

Nonlinear Network Identifiability with Full Excitations

Renato Vizuete and Julien M. Hendrickx

Abstract—We derive conditions for the identifiability of nonlinear networks characterized by additive dynamics at the level of the edges when all the nodes are excited. In contrast to linear systems, we show that the measurement of all sinks is necessary and sufficient for the identifiability of directed acyclic graphs, under the assumption that dynamics are described by analytic functions without constant terms (i.e., $f(0) = 0$). But if constant terms are present, then the identifiability is impossible as soon as one node has more than one in-neighbor. In the case of general digraphs where cycles can exist, we consider additively separable functions for the analysis of the identifiability, and we show that the measurement of one node of all the sinks of the condensation digraph is necessary and sufficient. Several examples are added to illustrate the results.

Index Terms—Network analysis and control, system identification.

I. INTRODUCTION

Networked systems composed of single entities or sub-systems that interact in a network can be found in many domains including biological networks, power networks, social networks, etc [1], [2]. In this type of systems, one of the most important characteristics is the network topology, which models the exchange of information among the nodes. However, in many networks, different dynamical systems may also be associated at the level of edges or nodes, which generates a more complex behavior in the system.

Knowledge of the interactions between the nodes is useful and in many situations can be essential for the analysis, estimation and control of networks [3]. For this reason, the identification of networks has become an important research area where the objective is to identify the network topology and all the dynamics associated with nodes and edges [4]–[7]. Since in many networks the number of nodes and edges can be relatively large, the appropriate placement of sensors and instruments to perform experiments for the identification process is crucial [8]–[10]. In this case, when the network topology is available, the notion of *identifiability* plays an important role since it allows us to determine which nodes should be excited and measured to identify the different dynamics in the network. The identifiability problem in networks has been extensively studied in the case of linear systems associated with edges where, based on the knowledge of the network

topology, conditions for the full measurement or full excitation cases have been provided in [11], [12]. The case of partial measurement/excitation has been analyzed in several works [13]–[17] where different identifiability conditions have been proposed depending on the scenario, though no necessary and sufficient condition is known. However, most of real networks are nonlinear, including systems in important fields of interest like coupled oscillators [18], gene regulatory networks [19], biochemical reaction networks [20], organic reactions [21], social networks [22], among others. To the best of our knowledge, the problem of identifiability of nonlinear networks has not been previously analyzed.

The identification of even a single nonlinear system is a challenging task due to the diverse types of nonlinearities and models that can be used to reproduce the behavior of the system [23]. In fact, the choice of the model might depend on the type of application and some particular models could not be well suited for several systems [24]–[26]. At the level of nonlinear networks, the complexity increases considerably since essentially the identification of nonlinear functions that represent the dynamics of edges or nodes must be performed without disconnecting the network. In this case, identifiability conditions could be even more important than in the linear case since in general the experiments for nonlinear identification are more complex and expensive, so that the knowledge of which nodes should be excited and measured is fundamental. Although the analysis of identifiability is based on all the information that could theoretically be obtained from measurements (even if it would not necessarily be practical to obtain so much information), it can give us a good intuition for the outcome of experiments. If an edge is not identifiable based on such perfect information, then it can certainly not be identified with partial information. On the other hand, if an edge can be identified in the ideal situation, it could be possible that with appropriate experiments we manage to obtain an approximation of the edge.

The class of functions considered in the identifiability of nonlinear networks is important for the derivation of conditions that guarantee the identification. The nonlinear dynamics of real networks can be modeled by functions of different nature like trigonometric in coupled oscillators [18] or non-differentiable in neural networks [27]. Clearly, the identifiability should be analyzed in a specific class of functions and an appropriate delimitation of this class is fundamental. If the class of functions is too restrictive, it could be easier to guarantee identifiability but the type of functions could not match real dynamical models. If the class of functions is overly general, identifiability might be very restrictive since many different functions could satisfy the information obtained

This work was supported by F.R.S.-FNRS via the *KORNET* project and via the Incentive Grant for Scientific Research (MIS) *Learning from Pairwise Comparisons*, and by the *RevealFlight* Concerted Research Action (ARC) of the Fédération Wallonie-Bruxelles.

R. Vizuete and J. M. Hendrickx are with ICTEAM institute, UCLouvain, B-1348, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium. R. Vizuete is a FNRS Postdoctoral Researcher - CR. renato.vizueteharo@uclouvain.be, julien.hendrickx@uclouvain.be.

with measurements. Nevertheless, we will derive strong results for the identifiability of nonlinear networks for very general classes of functions.

A preliminary version of this work was presented in [28] where identifiability conditions for directed acyclic graphs (DAGs) characterized by nonlinear static interactions were derived in the full excitation case to highlight the differences with linear networks. By contrast, in this work, we derive identifiability conditions in the full excitation case for more complex nonlinear networks where the edges are characterized by nonlinear dynamical systems (i.e., involving memory), and cycles are allowed. In this way, our results can be applied to real networks where the dynamics is one of the main characteristics of the edges and the presence of cycles is common.

The remainder of this article is organized as follows. In Section II, we present the dynamical model associated with each node and the notions of identifiability at the level of edges and networks. In Section III, we study the identifiability problem in DAGs. For path graphs and trees, we analyze the identifiability problem in a smaller class of functions where each function is analytic and the static part is removed, and we show that the measurement of the sink is necessary and sufficient for identifiability. In the case of general DAGs, we discard linear functions for the identifiability problem and we prove that the measurement of the sinks is necessary and sufficient for the identifiability. Section IV focuses on the case of general digraphs where cycles are allowed. By considering that the network is at rest at the initial time, we show that by measuring a node of all the sinks of the condensation digraph, we guarantee the identifiability of any digraph. Finally, conclusions and future perspectives for the identifiability of nonlinear networks are exposed in Section V.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

A. Notation

Scalars are denoted by $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and vectors are denoted by $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The vector of an appropriate size constituted of only zeros is denoted by $\mathbf{0}$. The value of a general input or output x at the time instant k is denoted by x^k . The shift operator acting on a vector $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ corresponds to a shift of coordinates and it is denoted by $\tau^p \mathbf{x} = (x_{1+p}, \dots, x_{n+p})$, where we assume that \mathbf{x} is well defined for coordinates x_i with $i > n$.

B. Model class

We consider the identifiability problem in a network where the dynamics are additive on the edges and have finite memory. The network is characterized by a weakly connected digraph $G = (V, E)$ composed by a set of nodes $V = \{1, \dots, n\}$ and a set of edges $E \subseteq V \times V$. The output of each node i in the network is given by:

$$y_i^k = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} f_{i,j}(y_j^{k-0}, y_j^{k-1}, y_j^{k-2}, \dots, y_j^{k-m_j}) + u_i^{k-1}, \quad (1)$$

where y_i^k is the state of the node i , u_i^{k-1} is an external excitation signal, \mathcal{N}_i is the set of in-neighbors of node i

without including i , $f_{i,j}$ is a nonzero nonlinear function depending on past outputs of the neighbors j of the node i , and each delay $m_j \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq}$ is finite (i.e., finite memory). The model (1) is causal if the nonlinear functions $f_{i,j}$ do not depend on y_j^{k-0} (i.e., $f_{i,j}(y_j^{k-1}, y_j^{k-2}, \dots, y_j^{k-m_j})$ with $m_j \in \mathbb{Z}^+$), and along this work we will only consider the identifiability of causal models (real-world dynamics). The particular case of a delay $m_j = 0$ will be used only for the adapted DAG introduced in Section IV, which is a mathematical construction used in the proof of Theorem 2. The model (1) implies that the output of a node i in the network is determined by its own excitation signal and the past outputs of its neighbors that are affected by nonlinear functions $f_{i,j}$ located in each edge that connect the neighbors with the node i . Furthermore, the model (1) corresponds to the full excitation case where all the nodes in the network can be excited through the inputs u_i . When the functions $f_{i,j}$ are linear, the identifiability problem with full excitations has been studied in [11]. In this work, we will consider analytic functions, whose representation as power series will allow us to derive conditions for the identifiability of nonlinear networks.

Assumption 1. *The topology of the network is known, where the presence of an edge implies a nonzero function.*

Assumption 1 implies that we know which nodes are connected by nonzero functions. Similarly to [11], [13], [14], for the identification process we assume that in an ideal scenario the relations between excitations and outputs of the nodes have been perfectly identified and all nodes are excited. In the first part, we focus on networks that do not contain any cycle (i.e., DAGs). Due to the absence of cycles and finite memory, the function F_i associated with the measurement of a node i , depends on a finite number of inputs:

$$y_i^k = u_i^{k-1} + F_i(u_1^{k-2}, \dots, u_1^{k-T_1}, \dots, u_{n_i}^{k-2}, \dots, u_{n_i}^{k-T_{n_i}}), \quad (2)$$

$1, \dots, n_i \in \mathcal{N}_i^p,$

where \mathcal{N}_i^p is the set of nodes with a path to node i . The function F_i is implicitly defined by (1) and the inputs in F_i correspond to the nodes that have a path to the measured node i .

Assumption 2. *If the node i is measured, the function F_i is known.*

With a slight abuse of notation, we use the superscript in the function $F_i^{(s)}$ to indicate that all the inputs in (2) are delayed by s (i.e., $F_i^{(s)} = F_i(u_1^{k-2-s}, \dots, u_{n_i}^{k-T_{n_i}-s})$).

Example 1 (Finite inputs). *Let us consider the DAG in Fig. 1 with nonlinear functions of the form $f_{3,2}(y_2^{k-1})$, $f_{3,1}(y_1^{k-1}, y_1^{k-2})$ and $f_{2,1}(y_1^{k-1})$. The measurement of the node 3 provides an output of the type:*

$$\begin{aligned} y_3^k &= u_3^{k-1} + f_{3,2}(y_2^{k-1}) + f_{3,1}(y_1^{k-1}, y_1^{k-2}) \\ &= u_3^{k-1} + f_{3,2}(u_2^{k-2} + f_{2,1}(u_1^{k-3})) + f_{3,1}(u_1^{k-2}, u_1^{k-3}), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

so that the function F_3 associated with the measurement is a function of a finite number of variables $F_3(u_1^{k-2}, u_1^{k-3}, u_2^{k-2})$.




Fig. 1. DAG where the function associated with the measurement of the node 3 only depends on a finite number of inputs.

C. Identifiability

We first define the relationships between the measurements of the nodes and the functions $f_{i,j}$.

Definition 1 (Set of measured functions). *Given a set of measured nodes \mathcal{N}^m , the set of measured functions $F(\mathcal{N}^m)$ associated with \mathcal{N}^m is given by:*

$$F(\mathcal{N}^m) := \{F_i \mid i \in \mathcal{N}^m\}.$$

We say that a digraph G and a set of functions $f_{i,j}$ generate $F(\mathcal{N}^m)$ if the functions $F_i \in F(\mathcal{N}^m)$ are obtained through (1).

Since the identifiability problem can be hard or unrealistic for general functions, we restrict the problem to a certain class of functions \mathcal{F} : the functions associated with the edges belong to \mathcal{F} and the identifiability is considered only among the functions belonging to \mathcal{F} . The different classes of functions will be defined depending on the different types of network topologies considered for the analysis.

Definition 2 (Identifiability). *Given a set of functions $\{f\} = \{f_{i,j} \in \mathcal{F} \mid (i,j) \in E\}$ that generates $F(\mathcal{N}^m)$ and another set of functions $\{\tilde{f}\} = \{\tilde{f}_{i,j} \in \mathcal{F} \mid (i,j) \in E\}$ that generates $\tilde{F}(\mathcal{N}^m)$. An edge $f_{i,j}$ is identifiable in a class \mathcal{F} if $F(\mathcal{N}^m) = \tilde{F}(\mathcal{N}^m)$, implies that $f_{i,j} = \tilde{f}_{i,j}$. A network G is identifiable in a class \mathcal{F} if $F(\mathcal{N}^m) = \tilde{F}(\mathcal{N}^m)$, implies that $\{f\} = \{\tilde{f}\}$.*

According to Definition 2, in a network G , an edge $f_{i,j}$ is identifiable in a class \mathcal{F} if given a set of measured functions $F(\mathcal{N}^m)$, every set of functions in \mathcal{F} leading to $F(\mathcal{N}^m)$ has the same $f_{i,j}$ [28]. A network G is identifiable in a class \mathcal{F} if all the edges are identifiable in the class \mathcal{F} [28].

Although Assumption 2 seems strong, it is clear that if a function $f_{i,j}$ cannot be identified with F_i , it is unidentifiable based on the measurement of this node. However, if the function $f_{i,j}$ is identifiable based on F_i , it is expected that a good approximation of F_i with experiments, may eventually provide a good approximation of the function $f_{i,j}$. Thus, the possibility of identifying $f_{i,j}$ could be determinant for the approximation of these functions based on measurements and experiments [29].

III. DIRECTED ACYCLIC GRAPHS (DAGs)

We now begin by deriving identifiability conditions for networks that do not contain any cycle (i.e., DAGs), considering specific classes of functions.

DAGs encompass a large number of graph topologies that present specific characteristics that can be used for the derivation of conditions for identifiability [30], [31]. Since sources and sinks¹ are important nodes in DAGs, we first provide a result similar to the static case in [28] about the information that we can obtain from the measurements of these nodes.

Proposition 1 (Sinks and sources). *The measurement of the sources is never necessary for the identifiability of the network. The incoming edges of sinks are not identifiable if the sinks are not measured.*

Proof. First, the measurement of any source ℓ generates the output $y_\ell^k = u_\ell^{k-1}$, which does not provide any information about functions associated with edges in the network. Then, let us consider a sink i with $|\mathcal{N}_i|$ in-neighbors. The measurement of this sink provides the output:

$$y_i^k = u_i^{k-1} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} f_{i,j}(y_j^{k-1}, \dots, y_j^{k-m_j}),$$

and it is the only way of obtaining information about the functions $f_{i,j}$ for $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$. Thus, if the sink i is not measured, the incoming edges $f_{i,j}$ are not identifiable. \square

A. Identifiability of general nonlinear functions

We start by considering the identifiability problem in the class of all analytic functions.

Definition 3 (Class of functions \mathcal{F}_{ALL}). *Let \mathcal{F}_{ALL} be the class of all analytic functions $f : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.*

Notice that the dimension m corresponds to the function $f_{i,j}$ in the network with the largest number of arguments (i.e., number of past inputs).

Unfortunately, the following proposition shows that even in the trivial case when we measure all the nodes, there are some important network topologies where the identifiability problem is unsolvable in the class \mathcal{F}_{ALL} .

Proposition 2 (Unidentifiability). *If a DAG contains two (or more) edges arriving at a same node, then none of them are identifiable in \mathcal{F}_{ALL} .*

Proof. Let us consider an arbitrary DAG with a node i with 2 or more in-neighbors. Let us assume that we measure all the nodes (i.e., $\mathcal{N}^m = V$), which is all the information that we can get from a network. Since the function $F_i \in F(\mathcal{N}^m)$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} y_i^k &= u_i^{k-1} + F_i \\ &= u_i^{k-1} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} f_{i,j}(u_j^{k-2} + F_j^{(1)}, \dots, u_j^{k-m_j-1} + F_j^{(m_j)}). \end{aligned}$$

Let us consider two arbitrary in-neighbors p and q of the node i and set the functions $\tilde{f}_{i,p} = f_{i,p} + \gamma$ and $\tilde{f}_{i,q} = f_{i,q} - \gamma$, with $\gamma \neq 0$. Notice that F_i can also be obtained with the functions $\tilde{f}_{i,p}$ and $\tilde{f}_{i,q}$, which implies that these edges cannot be identified. \square

¹A source is a node with no incoming edges. A sink is a node with no outgoing edges.




Fig. 2. If a DAG has at least a node i with two or more in-neighbors, then it is not identifiable in the class \mathcal{F}_{ALL} .

Proposition 2 implies that DAGs having nodes with two or more in-neighbors cannot be identified, which restricts considerably the types of networks that can be identified in the class \mathcal{F}_{ALL} . In the following proposition we show that the identifiability of graphs where all the nodes have only 1 in-neighbor (i.e., an arborescence) is possible but requires the measurement of all the nodes except by the source.

Proposition 3 (Arborescence). *An arborescence is identifiable in the class \mathcal{F}_{ALL} , if and only if all the nodes are measured except possibly the source.*

Proof. Let us consider an arborescence with $n > 2$ nodes and a node i , which is neither the source nor a sink². The output of an out-neighbor of i denoted by $i+1$ is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} y_{i+1}^k &= u_{i+1}^{k-1} + F_{i+1} & (4) \\ &= u_{i+1}^{k-1} + f_{i+1,i}(u_i^{k-2} + F_i^{(1)}, \dots, u_i^{k-m_i-1} + F_i^{(m_i)}) \\ &= u_{i+1}^{k-1} + f_{i+1,i}(u_i^{k-2} + f_{i,i-1}(u_{i-1}^{k-3} + F_{i-1}^{(2)}), \dots, \\ &\quad u_i^{k-m_i-1} + f_{i,i-1}(u_{i-1}^{k-m_i-2} + F_{i-1}^{(m_i-1)}), \dots), \end{aligned}$$

where $i-1$ is the in-neighbor of i . If the node i is not measured, we can consider the functions $\tilde{f}_{i,i-1}(\mathbf{x}) = f_{i,i-1}(\mathbf{x}) + \gamma$ and $\tilde{f}_{i+1,i}(\mathbf{x}) = f_{i+1,i}(x_1 - \gamma, \dots, x_{m_i} - \gamma)$ with $\gamma \neq 0$, that generate \tilde{F}_{i+1} and satisfy $F_{i+1} = \tilde{F}_{i+1}$ in (4), which implies that the arborescence cannot be identified.

On the other hand, if we measure all the nodes (i.e., $\mathcal{N}^m = V$), we know the function F_j associated with any node j in the network. Let us consider a node i with an in-neighbor and we set all the inputs to zero except u_i with the corresponding delays. Then, the measurement of the node i gives us:

$$\begin{aligned} y_i^k &= u_i^{k-1} + F_i & (5) \\ &= u_i^{k-1} + f_{i,i-1}(u_{i-1}^{k-2} + F_{i-1}^{(1)}(\mathbf{0}), \dots, \\ &\quad u_{i-1}^{k-m_{i-1}-1} + F_{i-1}^{(m_{i-1})}(\mathbf{0})). \end{aligned}$$

If there is another function $\tilde{f}_{i,i-1}$ that generates \tilde{F}_i and satisfies $F_i = \tilde{F}_i$ in (5), we would have for all $u_{i-1}^{k-2}, \dots, u_{i-1}^{k-m_{i-1}-1} \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\begin{aligned} f_{i,i-1}(u_{i-1}^{k-2} + F_{i-1}(\mathbf{0}), \dots, u_{i-1}^{k-m_{i-1}-1} + F_{i-1}^{(m_{i-1})}(\mathbf{0})) &= \\ \tilde{f}_{i,i-1}(u_{i-1}^{k-2} + F_{i-1}(\mathbf{0}), \dots, u_{i-1}^{k-m_{i-1}-1} + F_{i-1}^{(m_{i-1})}(\mathbf{0})), & \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $f_{i,i-1} = \tilde{f}_{i,i-1}$ because all the F_{i-1} are the same, and we thus identify $f_{i,i-1}$. Since the node i was

arbitrary, the analysis holds for the other nodes and therefore all the nonlinear functions in the arborescence are identified. By Proposition 1, it is never necessary to measure the source. Finally, since each edge between two measured nodes is identified, it is sufficient to measure all the nodes except possibly the source, which does not provide information. \square

Notice that in the proofs of Propositions 2 and 3 we do not use properties of analytic functions and the results are also valid for nonlinear functions that are not analytic. We can see that even for simple topologies like arborescences, the identifiability problem requires the measurement of all the nodes except by the source, which could be impractical due to physical limitations and economic costs. Furthermore, as Proposition 2 showed, for more complex graph topologies, even the measurement of all the nodes is not enough to identify all the nonlinear functions in a network. From the proof of Proposition 2, we can see that the main problem is the identification of the static part of the nonlinear functions since it requires more information through the measurement of additional nodes. Therefore, we will consider nonlinear functions where no static part is present (i.e., only a dynamic part), which could be interpreted as the difference with respect to the steady state.

Definition 4 (Class of functions \mathcal{F}_Z). *Let \mathcal{F}_Z be the class of functions $f : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with the following properties:*

- 1) f is analytic in \mathbb{R}^m .
- 2) $f(\mathbf{0}) = 0$.

B. Path graphs and trees

The notion of paths plays an important role in the identifiability problem in networks since they carry information between the excited nodes and the measured nodes. For this reason, in this section, we focus first on the identifiability of path graphs³. Before, we need the following lemma about the identifiability of in-neighbors.

Lemma 1. *Let G be a DAG such that the edge (i, j) is the only path from the node j to the node i . Then if i is measured, $f_{i,j}$ is identifiable in the class \mathcal{F}_Z .*

Proof. The measurement of the node i provides the output:

$$y_i^k = u_i^{k-1} + \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{N}_i} f_{i,\ell}(u_\ell^{k-2} + F_\ell^{(1)}, \dots, u_\ell^{k-m_\ell-1} + F_\ell^{(m_\ell)}). \quad (6)$$

Since $F_i \in F(\mathcal{N}^m)$, let us assume that there exists a set $\{\tilde{f}\} \neq \{f\}$ such that $F_i = \tilde{F}_i$, which implies:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{N}_i} f_{i,\ell}(u_\ell^{k-2} + F_\ell^{(1)}, \dots, u_\ell^{k-m_\ell-1} + F_\ell^{(m_\ell)}) &= \\ \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{N}_i} \tilde{f}_{i,\ell}(u_\ell^{k-2} + \tilde{F}_\ell^{(1)}, \dots, u_\ell^{k-m_\ell-1} + \tilde{F}_\ell^{(m_\ell)}). & \quad (7) \end{aligned}$$

Let us set to zero all the inputs except the inputs of the node $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$ with their respective delays. Since (i, j) is the only path between i and j , the functions F_ℓ, \tilde{F}_ℓ do not depend on

³A path graph is a digraph that can be drawn so that all the nodes and edges lie on a single straight line.

²An arborescence can have several sinks but only one source.

the inputs u_j , and given that all the functions are in the class \mathcal{F}_Z , the equality (7) becomes:

$$f_{i,j}(u_j^{k-2} + F_j^{(1)}(\mathbf{0}), \dots, u_j^{k-m_j-1} + F_j^{(m_j)}(\mathbf{0})) = \tilde{f}_{i,j}(u_j^{k-2} + \tilde{F}_j^{(1)}(\mathbf{0}), \dots, u_j^{k-m_j-1} + \tilde{F}_j^{(m_j)}(\mathbf{0})).$$

which yields for all $u_j^{k-2}, \dots, u_j^{k-m_j-1} \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$f_{i,j}(u_j^{k-2}, \dots, u_j^{k-m_j-1}) = \tilde{f}_{i,j}(u_j^{k-2}, \dots, u_j^{k-m_j-1}).$$

Therefore, we obtain $f_{i,j} = \tilde{f}_{i,j}$, which implies that the function $f_{i,j}$ is identifiable. \square

This leads to the following corollary.

Corollary 1. *For identifiability in the class \mathcal{F}_Z , the measurement of a node i provides the identification of all the incoming edges corresponding to in-neighbors with only one path to i .*

Proof. The proof is simply based on the successive application of Lemma 1 for other in-neighbors with only one path to the measured node i . \square

Due to the presence of past inputs, Corollary 1 is different from Lemma 2 in our preliminary work [28] corresponding to the static case, where the measurement of a node provides the identification of all the incoming edges of the node. For instance, let us consider again the network in Fig. 1 and the nonlinear functions of Example 1. Notice that based on (3), the function $f_{3,2}$ can be identified by setting to zero u_1^{k-2} and u_1^{k-3} , but the function $f_{3,1}$ cannot be identified by using the same approach since u_1^{k-3} is also present in $f_{3,2}$. This shows that the identifiability problem in the dynamic case is clearly more complex than in the static case.

Next, we provide the following technical lemma that will be used in the proofs of the main results, where we remind that τ is the shift operator of coordinates defined in Section II-A.

Lemma 2 (Multivariate function). *Given three nonzero analytic functions $f : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $g, \tilde{g} : \mathbb{R}^q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that satisfy:*

$$g(\mathbf{0}) = \tilde{g}(\mathbf{0}) = 0;$$

$$f(x_1 + g(\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_r), \dots, x_p + g(\tau^{p-1}\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \tau^{p-1}\mathbf{y}_r)) = f(x_1 + \tilde{g}(\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_r), \dots, x_p + \tilde{g}(\tau^{p-1}\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \tau^{p-1}\mathbf{y}_r)), \quad (8)$$

then either $g = \tilde{g}$ or f is constant.

Proof. The proof is deferred to Appendix A \square

Since the functions in the class \mathcal{F}_Z satisfy $f(\mathbf{0}) = 0$, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 2. *Under the same conditions as in Lemma 2, if $f(\mathbf{0}) = 0$, then*

$$g = \tilde{g}.$$

Proposition 4 (Path graphs). *A path graph is identifiable in the class \mathcal{F}_Z if and only if the sink is measured.*

Proof. By Proposition 1 the measurement of the sink i is necessary. The measurement gives us the output:

$$y_i^k = u_i^{k-1} + F_i = u_i^{k-1} + f_{i,i-1}(u_{i-1}^{k-2} + F_{i-1}^{(1)}, \dots, u_{i-1}^{k-m_{i-1}-1} + F_{i-1}^{(m_{i-1})}).$$

Since $F_i \in F(\mathcal{N}^m)$, let us assume that there exists a set $\{\tilde{f}\} \neq \{f\}$ such that $F_i = \tilde{F}_i$, which corresponds to the equality:

$$f_{i,i-1}(u_{i-1}^{k-2} + F_{i-1}^{(1)}, \dots, u_{i-1}^{k-m_{i-1}-1} + F_{i-1}^{(m_{i-1})}) = \tilde{f}_{i,i-1}(u_{i-1}^{k-2} + \tilde{F}_{i-1}^{(1)}, \dots, u_{i-1}^{k-m_{i-1}-1} + \tilde{F}_{i-1}^{(m_{i-1})}).$$

Notice that F_{i-1} and \tilde{F}_{i-1} could at this stage be different since the node $i-1$ has not been measured. Between the nodes i and $i-1$ there is only one path corresponding to the edge $(i, i-1)$, which implies that the function $f_{i,i-1}$ can be identified according to Lemma 1, so that $f_{i,i-1} = \tilde{f}_{i,i-1}$. Then, we get:

$$f_{i,i-1}(u_{i-1}^{k-2} + F_{i-1}^{(1)}, \dots, u_{i-1}^{k-m_{i-1}-1} + F_{i-1}^{(m_{i-1})}) = f_{i,i-1}(u_{i-1}^{k-2} + \tilde{F}_{i-1}^{(1)}, \dots, u_{i-1}^{k-m_{i-1}-1} + \tilde{F}_{i-1}^{(m_{i-1})}).$$

By virtue of Lemma 2 we can guarantee $F_{i-1}^{(1)} = \tilde{F}_{i-1}^{(1)}$. This is equivalent to the mathematical constrained obtained with the measurement of the node $i-1$ (i.e., $F_{i-1} \in F(\mathcal{N}^m)$) and we can continue with the same procedure until we reach the root. In this way, we guarantee $\{f\} = \{\tilde{f}\}$ and all the path can be identified. \square

Proposition 5 (Trees). *A tree is identifiable in the class \mathcal{F}_Z , if and only if all the sinks are measured.*

Proof. By Proposition 1 the measurement of all the sinks is necessary. Let us consider one of the sinks i of an arbitrary tree. The output is given by:

$$y_i^k = u_i^{k-1} + F_i = u_i^{k-1} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} f_{i,j}(u_j^{k-2} + F_j^{(1)}, \dots, u_j^{k-m_j-1} + F_j^{(m_j)}). \quad (9)$$

Given that $F_i \in F(\mathcal{N}^m)$, let us assume that there exists a set $\{\tilde{f}\} \neq \{f\}$ such that $F_i = \tilde{F}_i$, which implies:

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} f_{i,j}(u_j^{k-2} + F_j^{(1)}, \dots, u_j^{k-m_j-1} + F_j^{(m_j)}) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \tilde{f}_{i,j}(u_j^{k-2} + \tilde{F}_j^{(1)}, \dots, u_j^{k-m_j-1} + \tilde{F}_j^{(m_j)}). \quad (10)$$

Since in a tree, between two nodes, there is only one path, we can choose an arbitrary path that finishes in the sink i and set to zero the excitation signals of all the nodes that do not belong to that path. In this way, the equality (10) corresponds to the identifiability of a path graph and by Proposition 4 all the edges can be identifiable. We can use the same procedure for other paths that finish in the sink i to identify all the branches that ends in i , and by measuring the other sinks, we can identify all the edges in the tree. \square

We recall that the case of arborecences are also included in Proposition 5.




Fig. 3. Network with functions in \mathcal{F}_Z that cannot be identified by only measuring the sink when $f_{2,1}$ and $f_{3,1}$ are linear due to the superposition principle.

C. General DAGs

Unlike the particular case of trees, in more general DAGs, the functions $F_j^{(1)}$ in (9) could depend on common variables due to several possible paths between two nodes with the same length, which makes impossible to isolate parts of the network through appropriate zero inputs. In addition, some functions in the class \mathcal{F}_Z might not be identifiable in a DAG.

Example 2. Let us consider the network in Fig. 3 with nonlinear functions of the form $f_{4,3}(y_3^{k-1})$, $f_{4,2}(y_2^{k-1})$, $f_{2,1}(y_1^{k-1})$ and $f_{3,1}(y_1^{k-1})$. The measurement of the node 4 provides an output of the type:

$$y_4^k = u_4^{k-1} + f_{4,2}(y_2^{k-1}) + f_{4,3}(y_3^{k-1}) \\ = u_4^{k-1} + f_{4,2}(u_2^{k-2} + f_{2,1}(u_1^{k-3})) + f_{4,3}(u_3^{k-2} + f_{3,1}(u_1^{k-3})).$$

The excitation signal u_1^{k-3} appears in the the functions $f_{4,2}$ and $f_{4,3}$, so that the different paths from 1 to 4 cannot be isolated by setting to zero the corresponding excitation signals. Furthermore, let us assume that the functions $f_{4,2} = a_1 u_2^{k-1}$ and $f_{4,3} = a_2 u_3^{k-1}$ are linear. Then, we have:

$$y_4^k = u_4^{k-1} + a_1 u_2^{k-2} + a_2 u_3^{k-2} + a_1 f_{2,1}(u_1^{k-3}) + a_2 f_{3,1}(u_1^{k-3}) \\ = u_4^{k-1} + a_1 u_2^{k-2} + a_2 u_3^{k-2} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (a_1 \alpha_n + a_2 \beta_n) (u_1^{k-3})^n, \quad (11)$$

where $f_{2,1}(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \alpha_n x^n$ and $f_{3,1}(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \beta_n x^n$. There are infinitely many possible values for each pair (α_n, β_n) that satisfy (11), and each of them generates different functions $f_{2,1}$ and $f_{3,1}$. This is due to the superposition principle that does not allow to distinguish the information of node 1 that arrives through the node 2 or 3.

For this reason, we restrict the identifiability problem to a smaller class of functions [28].

Definition 5 (Class of functions $\mathcal{F}_{Z,NL}$). Let $\mathcal{F}_{Z,NL}$ be the class of functions $f : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with the following properties:

- 1) f is analytic in \mathbb{R}^m .
- 2) $f(\mathbf{0}) = 0$.
- 3) At least one of the partial derivatives of f is not constant.

Unlike the class \mathcal{F}_Z , the last condition in Definition 5 implies that none of the functions f in $\mathcal{F}_{Z,NL}$ is purely linear, which still encompasses numerous nonlinear functions. Since in a DAG, an input can influence a node via multiple paths,

we cannot apply the argument of the proof of Proposition 5 based on setting to zero specific inputs. For this reason, we need to exploit further properties of DAGs to derive identifiability conditions. The following lemma is well-known, and we provide a proof for the sake of completeness.

Lemma 3. In a DAG, any node i which is not a source has at least an in-neighbor j with only one path to i .

Proof. If all the nodes except the sources have only one in-neighbor, the result trivially holds. When there is a node with more than one in-neighbor, we prove it by contradiction. Let us assume there is a DAG with a node i with $|\mathcal{N}_i| \geq 2$ in-neighbors. Let us suppose that all the in-neighbors of i have more than one path to i and let us consider the subgraph induced⁴ by the set of in-neighbors of i and the nodes that correspond to any path between two in-neighbors of i . This subgraph does not have a sink, which contradicts the fact that any subgraph of a DAG is also a DAG. Therefore, there must be at least one neighbor j with only one path to i , which would correspond to the sink of the induced subgraph. \square

The following lemma provides a relationship between the identifiability problem based on the measurement of a node in a graph G and the identifiability problem based on the measurement of the same node in the induced subgraph $G_{V \setminus \{j\}}$. For our convenience, we introduce the notion of identifiability of a function F_ℓ that will be used in the lemma.

Definition 6 (Identifiability of F_ℓ). Given a set of functions $\{f\} = \{f_{i,j} \in \mathcal{F} \mid (i,j) \in E\}$ that generates $F(\mathcal{N}^m)$ and another set of functions $\{\tilde{f}\} = \{\tilde{f}_{i,j} \in \mathcal{F} \mid (i,j) \in E\}$ that generates $\tilde{F}(\mathcal{N}^m)$. The function F_ℓ is identifiable if $F(\mathcal{N}^m) = \tilde{F}(\mathcal{N}^m)$, implies that $F_\ell = \tilde{F}_\ell$, which is equivalent to the mathematical constraint associated with the measurement of the node ℓ .

Lemma 4 (Removal of a node). Given a DAG G and a node j with only one path to its out-neighbor i . Let us assume that j has been measured and the edge $f_{i,j}$ is identifiable. The edges $f_{i,\ell}$ and functions F_ℓ for $\ell \in \mathcal{N}_i$ are identifiable in G if they are identifiable in the induced subgraph $G_{V \setminus \{j\}}$ with the measurement of i .

Proof. In the DAG G , the measurement of the node i provides the output:

$$y_i^k = u_i^{k-1} + F_i \\ = u_i^{k-1} + \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{N}_i} f_{i,\ell}(u_\ell^{k-2} + F_\ell^{(1)}, \dots, u_\ell^{k-m_\ell-1} + F_\ell^{(m_\ell)}), \quad (12)$$

where the functions F_ℓ for $\ell \in \mathcal{N}_i \setminus \{j\}$ do not depend on any information coming through j since there is no path from j

⁴An induced subgraph G_S of a digraph G is a subgraph formed by a subset S of the vertices of G and all the edges of G that have both endpoints in S .

to other in-neighbors of i . Let us assume that there exists a set $\{\tilde{f}\} \neq \{f\}$ such that $F_i = \tilde{F}_i$, which implies:

$$\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{N}_i} f_{i,\ell}(u_\ell^{k-2} + F_\ell^{(1)}, \dots, u_\ell^{k-m_\ell-1} + F_\ell^{(m_\ell)}) = \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{N}_i} \tilde{f}_{i,\ell}(u_\ell^{k-2} + \tilde{F}_\ell^{(1)}, \dots, u_\ell^{k-m_\ell-1} + \tilde{F}_\ell^{(m_\ell)}).$$

Since the measurement of j implies the knowledge of F_j (i.e., $F_j = \tilde{F}_j$), and the edge $f_{i,j}$ is identifiable (i.e., $f_{i,j} = \tilde{f}_{i,j}$), we get:

$$\sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{N}_i \setminus \{j\}} f_{i,\ell}(u_\ell^{k-2} + F_\ell^{(1)}, \dots, u_\ell^{k-m_\ell-1} + F_\ell^{(m_\ell)}) = \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{N}_i \setminus \{j\}} \tilde{f}_{i,\ell}(u_\ell^{k-2} + \tilde{F}_\ell^{(1)}, \dots, u_\ell^{k-m_\ell-1} + \tilde{F}_\ell^{(m_\ell)}). \quad (13)$$

Now, let us consider the induced subgraph $G_{V \setminus \{j\}}$. With the removal of the node j , the measurement of the node i provides the output:

$$y_i^k = u_i^{k-1} + \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{N}_i \setminus \{j\}} f_{i,\ell}(u_\ell^{k-2} + \hat{F}_\ell^{(1)}, \dots, u_\ell^{k-m_\ell-1} + \hat{F}_\ell^{(m_\ell)}). \quad (14)$$

Since j does not affect the functions F_ℓ for $\ell \in \mathcal{N}_i \setminus \{j\}$, we have that $\hat{F}_\ell = F_\ell$, so that (14) implies (13). Therefore, if the edges $f_{i,\ell}$ and the functions F_ℓ for $\ell \in \mathcal{N}_i \setminus \{j\}$ are identifiable in $G_{V \setminus \{j\}}$, they are also identifiable in G . \square

Before introducing the main result of this section, we will need the following technical lemma where we remind that τ is the shift operator of coordinates defined in Section II-A.

Lemma 5 (Sum of multivariate functions). *Given three nonzero analytic functions $f : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $g, \tilde{g} : \mathbb{R}^q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Let us assume that at least one of the partial derivatives of f is not constant and they satisfy:*

$$f(\mathbf{0}) = g(\mathbf{0}) = \tilde{g}(\mathbf{0}) = 0;$$

$$f(x_1 + g(\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_r), \dots, x_p + g(\tau^{p-1}\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \tau^{p-1}\mathbf{y}_r)) = f(x_1 + \tilde{g}(\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_r), \dots, x_p + \tilde{g}(\tau^{p-1}\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \tau^{p-1}\mathbf{y}_r)) + h, \quad (15)$$

where h is an arbitrary function that does not depend on x_1, \dots, x_p . Then $g = \tilde{g}$.

Proof. The proof is deferred to Appendix B \square

Theorem 1 (DAGs). *A DAG is identifiable in the class $\mathcal{F}_{Z,NL}$, if and only if all the sinks are measured.*

Proof. By Proposition 1 the measurement of all the sinks is necessary. Let us consider an arbitrary DAG. The measurement of a sink i provides the output:

$$y_i^k = u_i^{k-1} + F_i = u_i^{k-1} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} f_{i,j}(u_j^{k-2} + F_j^{(1)}, \dots, u_j^{k-m_j-1} + F_j^{(m_j)}).$$

Let us assume that there exists a set $\{\tilde{f}\} \neq \{f\}$ such that $F_i = \tilde{F}_i$, which implies:

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} f_{i,j}(u_j^{k-2} + F_j^{(1)}, \dots, u_j^{k-m_j-1} + F_j^{(m_j)}) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \tilde{f}_{i,j}(u_j^{k-2} + \tilde{F}_j^{(1)}, \dots, u_j^{k-m_j-1} + \tilde{F}_j^{(m_j)}). \quad (16)$$

By Lemma 3, there is at least one in-neighbor ℓ with only one path to i . Then, we can use Lemma 1 to guarantee $f_{i,\ell} = \tilde{f}_{i,\ell}$, and (16) can be expressed as:

$$f_{i,\ell}(u_\ell^{k-2} + F_\ell^{(1)}, \dots, u_\ell^{k-m_\ell-1} + F_\ell^{(m_\ell)}) = f_{i,\ell}(u_\ell^{k-2} + \tilde{F}_\ell^{(1)}, \dots, u_\ell^{k-m_\ell-1} + \tilde{F}_\ell^{(m_\ell)}) + \phi, \quad (17)$$

where ϕ does not depend on any of the inputs u_ℓ since the only path from ℓ to i is the edge (i, ℓ) . By using Lemma 5 in (17) we obtain $F_\ell^{(1)} = \tilde{F}_\ell^{(1)}$, which corresponds to the mathematical constraint associated with the measurement of the node ℓ . Then, the equality (16) becomes:

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i \setminus \{\ell\}} f_{i,j}(u_j^{k-2} + F_j^{(1)}, \dots, u_j^{k-m_j-1} + F_j^{(m_j)}) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i \setminus \{\ell\}} \tilde{f}_{i,j}(u_j^{k-2} + \tilde{F}_j^{(1)}, \dots, u_j^{k-m_j-1} + \tilde{F}_j^{(m_j)}), \quad (18)$$

and according to Lemma 4, the edges $f_{i,j}$ and functions F_j for $j \in \mathcal{N}_i \setminus \{\ell\}$ are identifiable if they are identifiable in the induced subgraph $G_{V \setminus \{\ell\}}$. By Lemma 3, in the subgraph $G_{V \setminus \{\ell\}}$ there must be now another node with only one path to the node i and we can follow a similar approach. Then, we can show that

$$f_{i,j} = \tilde{f}_{i,j} \quad \text{for all } j \in \mathcal{N}_i,$$

and similarly for the functions

$$F_j^{(1)} = \tilde{F}_j^{(1)} \quad \text{for all } j \in \mathcal{N}_i.$$

The last condition corresponds to the mathematical constraint obtained with the measurement of all the in-neighbors of i (i.e., $F_j \in F(\mathcal{N}^m)$ for all $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$) and each in-neighbor can be treated in a similar way to the node i , independently of other in-neighbors. By following a similar approach, we can guarantee that $\{f\} = \{\tilde{f}\}$ for every path that ends in the sink i , and since in a DAG all the paths end in a sink [32], by measuring the other sinks we can identify all the network. \square

Theorem 1 is also valid if the nonlinear functions $f_{i,j}$ depend on outputs with zero delays (i.e., y_j^{k-0}), and this will be used in the proof of Theorem 2.

IV. GENERAL DIGRAPHS

Now, we analyze general digraphs where cycles are allowed. In this case, the delays T_j in (2) for $j \in \mathcal{N}_i^p$ might not be finite, which would imply an infinite number of variables due to the past values of the inputs.

Example 3 (Infinite inputs). *Let us consider the cycle graph in Fig. 4 with nonlinear functions of the form $f_{1,2}(y_2^{k-1})$, and*




Fig. 4. Cycle graph with 2 nodes, where the function associated with the measurement of node 2 depends on an infinite number of past inputs due to the cycle.

$f_{2,1}(y_1^{k-1})$. The measurement of the node 2 provides an output of the type:

$$\begin{aligned} y_2^k &= u_2^{k-1} + f_{2,1}(u_1^{k-2} + f_{1,2}(y_2^{k-2})) \\ &= u_2^{k-1} + f_{2,1}(u_1^{k-2} + f_{1,2}(u_2^{k-3} + f_{2,1}(y_1^{k-3}))), \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where we can observe that due to the cycles, the inputs will be repeated indefinitely with different delays, such that the function F_2 associated with the measurement is a function of an infinite number of variables.

Notice that the output (19) corresponds to a NARX model [25]:

$$y_2^k = F_{\text{NARX}}(u_1^{k-2}, u_2^{k-1}, y_2^{k-2}),$$

where past outputs are considered in the formulation. Nevertheless, in this work, we restrict our analysis to Volterra type models that depend only on excitation signals (i.e., inputs) of the system.

Given that a general digraph can have cycles that depend on an infinite number of past values of the inputs, the design of experiments to obtain the ideal information associated with F_i becomes more complex due to the infinite amount of information (past inputs) required. To avoid this case and obtain identifiability conditions that could match realistic experimental settings, we make the following assumption.

Assumption 3 (Network initially at rest). *The network is initially at rest at time $k = 0$, which implies $y_i^k = 0$ for all $k \leq 0$ and all $i \in V$.*

Assumption 3 covers the case of many networks that should be at rest at some time instant if external signals are no longer applied. Also, it is reasonable to assume that any experimental setting will consider the system at rest to begin with the application of the excitation signals, such that all the information obtained through the measured nodes is exclusively generated by the excitation signals, neglecting the influence of uncontrolled inputs.

Under Assumption 3, when there are cycles in the network, the number of inputs that appear in the function associated with the measurement of a node is finite because the excitation signals can be nonzero only for $k > 0$. This implies a truncation of the function F_i in (2) such that the output of a node i is given by:

$$y_i^k = u_i^{k-1} + F_i^k(u_1^{k-2}, \dots, u_1^0, \dots, u_{n_i}^{k-2}, \dots, u_{n_i}^0), \quad 1, \dots, n_i \in \mathcal{N}_i^p, \quad (20)$$

where F_i^k depends on inputs only until the time $k = 0$ (i.e., u_i^0). For instance, let us consider again the cycle graph in Fig. 4 with the functions of the Example 3 and the measurement of the node 2 at the time instant $k = 4$. Under Assumption 3, the output is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} y_2^k &= u_2^{k-1} + F_2^k \\ &= u_2^{k-1} + f_{2,1}(u_1^{k-2} + f_{1,2}(u_2^{k-3} + f_{2,1}(u_1^{k-4} + f_{1,2}(y_2^{k-4})))) \\ &= u_2^{k-1} + f_{2,1}(u_1^{k-2} + f_{1,2}(u_2^{k-3} + f_{2,1}(u_1^{k-4}))), \end{aligned}$$

which depends on a finite number of inputs since $y_2^{k-4} = 0$.

Unlike the case of DAGs, the functions F_i^k in (20) are parameterized by k . In this case we assume that for each k , when we measure a node i , we know perfectly the corresponding function F_i^k . Since we have a family of functions parameterized by k , the identifiability of edges must be guaranteed for each F_i^k . We extend the Definitions 1 and 2 for the family of functions.

Definition 7 (Set of measured functions at k). *Given a set of measured nodes \mathcal{N}^m , the set of measured functions $F^k(\mathcal{N}^m)$ associated with \mathcal{N}^m at a time instant k is given by:*

$$F^k(\mathcal{N}^m) := \{F_i^k \mid i \in \mathcal{N}^m\}.$$

F^k represents how the outputs of measured nodes y^k depend on the excitation signals from 0 to k .

Definition 8 (Identifiability at k). *Given a set of functions $\{f\} = \{f_{i,j} \in \mathcal{F} \mid (i,j) \in E\}$ that generates $F^k(\mathcal{N}^m)$ and another set of functions $\{\tilde{f}\} = \{\tilde{f}_{i,j} \in \mathcal{F} \mid (i,j) \in E\}$ that generates $\tilde{F}^k(\mathcal{N}^m)$. An edge $f_{i,j}$ is identifiable in a class \mathcal{F} at k if $F^k(\mathcal{N}^m) = \tilde{F}^k(\mathcal{N}^m)$, implies that $f_{i,j} = \tilde{f}_{i,j}$. A network G is identifiable in a class \mathcal{F} at k if $F^k(\mathcal{N}^m) = \tilde{F}^k(\mathcal{N}^m)$, implies that $\{f\} = \{\tilde{f}\}$.*

Unlike DAGs where nonzero excitation signals u_i^k at time instants $k < 0$ are allowed, for general digraphs, the time instant considered for the measurement of a node should be long enough to let all the excitation signals to have an effect on the output of the measured node. If we consider again the cycle graph in Fig. 4, but with a measurement of the node 2 performed at the time instant $k = 2$, the output is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} y_2^k &= u_2^{k-1} + F_2^k \\ &= u_2^{k-1} + f_{2,1}(u_1^{k-2} + f_{1,2}(y_2^{k-2})) \\ &= u_2^{k-1} + f_{2,1}(u_1^{k-2}), \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

since $y_2^{k-2} = 0$. Even if the measurement of the node 2 could give us information also about the function $f_{1,2}$, this is not reflected on the function F_2^k due to the short period of time chosen for the measurement. In this case, any function $f_{1,2} \in \mathcal{F}$ could generate the output (21), which implies that $f_{1,2}$ is not identifiable at the time instant $k = 2$. For this reason, we introduce the notion of general identifiability.

Definition 9 (General identifiability). *A network G is identifiable in a class \mathcal{F} if there exists a k_{\min} such that it is identifiable for $k > k_{\min}$.*

In any digraph, we will be able to consider:

$$\bar{k}_{\min} = m_{\max} + \text{diam}(G), \quad (22)$$

where m_{\max} is the largest delay of the nonlinear functions $f_{i,j}$, and $\text{diam}(G)$ is the diameter of the digraph G . By choosing $k_{\min} = \bar{k}_{\min}$ we will guarantee the appearance of all the possible nonlinear functions $f_{i,j}$ with all their arguments in $F^{k_{\min}}(\mathcal{N}^m)$ (see the proof of Lemma 6). Notice that the consideration of time instants $k > \bar{k}_{\min}$ for the analysis of identifiability is not restrictive since it is logical that in any experimental setting, we need to wait until the outputs of measured nodes reflect the influence of all the possible excitation signals. Also, since the definition of the time $k = 0$ depends on the context of the analysis, it can be associated with the beginning of the application of the excitation signals in the nodes.

Definition 1 for DAGs is encompassed by Definition 7 since the information obtained from the measurement of a node (i.e., $F(\mathcal{N}^m)$) is independent of the time instant k . Similarly, Definition 2 is encompassed by Definitions 8 and 9, since for DAGs, identifiability at an arbitrary time instant k guarantees identifiability for all time instants k because the functions F_i are not parameterized by k .

During the analysis of identifiability, one of the most basic steps that guarantees the identification of all the network is the identifiability of the in-neighbors of measured nodes. This has been performed by isolating parts of the network with appropriate zero excitation inputs (see Lemma 1). However, the extension of this methodology to general digraphs is not always possible since several inputs can be repeated due to the cycles. For example, let us consider again the cycle graph in Fig. 4 with the functions $f_{3,2}(y_2^{k-1}, y_2^{k-4})$, $f_{2,1}(y_1^{k-1})$ and $f_{1,3}(y_3^{k-1})$ where the measurement of the node 3 provides the output:

$$\begin{aligned} y_3^k &= u_3^{k-1} + f_{3,2}(y_2^{k-1}, y_2^{k-4}) \\ &= u_3^{k-1} + f_{3,2}(u_2^{k-2} + f_{2,1}(u_1^{k-3} + f_{1,3}(u_3^{k-4} + \\ &\quad f_{3,2}(u_2^{k-5}))), u_2^{k-5}). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that we cannot identify $f_{3,2}$ by setting to zero the other inputs because the input u_2^{k-5} is repeated due to the cycle. Nevertheless, the results can still be extended by considering additively separable functions.

Assumption 4 (Additively separable functions). *The nonlinear functions $f_{i,j}$ are additively separable:*

$$f_{i,j}(y_j^{k-1}, \dots, y_j^{k-m_j}) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{m_j} f_{i,j}^{\{\ell\}}(y_j^{k-\ell}), \quad (23)$$

where if each function $f_{i,j}^{\{\ell\}}$ is nonzero, then it belongs to $\mathcal{F}_{Z,NL}$.

The determination of an initial time and a final time for the identification process implies in some way that nodes associated with inputs u^0 stop being influenced through incoming edges and nodes associated with inputs u^k stop influence other nodes through outgoing edges. This clearly entails an analogy with the notions of sources and sinks of DAGs, and this allows us to construct a special type of DAG associated with any digraph that will be used in the proofs of the results. This DAG

Algorithm 1: Adapted DAG $H_i^k(G)$

Data: Graph $G = (V, E)$, measured node i ,
measurement time k
Result: Adapted DAG $H_i^k(G)$

- 1 Create a copy of the node i denoted by i_0 with excitation signal $u_{i_0}^k$
- 2 **for** $t = 1, \dots, k - 1$ **do**
- 3 Create copies of the nodes $v \in V$ denoted by v_t with excitation signal $u_{v_t}^{k-t}$
- 4 **for each node** v_t **and each node** w_m **with** $\mathcal{N}_{w_m}^{\text{out}} \neq \emptyset$ **and** $m = 0, \dots, t - 1$ **do**
- 5 **if** $f_{w_m, v_t}^{\{t-m\}}(y_{v_t}^{k-t+m}) \neq 0$ **then**
- 6 Connect w_m and v_t with $f_{w_m, v_t}^{\{t-m\}}(y_{v_t}^k)$
- 7 **end**
- 8 **end**
- 9 **end**

will be generated based on nodes with a nonempty set of out-neighbors (i.e., $\mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}} \neq \emptyset$), where only for its construction, we will assume that the first node denoted by i_0 satisfies $\mathcal{N}_{i_0}^{\text{out}} \neq \emptyset$.

Definition 10 (Adapted DAG). *An adapted DAG at a node i at the time instant k of a digraph G denoted by $H_i^k(G)$ is a DAG generated through Algorithm 1 where the nonlinear functions of the edges have delay 0.*

Intuitively, in the adapted DAG, there is a copy of each node for each time instant $t = 1, \dots, k - 1$, and two nodes v_t and w_m are connected if the node v_t at time t influences directly the node w_m at time m . Notice that the adapted DAG $H_i^k(G)$ is composed by several copies of all the nodes in G . However, some of the copies are disconnected (no incoming or outgoing edges) and their effect will be neglected in the analysis of identifiability. In addition, the adapted DAG can be seen as a multipartite digraph⁵ where each set is composed by the nodes with excitation signals having the same delays. Since the edges can only go from a node to another node with a smaller delay, there are no cycles and the graph is clearly a DAG. In Fig. 5 we present the adapted DAG $H_i^k(G)$ of a general digraph G with several cycles and nonlinear functions of the form $f_{i,j}(y_j^{k-1})$ where we can see the several copies of the nodes grouped according to the delays of the excitation signals (each group corresponds to a different set of a multipartite digraph). The disconnected copies of nodes have been removed from $H_i^k(G)$, since they have no effect on the identifiability problem. Notice that the adapted DAG $H_i^k(G)$ is unique and different for each measured node i .

The utility of this mathematical construction is highlighted by the following lemma.

Lemma 6. *Given a digraph G and a measured node i . Under Assumptions 3 and 4, for any $k > \bar{k}_{\min}$, the edges on all the paths that arrive to the node i in G are identifiable if the adapted DAG $H_i^k(G)$ is identifiable with the measurement of i .*

⁵A k -partite digraph is a digraph whose vertices can be partitioned into k different sets such that for each set, there is no an edge connecting two nodes.




Fig. 5. General digraph G with its corresponding condensation digraph $C(G)$ and adapted DAG $H_3^4(G)$ constructed at the node 3 and the time instant $k = 4$. The identification of G at $k = 4$ is equivalent to the identification of $H_3^4(G)$ where several copies of the nodes of G are created for its construction with inputs determined by the corresponding delays. The adapted DAG is also a multipartite digraph with sets $\{3_0\}$, $\{1_1, 2_1, 6_1\}$, $\{4_2, 1_2, 5_2\}$ and $\{3_3, 4_3\}$, which are constructed by grouping nodes with the same delays on the inputs.

Proof. Under Assumption 3, the function F_i^k associated with the measurement of a node i depends on a finite number of inputs. The measurement of the node i in G provides an output of the form:

$$\begin{aligned}
 y_i^k &= u_i^{k-1} + F_i^k \\
 &= u_i^{k-1} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} f_{i,j}(y_j^{k-1}, \dots, y_j^{k-m_j}) \\
 &= u_i^{k-1} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \sum_{\ell_j=1}^{\hat{m}_j} f_{i,j}^{\{\ell_j\}}(y_j^{k-\ell_j}) \\
 &= u_i^{k-1} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \sum_{\ell_j=1}^{\hat{m}_j} f_{i,j}^{\{\ell_j\}} \left(u_j^{k-\ell_j-1} + F_j^{(\ell_j)} \right). \quad (24)
 \end{aligned}$$

Since $k > \bar{k}_{\min}$ we guarantee that $\hat{m}_j = m_j$ such that all the possible nonlinear functions $f_{i,j}^{\{\ell_j\}}$ appear in (24). Let us assume that there exists a set $\{\tilde{f}\} \neq \{f\}$ such that $F_i^k = \tilde{F}_i^k$, which implies:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \sum_{\ell_j=1}^{m_j} f_{i,j}^{\{\ell_j\}} \left(u_j^{k-\ell_j-1} + F_j^{(\ell_j)} \right) &= \\
 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \sum_{\ell_j=1}^{m_j} \tilde{f}_{i,j}^{\{\ell_j\}} \left(u_j^{k-\ell_j-1} + \tilde{F}_j^{(\ell_j)} \right). \quad (25)
 \end{aligned}$$

Now, let us consider the adapted DAG $H_i^k(G)$. The measurement of the sink i in $H_i^k(G)$ provides the output:

$$y_i^k = u_i^{k-1} + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} \sum_{\ell_j=1}^{m_j} f_{i,j}^{\{\ell_j\}} \left(u_j^{k-\ell_j-1} + \hat{F}_j^{(\ell_j)} \right). \quad (26)$$

Since the adapted DAG $H_i^k(G)$ guarantees that each node is connected by copies of the same in-neighbors in G where the

delays of the excitation signals are given by the delays of the nonlinear functions and the time instants in which the nodes were created, we can guarantee that the outputs of all the nodes in G and $H_i^k(G)$ are the same with the corresponding delays, which implies $\hat{F}_j^{(\ell_j)} = F_j^{(\ell_j)}$ and hence $\hat{F}_j = F_j$. Then, (26) implies (25). Since $k > \bar{k}_{\min}$, we have that for each F_j , all the possible nonlinear functions $f_{j,p}^{\{\ell_p\}}$ associated with an in-neighbor p of j appear in F_j . Hence, if the nonlinear functions of the edges are identifiable in $H_i^k(G)$, they are also identifiable in G . \square

The following theorem provides identifiability conditions for any digraph G based on the measurement of nodes associated with the condensation digraph $C(G)$ ⁶.

Theorem 2 (General digraph). *Under Assumptions 3 and 4, for any $k > \bar{k}_{\min}$, a digraph is identifiable in the class $\mathcal{F}_{Z,NL}$, if and only if one node is measured in every sink of the condensation digraph.*

Proof. Let us consider an arbitrary digraph G . By measuring one node of each sink of the condensation digraph $C(G)$, we can guarantee that there is a path from any node of the network to one of the measured nodes. Let us assume that we measure one node i of a sink of $C(G)$ at an arbitrary time instant $k > \bar{k}_{\min}$. According to Lemma 6, the paths that arrive to the node i are identifiable if the adapted DAG $H_i^k(G)$ is identifiable at $k > \bar{k}_{\min}$. By Theorem 1, the adapted DAG $H_i^k(G)$ is identifiable with the measurement of the sink corresponding to the node i , which implies that the edges of all the paths in G that end in the node i are identifiable, and since all the paths

⁶The condensation digraph $C(G)$ of a digraph G is a digraph where each strongly connected component is replaced by a node and all the edges from one strongly connected component to another are replaced by a single edge.

end in a sink of $C(G)$, we identify all the network at the time instant k . Since k was arbitrary, the procedure can be applied for other $k > \bar{k}_{\min}$, such that the network is identifiable. \square

The static model is a particular case of additively separable functions, where the function f_{ij} in (23) only depends on y_j^{k-1} :

$$y_i^k = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} f_{i,j}(y_j^{k-1}) + u_i^{k-1}. \quad (27)$$

Therefore, Theorem 2 allows us to complete the results of identifiability of networks in the static case analyzed in [28], where the case of general digraphs was missing.

Remark 1 (Self-loops). *In the case of nonlinear state space representations where dynamics at the level of nodes can be present as self-loops, the output of each node i is given by:*

$$y_i^k = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^i} f_{i,j}(y_j^{k-1}, y_j^{k-2}, \dots, y_j^{k-m_j}) + u_i^{k-1}, \quad (28)$$

where \mathcal{N}_i^i is the set of in-neighbors of the node i including i . Notice that in the associated adapted DAG, the set of in-neighbors of a node i is just extended to \mathcal{N}_i^i including the same node i connected by $f_{i,i}$. Therefore, Theorem 2 is also valid in this case.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

We have shown fundamental differences in the identifiability conditions for nonlinear networks with respect to the linear case. Specifically, we have shown for pure nonlinear functions that identifiability was determined by measuring the sinks in the case of DAGs, or nodes in the sinks of the condensation digraph for general digraphs assuming that the nonlinear functions are additively separable and the network is at rest in the last case.

Our approach of the nonlinear network identifiability is novel, and there are consequently many open problems. Clearly, the family of functions considered for the identifiability problem plays a crucial role. The first extension would be the analysis of general digraphs when the nonlinear functions are not necessarily additively separable. Also, in a more general framework, it would be important to analyze more general classes of functions that are not analytic or differentiable. Finally, the derivation of identifiability conditions for a non-additive dynamical model is definitely an interesting area of research.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Boccaletti, V. Latora, Y. Moreno, M. Chavez, and D.-U. Hwang, "Complex networks: Structure and dynamics," *Physics reports*, vol. 424, no. 4-5, pp. 175–308, 2006.
- [2] F. Bullo, *Lectures on Network Systems*, 1.6 ed. Kindle Direct Publishing, 2022.
- [3] X. Wang and H. Su, "Pinning control of complex networked systems: A decade after and beyond," *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 103–111, 2014.
- [4] J. Gonçalves and S. Warnick, "Necessary and sufficient conditions for dynamical structure reconstruction of LTI networks," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 53, no. 7, pp. 1670–1674, 2008.
- [5] A. Mauroy and J. M. Hendrickx, "Spectral identification of networks using sparse measurements," *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 479–513, 2017.
- [6] S. Jahandari and D. Materassi, "Optimal selection of observations for identification of multiple modules in dynamic networks," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 67, no. 9, pp. 4703–4716, 2022.
- [7] M. Verhaegen, C. Yu, and B. Siquin, *Data-Driven Identification of Networks of Dynamic Systems*. Cambridge University Press, 2022.
- [8] K. R. Ramaswamy, P. M. J. Van den Hof, and A. G. Dankers, "Generalized sensing and actuation schemes for local module identification in dynamic networks," in *2019 IEEE 58th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2019, pp. 5519–5524.
- [9] X. Bombois, K. Colin, P. M. J. Van den Hof, and H. Hjalmarsson, "On the informativity of direct identification experiments in dynamical networks," *Automatica*, vol. 148, p. 110742, 2023.
- [10] E. M. M. Kivits and P. M. J. Van den Hof, "Identifiability of diffusively coupled linear networks with partial instrumentation," in *22nd World Congress of the International Federation of Automatic Control (IFAC 2023 World Congress)*, 2023.
- [11] J. M. Hendrickx, M. Gevers, and A. S. Bazanella, "Identifiability of dynamical networks with partial node measurements," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 64, no. 6, pp. 2240–2253, 2019.
- [12] H. J. van Waarde, P. Tesi, and M. K. Camlibel, "Necessary and sufficient topological conditions for identifiability of dynamical networks," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 65, no. 11, pp. 4525–4537, 2020.
- [13] A. Legat and J. M. Hendrickx, "Local network identifiability with partial excitation and measurement," in *2020 59th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2020, pp. 4342–4347.
- [14] —, "Path-based conditions for local network identifiability," in *2021 60th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2021, pp. 3024–3029.
- [15] A. S. Bazanella, M. Gevers, and J. M. Hendrickx, "Network identification with partial excitation and measurement," in *2019 IEEE 58th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2019, pp. 5500–5506.
- [16] X. Cheng, S. Shi, I. Lestas, and P. M. J. Van den Hof, "A necessary condition for network identifiability with partial excitation and measurement," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 11, pp. 6820–6827, 2023.
- [17] A. Legat and J. M. Hendrickx, "Combinatorial characterization for global identifiability of separable networks with partial excitation and measurement," in *2023 62nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2023.
- [18] F. Dörfler and F. Bullo, "Synchronization in complex networks of phase oscillators: A survey," *Automatica*, vol. 50, no. 6, pp. 1539–1564, 2014.
- [19] W. Pan, Y. Yuan, J. Gonçalves, and G.-B. Stan, "Reconstruction of arbitrary biochemical reaction networks: A compressive sensing approach," in *2012 IEEE 51st IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 2334–2339.
- [20] A. Aalto, L. Viitasaari, P. Ilmonen, L. Mombaerts, and J. Gonçalves, "Gene regulatory network inference from sparsely sampled noisy data," *Nature communications*, vol. 11, no. 1, p. 3493, 2020.
- [21] J. Burés and I. Larrosa, "Organic reaction mechanism classification using machine learning," *Nature*, vol. 613, no. 7945, pp. 689–695, 2023.
- [22] A. Bizyaeva, A. Franci, and N. E. Leonard, "Nonlinear opinion dynamics with tunable sensitivity," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 68, no. 3, pp. 1415–1430, 2023.
- [23] J. Schoukens and L. Ljung, "Nonlinear system identification: A user-oriented road map," *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, vol. 39, no. 6, pp. 28–99, 2019.
- [24] A. Janczak, *Identification of Nonlinear Systems Using Neural Networks and Polynomial Models*. Springer, 2004.
- [25] O. Nelles, *Nonlinear System Identification*. Springer, 2020.
- [26] J. Paduart, L. Lauwers, J. Swevers, K. Smolders, J. Schoukens, and R. Pintelon, "Identification of nonlinear systems using polynomial nonlinear state space models," *Automatica*, vol. 46, no. 4, pp. 647–656, 2010.
- [27] C. C. Aggarwal, "Neural Networks and Deep Learning," *Springer*, 2018.
- [28] R. Vizuete and J. M. Hendrickx, "Nonlinear network identifiability: The static case," in *2023 62nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2023, pp. 443–448.
- [29] L. Ljung, *System Identification: Theory for the User*. Prentice Hall PTR, 1999.
- [30] X. Cheng, S. Shi, I. Lestas, and P. M. Van den Hof, "Identifiability in dynamic acyclic networks with partial excitations and measurements," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.07548*, 2022.
- [31] E. Mapurunga, M. Gevers, and A. S. Bazanella, "Excitation and measurement patterns for the identifiability of directed acyclic graphs," in *2022 IEEE 61st Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2022, pp. 1616–1621.

[32] J. Bang-Jensen and G. Z. Gutin, *Digraphs: Theory, Algorithms and Applications*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.

APPENDIX

A. Proof of Lemma 2

Let us consider the change of variables:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{x}_1 &= x_1 + g(\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_r); \\ &\vdots \\ \hat{x}_p &= x_p + g(\tau^{p-1}\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \tau^{p-1}\mathbf{y}_r).\end{aligned}$$

Then, (8) can be written as:

$$f(\hat{x}_1, \dots, \hat{x}_p) = f(\hat{x}_1 + \psi(\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_r), \dots, \hat{x}_p + \psi(\tau^{p-1}\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \tau^{p-1}\mathbf{y}_r)), \quad (29)$$

where $\psi = \tilde{g} - g$. The equality (29) must hold for the particular case $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = (\hat{x}_1, \dots, \hat{x}_p) = \mathbf{0}$, so that we get:

$$f(\psi(\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_r), \dots, \psi(\tau^{p-1}\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \tau^{p-1}\mathbf{y}_r)) = f(\mathbf{0}). \quad (30)$$

If f is constant, then it corresponds to one of the possible results of the Lemma. Let us assume that there exists at least some z_q in $f(z_1, \dots, z_q, \dots, z_p)$ such that $\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_q} \neq 0$. If ψ is constant, we have $\psi \equiv 0$, which implies $g = \tilde{g}$ and the result is already proved. Let us consider that $y_q^{(s)}$ is the first variable in $\psi(\tau^{q-1}\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \tau^{q-1}\mathbf{y}_r)$ such that $\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial y_q^{(s)}} \neq 0$. Let us take the partial derivative with respect to $y_q^{(s)}$, in both sides of (30). Since $y_q^{(s)}$ only appears in $\psi(\tau^{q-1}\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \tau^{q-1}\mathbf{y}_r)$ because the first partial derivatives of f are zero (i.e., $\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_w} = 0$ for $w = 1, \dots, q-1$), and the shift operator τ is applied in the other arguments of f , we obtain

$$\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_q} \right) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_q^{(s)}} \psi(\tau^{q-1}\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \tau^{q-1}\mathbf{y}_r) \right) \equiv 0, \quad (31)$$

where the partial derivative $\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_q} \right)$ is evaluated at $(\psi(\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_r), \dots, \psi(\tau^{p-1}\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \tau^{p-1}\mathbf{y}_r))$. In (31), we have the product of two analytic functions and one of them must be zero everywhere to satisfy the equality. However, this is a contradiction. If $\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_q} \neq 0$, there is no z_q such that $\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_q} \neq 0$ and therefore f is constant. If $\frac{\partial}{\partial y_q^{(s)}} \psi(\tau^{q-1}\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \tau^{q-1}\mathbf{y}_r) = 0$, we have that ψ is constant, which implies $g = \tilde{g}$.

B. Proof of Lemma 5

According to the hypothesis, the derivative of $f(z_1, \dots, z_p)$ with respect to at least one variable z_i is not constant. Let us take the derivative in both sides of (15) with respect to an arbitrary variable z_i such that the derivative is not constant. Then, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial z_i} \right) (x_1 + g(\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_r), \dots, x_p + g(\tau^{p-1}\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \tau^{p-1}\mathbf{y}_r)) &= \\ \left(\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial z_i} \right) (x_1 + \tilde{g}(\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_r), \dots, x_p + \tilde{g}(\tau^{p-1}\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \tau^{p-1}\mathbf{y}_r)). &\end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Since the partial derivative of an analytic function is also an analytic function, (32) is equivalent to (8) and we can apply Lemma 2 to guarantee that either $g = \tilde{g}$ or $\left(\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial z_i} \right)$ is constant. But if $\left(\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial z_i} \right)$ is constant, we have a contradiction and then we can conclude that $g = \tilde{g}$.



Renato Vizuete received the M.S. degree (très bien) in Systems, Control, and Information Technologies from Université Grenoble Alpes, France (2019), and the PhD degree in Automatic Control from Université Paris-Saclay, France (2022). He is currently a FNRS postdoctoral researcher - CR at UCLouvain, Belgium, in the ICTEAM Institute. His research interests include multi-agent systems, distributed optimization, control theory and networked control systems. He was the recipient of the Networks and Communication Systems TC Outstanding Student

Paper Prize of the IEEE Control Systems Society in 2022, and the Second Thesis Prize in the category Impact Science of the Fondation CentraleSupélec in 2023.



Julien M. Hendrickx is professor of mathematical engineering at UCLouvain, in the Ecole Polytechnique de Louvain since 2010.

He obtained an engineering degree in applied mathematics (2004) and a PhD in mathematical engineering (2008) from the same university. He has been a visiting researcher at the University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign in 2003-2004, at the National ICT Australia in 2005 and 2006, and at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 2006 and 2008. He was a postdoctoral fellow at the Laboratory

for Information and Decision Systems of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology 2009 and 2010, holding postdoctoral fellowships of the F.R.S.-FNRS (Fund for Scientific Research) and of Belgian American Education Foundation. He was also resident scholar at the Center for Information and Systems Engineering (Boston University) in 2018-2019, holding a WBI World excellence fellowship.

Doctor Hendrickx is the recipient of the 2008 EECI award for the best PhD thesis in Europe in the field of Embedded and Networked Control, and of the Alcatel-Lucent-Bell 2009 award for a PhD thesis on original new concepts or application in the domain of information or communication technologies.