, Hill, & Liu, 2011). The studies on the discrete-time case are rather limited, but some results can be found in (e.g., Blondel, Hendrickx, Olshevsky, & Tsitsiklis, 2005; Jadbabaie et al., 2003; Moreau, 2005; Ren & Beard, 2005; Tuna, 2008; You & Xie, 2011; Zhang & Tian, 2009).

Most consensus literature does not consider the case where the agents are subject to input saturation. However, in almost every physical application, the actuator has bounds on its input, and thus actuator saturation is important to study. The protocol design for achieving consensus for the case with input saturation constraints is a challenging problem, and only few results are available for continuous-time agent models (e.g., Cortés, 2006; Du, Li, & Ding, 2013; Li, Xiang, & Wei, 2011; Meng, Zhao, & Lin, 2013; Yang, Stoorvogel, Grip, & Saberi, in preparation). For the single integrator case, Li, Xiang et al. (2011) showed that any linear protocol based on the relative state information, which solves the consensus problem for the case without input saturation constraints under fixed directed network topologies, also solves the global consensus problem in the presence of input saturation constraints. Meng et al. (2013) proposed a linear protocol based on the relative state information to solve the global consensus problem for an MAS with input saturation constraints under fixed undirected network topologies and time varying network topologies. Yang, Stoorvogel,

[☆] This work has been supported in part by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation and the Swedish Research Council. The material in this paper was partially presented at the 2013 European Control Conference (ECC'13), July 17–19, 2013, Zurich, Switzerland. This paper was recommended for publication in revised form by Associate Editor David Angeli under the direction of Editor Andrew R. Teel.

E-mail addresses: taoyang@kth.se (T. Yang), ziyangm@kth.se (Z. Meng), dimos@kth.se (D.V. Dimarogonas), kallej@kth.se (K.H. Johansson).

¹ Tel.: +46 720160061; fax: +46 8 7907329.

Grip et al. (in preparation) studied semi-global regulation of output synchronization for heterogeneous networks under fixed directed network topologies.

To the best of the authors' knowledge, all the existing works on the consensus problem for an MAS with input saturation constraints are restricted to continuous-time agent models. This motivates us to consider the consensus problem for the case where the agents models are discrete-time, as such models are relevant for many practical sampled-data systems. As a first step, in this paper, we assume that the network topology is fixed and undirected. This paper may be seen as a continuation of the work of Meng et al. (2013). We extend their continuous-time results for fixed topologies to a discrete-time setting. The extension is considerable. First, Meng et al. (2013) considered the leader–follower case while we consider the leaderless case. Second, we use a completely new set Lyapunov stability theory argument.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, some preliminaries and notations are introduced. In Section 3, we first formulate the global consensus problem with input saturation constraints, and then give necessary conditions for achieving global consensus under fixed undirected topologies. In Sections 4 and 5, we consider the case where the agent model is neutrally stable and a double integrator, respectively. Simulation examples are presented in Section 6 followed by conclusions.

2. Preliminaries and notations

In this paper, we assume that the network topology among the agents is described by a fixed undirected weighted graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{A})$, with the set of agents $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, N\}$, the set of undirected edges $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$, and a weighted adjacency matrix $\mathcal{A} = [a_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$, where $a_{ij} > 0$ if and only if $(j, i) \in \mathcal{E}$ and $a_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. In this paper, we also assume that $a_{ij} = a_{ji}$ for all $i, j \in \mathcal{V}$, and that there are no self-loops, i.e., $a_{ii} = 0$ for $i \in \mathcal{V}$. The set of neighboring agents of agent i is defined as $\mathcal{N}_i = \{j \in \mathcal{V} | a_{ij} > 0\}$. A path from node i_1 to i_k is a sequence of nodes $\{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ such that $(i_j, i_{j+1}) \in \mathcal{E}$ for $j = 1, \dots, k-1$ in the undirected graph. An undirected graph is said to be connected if there exists a path between any pair of distinct nodes.

For an undirected weighted graph \mathcal{G} , a matrix $L = [\ell_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ with $\ell_{ii} = \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij}$ and $\ell_{ij} = -a_{ij}$ for $j \neq i$ is called the Laplacian matrix associated with graph \mathcal{G} . It is well known that the Laplacian matrix has the property that all the row sums are zero. If the undirected weighted graph \mathcal{G} is connected, then L has a simple eigenvalue at zero with corresponding right eigenvector $\mathbf{1}$ and all other eigenvalues are strictly positive. All the eigenvalues can be ordered as $0 = \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_N \leq 2\Delta$, where $\Delta = \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \ell_{ii}$.

Given a matrix A , A^T denotes its transpose and $\|A\|$ denotes its induced norm. A symmetric matrix A is positive (negative) definite if and only if all its eigenvalues are positive (negative), and is positive (negative) semi-definite if and only if all its eigenvalues are non-negative (non-positive). We denote by $A \otimes B$ the Kronecker product between matrices A and B . For two column vectors a and b of the same dimensions, $a < (\leq) b$ means that each entry of $a - b$ is negative (non-positive), while $a > (\geq) b$ means that each entry of $a - b$ is positive (non-negative). I_N denotes the identity matrix of dimension $N \times N$. $\mathbf{1}_N$ denotes the column vector with each entry being 1. For column vectors x_1, \dots, x_N , the stacked column vector of x_1, \dots, x_N is denoted by $[x_1; \dots; x_N]$.

3. Problem formulation

We consider an MAS of N identical discrete-time agents

$$x_i(k+1) = Ax_i(k) + B\sigma(u_i(k)), \quad i \in \mathcal{V}, \quad (1)$$

where $x_i(k) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $u_i(k) \in \mathbb{R}^m$,

$$\sigma(u_i(k)) = [\sigma_1(u_{i,1}(k)); \sigma_1(u_{i,2}(k)); \dots; \sigma_1(u_{i,m}(k))],$$

and each $\sigma_1(u)$ is the standard saturation function

$$\sigma_1(u) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } u > 1, \\ u & \text{if } |u| \leq 1, \\ -1 & \text{if } u < -1. \end{cases}$$

The only information available for agent i comes from the network. In particular, agent i receives a linear combination of its own state relative to that of neighboring agents, i.e.,

$$\zeta_i(k) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} a_{ij}(x_i(k) - x_j(k)).$$

Our goal is to design distributed protocols $u_i(k)$ for $i \in \mathcal{V}$ by using $\zeta_i(k)$ to solve the *global* consensus problem, i.e., for any initial conditions $x_i(0)$, where $i \in \mathcal{V}$, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (x_i(k) - x_j(k)) = 0$ for all $i, j \in \mathcal{V}$.

Each agent is subject to the input saturation constraints. These nonlinearities make the protocol design for achieving consensus difficult since we have to guarantee that consensus is achieved for all initial conditions.

3.1. Necessary conditions

Assumption 1. The agent model (1) is asymptotically null controllable with bounded controls (ANCBC), i.e., the pair (A, B) is stabilizable and all the eigenvalues of the matrix A are within or on the unit circle.

Based on the results in Saberi, Stoorvogel, and Sannuti (2012, Section 4.2) and Yang, Sontag, and Sussmann (1997), we have the following result.

Proposition 1. An MAS of N agents (1) achieves global consensus via distributed protocols $u_i(k) = f_i(\zeta_i(k), k)$, $i \in \mathcal{V}$, only if Assumption 1 is satisfied.

From the saturation literature (e.g., Sussmann, Sontag, & Yang, 1994; Teel, 1992), it is evident that, in general, we need to design a nonlinear protocol to solve the global consensus problem. In this paper, we shall concentrate on a linear protocol

$$u_i(k) = K\zeta_i(k) = K \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} a_{ij}(x_i(k) - x_j(k)), \quad i \in \mathcal{V}, \quad (2)$$

as such a protocol may suffice in some cases.

Given a fixed undirected graph and Assumption 1, it follows from You and Xie (2011, Theorem 3.1) that a network of N agents (1) in the absence of input saturation achieves consensus via the protocol (2) if and only if the following assumption is satisfied.

Assumption 2. The graph \mathcal{G} is connected.

This together with Proposition 1 yields the following result.

Proposition 2. An MAS of N agents (1) achieves global consensus via distributed protocols (2) only if Assumptions 1 and 2 are satisfied.

There is limited knowledge regarding which discrete-time linear time-invariant systems subject to actuator saturation allow for global stabilization via linear state feedback control laws. It is known that for some special discrete-time cases, such as open-loop neutrally stable systems² (Bao, Lin, & Sontag, 2000), and a double integrator (Yang, Stoorvogel, & Saberi, 2013), there exist saturated globally stabilizing linear state feedback control laws.

² A discrete-time system is said to be open-loop neutrally stable if all its open-loop poles are within or on the unit circle with those on the unit circle being simple.

Hence, in the following sections, we consider the global consensus problem for such special cases. We show that [Assumptions 1 and 2](#) are also sufficient for achieving global consensus for these cases by explicitly specifying the matrix K for (2).

4. Neutrally stable agent model

In this section, we consider the case where the agent model (1) is open-loop neutrally stable.

Under [Assumption 1](#), there exists a non-singular state transformation T^{-1} , such that

$$A = T^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} A_c & 0 \\ 0 & A_s \end{bmatrix} T, \quad B = T^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} B_c \\ B_s \end{bmatrix},$$

where $A^T_c A_c = I$, A_s is the Schur stable (i.e., all its eigenvalues are within the unit circle), and the pair (A_c, B_c) is controllable.

As shown in [You and Xie \(2011\)](#), the asymptotically stable modes can be ignored since we can set the corresponding gain matrix to zero. Thus, without loss of generality, we make the following assumption in this section.

Assumption 3. $A^T A = I_n$ and the pair (A, B) is controllable.

Under [Assumption 3](#), controllability of the pair (A, B) is equivalent to stabilizability of the pair (A, B) .

Consider the following control law:

$$u_i(k) = -\varepsilon B^T A \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} a_{ij} (x_i(k) - x_j(k)), \quad i \in \mathcal{V}. \quad (3)$$

Note that (3) is of the form (2) with $K = -\varepsilon B^T A$, where ε is a designed parameter. The following lemma shows that the protocol (3) with a properly chosen ε solves the consensus problem for an MAS without input saturation.

Lemma 1. Consider an MAS of N agents (1) in the absence of input saturation constraints. Assume that [Assumptions 2 and 3](#) are satisfied. Then any protocol (3) with $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{2}{\lambda_N \|B^T B\|})$, where λ_N is the largest eigenvalue of the corresponding Laplacian matrix, solves the consensus problem.

Proof. It is well known that (e.g. [Seo et al., 2009; Zhang & Tian, 2009](#)) the consensus problem for a network of N identical agents is equivalent to the simultaneous stabilization problem of $N - 1$ systems. Hence, it can be verified that consensus is achieved via (3) if all the matrices $A - \varepsilon \lambda_i B B^T A$, where $\lambda_i, i \in \{2, \dots, N\}$ (i.e., the nonzero eigenvalues of the Laplacian matrix) are Schur stable. It then follows from [Shi, Saberi, and Stoorvogel \(2003, Lemma 4.2\)](#) that all these matrices are Schur stable if $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{2}{\lambda_N \|B^T B\|})$. ■

The following theorem shows that (3) with $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{2}{\lambda_N \|B^T B\|})$ also solves the global consensus problem for an MAS.

Theorem 1. Consider an MAS of N agents (1). Assume that [Assumptions 2 and 3](#) are satisfied. Then any protocol (3) with $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{2}{\lambda_N \|B^T B\|})$ solves the global consensus problem.

Proof. Define $x(k) = [x_1(k); \dots; x_N(k)]$ and $u(k) = [u_1(k); \dots; u_N(k)]$. To simplify the notation, sometimes x or u without explicitly indicating the time instant will refer to $x(k)$ or $u(k)$ respectively. With these definitions, we obtain the following dynamics:

$$x(k+1) = (I_N \otimes A)x(k) + (I_N \otimes B)\sigma(u(k)), \quad (4a)$$

$$u(k) = -\varepsilon(L \otimes B^T A)x(k). \quad (4b)$$

Motivated by the Lyapunov function in [Cortés \(2006\)](#) and [Zhang, Lewis, and Qu \(2012\)](#), we consider the Lyapunov candidate

$$V(x(k)) = \frac{1}{2} x^T(k) (L \otimes I_n) x(k).$$

Define a manifold where all the agent states are identical

$$M := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{Nn} | x_1 = x_2 = \dots = x_N\}.$$

Note that $V(x) \geq 0$ and $V(x) = 0$ if and only if $x \in M$. Let us now evaluate $\Delta V(x(k)) = V(x(k+1)) - V(x(k))$. We sometimes drop the dependency of $V(x(k))$ and $\Delta V(x(k))$ on $x(k)$ for notational simplification when it is clear from the context. From the dynamics of (4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta V &= \frac{1}{2} \sigma^T(u) (L \otimes B^T A) x + \frac{1}{2} x^T (L \otimes A^T B) \sigma(u) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^T(u) (L \otimes B^T B) \sigma(u) \\ &= -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sigma^T(u) u + \frac{1}{2} \sigma^T(u) (L \otimes B^T B) \sigma(u) \\ &\leq -\sigma^T(u) \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} I_{Nm} - \frac{1}{2} L \otimes B^T B \right) \sigma(u), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $L = L^T$ for undirected graphs and that $z^T \sigma(z) \geq \sigma^T(z) \sigma(z)$ for any column vector z .

Since $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{2}{\lambda_N \|B^T B\|})$, $\Delta V \leq 0$ and $\Delta V = 0$ if and only if $(L \otimes B^T A)x = 0$. We shall show that $(L \otimes B^T A)x = 0$ if and only if $x \in M$, which in turn implies that $\Delta V = 0$ if and only if $x \in M$. We first note that if $x \in M$, then $(L \otimes B^T A)x = 0$ since the graph is connected. We then show that $(L \otimes B^T A)x = 0$ implies that $x \in M$. Note that $(L \otimes B^T A)x = 0$ implies that $(\tilde{L} \otimes B^T A)q = 0$, where the relative state $q = [q_2; \dots; q_N]$, $q_i = x_i - x_1$ for $i \in \{2, \dots, N\}$, and

$$\tilde{L} = \begin{bmatrix} \ell_{2,2} - \ell_{1,2} & \dots & \ell_{2,N} - \ell_{1,N} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \ell_{N,2} - \ell_{1,2} & \dots & \ell_{N,N} - \ell_{1,N} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(N-1) \times (N-1)}. \quad (5)$$

Since the graph is connected, it follows from [Zhang and Tian \(2009, Lemma 1\)](#) that the eigenvalues of \tilde{L} are the nonzero eigenvalues of the matrix L , which are positive. Thus, the matrix \tilde{L} is non-singular, i.e., $\text{rank}(\tilde{L}) = N - 1$.

From the fact that $A^T A = I_n$, we see that $(\tilde{L} \otimes B^T A)q = 0$ implies $q^T (\tilde{L} \otimes A^{-1} B) = 0$. Also note that $q(k+1) = (I_{N-1} \otimes A)q(k)$, since $u(k) = -\varepsilon(L \otimes B^T A)x(k) = 0$. Therefore

$$(\tilde{L} \otimes B^T A)q(k+1) = (\tilde{L} \otimes B^T A^2)q(k),$$

which is equivalent to $q^T (\tilde{L} \otimes A^{-2} B) = 0$. By iteration, we obtain $q^T (\tilde{L} \otimes A^{-r} B) = 0$ for $r = 3, 4, \dots, n+1$. Hence,

$$q^T \left(\tilde{L} \otimes A^{-(n+1)} \begin{bmatrix} A^n B & \dots & AB & B \end{bmatrix} \right) = 0. \quad (6)$$

Note that $\text{rank} \left(\begin{bmatrix} A^n B & \dots & AB & B \end{bmatrix} \right) = n$ since the pair (A, B) is controllable. This together with the fact that the matrix A is non-singular implies that $\text{rank} \left(A^{-(n+1)} \begin{bmatrix} A^n B & \dots & AB & B \end{bmatrix} \right) = n$. Finally, using the property of Kronecker product, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{rank} \left(\tilde{L} \otimes A^{-(n+1)} \begin{bmatrix} A^n B & \dots & AB & B \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &= \text{rank}(\tilde{L}) \text{rank} \left(A^{-(n+1)} \begin{bmatrix} A^n B & \dots & AB & B \end{bmatrix} \right) = (N-1)n. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the only solution of (6) is $q = 0$, which is equivalent to $x_1 = \dots = x_N$, i.e., $x \in M$. Hence, we have shown that $\Delta V(x) \leq 0$ and $\Delta V(x) = 0$ if and only if $x \in M$.

Since $\Delta V(x(k)) = V(x(k+1)) - V(x(k)) \leq 0$, we conclude that $V(x(k))$ is non-increasing in k . Thus, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} V(x(k)) = V_*$ for some $V_* \geq 0$ since $V \geq 0$. This implies that $\Delta V(x(k)) \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and hence $x(k) \rightarrow M$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, global consensus is achieved. ■

Remark 1. Note that the continuous-time counterpart was considered in Meng et al. (2013, Theorem 4.1). They considered the leader–follower case while we consider the leaderless case. It results in a completely different analysis which relies on set Lyapunov stability theory argument.

5. Double integrator agent model

In this section, we consider the case where the agent model (1) is a double integrator.

Assumption 4. The matrices A and B are of the form

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let us first recall the following result which gives a necessary and sufficient condition on the feedback gain parameters for achieving consensus without input saturation constraints.

Lemma 2 (Xie & Wang, 2012). Consider an MAS of N agents described by

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_i(k+1) \\ v_i(k+1) \end{bmatrix} = A \begin{bmatrix} x_i(k) \\ v_i(k) \end{bmatrix} + Bu_i(k), \quad i \in \mathcal{V}. \quad (7)$$

Assume that Assumptions 2 and 4 are satisfied. Then the protocol (2) with $K = -\begin{bmatrix} \alpha & \beta \end{bmatrix}$:

$$u_i(k) = -\alpha \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} a_{ij}(x_i(k) - x_j(k)) - \beta \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} a_{ij}(v_i(k) - v_j(k)), \quad (8)$$

solves the consensus problem if and only if

$$0 < \alpha < \beta < \frac{\alpha}{2} + \frac{2}{\lambda_N}. \quad (9)$$

The following theorem shows that a subset of the protocols (8), which solve the consensus problem for an MAS without input saturation constraints, also solve the global consensus problem for an MAS with input saturation constraints.

Theorem 2. Consider an MAS of N agents (1). Assume that Assumptions 2 and 4 are satisfied. Then the protocol (8) with

$$0 < \sqrt{3}\alpha < \beta < \frac{3}{2\lambda_N}, \quad (10)$$

solves the global consensus problem.

Proof. Let $x(k) = [x_1(k); \dots; x_N(k)]$, $v(k) = [v_1(k); \dots; v_N(k)]$, $u(k) = [u_1(k); \dots; u_N(k)]$, $y_i(k) = [x_i(k); v_i(k)]$, and $y(k) = [y_1(k); \dots; y_N(k)]$. To simplify the notation, sometimes x , v , u or y without explicitly indicating the time instant will refer to $x(k)$, $v(k)$, $u(k)$ or $y(k)$ respectively. With these definitions, we obtain the following dynamics:

$$\begin{aligned} y(k+1) &= (I_N \otimes A)y(k) + (I_N \otimes B)\sigma(u(k)), \\ u(k) &= (L \otimes \begin{bmatrix} -\alpha & -\beta \end{bmatrix})y(k). \end{aligned}$$

We also obtain that $x(k+1) = x(k) + v(k)$ and $v(k+1) = v(k) + \sigma(u(k))$. Note that $u(k)$ can be written in terms of $x(k)$ and $v(k)$ as

$$u(k) = -\alpha Lx(k) - \beta Lv(k). \quad (11)$$

Hence, we obtain

$$u(k+1) = u(k) - \alpha Lv(k) - \beta L\sigma(u(k)). \quad (12)$$

Motivated by the Lyapunov function in Yang, Stoorvogel et al. (2013), we consider the following Lyapunov candidate

$$V(y) = -\sigma^T(u)\sigma(u) + 2\sigma^T(u)u + 2\alpha\sigma^T(u)Lv + \alpha v^T Lv.$$

We sometimes drop the dependency of $V(y(k))$ on $y(k)$ for notational simplification when it is clear from the context. Similar to the proof of Theorem 1, we define a manifold where all the agent states are identical

$$M := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^{2N} | y_1 = y_2 = \dots = y_N\}.$$

Note that $V(y) = 0$ if $y \in M$. We will show that $V(y) \geq 0$ and $V(y) = 0$ if only if $y \in M$. Since $\sigma^T(z)z \geq \sigma^T(z)\sigma(z)$ for any column vector z , where the equality holds if and only if $-1 \leq z \leq 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} V &\geq \sigma^T(u)\sigma(u) + 2\alpha\sigma^T(u)Lv + \alpha v^T Lv \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \sigma(u) \\ Lv \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \alpha \\ \alpha & \frac{2}{3}\alpha\beta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sigma(u) \\ Lv \end{bmatrix} + v^T \left(\alpha L - \frac{2}{3}\alpha\beta L^T L \right) v, \quad (13) \end{aligned}$$

where the equality of (13) holds if and only if $-1 \leq u \leq 1$. Since $\beta > \sqrt{3}\alpha > \frac{3}{2}\alpha > 0$, the first term of (14) is non-negative and is equal to zero if and only if $\sigma(u) = 0$ and $Lv = 0$. Note that from (11), we see that $u = -\alpha Lx - \beta Lv = -\alpha Lx$; therefore, $Lx = 0$ since $\alpha \neq 0$. Thus, the first term is equal to zero if and only if $y \in M$. We next show that the second term is also non-negative. Since $L = L^T$, we see that the eigenvalues of the matrix $\alpha L - \frac{2}{3}\alpha\beta L^T L$ are $\alpha\lambda_i(1 - \frac{2}{3}\beta\lambda_i)$, where λ_i , $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ are the eigenvalues of the Laplacian matrix L . Since $\beta\lambda_N < \frac{3}{2}$, the second term is non-negative and equal to zero if and only if $Lv = 0$. Therefore, $V(y) \geq 0$ and $V(y) = 0$ if and only if $y \in M$.

Next, we show that $\Delta V(y(k)) = V(y(k+1)) - V(y(k)) \leq 0$. We sometimes drop the dependency $\Delta V(y(k))$ on $y(k)$ for notational simplification when it is clear from the context. With some algebra, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} V(y(k+1)) &= -t^T t + 2t^T u + 2(\alpha - \beta)t^T L\sigma(u) + \alpha v^T Lv \\ &\quad + 2\alpha v^T L\sigma(u) + \alpha\sigma^T(u)L\sigma(u), \end{aligned}$$

where to simplify notation we have used $t = \sigma(u(k+1))$. Note that $-1 \leq t \leq 1$ by the definition of the saturation function. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta V(y(k)) &= V(y(k+1)) - V(y(k)) \\ &= -t^T t + 2t^T u + 2(\alpha - \beta)t^T L\sigma(u) \\ &\quad + \sigma^T(u)(\alpha L + I)\sigma(u) - 2\sigma^T(u)u. \end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $u_i > 1$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, N_1\} := S_p$, $|u_i| \leq 1$ for $i \in \{N_1 + 1, \dots, N_2\} := S_m$, and $u_i < -1$ for $i \in \{N_2 + 1, \dots, N\} := S_q$, since if this is not the case, we can always relabel the nodes to achieve this. Note that the sets S_p , S_m , and S_q may be empty. We then define the partition $t = [t_p; t_m; t_q]$, $u = [u_p; u_m; u_q]$, where $t_p, u_p \in \mathbb{R}^{N_1}$, $t_m, u_m \in \mathbb{R}^{N_2 - N_1}$, and $t_q, u_q \in \mathbb{R}^{N - N_2}$ are defined accordingly. We partition the Laplacian matrix L accordingly

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} L_{pp} & L_{pm} & L_{pq} \\ L_{pm}^T & L_{mm} & L_{mq} \\ L_{pq}^T & L_{mq}^T & L_{qq} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $L_{pp}, L_{pm}, L_{pq}, L_{mm}, L_{mq}$ and L_{qq} are real matrices of appropriate dimensions. With some algebra, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta V &= -t^T_p t_p - t^T_m t_m - t^T_q t_q + 2t^T_p u_p + 2t^T_m u_m + 2t^T_q u_q \\ &\quad + 2(\alpha - \beta) \begin{bmatrix} t^T_p & t^T_m & t^T_q \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} L_{pp} & L_{pm} & L_{pq} \\ L^T_{pm} & L_{mm} & L_{mq} \\ L^T_{pq} & L^T_{mq} & L_{qq} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_p \\ u_m \\ -\mathbf{1}_q \end{bmatrix} \\ &\quad + \alpha \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}^T_p & u^T_m & -\mathbf{1}^T_q \end{bmatrix} L \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_p \\ u_m \\ -\mathbf{1}_q \end{bmatrix} + \mathbf{1}^T_p \mathbf{1}_p + u^T_m u_m + \mathbf{1}^T_q \mathbf{1}_q \\ &\quad - 2 \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}^T_p & u^T_m & -\mathbf{1}^T_q \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u_p \\ u_m \\ u_q \end{bmatrix} \\ &= 2(t_p - \mathbf{1}_p)^T(u_p - \mathbf{1}_p) + 2t^T_p \mathbf{1}_p - 2\mathbf{1}^T_p \mathbf{1}_p \\ &\quad + 2(t_q + \mathbf{1}_q)^T(u_q + \mathbf{1}_q) - 2t^T_q \mathbf{1}_q - 2\mathbf{1}^T_q \mathbf{1}_q - t^T_p t_p + 2t^T_p \\ &\quad \times \left[(\alpha - \beta) \begin{bmatrix} L_{pp} & L_{pm} & L_{pq} \\ \mathbf{1}_p \\ u_m \\ -\mathbf{1}_q \end{bmatrix} + \mathbf{1}_p \right] - 2t^T_p \mathbf{1}_p \\ &\quad - t^T_m t_m + 2t^T_m \left[(\alpha - \beta) \begin{bmatrix} L^T_{pm} & L_{mm} & L_{mq} \\ \mathbf{1}_p \\ u_m \\ -\mathbf{1}_q \end{bmatrix} + u_m \right] \\ &\quad - t^T_q t_q + 2t^T_q \left[(\alpha - \beta) \begin{bmatrix} L^T_{pq} & L^T_{mq} & L_{qq} \\ \mathbf{1}_p \\ u_m \\ -\mathbf{1}_q \end{bmatrix} - \mathbf{1}_q \right] \\ &\quad + 2t^T_q \mathbf{1}_q + \alpha \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}^T_p & u^T_m & -\mathbf{1}^T_q \end{bmatrix} L \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_p \\ u_m \\ -\mathbf{1}_q \end{bmatrix} + \mathbf{1}^T_p \mathbf{1}_p \\ &\quad + \mathbf{1}^T_q \mathbf{1}_q - u^T_m u_m. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} &-t^T_p t_p + 2t^T_p \left[(\alpha - \beta) \begin{bmatrix} L_{pp} & L_{pm} & L_{pq} \\ \mathbf{1}_p \\ u_m \\ -\mathbf{1}_q \end{bmatrix} + \mathbf{1}_p \right] \\ &= - \left\{ t_p - \left[(\alpha - \beta) \begin{bmatrix} L_{pp} & L_{pm} & L_{pq} \\ \mathbf{1}_p \\ u_m \\ -\mathbf{1}_q \end{bmatrix} + \mathbf{1}_p \right] \right\}^T \\ &\quad \times \left\{ t_p - \left[(\alpha - \beta) \begin{bmatrix} L_{pp} & L_{pm} & L_{pq} \\ \mathbf{1}_p \\ u_m \\ -\mathbf{1}_q \end{bmatrix} + \mathbf{1}_p \right] \right\} \\ &\quad + \left[(\alpha - \beta) \begin{bmatrix} L_{pp} & L_{pm} & L_{pq} \\ \mathbf{1}_p \\ u_m \\ -\mathbf{1}_q \end{bmatrix} + \mathbf{1}_p \right]^T \\ &\quad \times \left[(\alpha - \beta) \begin{bmatrix} L_{pp} & L_{pm} & L_{pq} \\ \mathbf{1}_p \\ u_m \\ -\mathbf{1}_q \end{bmatrix} + \mathbf{1}_p \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Similar completion of squares for

$$-t^T_m t_m + 2t^T_m \left[(\alpha - \beta) \begin{bmatrix} L^T_{pm} & L_{mm} & L_{mq} \\ \mathbf{1}_p \\ u_m \\ -\mathbf{1}_q \end{bmatrix} + u_m \right],$$

and

$$-t^T_q t_q + 2t^T_q \left[(\alpha - \beta) \begin{bmatrix} L^T_{pq} & L^T_{mq} & L_{qq} \\ \mathbf{1}_p \\ u_m \\ -\mathbf{1}_q \end{bmatrix} - \mathbf{1}_q \right],$$

yields

$$\Delta V = 2(t_p - \mathbf{1}_p)^T(u_p - \mathbf{1}_p) + 2(t_q + \mathbf{1}_p)^T(u_q + \mathbf{1}_p) - \left\{ t_p - \left[(\alpha - \beta) \begin{bmatrix} L_{pp} & L_{pm} & L_{pq} \\ \mathbf{1}_p \\ u_m \\ -\mathbf{1}_q \end{bmatrix} + \mathbf{1}_p \right] \right\}^T \quad (15)$$

$$\times \left\{ t_p - \left[(\alpha - \beta) \begin{bmatrix} L_{pp} & L_{pm} & L_{pq} \\ \mathbf{1}_p \\ u_m \\ -\mathbf{1}_q \end{bmatrix} + \mathbf{1}_p \right] \right\} \quad (16)$$

$$- \left\{ t_m - \left[(\alpha - \beta) \begin{bmatrix} L^T_{pm} & L_{mm} & L_{mq} \\ \mathbf{1}_p \\ u_m \\ -\mathbf{1}_q \end{bmatrix} + u_m \right] \right\}^T$$

$$\times \left\{ t_m - \left[(\alpha - \beta) \begin{bmatrix} L^T_{pm} & L_{mm} & L_{mq} \\ \mathbf{1}_p \\ u_m \\ -\mathbf{1}_q \end{bmatrix} + u_m \right] \right\} \quad (17)$$

$$- \left\{ t_q - \left[(\alpha - \beta) \begin{bmatrix} L^T_{pq} & L^T_{mq} & L_{qq} \\ \mathbf{1}_p \\ u_m \\ -\mathbf{1}_q \end{bmatrix} - \mathbf{1}_q \right] \right\}^T$$

$$\times \left\{ t_q - \left[(\alpha - \beta) \begin{bmatrix} L^T_{pq} & L^T_{mq} & L_{qq} \\ \mathbf{1}_p \\ u_m \\ -\mathbf{1}_q \end{bmatrix} - \mathbf{1}_q \right] \right\} \quad (18)$$

$$+ s^T \tilde{M} s, \quad (19)$$

where $s = [\mathbf{1}_p; u_m; -\mathbf{1}_q]$ and $\tilde{M} = (\alpha - \beta)^2 L^2 + (3\alpha - 2\beta)L$ since $L = L^T$. Note that the two terms in (15) are negative since $t_p - \mathbf{1}_p < 0, u_p - \mathbf{1}_p > 0, t_q + \mathbf{1}_q > 0, u_q + \mathbf{1}_q < 0$, and that the terms in (16)–(18) are all non-positive. In order to show that $\Delta V \leq 0$, it is sufficient to show that the term (19) is also non-positive, i.e., to show that the matrix \tilde{M} is negative semi-definite. It is easy to see that the eigenvalues of the matrix \tilde{M} are $(\alpha - \beta)^2 \lambda_i^2 + (3\alpha - 2\beta)\lambda_i, i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. Hence, \tilde{M} has one simple eigenvalue at zero with the corresponding right eigenvector $\mathbf{1}$, while all other eigenvalues are $(\alpha - \beta)^2 \lambda_i^2 + (3\alpha - 2\beta)\lambda_i, i \in \{2, \dots, N\}$. We shall show that all these eigenvalues are negative. Since $\lambda_i > 0$ and $\lambda_i \leq \lambda_N$, it is sufficient to show that $\lambda_N < \frac{2\beta - 3\alpha}{(\alpha - \beta)^2}$. We note that $\lambda_N < \frac{3}{2\beta}$ from (10).

Thus, it is sufficient to show that $\frac{3}{2\beta} < \frac{2\beta - 3\alpha}{(\alpha - \beta)^2}$. With some algebra, we see that this is equivalent to show that $\beta > \sqrt{3}\alpha$, which is true given (10).

Hence, we have shown that $\Delta V(y) \leq 0$. We then show that $\Delta V(y) = 0$ if and only if $y \in M$. To show this, we first note that $\Delta V < 0$ if the first two terms (15) are not empty since they are negative. Therefore, $\Delta V = 0$ only if these terms are empty. This is the case when $|u_i| \leq 1$ for all the agents $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, i.e., when the sets S_p and S_q are empty. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta V &= -t^T t + 2t^T u + 2(\alpha - \beta)t^T L u + u^T(\alpha L - I)u \\ &= -\{t - [(\alpha - \beta)L + I_N]u\}^T \{t - [(\alpha - \beta)L + I_N]u\} \\ &\quad + u^T \tilde{M} u. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Note that the term in (20) is non-positive and is equal to zero if and only if $t = [(\alpha - \beta)L + I_N]u$.

Recall that \tilde{M} has exactly one zero eigenvalue with the corresponding right eigenvector $\mathbf{1}$, while all other eigenvalues are negative. Therefore, the term $u^T \tilde{M} u$ is also non-positive and it is equal to zero if and only if $Lu = 0$.

Hence, we conclude that $\Delta V = 0$ if and only if $t = [(\alpha - \beta)L + I]u$ and $Lu = 0$. Since $Lu = 0$, we obtain $t = u$. On the other hand, from (12), we obtain

$$t = \sigma(u(k + 1)) = u(k + 1) = u - \alpha Lv - \beta L\sigma(u) = u - \alpha Lv.$$

Thus, we see that $Lv = 0$ since $\alpha \neq 0$. Thus $v_1 = \dots = v_N$ since the graph is connected. From (11), we obtain $u = -\alpha Lx - \beta Lv = -\alpha Lx$.




Fig. 1. Network with seven agents.

This together with the fact that $Lu = 0$ implies that $\tilde{L}q = 0$, where the relative state $q = [q_2; \dots; q_N]$, $q_i = x_i - x_1$ for $i \in \{2, \dots, N\}$, and \tilde{L} is given by (5). Since the matrix \tilde{L} is non-singular, we see that $q = 0$, i.e., $x_1 = \dots = x_N$. Therefore $\Delta V(y) = 0$ if and only if $y \in M$.

Hence, we have shown that $\Delta V(y) \leq 0$ and $\Delta V(y) = 0$ if and only if $y \in M$. It then follows from a similar analysis as in the end of the proof of Theorem 1, that $y(k) \rightarrow M$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, global consensus is achieved. ■

Remark 2. Note that for the continuous-time case, Meng et al. (2013, Theorem 5.1) shows that any linear protocols, which solve the consensus problem for an MAS without input saturation

constraints, also solve the global consensus problem for an MAS with input saturation constraints. In this sense, the result of Theorem 2 is different since it requires a more restricted condition given by (10) on the feedback gain parameters of the linear protocol (8).

Remark 3. The Lyapunov function (14) has one additional term $\alpha \sigma^T(u)Lv$ compared to the Lyapunov function used in Meng et al. (2013, Theorem 5.1) for the continuous-time case. The stability analysis is substantially different from the one in Meng et al. (2013, Theorem 5.1).

6. Illustrative example

In this section, we illustrate our results on global consensus with input saturation constraints for a network with $N = 7$ double integrators, whose topology is given in Fig. 1. Choose $\alpha = 0.07$ and $\beta = 0.15$ such that the condition (10) is satisfied. The simulation results shown in Fig. 2 confirm the results of Theorem 2.

7. Conclusions and future work

This paper considered the global consensus problem for an MAS of discrete-time identical linear agents, where the agent dynamics are either neutrally stable or a double integrator, with input saturation constraints under fixed undirected network topologies. Extensions to directed topologies and time-varying topologies are currently under investigation. Another interesting topic is to consider heterogeneous networks.




Fig. 2. Simulation results with input saturation constraint.

References

- Bai, H., Arcak, M., & Wen, J. (2011). *Communications and control engineering, Cooperative control design: a systematic, passivity-based approach*. New York: Springer.
- Bao, X., Lin, Z., & Sontag, E. D. (2000). Finite gain stabilization of discrete-time linear systems subject to actuator saturation. *Automatica*, 36(2), 269–277.
- Blondel, V., Hendrickx, J., Olshevsky, A., & Tsitsiklis, J. (2005). Convergence in multiagent coordination, consensus, and flocking. In *Proc. joint 44th CDC and ECC* (pp. 2996–3000). Sevilla, Spain.
- Cortés, J. (2006). Finite-time convergence gradient flows with applications to network consensus. *Automatica*, 42(11), 1993–2000.
- Du, H., Li, S., & Ding, S. (2013). Bounded consensus algorithms for multi-agent systems in directed networks. *Asian Journal of Control*, 15(1), 282–291.
- Grip, H., Yang, T., Saberi, A., & Stoorvogel, A. (2012). Output synchronization for heterogeneous networks of non-introspective agents. *Automatica*, 48(10), 2444–2453.
- Jadbabaie, A., Lin, J., & Morse, A. (2003). Coordination of groups of mobile autonomous agents using nearest neighbor rules. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 48(6), 988–1001.
- Li, S., Du, H., & Lin, X. (2011). Finite-time consensus algorithm for multi-agent systems with double-integrator dynamics. *Automatica*, 47(8), 1706–1712.
- Li, Z., Duan, Z., Chen, G., & Huang, L. (2010). Consensus of multi-agent systems and synchronization of complex networks: a unified viewpoint. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems I: Regular Papers*, 57(1), 213–224.
- Li, Y., Xiang, J., & Wei, W. (2011). Consensus problems for linear time-invariant multi-agent systems with saturation constraints. *IET Control Theory and Applications*, 5(6), 823–829.
- Low, S., Paganini, F., & Doyle, J. (2002). Internet congestion control. *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, 22, 28–43.
- Lynch, N. (1996). *Distributed algorithms*. San Mateo, CA: Morgan Kaufmann.
- Meng, Z., Zhao, Z., & Lin, Z. (2013). On global leader-following consensus of identical linear dynamic systems subject to actuator saturation. *Systems & Control Letters*, 62(2), 132–142.
- Moreau, L. (2005). Stability of multiagent systems with time-dependent communication links. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 50(2), 169–182.
- Olfati-Saber, R., & Murray, R. (2004). Consensus problems in networks of agents with switching topology and time-delays. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 49(9), 1520–1533.
- Ren, W., & Beard, R. (2005). Consensus seeking in multiagent systems under dynamically changing interaction topologies. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 50(5), 655–661.
- Saberi, A., Stoorvogel, A., & Sannuti, P. (2012). *Internal and external stabilization of linear systems with constraints*. Boston: Birkhäuser.
- Scardovi, L., & Sepulchre, R. (2009). Synchronization in networks of identical linear systems. *Automatica*, 45(11), 2557–2562.
- Seo, J., Shim, H., & Back, J. (2009). Consensus of high-order linear systems using dynamic output feedback compensator: low gain approach. *Automatica*, 45(11), 2659–2664.
- Seyboth, G., Dimarogonas, D., & Johansson, K. (2013). Event-based broadcasting for multi-agent average consensus. *Automatica*, 49(1), 245–252.
- Shi, G., & Hong, Y. (2009). Global target aggregation and state agreement of nonlinear multi-agent systems with switching topologies. *Automatica*, 45(5), 1165–1175.
- Shi, G., Saberi, A., & Stoorvogel, A. (2003). On the L_p (ℓ_p) stabilization of open-loop neutrally stable linear plants with input subject to amplitude saturation. *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, 13(8), 735–754.
- Sussmann, H., Sontag, E., & Yang, Y. (1994). A general result on the stabilization of linear systems using bounded controls. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 39(12), 2411–2425.
- Teel, A. (1992). Feedback stabilization: nonlinear solutions to inherently nonlinear problems. Ph.D. Thesis, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, CA.
- Tsitsiklis, J. (1984). Problems in decentralized decision making and computation. Ph.D. Thesis, MIT, Cambridge, MA.
- Tuna, S. (2008). Synchronizing linear systems via partial-state coupling. *Automatica*, 44(8), 2179–2184.
- Wen, J., & Arcak, M. (2004). A unifying passivity framework for network flow control. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 49(2), 162–174.
- Wieland, P., Sepulchre, R., & Allgöwer, F. (2011). An internal model principle is necessary and sufficient for linear output synchronization. *Automatica*, 47(5), 1068–1074.
- Wu, C., & Chua, L. (1995). Application of Kronecker products to the analysis of systems with uniform linear coupling. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems I: Fundamental Theory and Applications*, 42(10), 775–778.
- Xiao, F., & Wang, L. (2008). Asynchronous consensus in continuous-time multi-agent systems with switching topology and time-varying delays. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 53(8), 1804–1816.
- Xie, D., & Wang, S. (2012). Consensus of second-order discrete-time multi-agent systems with fixed topology. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 387(1), 8–16.
- Yang, T., Roy, S., Wan, Y., & Saberi, A. (2011). Constructing consensus controllers for networks with identical general linear agents. *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, 21(11), 1237–1256.
- Yang, Y., Sontag, E., & Sussmann, H. (1997). Global stabilization of linear discrete-time systems with bounded feedback. *Systems & Control Letters*, 30(5), 273–281.
- Yang, T., Stoorvogel, A., Grip, H., & Saberi, A. (2012). Semi-global regulation of output synchronization for heterogeneous networks of non-introspective, invertible agents subject to actuator saturation. *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control* (in preparation).
- Yang, T., Stoorvogel, A., & Saberi, A. (2013). Dynamic behavior of the discrete-time double integrator with saturated locally stabilizing linear state feedback laws. *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, 23(17), 1899–1931.
- You, K., & Xie, L. (2011). Network topology and communication data rate for consensusability of discrete-time multi-agent systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 56(10), 2262–2275.
- Yu, W., Chen, G., & Cao, M. (2010). Some necessary and sufficient conditions for second-order consensus in multi-agent dynamical systems. *Automatica*, 46(6), 1089–1095.
- Zhang, H., Lewis, F., & Qu, Z. (2012). Lyapunov, adaptive, and optimal design techniques for cooperative systems on directed communication graphs. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, 59(7), 3026–3041.
- Zhang, Y., & Tian, Y. (2009). Consensusability and protocol design of multi-agent systems with stochastic switching topology. *Automatica*, 45(5), 1195–1201.
- Zhao, J., Hill, D. J., & Liu, T. (2011). Synchronization of dynamical networks with nonidentical nodes: criteria and control. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems I: Regular Papers*, 58(3), 584–594.



Tao Yang received the B.S. degree in Computer Science from the Harbin University of Science and Technology in July 2003, the M.S. degree with distinction in Control Engineering from City University, London, in November 2004, and the Ph.D. degree in Electrical Engineering from Washington State University in August 2012. He is currently a Postdoctoral Researcher at the ACCESS Linnaeus Centre, Royal Institute of Technology (KTH), Sweden. His research interests are multi-agent systems, constrained control, and switched linear systems.



Ziyang Meng received the B.S. degree from the Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, China, in 2006 and the Ph.D. degree from Tsinghua University, Beijing, China, in 2010. From 2008 to 2009, he was an exchange Ph.D. student supported by China Scholarship Council with the Department Electrical and Computer Engineering, Utah State University, Logan. He was a Postdoctoral Researcher from 2010 to 2012 with Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China. He is currently a Postdoctoral Researcher with the KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden. His research interests include cooperative

control of distributed multi-agent systems and spacecraft attitude determination and control.



Dimos V. Dimarogonas was born in Athens, Greece, in 1978. He received the Diploma in Electrical and Computer Engineering in 2001 and the Ph.D. in Mechanical Engineering in 2006, both from the National Technical University of Athens (NTUA), Greece. Between May 2007 and February 2009, he was a Postdoctoral Researcher at the Automatic Control Laboratory, School of Electrical Engineering, ACCESS Linnaeus Center, Royal Institute of Technology (KTH), Stockholm, Sweden. Between February 2009 and March 2010, he was a Postdoctoral Associate at the Laboratory for Information and Decision Systems (LIDS) at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), Boston, MA, USA. He is currently an Assistant Professor at the Automatic Control Laboratory, ACCESS Linnaeus Center, Royal Institute of Technology (KTH), Stockholm, Sweden.

His current research interests include Multi-Agent Systems, Hybrid Systems and Control, Robot Navigation and Networked Control. He was awarded a Docent in Automatic Control at KTH in 2012. He serves in the Editorial Board of *Automatica* and the IET Control Theory and Applications and is a member of IEEE and the Technical Chamber of Greece.



Karl H. Johansson is Director of the KTH ACCESS Linnaeus Centre and Professor at the School of Electrical Engineering, Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden. He is a Wallenberg Scholar and has held a six-year Senior Researcher Position with the Swedish Research Council. He is the Director of the Stockholm Strategic Research Area ICT The Next Generation. He received M.Sc. and Ph.D. degrees in Electrical Engineering from Lund University. He has held visiting positions at UC Berkeley (1998–2000) and the California Institute of Technology (2006–2007). His research interests are in networked control systems,

hybrid and embedded system, and applications in smart transportation, energy,

and automation systems. He has been a member of the IEEE Control Systems Society Board of Governors and the Chair of the IFAC Technical Committee on Networked Systems. He has been on the Editorial Boards of several journals, including *Automatica*, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, and *IET Control Theory and Applications*. He has been Guest Editor for special issues, including the one on “Wireless Sensor and Actuator Networks” of *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 2011. He was the General Chair of the ACM/IEEE Cyber-Physical Systems Week 2010 in Stockholm and IPC Chair of many conferences. He has served on the Executive Committees of several European research projects in the

area of networked embedded systems. In 2009, he received the Best Paper Award of the IEEE International Conference on Mobile Ad-hoc and Sensor Systems. In 2009, he was also awarded Wallenberg Scholar, as one of the first ten scholars from all sciences, by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation. He was awarded an Individual Grant for the Advancement of Research Leaders from the Swedish Foundation for Strategic Research in 2005. He received the triennial Young Author Prize from IFAC in 1996 and the Peccei Award from the International Institute of System Analysis, Austria, in 1993. He received Young Researcher Awards from Scania in 1996 and from Ericsson in 1998 and 1999. He is a Fellow of the IEEE.