

- [12] T. T. Georgiou and A. Lindquist, "Kullback-Leibler approximation of spectral density functions," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 49, no. 11, pp. 2910–2917, Nov. 2003.
- [13] T. T. Georgiou, "Solution of the general moment problem via a one-parameter imbedding," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 50, no. 6, pp. 811–826, Jun. 2005.
- [14] —, "Relative entropy and the multi-variable multi-dimensional moment problem," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 52, no. 3, pp. 1052–1066, Mar. 2006.
- [15] M. G. Krein and A. A. Nudel'man, *The Markov Moment Problem and Extremal Problems*. Providence, RI: AMS, 1977, p. 417.
- [16] D. Mustafa and K. Glover, "Minimum entropy H_∞ control," *SIAM Rev.*, vol. 35, pp. 652–654, 1993.
- [17] R. Nagamune, "Robust control with complexity constraint: A Nevanlinna–Pick interpolation approach," Ph.D. dissertation, Royal Inst. Technol., Stockholm, Sweden, 2002, TRITA-MAT-02-OS-10.
- [18] D. Sarason, "Generalized interpolation in H^∞ ," *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, vol. 127, pp. 179–203, 1967.
- [19] R. E. Skelton, T. Iwasaki, and K. Grigoriadis, *A Unified Approach to Linear Control Design*. New York: Taylor and Francis, 1997.
- [20] A. R. Tannenbaum, "Feedback stabilization of linear dynamical plants with uncertainty in the gain factor," *Int. J. Control*, vol. 32, pp. 1–16, 1980.
- [21] L. Y. Wang and G. Zames, "Lipschitz continuity of H-infinity interpolation," *Syst. Control Lett.*, vol. 14, pp. 381–387, 1990.
- [22] G. Zames, "Feedback and optimal sensitivity: Model reference transformations, multiplicative seminorms, and approximate inverses," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. AC-26, no. 4, pp. 301–320, Apr. 1981.
- [23] K. Zhou, J. C. Doyle, and K. Glover, *Robust and Optimal Control*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice-Hall, 1996.

A Theoretical Study of Different Leader Roles in Networks

Wei Wang and Jean-Jacques E. Slotine

Abstract—We study synchronization conditions for distributed dynamic networks with different types of leaders. The role of a "power" leader specifying a desired global state trajectory through local interactions has long been recognized and modeled. This note introduces the complementary notion of a "knowledge" leader holding information on the target dynamics, which is propagated to the entire network through local adaptation mechanisms. Different types of leaders can coexist in the same network. For instance, in a network of locally connected oscillators, the power leader may set the global phase while the knowledge leader may set the global frequency and the global amplitude. Knowledge-based leader-followers networks have many analogs in biology, e.g., in evolutionary processes and disease propagation.

Index Terms—Adaptation, group cooperation, leaders, networks, synchronization.

I. INTRODUCTION

Recent results in the theoretical study of synchronization and group cooperation [10], [13], [22], [5], [24], [30], [32], [28], [33] have greatly helped understand distributed networks in the natural world and emulate them in artificial systems. In these networks, each element only

Manuscript received October 7, 2004; revised August 26, 2005. Recommended by Associate Editor G. Pappas. This work was supported in part by a Grant from the National Institutes of Health.

The authors are with the Nonlinear Systems Laboratory, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139 USA (e-mail: wangwei@mit.edu; jjs@mit.edu).

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/TAC.2006.878754

gets local information from a set of neighbors but the whole system exhibits a collective behavior. Examples of such networked systems pervade nature at every scale, including for instance neural networks, pacemaker cells, flashing fireflies, chirping crickets, and the aggregate motions of bird flocks, fish schools, animal herds and bee swarms. For diffusion-coupled networks with arbitrary size and general structure, explicit conditions on the coupling strengths can be derived for synchronization to occur, based on network connectivity and uncoupled element dynamics [28], [33].

In a network composed of peers, the phase of the collective behavior is hard to predict, since it depends on the initial conditions of all the coupled elements. To let the whole network converge to a specific trajectory, a "leader" can be added [10], [13]. Here, the leader is an element whose dynamics is independent from and thus followed by all the others. Such leader–followers network occurs in natural aggregate motions, with the leader specifying "where to go." We will refer to this kind of leader as the *power leader*. A synchronization condition for a dynamic network with a power leader was derived in [28] and [33], and will be briefly reviewed here (Section II).

The main goal of this note is to introduce a different type of leader, which we shall refer to as a *knowledge leader* (Section III). In this case, the network members' dynamics can all be different. The knowledge leader is the one whose dynamics properties are fixed (or changes comparatively slowly), with the followers obtaining dynamic knowledge from the leader through local adaptation mechanisms. In this sense, a knowledge leader can be understood as the one who indicates "how to go." Such knowledge leaders may exist in many natural processes. For instance, in evolutionary biology [21], [23], the adaptive model we describe could represent genotype–phenotype mappings. Similar mechanisms occur in infectious-disease dynamics [16]. Knowledge leaders may also exist in animal aggregate motion as a junior or injured member with limited capacities. Using Lyapunov analysis, we shall derive conditions of synchronization and also for dynamics convergence for networks with knowledge leaders.

Both types of leaders may coexist (Section IV), and be located anywhere in the network. In a circuit of electronic oscillators, the power leader may be a local clock setting global phase while the knowledge leader sets global frequency or amplitude, for instance. Both types of leaders can be virtual (as, e.g., in [13] in the case of power leaders) and may be used for instance to coordinate behaviors in groups of robots of different types.

II. POWER LEADER

Consider the dynamics of a coupled network containing one power leader and n power followers

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\mathbf{x}}_0 &= \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_0, t) \\ \dot{\mathbf{x}}_i &= \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_i, t) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \mathbf{K}_{ji}(\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i) \\ &\quad + \gamma_i \mathbf{K}_{0i}(\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{x}_i).\end{aligned}\quad (1)$$

Here, vector $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the state of the leader whose dynamics is independent, and \mathbf{x}_i the state of the i th follower, $i = 1, \dots, n$. The vector function \mathbf{f} represents the uncoupled dynamics, which is assumed to be identical for each element. For notational simplicity, the coupling forces are set to be diffusive, where all coupling gains are symmetric positive definite, and the couplings between the followers are bidirectional with $\mathbf{K}_{ji} = \mathbf{K}_{ij}$ if both $i, j \neq 0$. \mathcal{N}_i denotes the set of peer-neighbors of element i , which for instance could be defined as the set of the followers within a certain distance around element i . γ_i is equal to either 0 or 1, representing the connection from the leader to the followers. In our model, the network connectivity can be very general. Thus, \mathcal{N}_i and γ_i can be defined arbitrarily. An example is illustrated in Fig. 1(a).




Fig. 1. Graphs illustrate networked systems with (a) a power leader (the left-most node); (b) a knowledge leader (the hollow node); and (c) both leaders. The arrows indicate the directions of the couplings.

Since the dynamics of \mathbf{x}_0 is independent, it can be considered as an external input to the rest of the network. Therefore, it can be seen as an undirected graph with n nodes containing only the followers. We further assume that it has τ inner links.

In Theorem 1, λ represents an eigenvalue and subscript s the symmetric part of a matrix; notation $\mathbf{I}_{\gamma_i \mathbf{K}_{0i}}^n$ denotes an $n \times n$ block diagonal matrix with the i th diagonal entry as $\gamma_i \mathbf{K}_{0i}$; \mathbf{L}_K is the weighted Laplacian matrix [7] and

$$\mathbf{L}_K = \mathbf{D} \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{K}_{ij}}^{\tau} \mathbf{D}^T$$

where the $n \times \tau$ block matrix \mathbf{D} is a generalized incidence matrix by replacing each number 1 or -1 in the incidence matrix [7] with identity matrix $\mathbf{I} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ or $-\mathbf{I}$. Note that the incidence matrix here is obtained by assigning an arbitrary orientation to the undirected graph which contains all the followers. $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{K}_{ij}}^{\tau}$ is a $\tau \times \tau$ block diagonal matrix with the k th diagonal entry \mathbf{K}_{ij} corresponding to the weight of the k th link which connects the nodes i and j .

Theorem 1: The states of all the followers will converge exponentially to the state of the leader if

$$\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{L}_K + \mathbf{I}_{\gamma_i \mathbf{K}_{0i}}^n) > \max_{i=1}^n \lambda_{\max} \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}_i, t) \right) \quad \text{uniformly.}$$

The proof of Theorem 1 [33, Th. 7] is based on the Contraction Theory [14], [15], the details of which can be found in [28] and [33].

Remarks:

- Theorem 1 can be extended to study networks with unidirectional couplings between the followers, with positive-semidefinite couplings, or with switching structures [28], [33]. Moreover, the leader does not have to be single, but it can be a group of leading elements, for instance, a synchronized leaders' group. In addition, in some cases it may receive feedback from the followers as well. This is the case in synchronization propagation, where the node density is unevenly distributed through the network. Since the synchronization rate depends on network connectivity, a high-density region will synchronize very quickly despite disturbances from other parts of the network. The inputs from these leaders then facilitate synchronization in low-density regions, where the elements may not be able to synchronize by themselves. A simple simulation was given in [28], and [34] observed a similar phenomenon by setting different interior connection weights inside different subgroups. Note that the leaders group here is very similar to the concept of *core group* in infectious disease dynamics [16], which is a group of the most active individuals. A small change in the core group will make a big difference in whether or not an epidemic can occur in the whole population.
- Synchronization can be made to propagate from the center outward in a more active way, for instance, through diffusion of a chemical produced by leaders or high-level elements and having the ability to expand the communication channels it passes through, i.e., to increase the gains through diffusion. Such a mechanism represents a hierarchical combination with gain

dynamics. By extending the state, the analysis tools provided here can apply more generally to combinations where the gain dynamics are coupled to each other (with arbitrary connectivity) and to the \mathbf{x}_i .

- Different leaders \mathbf{x}_0^j of arbitrary dynamics can define different *primitives* which can be combined. Contraction of the follower dynamics ($i = 1, \dots, n$)

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}}_i = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_i, t) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \mathbf{K}_{ji}(\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i) + \sum_j \alpha_j(t) \gamma_j^d \mathbf{K}_{0i}^j (\mathbf{x}_0^j - \mathbf{x}_i)$$

is preserved if $\sum_j \alpha_j(t) \geq 1, \forall t \geq 0$.

- Besides its dubious moral implications, Theorem 1 also means that it is easy to detract a group from its nominal behavior by introducing a “covert” element, with possible applications to group control games, ethology, and animal and plant mimicry.
- Having a leader in a moving formation may yield other advantages, such as energy saving in aerodynamics [2], [26].
- In the central nervous system, the recently recognized pervasiveness of electrical synapses facilitates such bilateral, diffusion-like mechanisms.

III. KNOWLEDGE LEADER

A knowledge-based leader–followers network is composed of elements with nonidentical but adaptive dynamics. A knowledge leader may be located in any position inside a network as we illustrated in Fig. 1(b). Its dynamics is fixed or slowly changing, while those of the followers are learned from the leader through adaptation. If we consider the power leader as the one which tells the rest of the network “where to go,” a knowledge leader indicates “how to go.” Synchronization or group agreement can still be achieved in such a network with only local interactions.

Consider a coupled network containing n elements without a power leader

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}}_i = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{a}_i, t) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \mathbf{K}_{ji}(\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad (2)$$

where the connectivity can be general. Assume that the uncoupled dynamics $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{a}_i, t)$ is continuous, smooth, and identical to each element except the value of a parameter set \mathbf{a}_i , which is different for knowledge followers but has a fixed value \mathbf{a} for all the knowledge leaders. Denote Ω as the set of the followers, whose adaptation laws are based on local interactions

$$\dot{\mathbf{a}}_i = \mathbf{P}_i \mathbf{W}^T(\mathbf{x}_i, t) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \mathbf{K}_{ji}(\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i) \quad \forall i \in \Omega \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{P}_i > 0$ is constant and symmetric, and $\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}_i, t)$ is defined as

$$\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{a}_i, t) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{a}, t) + \mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}_i, t) \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_i$$

with estimation error $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_i = \mathbf{a}_i - \mathbf{a}$.

To prove convergence, we first define $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}\Lambda}$ as a symmetric matrix with

$$\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}\Lambda} = \mathbf{D} \left(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{K}_{ij}^s} \mathbf{I}_{\Lambda_{ij}^s} \right)_s \mathbf{D}^T = \mathbf{D} \mathbf{I}_{(\mathbf{K}\Lambda)_{ij}^s} \mathbf{D}^T. \quad (4)$$

Here, $\mathbf{I}_{\Lambda_{ij}^s}$ is a $\tau \times \tau$ block diagonal matrix with the k th diagonal entry

$$\Lambda_{ij} = \int_0^1 \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}_j + \chi(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j), \mathbf{a}, t) d\chi$$

corresponding to the k th link which has been assigned an orientation by the incidence matrix \mathbf{D} . $\mathbf{I}_{(\mathbf{K}\Lambda)_{ij}^s}$ is defined in a similar manner with $(\mathbf{K}\Lambda)_{ij}^s$ the symmetric part of $\mathbf{K}_{ij}^s \Lambda_{ij}^s$.

We then define a Lyapunov-like function

$$V = \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}} \mathbf{x} + \sum_{i \in \Omega} \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_i^T \mathbf{P}_i^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_i)$$

where $\mathbf{x}^T = [\mathbf{x}_1^T, \mathbf{x}_2^T, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n^T]$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\mathbf{x}} &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{a}_1, t) \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{a}_n, t) \end{bmatrix} - \mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}} \mathbf{x} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{a}, t) \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{a}, t) \end{bmatrix} - \mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}} \mathbf{x} + \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}_1, t)(\mathbf{a}_1 - \mathbf{a}) \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}_n, t)(\mathbf{a}_n - \mathbf{a}) \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V} &= \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}} \dot{\mathbf{x}} + \sum_{i \in \Omega} \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_i^T \mathbf{P}_i^{-1} \dot{\tilde{\mathbf{a}}}_i \\ &= \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{a}, t) \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{a}, t) \end{bmatrix} - \mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}} \mathbf{x} \right) \\ &= \mathbf{x}^T (\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}} \Lambda - \mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}}^2) \mathbf{x}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mathbf{a}_i - \mathbf{a} = 0$ if element i is a knowledge leader.

To complete the proof, we use the following lemma, which is derived in Appendix I.

Lemma 1: Giving any $\mathbf{x}^T = [\mathbf{x}_1^T, \mathbf{x}_2^T, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n^T]$ where $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$, if

$$\frac{\lambda_{m+1}^2(\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}})}{\lambda_n(\mathbf{L})} > \max_k \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{K}\Lambda)_{ij}^s \quad (5)$$

$\mathbf{x}^T (\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}} \Lambda - \mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}}^2) \mathbf{x} \leq 0$ and the equality is true if and only if $\mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{x}_2 = \dots = \mathbf{x}_n$.

Note that for condition (5) to be true, we need a connected network (otherwise, $\lambda_{m+1}(\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}}) = 0$), an upper bounded $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{K}\Lambda)_{ij}^s$, and strong enough coupling strengths (to make the inequality to be true). For an example, if $m = 1$ and all the coupling gains are identical with value κ , condition (5) turns to be

$$\kappa > \frac{\lambda_n(\mathbf{L})}{\lambda_2^2(\mathbf{L})} \max \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{a}, t).$$

Theorem 2: For a knowledge-based leader-followers network, the states of all the elements will converge together asymptotically if (5) is

verified and all the states are bounded. Furthermore, $\forall i \in \Omega$, \mathbf{a}_i will converge to \mathbf{a} if

$$\begin{aligned} \exists \alpha > 0, T > 0 \quad \forall t \geq 0 \\ \times \int_t^{t+T} \mathbf{W}^T(\mathbf{x}_i, r) \mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}_i, r) dr \geq \alpha \mathbf{I}. \quad (6) \end{aligned}$$

Proof: Condition (5) means V is nonincreasing. Assuming all the functions are smoothly differentiable, the boundedness of \dot{V} can be concluded if all the states are bounded. According to Barbalat's lemma [27], \dot{V} will then tend to 0 asymptotically, implying that all the states \mathbf{x}_i converge together. Hence, $\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{x}_i, t) \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_i$ will tend to zero. This in turn, using standard persistency of excitation arguments [20], [27], leads to the convergence of the followers' parameters under condition (6). \square

Theorem 2 implies that new elements can be added into the network without prior knowledge of the individual dynamic parameters, and that elements in an existing network have the ability to recover dynamic information if temporarily lost. Similar knowledge-based leader-followers mechanism may exist in many natural processes. In evolutionary biology, knowledge leaders are essential to keep the evolution processes uninvasive or evolutionary stable [21], [23]. In reproduction, for instance, the leaders could be senior members. The knowledge-based mechanism may also describe evolutionary mutation or disease infection [16], where the leaders are mutants or invaders. Knowledge-based leader-following may also occur in animal aggregate motions or human social activities. In a bird flock, for instance, the knowledge leader can be a junior or injured member whose moving capacity is limited, and which is protected by others through dynamic adaptation.

Note that in evolutionary biology, the adaptive model we describe may loosely represent a genotype-phenotype mapping, where adaptation occurring in genotypic space is based on the interactions of behavioral phenotypes.

Example 3.1: Consider six neurons of FitzHugh–Nagumo type (a well-known spiking neuron model [6], [18], [19]), connected as in Fig. 1(b)

$$\begin{cases} \dot{v}_i = v_i(\alpha_i - v_i)(v_i - 1) - w_i + I_i + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} k_{ij}(v_j - v_i) \\ \dot{w}_i = \beta_i v_i - \gamma_i w_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, 6 \end{cases}$$

Let the parameter set $\mathbf{a}_i = [\alpha_i, I_i, \gamma_i, \beta_i]^T$ be fixed for the knowledge leader, and let those of the other neurons change according to the adaptation law (3). Simulation results are plotted in Fig. 2.

Remarks:

- Leaders holding different parameters may exist in the same network, a situation somewhat analogous to a human society containing experts in different fields. For instance, consider (2) again. Assume the dynamics \mathbf{f} contains l parameter sets $\mathbf{a}^1, \mathbf{a}^2, \dots, \mathbf{a}^l$ with

$$\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{a}_i^1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_i^l, t) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{a}^1, \dots, \mathbf{a}^l, t) + \sum_{k=1}^l \mathbf{W}_k(\mathbf{x}_i, t) \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_i^k.$$

Denoting by $\Omega^1, \Omega^2, \dots, \Omega^l$, the followers sets corresponding to different parameters, the adaptation laws are, for $k = 1, 2, \dots, l$,

$$\dot{\tilde{\mathbf{a}}}_i^k = \mathbf{P}_i^k \mathbf{W}_k^T(\mathbf{x}_i, t) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \mathbf{K}_{ji}(\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i) \quad \forall i \in \Omega^k.$$

States and parameters will converge under the same conditions as those given in Theorem 2.




Fig. 2. Simulation results of Example 3.1. With initial conditions chosen arbitrarily, the plots show that (a) states v_i ($i = 1, \dots, 6$) synchronize in the time space; and (b) estimation error set $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i$ of any of the knowledge followers vanish in the time space.

- To further improve the convergence rate, the adaptation law (3) may be refined as

$$\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i = \mathbf{a}_i + \mathbf{Q}_i \mathbf{W}^T(\mathbf{x}_i, t) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \mathbf{K}_{ji}(\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i)$$

where $\mathbf{Q}_i > 0$ is constant and symmetric, \mathbf{a}_i is defined by (3), and $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i$ is used in real dynamics, i.e., $\mathbf{f}_i = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_i, \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i, t)$. Note that in the theoretical analysis we should use a modified Lyapunov-like function

$$V = \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{L}_K \mathbf{x} + \sum_{i \in \Omega} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i^T \mathbf{P}_i^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i \right) + \sum_{i \in \Omega} \int_0^t \mathbf{z}_i^T \mathbf{Q}_i \mathbf{z}_i dt$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_i = \mathbf{a}_i - \mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{z}_i = \mathbf{W}^T(\mathbf{x}_i, t) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \mathbf{K}_{ji}(\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i)$.

- The number of leaders in a knowledge-based network can be arbitrary. At the limit all elements could be adaptive, i.e., there is no leader at all, in which case the system may converge to any odd parameter set depending on initial conditions. While all states will still converge together, the desired individual behaviors (such as oscillations) may not be preserved.
- Synchronization conditions derived in Theorem 2 are very similar to those in [28] and [33] for coupled networks without any leader or adaptation. Note that if condition (5) is true, \forall neighbors i, j , $\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j$ are bounded. Thus, the boundedness of the states are simply determined by $\dot{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{a}, t) + \mathbf{u}$ where the input \mathbf{u} is bounded [12].
- Condition (6) is true if the stable system behaviors are sufficiently rich or persistently exciting [27]. This is the case, for instance, when the individual elements are oscillators, where the possibilities that any component of \mathbf{x}_i converges to zero can be excluded by dynamic analysis showing that zero is an unstable state.
- Both power leaders and knowledge leaders could be virtual, which is common in animal aggregate motions. For instance, a landmark may be used as a virtual power leader. Similarly, when hunting, an escaping prey could specify both the where and the how of the movement.

- In a neural context, parameter changes in low order models may lead to entirely different qualitative behaviors [9], [25]. Thus, modifying the parameters of a single element, the knowledge leader, can select radically different qualitative properties for entire networks.

IV. PACIFIC COEXISTENCE

Different types of leaders can co-exist in the same network. As illustrated in Fig. 1(c), a power leader guiding the direction may use state measurements from its neighbors to adapt its parameters to the values of the knowledge leaders. In addition, a power leader could be also a knowledge leader.

Consider the power-based leader-followers network (1) again, assuming the dynamics \mathbf{f} contains a parameter set \mathbf{a} . There are knowledge leaders holding the fixed value \mathbf{a} and knowledge followers using adaptation to learn. If $0 \in \Omega$, the set of the knowledge followers, we have

$$\dot{\mathbf{a}}_0 = \mathbf{P}_0 \mathbf{W}^T(\mathbf{x}_0, t) \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i \mathbf{K}_{0i}(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_0)$$

while if $i \in \Omega$ with $i = 1, \dots, n$

$$\dot{\mathbf{a}}_i = \mathbf{P}_i \mathbf{W}^T(\mathbf{x}_i, t) \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \mathbf{K}_{ji}(\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i) + \gamma_i \mathbf{K}_{0i}(\mathbf{x}_0 - \mathbf{x}_i) \right).$$

To prove state convergence, we first define several (extended) Laplacian matrices for a power-based network structure.

- \mathbf{L}_K , the weighted Laplacian of the followers network.
- $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_K$, the weighted Laplacian of the whole network, which is non-symmetric since we have unidirectional links between the leader and the followers. Thus

$$\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_K = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ -\mathbf{b} & \mathbf{C} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{where } \mathbf{b} = \begin{bmatrix} \vdots \\ \gamma_i \mathbf{K}_{0i} \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{L}_K + \mathbf{I}_{\gamma_i \mathbf{K}_{0i}}^n.$$

\mathbf{C} is positive definite if the whole network is connected.

- $\bar{\mathbf{L}}_{\mathbf{K}}$, the weighted Laplacian of the whole network which we consider as an undirected graph. Thus

$$\bar{\mathbf{L}}_{\mathbf{K}} = \bar{\mathbf{L}}_{\mathbf{K}}^T + \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i \mathbf{K}_{0i} & \mathbf{0} \\ -\mathbf{b} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Define the Lyapunov-like function

$$V = \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbf{x}^T \bar{\mathbf{L}}_{\mathbf{K}} \mathbf{x} + \sum_{i \in \Omega} \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_i^T \mathbf{P}_i^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_i \right).$$

We can show that

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V} &= \mathbf{x}^T \bar{\mathbf{L}}_{\mathbf{K}} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{a}, t) \\ \dots \\ \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{a}, t) \end{bmatrix} - \bar{\mathbf{L}}_{\mathbf{K}} \mathbf{x} \right) \\ &= \mathbf{x}^T \left(\bar{\mathbf{L}}_{\mathbf{K}\Lambda} - \bar{\mathbf{L}}_{\mathbf{K}}^T \bar{\mathbf{L}}_{\mathbf{K}} \right) \mathbf{x} \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{L}}_{\mathbf{K}\Lambda}$ is defined similarly to (4), except that here the incidence matrix is based on the whole network. See Appendix II for the condition for $\bar{\mathbf{L}}_{\mathbf{K}\Lambda} - \bar{\mathbf{L}}_{\mathbf{K}}^T \bar{\mathbf{L}}_{\mathbf{K}}$ to be negative semidefinite. Following the same proofs as those in Section III, this then implies that all the states \mathbf{x}_i , $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$ will converge together asymptotically. Parameter convergence conditions are also the same.

APPENDIX

Proof of Lemma 1: For notational simplicity, we show the derivations for the case $m = 1$.

Notice that 0 is always one of the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}\Lambda} - \mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}}^2$, with one corresponding eigenvector $\mathbf{v} = [1, 1, \dots, 1]^T$. According to Weyl's Theorem [8]

$$\lambda_{n-k+1}(\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}\Lambda} - \mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}}^2) \leq \lambda_n(\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}\Lambda}) - \lambda_k(\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}}^2)$$

where $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, and the eigenvalues λ_i are arranged in increasing order for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. This implies that, $\forall k > 1$, $\lambda_{n-k+1}(\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}\Lambda} - \mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}}^2) < 0$ if

$$\lambda_n(\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}\Lambda}) < \lambda_2(\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}}^2). \quad (7)$$

Therefore, $\lambda_n(\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}\Lambda} - \mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}}^2) = 0$, i.e., $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}\Lambda} - \mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}}^2$ is negative semidefinite.

Denote $\max_k \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{K}\Lambda)_{ijs} = \bar{\lambda}$. If $\bar{\lambda} \leq 0$, we have $\lambda_n(\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}\Lambda}) \leq 0$ and both the conditions (7) and (5) are always true; if $\bar{\lambda} > 0$

$$\lambda_n(\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}\Lambda}) \leq \bar{\lambda} \lambda_n(\mathbf{L})$$

where \mathbf{L} is the graph Laplacian matrix. Considering the fact that $\lambda_2(\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}}^2) = \lambda_2^2(\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}})$, condition (5) is sufficient to guarantee (7).

The eigenvectors of real symmetric matrix form an orthogonal basis of the state space. Without loss of generality, consider such an orthogonal eigenvector set, $\{\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n\}$, of $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}\Lambda} - \mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}}^2$, where $\mathbf{v}_n = [1, 1, \dots, 1]^T$ is the only zero eigenvector. For any \mathbf{x} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x} &= \sum_{i=1}^n k_i \mathbf{v}_i \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{x}^T (\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}\Lambda} - \mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}}^2) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \lambda_i k_i^2 \mathbf{v}_i^T \mathbf{v}_i, \end{aligned}$$

Since the eigenvalue $\lambda_i < 0 \forall i < n$, $\mathbf{x}^T (\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}\Lambda} - \mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{K}}^2) \mathbf{x} = 0$ if and only if $\mathbf{x} = k_n \mathbf{v}_n$, that is, $\mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{x}_2 = \dots = \mathbf{x}_n$.

In the case $m > 1$, we can follow the same proof except that the zero eigenvalue now has multiplicity m , and the corresponding eigenvectors $\{\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_m\}$ are linear combinations of the orthogonal set $[\mathbf{I}, \mathbf{I}, \dots, \mathbf{I}]^T$ where $\mathbf{I} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ is the identity matrix.

APPENDIX

Network With Both Types of Leaders: Similar to the previous proof, $\bar{\mathbf{L}}_{\mathbf{K}\Lambda} - \bar{\mathbf{L}}_{\mathbf{K}}^T \bar{\mathbf{L}}_{\mathbf{K}}$ is negative semidefinite if

$$\lambda_{n+1}(\bar{\mathbf{L}}_{\mathbf{K}\Lambda}) < \lambda_2(\bar{\mathbf{L}}_{\mathbf{K}}^T \bar{\mathbf{L}}_{\mathbf{K}})$$

and its only eigendirection for the zero eigenvalue is thus $\mathbf{v} = [1, 1, \dots, 1]^T$. Since

$$\bar{\mathbf{L}}_{\mathbf{K}}^T \bar{\mathbf{L}}_{\mathbf{K}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{b} & -\mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{C} \\ -\mathbf{C} \mathbf{b} & \mathbf{C}^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

we have

$$\lambda_2(\bar{\mathbf{L}}_{\mathbf{K}}^T \bar{\mathbf{L}}_{\mathbf{K}}) \geq \lambda_1(\mathbf{C}^2) = \lambda_1^2(\mathbf{C})$$

according to the Interlacing Eigenvalues Theorem for bordered matrices [8]. Thus a sufficient condition to guarantee negative semidefinite is

$$\lambda_1^2(\mathbf{C}) > \lambda_{n+1}(\bar{\mathbf{L}}_{\mathbf{K}\Lambda}) \quad (8)$$

This condition is similar to the one we derived in Theorem 1 for synchronization of pure power-based leader-followers network. Assuming all the coupling strengths are identical with value κ , condition (8) becomes

$$\kappa > \frac{\lambda_{n+1}(\bar{\mathbf{L}})}{\lambda_1^2(\mathbf{L} + \mathbf{I}_{\gamma_i}^n)} \max_{\mathbf{x}} \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{a}, t).$$

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Cortes and F. Bullo, "Coordination and geometric optimization via distributed dynamical systems," *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, vol. 44, no. 5, pp. 1543–1574, 2005.
- [2] C. Cutts and J. Speakman, "Energy savings in formation flight of pink-footed geese," *J. Exp. Biol.*, vol. 189, pp. 251–261, 1994.
- [3] R. D'Andrea and G. E. Dullerud, "Distributed control design for spatially interconnected systems," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 48, no. 9, pp. 1478–1495, Sep. 2003.
- [4] M. Fiedler, "Algebraic connectivity of graphs," *Czech. Math. J.*, vol. 23, no. 98, pp. 298–305, 1973.
- [5] R. Fierro, P. Song, A. Das, and V. Kumar, "Cooperative control of robot formations," in *Cooperative Control and Optimization: Series on Applied Optimization*. Norwell, MA: Kluwer, 2002, pp. 79–93.
- [6] R. A. FitzHugh, "Impulses and physiological states in theoretical models of nerve membrane," *Biophys. J.*, vol. 1, pp. 445–466, 1961.
- [7] C. Godsil and G. Royle, *Algebraic Graph Theory*. New York: Springer-Verlag, 2001.
- [8] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1985.
- [9] E. Izhikevich, "Simple model of spiking neuron," *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw.*, vol. 14, no. 6, pp. 1569–1572, Nov. 2003.
- [10] A. Jadbabaie, J. Lin, and A. S. Morse, "Coordination of groups of mobile autonomous agents using nearest neighbor rules," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 48, no. 6, pp. 988–1001, Jun. 2003.
- [11] A. Jadbabaie, N. Motesh, and M. Barahona, "On the stability of the kuramoto model of coupled nonlinear oscillators," in *Proc. Amer. Control Conf.*, 2004, vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 4296–4301.

- [12] H. K. Khalil, *Nonlinear Systems*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1996.
- [13] N. E. Leonard and E. Fiorelli, "Virtual leaders, artificial potentials and coordinated control of groups," in *Proc. 40th IEEE Conf. Decision and Control*, Orlando, FL, Dec. 2001, pp. 2968–2973.
- [14] W. Lohmiller and J. J. E. Slotine, "On contraction analysis for nonlinear systems," *Automatica*, vol. 34, no. 6, 1998.
- [15] W. Lohmiller, "Contraction analysis of nonlinear systems," Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. Mech. Eng., MIT, Cambridge, MA, 1999.
- [16] R. M. May, S. Gupta, and A. R. McLean, "Infectious disease dynamics: What characterizes a successful invader?," *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B*, vol. 356, pp. 901–910, 2001.
- [17] B. Mohar, "Eigenvalues, diameter, and mean distance in graphs," *Graphs Combinat.*, vol. 7, pp. 53–64, 1991.
- [18] J. D. Murray, *Mathematical Biology*. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1993.
- [19] J. Nagumo, S. Arimoto, and S. Yoshizawa, "An active pulse transmission line simulating nerve axon," in *Proc. Inst. Radio Engineers*, 1962, vol. 50, pp. 2061–2070.
- [20] K. Narendra and A. Annaswamy, *Stable Adaptive Systems*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1989.
- [21] M. A. Nowak and K. Sigmund, "Evolutionary dynamics of biological games," *Science*, vol. 303, pp. 793–799, 2004.
- [22] R. Olfati-Saber and R. M. Murray, "Consensus protocols for networks of dynamic agents," in *Proc. Amer. Control Conf.*, Denver, CO, Jun. 2003, pp. 951–956.
- [23] K. M. Page and M. A. Nowak, "Unifying evolutionary dynamics," *J. Theor. Biol.*, vol. 219, pp. 93–98, 2002.
- [24] A. Pikovsky, M. Rosenblum, and J. Kurths, *Synchronization: A Universal Concept in Nonlinear Sciences*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2003.
- [25] A. Schnitzler and J. Gross, "Normal and pathological oscillatory communication in the brain," *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.*, 2005.
- [26] P. Seiler, A. Pant, and J. K. Hedrick, "A systems interpretation for observations of bird V-formations," *J. Theoret. Biol.*, vol. 221, pp. 279–287, 2003.
- [27] J. J. E. Slotine and W. Li, *Applied Nonlinear Control*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1991.
- [28] J. J. E. Slotine and W. Wang, "A study of synchronization and group cooperation using partial contraction theory," in *Block Island Workshop on Cooperative Control*, V. Kumar, Ed. New York: Springer-Verlag, 2003.
- [29] G.-B. Stan and R. Sepulchre, "Dissipativity characterization of a class of oscillators and networks of oscillators," in *Proc. 42nd IEEE Conf. Decision and Control*, Maui, HI, Dec. 2003, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 4169–4173.
- [30] S. Strogatz, *Sync: The Emerging Science of Spontaneous Order*. New York: Hyperion, 2003.
- [31] H. Tanner, A. Jadbabaie, and G. J. Pappas, "Stable flocking of mobile agents, Part I: Fixed topology," in *Proc. Conf. Decision and Control*, Maui, HI, Dec. 2003, pp. 2010–2015.
- [32] T. Vicsek, "The bigger picture," *Nature*, vol. 418, p. 131, 2002.
- [33] W. Wang and J. J. E. Slotine, "On partial contraction analysis for coupled nonlinear oscillators, submitted to," *Biol. Cybern.*, 2003.
- [34] S. C. Yen, E. D. Menshik, and L. H. Finkel, "Perceptual grouping in striate cortical networks mediated by synchronization and desynchronization," *Neurocomput.*, vol. 26–27, no. 1–3, pp. 609–616, 1999.

An Exact Stability Analysis Test for Single-Parameter Polynomially-Dependent Linear Systems

P. Tsiotras and P.-A. Bliman

Abstract—We provide a new condition for testing the stability of a single-parameter, polynomially-dependent linear system of polynomial degree N of the form

$$\dot{x} = A(\rho)x, \quad A(\rho) = \sum_{i=0}^N \rho^i A_i \quad (1)$$

over a compact interval. The test is nonconservative and can be cast as a convex feasibility problem in terms of a pair of linear matrix inequalities (LMIs).

Index Terms—Linear matrix inequalities (LMIs), parameter-dependent systems, robust stability.

I. INTRODUCTION

We consider single-parameter dependent linear systems where the state matrix A depends polynomially on the parameter ρ , as in (1). It is assumed that ρ belongs to a compact interval Ω , henceforth taken as $\Omega = [-1, +1]$, without loss of generality. The stability of (1) over a compact interval has been investigated, for example, in [1], [2] where the maximum interval of stability around the origin was given. A few years later, Saydy *et al.* [3], [4] gave necessary and sufficient conditions for the stability of (1) using guardian maps. This method was later extended in [5] and [6] to LTI systems with many parameters of the form

$$\dot{x} = \left(A_0 + \sum_{i=1}^m \rho_i A_i \right) x.$$

However, the stability conditions in [5] and [6] are only sufficient. Despite the results of [3] and [4], nonconservative *Lyapunov-based* conditions for stability for (1) have remained elusive thus far. The main obstacle in deriving sufficient and *necessary* conditions using Lyapunov function theory is the absence of the knowledge of the correct functional dependence of the parameter-dependent quadratic Lyapunov function $V(x) = x^T P(\rho)x$ that will lead to necessary conditions. One is therefore content with the derivation of sufficient conditions only, based on an *a-priori* postulate of the Lyapunov matrix $P(\rho)$ [7]–[10]. In fact, by choosing a constant P one ensures the so-called quadratic stability for (1). This notion of stability is restrictive for most applications of interest, since it ensures stability against arbitrary fast variations of ρ .

Recently, Bliman [11]–[13] developed Lyapunov-based necessary and sufficient conditions for multivariable, *affinely dependent* parameter linear systems. A similar result, albeit using a completely different approach, was given in [14] for the single-parameter case. The results of [11], [12], and [14] show that the search for Lyapunov functions for such systems can be restricted, without loss of generality, within the

Manuscript received May 19, 2004; revised April 4, 2005 and March 2, 2006. Recommended by Associate Editor M. Rotea. This work was performed during Spring 2003, while P. Tsiotras was a Visiting Researcher at INRIA Rocquencourt.

P. Tsiotras is with the D. Guggenheim School of Aerospace Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA 30332-0150 USA (e-mail: tsiotras@gatech.edu).

P.-A. Bliman is with the INRIA Rocquencourt, Domaine de Voluceau, 78153 Le Chesnay Cedex, France (e-mail: pierre-alexandre.bliman@inria.fr).

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/TAC.2006.878773