

Event-Triggered ℓ_2 -Optimal Formation Control with State-Estimation for Agents Modeled as LPV Systems

Gerald Gebhardt, Hamideh Saadabadi and Herbert Werner

Abstract—This paper proposes a distributed scheme with different estimators for the event-triggered formation control of polytopic homogeneously scheduled linear parameter-varying (LPV) multi-agent systems (MAS). Each agent consists of a time-triggered inner feedback loop and a larger event-triggered outer feedback loop to track a formation reference signal and reject input and output noise. If a local event-trigger condition is violated, the event-triggered outer feedback loop is closed through the communication network. The event-trigger condition is only based on locally available information. To design the controller, a synthesis problem is formulated as a linear matrix inequality of the size of a single agent under the assumption, that local estimators trigger intercommunication events with neighboring agents if the event-trigger condition is violated. The design procedure guarantees stability and bounded ℓ_2 -performance. Furthermore, the estimators are interchangeable for a given controller. We compare in simulation zero-order hold, open-loop estimation, and closed-loop estimation strategies. Simulation trials are carried out with non-holonomic dynamic unicycles modeled as polytopic LPV systems.

I. INTRODUCTION

Cooperative control of MAS has been widely studied, and the many applications include sensor networks, formation control of vehicles and swarm robotics [1]-[2]. Autonomous vehicles or mobile robots are often subject to non-holonomic constraints. The dynamics of such vehicles cannot be represented by linear time-invariant systems, but they can be modeled as polytopic LPV systems [3].

The number of intercommunication events for MAS can be unnecessarily high if the agents communicate at fixed time intervals determined by the sampling rate of a digital controller [4]-[5]. However, it can be reasonably reduced through the application of distributed event-triggered control strategies. In [6]-[23] the authors propose centralized and decentralized event-triggered formation control or consensus for LTI MAS. In [24] a MAS control problem is modelled via decomposable systems.

The event-triggered control of LPV systems is the subject of [25]-[40]. In [27]-[29] the design of an output feedback and event-triggered state feedback controller for discrete-time LPV systems with LMI conditions for bounded ℓ_2 -performance is studied. In [30] event-triggered H_∞ state-

feedback control for LPV systems with time triggered sensors is considered. This approach is extended in [31] to event-triggered output feedback control. The event-triggered control of continuous-time switched single loop LPV systems is considered in [32]-[33]. Event-triggered fault detection schemes are proposed in [34]-[35] for LPV systems.

In addition to event-triggered control, local state estimation can reduce the number of intercommunication events rapidly and reasonably [41]-[46]. In [41] sampled data is used for event-triggered state estimation with bounded estimation error for a complex network. In [42] event-triggered, observer-based estimation is applied to reject disturbances and track references for discrete-time LTI systems. In [43] event-triggered distributed state estimation is used for a class of uncertain stochastic systems, which are subject to state-dependent noises and uncertainties. In [44] the optimal trade-off between the expected number of transmissions and the mean square estimation error is found over a finite horizon for an event-triggered estimation strategy for LTI systems. In [45] moving horizon event-triggered state estimation is used for an LTI MAS subject to noise and disturbances. In [46] an observer-based optimal event-triggered control strategy for LTI systems is proposed. In [47] event-triggered open-loop estimation is used for a undirected continuous LTI MAS.

To the best of the authors' knowledge, so far no results on distributed event-triggered open-loop and fully connected closed-loop estimator-based control of LPV agent networks have been reported.

The contribution of this paper is a method for co-designing an event-triggered distributed LPV formation controller together with a trigger condition that depends only on locally available information, with guaranteed stability, ℓ_2 performance, and interchangeable estimators. The gain-scheduled state feedback matrices are found via solving LMIs of the size of a single agent. The information transmitted to the neighbors depends on the applied estimator. The estimators require a certain communication structure and signal availability. Zero-order hold and open-loop estimation are considered for arbitrary communication graphs which are assumed to be undirected and connected, and closed-loop estimation is considered for a fully connected graph, in contrast to [37], where only the zero-order hold estimation scheme is investigated. The open-loop and closed-loop estimators also estimate the scheduling parameters. For the proposed design procedure, it is assumed that the scheduling is homogeneous. This assumption is approximately satisfied for non-holonomic agents which move in formation. A simulation example suggests that the proposed scheme will

Herbert Werner is with the Institute of Control Systems, Hamburg University of Technology, Eissendorfer Str. 40, 21073 Hamburg, Germany h.werner@tuhh.de

Hamideh Saadabadi is with the Institute of Control Systems, Hamburg University of Technology, Eissendorfer Str. 40, 21073 Hamburg, Germany hamideh.saadabadi@tuhh.de

Gerald Gebhardt is with the Institute of Control Systems, Hamburg University of Technology, Eissendorfer Str. 40, 21073 Hamburg, Germany gerald.gebhardt@tuhh.de

still work well even when this assumption is violated through a locally acting disturbance.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: The preliminaries and notation are given in section II. The problem is formulated, and the estimators are proposed in section III. Section IV presents a sufficient LMI condition for the considered problem. A non-holonomic system is introduced in section V and the corresponding simulation results are given in section VI. Finally in section VII conclusions are presented.

II. PRELIMINARIES AND NOTATION

For a signal x_k taking values in \mathbb{R}^{n_x} , the Euclidean 2-norm at time k is $\|x_k\|_2 = \sqrt{x_k^\top x_k}$, and the signal ℓ_2 -norm is defined via $\|x_k\|_{\ell_2} = \sqrt{\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \|x_k\|_2^2}$. An $m \times n$ matrix, which consists only of zeros, is denoted by $0_{m \times n}$. If the dimensions of a zero matrix are clear from context, the index is omitted. The i^{th} unit vector $q_i \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is a column vector, which consists of zeros, except for the i^{th} entry, which is equal to 1. A column vector with N rows, which entries are all equal to 1, is denoted by $\mathbf{1}_N$. For two matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n} := [a_{ij}]$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$ the Kronecker product between A and B is defined as $A \otimes B := [a_{ij}B] \in \mathbb{R}^{mp \times nq}$. Properties of the Kronecker product are $(A \otimes B)^\top = A^\top \otimes B^\top$ and $(A \otimes B)(C \otimes D) = (AC) \otimes (BD)$. A Kronecker product between a matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ and the n^{th} degree identity matrix I_n is expressed as $M_{(n)} = M \otimes I_n$. Block diagonal matrices can be represented as $D = \text{diag}(D_1, \dots, D_N)$, where D_i is a scalar or a matrix.

The positive semi-definite and symmetric Laplacian \mathcal{L} corresponds to the undirected and connected graph \mathcal{G} . The column space $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{1}_N)$, which is the null space of the Laplacian \mathcal{L} , is the agreement space of the MAS and corresponds to the Laplacian's smallest and only non-positive eigenvalue $0 = \lambda_1(\mathcal{L}) < \lambda_2(\mathcal{L}) \leq \dots \leq \lambda_N(\mathcal{L})$ [48].

III. PROBLEM FORMULATION

A. Agent Model

Consider a group of N agents with identical nonlinear dynamics, each modeled as polytopic LPV system $P(\theta_k^i)$ with state space realization

$$\begin{aligned} x_{k+1}^i &= A(\theta_k^i)x_k^i + B_w(\theta_k^i)w_k^i + B_u(\theta_k^i)u_k^i, \\ y_k^i &= C_y(\theta_k^i)x_k^i, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $x_k^i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$, $w_k^i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_w}$, $u_k^i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u}$ and $y_k^i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y}$, denote the state, perturbation, input and transmitted output at time k . The system $\check{P}(\theta_k)$ containing the dynamics of all agents is expressed via

$$\begin{aligned} x_{k+1} &= \check{A}(\theta_k)x_k + \check{B}_u(\theta_k)u_k + \check{B}_w(\theta_k)w_k, \\ y_k &= \check{C}_y(\theta_k)x_k, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where stacked vectors, e.g. $x_k = [(x_k^1)^\top (x_k^2)^\top \dots (x_k^N)^\top]^\top$, and diagonal matrices, e.g.

$$\check{A}(\theta_k) = \text{diag}(A(\theta_k^1), A(\theta_k^2), \dots, A(\theta_k^N)),$$

are used. The model matrices, e.g. $A(\theta_k^i)$ and $B_w(\theta_k^i)$, depend affinely on the time-varying vector of scheduling variables θ_k^i of agent i . The scheduling variables θ_k^i are restricted to a compact set Θ via $\theta_k^i \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_\theta}$ at all times. We assume that the parameter set

$$\Theta = \left\{ \theta \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\theta} \mid \theta = \sum_{l=1}^s \alpha_l \theta_l, \sum_{l=1}^s \alpha_l = 1, \alpha_l \geq 0 \right\}$$

is represented as a polytope in terms of vertex vectors $\theta_l \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\theta}$. This restriction is represented via $\theta \in \mathcal{F}_\Theta$. Defining vertex model matrices, e.g. $A^l = A(\theta_l)$, the LPV model matrices for agent i can be expressed in terms of the convex coordinates $\alpha_l(\theta_k^i)$ as

$$\begin{bmatrix} A(\theta_k^i) & B_w(\theta_k^i) & B_u(\theta_k^i) \\ C_y(\theta_k^i) & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \sum_{l=1}^s \alpha_l(\theta_k^i) \begin{bmatrix} A^l & B_w^l & B_u^l \\ C_y^l & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3)$$

B. Event-Triggered Formation Control

The group of N agents, governed by (2), can communicate through an undirected and connected graph \mathcal{G} . Every agent estimates the output \hat{y}_k^j of its neighbors $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$ and its own output \hat{y}_k^i in the same way as its neighbors do, to calculate the estimated formation error

$$\hat{\eta}_k^i = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} ((r_k^i - \hat{y}_k^j) - (r_k^j - \hat{y}_k^i)) = (q_i^\top \mathcal{L})_{(n_y)} (r_k - \hat{y}_k) \quad (4)$$

locally, where r_k^i is the reference, which should be tracked. The control structure for agent i is shown in Figure 1. The estimated formation error $\hat{\eta}_k^i$ is used to approximate




Fig. 1. Control structure for a single agent

the formation error $\eta_k = \mathcal{L}_{(n_y)}(r_k - y_k)$. Figure 2 shows the closed-loop network, where the cost z_k and also estimators are pictured.




Fig. 2. Control structure of the closed-loop network with performance output and estimator

The "ET"-block in Figure 1 evaluates the local trigger condition

$$(e_k^i)^\top e_k^i \leq \sigma (\hat{\eta}_k^i)^\top \hat{\eta}_k^i, \quad (5)$$

where $e_k^i = \hat{y}_k^i - y_k^i$ is the estimation error and $\sigma > 0$ is the trigger level. If the current estimate \hat{y}_k^i violates the event-trigger condition, a message κ_k^i is sent. This sets the estimation error e_k^i to zero. A message consists of necessary information to locally formulate new identical estimates $\hat{y}_{k+1}^i, \hat{y}_{k+2}^i, \dots$ by every agent $j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cup i$. Three different estimators are presented in subsection III-C. The integrated formation error

$$\zeta_{k+1}^i = \zeta_k^i + \hat{\eta}_k^i \quad (6)$$

is used together with the agent's states x_k^i for gain-scheduled state feedback via

$$u_k^i = F_\zeta(\theta_k^i)\zeta_k^i + F_x(\theta_k^i)x_k^i. \quad (7)$$

Since the agents are affine in θ_k^i , affine parameter dependence is imposed on the controllers, too, i.e.

$$F_x(\theta_k^i) = \sum_{l=1}^s \alpha_l(\theta_k^i)F_x^l, \quad F_\zeta(\theta_k^i) = \sum_{l=1}^s \alpha_l(\theta_k^i)F_\zeta^l, \quad (8)$$

where $F_x^l = F_x(\theta_l)$ and $F_\zeta^l = F_\zeta(\theta_l)$ denote the vertex controllers at vertex l . Thus, the input signal can be expressed via

$$u_k = \check{F}_\zeta(\theta_k)\zeta_k + \check{F}_x(\theta_k)x_k. \quad (9)$$

Since the control objective is to design a controller which follows a reference input r_k and rejects the disturbance w_k the control performance can be measured with the performance output

$$z_k = w_z(k) * \mathcal{L}_{(n_y)}(r_k - y_k), \quad (10)$$

where $(*)$ denotes the discrete convolution and $W_z(z) = \frac{\beta_z}{z + \alpha_z}$ is the z -transformed filter $w_z(k)$ with variables α_z and β_z as design parameters. The parameter α_z is used to set a weight on the latest cost function value. With (2) the performance output z_k can be expressed as state space model

$$\tilde{z}_{k+1} = -\alpha_z \tilde{z}_k + \beta_z r_k - \beta_z \check{C}_y(\theta_k)x_k, \quad z_k = \mathcal{L} \tilde{z}_k, \quad (11)$$

with the local performance \tilde{z}_k as state vector. (1), (4) and (6) lead to

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\eta}_k &= \mathcal{L}_{(n_y)}(r_k - \check{C}_y(\theta_k)x_k - e_k), \\ \zeta_{k+1}^i &= \zeta_k^i + \mathcal{L}_{(n_y)}(r_k - \check{C}_y(\theta_k)x_k - e_k). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Thus, (1), (9), (11) and (12) can be combined to form

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c} x_{k+1}^\top & \zeta_{k+1}^\top & \tilde{z}_{k+1}^\top & \hat{\eta}_k^\top & z_k^\top \end{array} \right]^\top = \\ & \left[\begin{array}{ccc|ccc} \check{A} + \check{B}_u \check{F}_x & \check{B}_u \check{F}_\zeta & 0 & 0 & 0 & \check{B}_w \\ -\mathcal{L}_{(n_y)} \check{C}_y & I_{Nn_y} & 0 & -\mathcal{L}_{(n_y)} & \mathcal{L}_{(n_y)} & 0 \\ -\beta_z \check{C}_y & 0 & -\alpha_z I_{Nn_y} & 0 & \beta_z I_{Nn_y} & 0 \\ \hline -\mathcal{L}_{(n_y)} \check{C}_y & 0 & 0 & -\mathcal{L}_{(n_y)} & \mathcal{L}_{(n_y)} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mathcal{L}_{(n_y)} & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right] \\ & \cdot \left[\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c} x_k^\top & \zeta_k^\top & \tilde{z}_k^\top & e_k^\top & r_k^\top & w_k^\top \end{array} \right]^\top, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where the dependence on the scheduling parameter θ_k is omitted for ease of notation. (13) can be abbreviated via

$$\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \psi_{k+1} \\ \hat{\eta}_k \\ z_k \end{bmatrix}}_{=v_k} = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \bar{A}_{CL} & \bar{B}_e & \bar{B}_f \\ \bar{C}_{\hat{\eta}} & \bar{D}_{\hat{\eta}e} & \bar{D}_{\hat{\eta}f} \\ \bar{C}_z & \bar{D}_{ze} & \bar{D}_{zf} \end{bmatrix}}_{=\bar{H}(\theta_k)} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \psi_k \\ e_k \\ f_k \end{bmatrix}}_{=\phi_k}, \quad (14)$$

where

$$\psi_k = \begin{bmatrix} x_k^\top & \zeta_k^\top & \tilde{z}_k^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{N \cdot n_\psi}, \quad f_k = \begin{bmatrix} r_k^\top & w_k^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{N \cdot n_f},$$

$n_\psi = n_x + n_y + n_z$ and $n_f = n_y + n_w$. The horizontal (–) and vertical (|) lines make the correlations between (13) and (14) unambiguous. The closed-loop matrix

$$\bar{A}_{CL} = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \check{A} & 0 & 0 \\ -\mathcal{L}_{(n_y)} \check{C}_y & I_{Nn_y} & 0 \\ -\beta_z \check{C}_y & 0 & -\alpha_z I_{Nn_y} \end{bmatrix}}_{=\bar{A}_{OL}} + \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \check{B}_u \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}}_{=\bar{B}_F} \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \check{F}_x^\top \\ \check{F}_\zeta^\top \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}}_{=\bar{F}} \quad (15)$$

introduces feedback via \bar{F} . In equation (15), I_{Nn_y} denotes the identity matrix of degree $N \cdot n_y$.

C. Estimation

The proposed zero-order hold estimation, open-loop estimation and closed-loop estimation schemes require different information to formulate new estimates locally.

1) *Zero-Order Hold Estimation:* For zero-order hold estimation, the necessary information is the output $\kappa_k^i = y_k^i$, since $\hat{y}_{k+1}^i = \hat{y}_k^i$ is the estimate, if no event-triggering occurs at agent i . This estimate is updated to $\hat{y}_k^i = y_k^i = \kappa_k^i$, if an event is triggered at time k .

2) *Open-Loop Estimation:* For open-loop estimation, agent i sends a message $\kappa_k^i = [(x_k^i)^\top (\theta_k^i)^\top]^\top$ to its neighbors when the event-trigger condition is violated, since the local estimation is based upon the prediction of the next scheduling parameter $\hat{\theta}_{k+1}^i = f(\hat{\theta}_k^i, \hat{x}_k^i)$ and the output prediction via

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}_{k+1} \\ \hat{y}_k \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A(\hat{\theta}_k^i) \\ C_y(\hat{\theta}_k^i) \end{bmatrix} \hat{x}_k^i. \quad (16)$$

The function $f(\hat{\theta}_k^i, \hat{x}_k^i)$ is a combination of the locally available parameters $\hat{\theta}_k^i$ and \hat{x}_k^i to predict the next scheduling parameter $\hat{\theta}_{k+1}^i$.

3) *Closed-Loop Estimation for Fully Connected Network:* For the proposed closed-loop estimator, the network needs to be fully connected, i.e. $\mathcal{L} = N I_N - \mathbf{1}_N \mathbf{1}_N^\top$, since every agent estimates the full network and is required to produce the same estimate \hat{y}_k as its neighbors. Furthermore, the necessary information for this estimation scheme are $\hat{\theta}_k, \hat{x}_k, \hat{\zeta}_k$ and r_k , since output estimates \hat{y}_k are generated via

$$\hat{\theta}_{k+1} = f(\hat{\theta}_k, \hat{x}_k, \hat{\zeta}_k, r_k) \text{ and}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}_{k+1}^\top & \hat{\zeta}_{k+1}^\top & \hat{y}_k^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top =$$

$$\left[\begin{array}{ccc|c} \check{A}(\hat{\theta}_k) + \check{B}_u(\hat{\theta}_k)\check{F}_x(\hat{\theta}_k) & \check{B}_u(\hat{\theta}_k)\check{F}_\zeta(\hat{\theta}_k) & 0 & 0 \\ -\mathcal{L}_{(n_y)}\check{C}_y(\hat{\theta}_k) & I_{Nn_y} & \mathcal{L}_{(n_y)} & 0 \\ \mathcal{L}_{(n_y)}\check{C}_y(\hat{\theta}_k) & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right] \begin{bmatrix} \hat{x}_k \\ \hat{\zeta}_k \\ r_k \end{bmatrix}. \quad (17)$$

Thus, if an event is triggered at agent i and time k , agent i sends a message $\kappa_k^i = [(\theta_k^i)^\top (x_k^i)^\top (\zeta_k^i)^\top]^\top$ to the other agents.

D. Problem Formulation

The problem addressed in this paper is the following: For a given positive constant γ , a network with dynamics governed by (13) and (14) and a given estimator, which ensures that (5) is true, find the scheduled state feedback gain matrices $F_x(\theta_k^i)$ and $F_\zeta(\theta_k^i)$ in (7), such that the group of N agents is stable and satisfies

$$\|T_{zf}\|_{\ell_2} \Big|_{x_0=0} = \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{F}_\Theta} \sup_{f \neq 0} \frac{\|z_k\|_{\ell_2}}{\|f_k\|_{\ell_2}} \Big|_{x_0=0} \leq \gamma. \quad (18)$$

IV. CONTROLLER SYNTHESIS

Assumption 1: The scheduling in the group is homogeneous, i.e. $\theta_k^i = \theta_k^j, \forall 1 \leq i \leq N, 1 \leq j \leq N$ and $k \geq 1$.

The matrix inequality

$$\begin{bmatrix} G^l \top + G^l - S & & & & & & & & & \\ 0 & I_{n_y} & & & & & & & & * \\ 0 & 0 & tI_{n_f} & & & & & & & \\ A_{OL}^{li} G^l + B_F^l K^l & B_e^i & B_f^i & S & & & & & & \\ C_{\hat{\eta}}^{li} G^l & D_{\hat{\eta}e}^i & D_{\hat{\eta}f}^i & 0 & \sigma_x I_{n_y} & & & & & \\ C_z^l G^l & D_{ze} & D_{zf} & 0 & 0 & & & I_{n_y} & & \end{bmatrix} > 0, \quad (19)$$

where

$$G^l = \text{diag}(G_1^l, G_2^l), G_1^l = \begin{bmatrix} G_x^l & G_{x\zeta}^l \\ G_{\zeta x}^l & G_\zeta^l \end{bmatrix}, \quad (20)$$

$$K^l = [K^l 0_{n_u \times n_y}], K_1^l = [K_x^l K_{x\zeta}^l], B_F^l = \begin{bmatrix} B_u^l \\ 0_{2 \cdot n_y \times n_u} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (21)$$

$$n_f = n_y + n_w, t = \gamma^2, \sigma_x = \sigma^{-1}, \quad (22)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_{OL}^{li} & B_e^i & B_f^i \\ C_{\hat{\eta}}^{li} & D_{\hat{\eta}e}^i & D_{\hat{\eta}f}^i \\ C_z^l & D_{ze} & D_{zf} \end{bmatrix} =$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} A^l & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & B_w^l \\ -\lambda_i C_y^l & I_{n_y} & 0 & -\lambda_i I_{n_y} & \lambda_i I_{n_y} & 0 \\ -\beta_z C_y^l & 0 & -\alpha_z I_{n_y} & 0 & \beta_z I_{n_y} & 0 \\ -\lambda_i C_y^l & 0 & 0 & -\lambda_i I_{n_y} & \lambda_i I_{n_y} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_i I_{n_y} & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (23)$$

is linear in S, G^l, K^l, t and σ_x . In (19), $(*)$ denotes a matrix block that can be inferred by symmetry.

Theorem 1: The closed-loop MAS defined by (13) and (14), with an estimator and event-triggering mechanism, which ensures that (5) is true and distributed feedback governed by (8), where $(F_x F_\zeta) = K_1^l G_1^l{}^{-1}$ is stable and satisfies

(18), if there exist a symmetric positive-definite matrix $S \in \mathbb{R}^{n_\psi \times n_\psi}$ and matrices $K_1^l \in \mathbb{R}^{n_u \times (n_y + n_x)}, G_1^l \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_y + n_x) \times (n_y + n_x)}$ and $G_2^l \in \mathbb{R}^{n_y \times n_y}$ that satisfy (19) for $l = 1, 2, \dots, s$ and $i = 2, N$.

Proof: See appendix

Note that the assumption of homogeneous scheduling may be violated, especially when a perturbation acts on an individual agent. The simulations shown below suggest, that even then the proposed scheme performs well.

V. LPV REPRESENTATION OF A NON-HOLONOMIC VEHICLE

To motivate the use of LPV models as agents in formation control problems, unicycles are used as an example for non-holonomic systems. The position of the agent in a plane is given by the Cartesian coordinates $x(t)$ and $y(t)$ and its orientation by the angle $\phi(t)$. The non-holonomic constraint on the mobile robot shown in Figure 3 is that only acceleration via a force f and steering via a torque τ is allowed.

A. Non-holonomic system with handle point

The unicycle's dynamic equations are

$$\dot{x} = v \cos(\phi), \dot{y} = v \sin(\phi), \dot{v} = \frac{f}{m}, \dot{\phi} = \omega, \dot{\omega} = \frac{\tau}{I},$$

where m is the unicycle's mass and I is its moment of inertia. Figure 3 shows the unicycle with a fictitious handle




Fig. 3. Dynamic unicycle with handle

point at position (x^d, y^d) , which is a distance d apart in \tilde{x} -direction from the unicycles center of mass at position (x, y) . The handle point is introduced to improve the system's controllability [49]. The transformation matrix

$$T_\phi = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \phi & \sin \phi \\ -\sin \phi & \cos \phi \end{bmatrix} \quad (24)$$

is used to transform from xy -coordinates to $\tilde{x}\tilde{y}$ -coordinates. An LPV model of the handle is then obtained by writing the state space model as

$$\begin{bmatrix} (\tilde{x}^d)^\top (\tilde{y}^d)^\top \dot{v}_n^\top \dot{v}_t^\top \end{bmatrix}^\top =$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \frac{v_t}{d} & 1 & 0 \\ -\frac{v_t}{d} & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x}^d \\ \tilde{y}^d \\ v_n \\ v_t \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{m} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{d}{I} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} f \\ \tau \end{bmatrix}, \quad (25)$$

where v_n and v_t are the normal and lateral velocities and the only scheduling parameter is $v_t = \theta$. Note, that (25) has the form

$$\dot{x}(t) = A(\theta(t))x(t) + B_u u(t) \quad (26)$$

and that $A(\theta(t))$ is affine in θ . Furthermore, the matrices B_w , B_u and C_y are independent of the scheduling parameter. Thus, the design procedure proposed in section IV is applicable. Euler's discretization is used to discretize the model with sampling time T_s via

$$x_{k+1} = (I + T_s \cdot A(\theta_k))x_k + (T_s \cdot B_u)u_k \quad (27)$$

for the simulations.

VI. SIMULATION RESULTS

To show the effectiveness of the proposed method, a simulation example is provided [50]. For the simulations a network of three agents with complete communication graph and corresponding Laplacian $\mathcal{L} = 3I_3 - \mathbf{1}_3\mathbf{1}_3^T$ is used. The reference is $r_k = [1, 0, 0, 0.5, 0.5, -0.5]^T$, the trigger level is $\sigma = 10^{-3}$ and the sampling time is $T_s = 0.01$. Between the times $t = 4$ and $t = 4.5$ an \tilde{x} -directional input disturbance w_k^1 is applied to the agent 1. The simulation results are provided by Figures 4 and 5. Figure 4 shows the xy -




Fig. 4. Spatial response for ZOH, OLE and CLE




Fig. 5. Formation error and simultaneous trigger events for ZOH, OLE and CLE

directional time response of the three agents for zero-order hold, open-loop and closed loop estimation. The spatial responses are overlapping each other in Figure 4 for the three estimators. Figure 5 displays the Euclidean 2-norm

of the formation error η_k and the amount of simultaneous trigger instants per time instant. The differences in the spatial response are negligible, but the amount of trigger events varies significantly. This result is also supported by Table I. The mean of the formation error norm $\overline{\|\eta\|_2} = \sum_{k=1}^{30} \frac{T_s \|\eta_k\|_2}{30}$

TABLE I
ESTIMATOR PERFORMANCE

Estimator	$\overline{\ \eta\ _2}$	Trigger events	Trigger rate
ZOH	0.3852	362	0.1205
OLE	0.3995	131	0.0436
CLE	0.3923	54	0.0180

in Table I does not differ significantly for the three proposed estimators. However, Table I also shows the amount of trigger events and the trigger rate, which is the amount of actual trigger events divided by the amount of possible trigger events. The amount of trigger events and the trigger rate is almost half as large for OLE compared to ZOH and more than seven times smaller for CLE compared to ZOH in the considered simulation.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

This paper proposes a distributed event-triggered formation control scheme for polytopic LPV MAS, that guarantees stability and a level of control performance for the network and is suitable for different local estimation schemes. The synthesis problem is formulated as an LMI problem of the size of a single agent. The estimators reduce the communication load and are interchangeable for given control matrices. A simulation example illustrates the practicality of the proposed method and compares the proposed estimators.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Olfati-Saber, J. Alex Fax, M. M. Richard, (2007). Consensus and cooperation in networked multi-agent systems. *Proc. IEEE*, , vol. 97, no. 1, pp. 215-233.
- [2] J. A. Fax and R. M. Murray, "Information flow and cooperative control of vehicle formations", in *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 49, no. 9, pp. 1465-1476, Sept. 2004, doi: 10.1109/TAC.2004.834433.
- [3] A. Mendez Gonzalez, C. Hoffmann, C. Radisch, H. Werner; LPV Formation Control for a Class of Non-Holonomic Agents with Directed and Switching Communication Topologies, 54th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, 2015, Osaka, JP.
- [4] E. Garcia, Y. Cao, H. Yu, P. Antsaklis, and D. Casbeer, "Decentralised event-triggered cooperative control with limited communication", *Int. J. Control*, vol. 86, no. 9, pp. 1479-1488, 2013.
- [5] K. Zhu, D. Ma, and J. Zhao, "Event-triggered control for a switched LPV system with applications to aircraft engines", in *IET Control Theory and Applications*, vol. 12, no. 10, pp. 1505-1514, 3 7 2018.
- [6] D. V. Dimarogonas, K. H. Johansson, "Event-triggered cooperative control", *Proc. of the 2009 European Control Conference*, pp. 3015-3020, 2009.
- [7] D. V. Dimarogonas, E. Frazzoli, and K. J. Johansson, "Distributed event-triggered control for multi-agent systems", *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 57, no. 5, pp. 1291-1297, May 2012.
- [8] S. G. Seyboth, D. V. Dimarogonas, and K. H. Johansson, "Event-based broadcasting for multi-agent average consensus", *Automatica*, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 245-252, Jan. 2013.
- [9] P. Tabuada, "Event-triggered real-time scheduling of stabilizing control tasks", *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 52, no. 9, pp. 1680-1685, Sep. 2007.

- [10] M. Mazo, P. Tabuada, "On event-triggered and self-triggered control over sensor/actuator networks", Decision and Control 47th IEEE Conference on. IEEE, pp. 435-440, 2008.
- [11] E. Garcia, Y. Cao, D. W. Casbeer, "Decentralized event-triggered consensus with general linear dynamics", Automatica, vol. 50, no. 10, pp. 2633-2640, Oct. 2014.
- [12] T. H. Cheng, Z. Kan, R. J. Klotz, J. M. Shea, and W.E. Dixon, (2017). "Event-triggered control of multi-agent systems for fixed and time-varying network topologies", IEEE Trans. Autom. Control, vol. 62, no. 10, pp. 5365-5371,
- [13] Z. Liu, Z. Chen, and Z. Yuan, "Event-triggered average-consensus of multi-agent systems with weighted and direct topology", J. Syst. Sci.Complex., vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 845-855, 2012.
- [14] X. Chen, F. Hao, "Event-triggered average consensus control for discrete-time multi-agent systems", IET Control Theory Appl., vol. 6, no. 16, pp. 2493-2498, Nov. 2012.
- [15] T. Yang, Z. Meng, D. V. Dimarogonas, K. H. Johansson, "Global consensus for discrete-time multi-agent systems with input saturation constraints", Automatica, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 499-506, Feb. 2014.
- [16] A. Amini, Z. Zeinaly, A. Mohammadi and A. Asif, "Performance Constrained Distributed Event-triggered Consensus in Multi-agent Systems", 2019 American Control Conference (ACC), Philadelphia, PA, USA, 2019, pp. 1830-1835.
- [17] X. Ge and Q.-L. Han, "Distributed formation control of networked multi-agent systems using a dynamic event-triggered communication mechanism", IEEE Trans. Ind. Electron., vol. 64, no. 10, pp. 8118-8127, Oct. 2017.
- [18] W. Zhu, W. Cao and Z. Jiang, "Distributed Event-Triggered Formation Control of Multi-agent Systems via Complex-Valued Laplacian", in IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics.
- [19] C. Viel, S. Bertrand, M. Kieffer, and H. Piet-Lahanier, "Distributed event-triggered control for multi-agent formation stabilization", IFAC-PapersOnLine, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 8025-8030, 2017.
- [20] A. Amini, A. Asif and A. Mohammadi, "Dynamic Event-triggered Formation Control for Multi-agent Systems: A Co-design Optimization Approach", 2020 American Control Conference (ACC), Denver, CO, USA, 2020, pp. 707-712.
- [21] Li. X, Dong. X, Li. Q, and Ren. Z, "Event-triggered time-varying formation control for general linear multi-agent systems", J. Frankl. Inst.,Feb. 2018.
- [22] R. Toyota, T. Namerikawa, "Event-Triggered Formation Control of a Generalized Multi-Agent System", 2018, 57th Annual Conference of the Society of Instrument and Control Engineers of Japan (SICE).
- [23] A. Eqtami, A. Dimarogonas, D. V, K. J. Kyriakopoulos, "Event-triggered control for discrete-time systems", Proc. Amer. Control Conf., pp. 4719-4724, Jun. 2010.
- [24] P. Massioni, M. Verhaegen, "Distributed control for identical dynamically coupled systems: A decomposition approach", IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, vol. 54, pp. 124-135, 2009.
- [25] J. S. Shamma, "An Overview of LPV Systems", in Control of Linear Parameter Varying Systems with Applications, J. Mohammadpour, C. Scherer (Eds). Springer, Boston,2012, PP.3-26.
- [26] M. F. Braga, C. F. Morais, E. S. Tognetti, R. C. L. F. Oliveira, P. L. D. Peres, "Discretization and event triggered digital output feedback control of LPV systems", Systems & Control Letters, Volume 86, 2015, pp. 54-65.
- [27] C. Souza, S. Tarbouriech, V. J. S. Leite, E. B. Castelan, "Co-design of an event-triggered dynamic output feedback controller for discrete-time LPV systems with constraints", Journal of the Franklin Institute, Volume 359, Issue 2, 2022, pp. 697-718.
- [28] A. Golabi, N. Meskin, R. Tóth, J. Mohammadpour, and T. Donkers, "Event-triggered control for discrete-time linear parameter varying systems", 2016 American Control Conference (ACC), Boston, MA, 2016, pp. 3680-3685.
- [29] H. Saadabadi, H. Werner, "Event-Triggered Dynamic Output Feedback Control For Discrete-Time Polytopic Linear Parameter-Varying Systems", 2020 IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC).
- [30] S. Li, D. Sauter, B. Xu, "Co-design of event-triggered H_∞ control for discrete-time linear parameter varying systems with network-induced delays", Journal of the Franklin Institute, Volume 352, Issue 5, pp. 1867-1892, 2015.
- [31] J. J. Huang, X. Z. Pan, X. Z. Hao, "Event-triggered and self-triggered H_∞ output tracking control for discrete-time linear parameter-varying systems with network-induced delays", International Journal of Systems Science, 2020.
- [32] J. Liu, D. Chang and D. Ma, "Event-Triggered H_∞ Tracking Control for Switched LPV Systems", 2019 Chinese Control Conference (CCC), Guangzhou, China, 2019, pp. 1235-1240.
- [33] K. Zhu, D. Ma, and J. Zhao, "Event-triggered control for a switched LPV system with applications to aircraft engines", in IET Control Theory and Applications, vol. 12, no. 10, pp. 1505-1514, 3 7 2018.
- [34] A. Golabi, M. Davoodi, N. Meskin, J. Mohammadpour and R. Tóth, "Event-triggered fault detection for discrete-time LPV systems", 2016 Second International Conference on Event-based Control, Communication, and Signal Processing (EBCCSP), Krakow, 2016, pp. 1-8.
- [35] S. Li, S. Jiang, and F. Pan, "Event-Triggered Fault Detection for Networked LPV Systems", Circuits Syst Signal Process 38, 2992-3019 (2019).
- [36] P. H. S. Coutinho, R. M. Palhares, "Dynamic periodic event-triggered gain-scheduling control co-design for quasi-LPV systems", Nonlinear Analysis: Hybrid Systems, Volume 41, 2021.
- [37] H. Saadabadi, H. Werner, "Event-Triggered ℓ_2 -Optimal Formation Control for Agents Modeled as LPV Systems", CDC, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5541990>.
- [38] C. de Souza, S. Tarbouriech, E. B. Castelan, V. J. S. Leite, "Event-triggered Dynamic Output Feedback Controller for Discrete-time LPV Systems with Constraints", IFAC-PapersOnLine, Volume 54, Issue 9, 2021, pp. 213-218.
- [39] M. J. L. Boada, B. L. Boada, H. Zhang, "Event-triggering H_∞ -based observer combined with NN for simultaneous estimation of vehicle sideslip and roll angles with network-induced delays", Nonlinear Dyn 103, 2021, pp. 2733-2752.
- [40] D. V. Zanette, A. H. K. Palmeira, L. G. Moreira and J. M. G. Da Silva, "Periodic Event-Trigger Control for Continuous-Time LPV Systems", 2021 European Control Conference (ECC), 2021, pp. 156-161.
- [41] L. Zou, Z. Wang, H. Gao and X. Liu, "Event-Triggered State Estimation for Complex Networks With Mixed Time Delays via Sampled Data Information: The Continuous-Time Case", IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics, vol. 45, no. 12, pp. 2804-2815.
- [42] D. Sbarbaro, J. M. Gomes da Silva Jr., L. G. Moreira. "Event-Triggered Tracking Control: a Discrete-Time Approach", IFAC-PapersOnLine, Volume 53, Issue 2, 2020, pp. 4565-4570.
- [43] H. Dong, Z. Wang, F. E. Alsaadi, B. Ahmad "Event-triggered robust distributed state estimation for sensor networks with state-dependent noises", International Journal of General Systems, 2015 Vol. 44, No. 2, pp. 254-266.
- [44] A. Molin and S. Hirche, "Event-Triggered State Estimation: An Iterative Algorithm and Optimality Properties", in IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, vol. 62, no. 11, 2017, pp. 5939-5946.
- [45] X. Yin and J. Liu, "Event-Triggered State Estimation of Linear Systems Using Moving Horizon Estimation", in IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology, vol. 29, no. 2, 2021, pp. 901-909.
- [46] H. Li, L. Li, R. Cheng and Y. Fan, "Optimized event-triggered control for linear systems with state observer", 2021 33rd Chinese Control and Decision Conference (CCDC), 2021, pp. 6584-6589.
- [47] E. Garcia, Y. Cao, D.W. Casbeer "Decentralized event-triggered consensus with general linear dynamics", Automatica, Volume 50, Issue 10, 2014, pp. 2633-2640.
- [48] M. Mesbahi, M. Egerstedt, "Graph-Theoretic Methods in Multiagent Networks", NJ, Princeton:Princeton Univ. Press, 2010.
- [49] A. Attallah, H. Werner, "Information Flow in Formation Control for Nonholonomic Agents Modeled as LPV Systems", European Control Conference, 2020, pp. 459-464.
- [50] G. Gebhardt, H. Saadabadi, H. Werner, "TUHH-ICS/2022-code-CDC-Event-Triggered-State-Estimation- ℓ_2 -Optimal-Formation-Control-for-Agents-Modeled-as-LP: code for Event-Triggered State-Estimation ℓ_2 -Optimal Formation Control for Agents Modeled as LPV Systems", 2022, doi: 10.5281/zenodo.6401952, url: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6401952>.

Proof of Theorem 1:

Consider the Lyapunov function candidate

$$V(x_k, \zeta_k, \tilde{z}_k) = \begin{bmatrix} x_k \\ \zeta_k \\ \tilde{z}_k \end{bmatrix}^\top \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} \check{P}_x & \check{P}_{x\zeta} & \check{P}_{x\tilde{z}} \\ \check{P}_{\zeta x} & \check{P}_\zeta & \check{P}_{\zeta\tilde{z}} \\ \check{P}_{\tilde{z}x} & \check{P}_{\tilde{z}\zeta} & \check{P}_{\tilde{z}} \end{bmatrix}}_{=\bar{P}} \begin{bmatrix} x_k \\ \zeta_k \\ \tilde{z}_k \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\bar{P} = \bar{P}^\top > 0$. Stability, ℓ_2 performance due to (18) and the event-trigger condition via (5) are combined to

$$\begin{aligned} & \psi_{k+1}^\top \bar{P} \psi_{k+1} - \psi_k^\top \bar{P} \psi_k \leq \\ & -z_k^\top z_k + \gamma^2 f_k^\top f_k - \sigma \hat{\eta}_k^\top \hat{\eta}_k + e_k^\top e_k. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Applying (14) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & 0 \geq \phi_k^\top \left((\bar{H}^\top(\theta_k) \bar{R}_2 \bar{H}(\theta_k) - \bar{R}_1) \phi_k, \right. \\ & \bar{R}_1 = \text{diag}(\bar{P}, I_{Nn_y}, \gamma^2 I_{Nn_f}), \\ & \left. \bar{R}_2 = \text{diag}(\bar{P}, \sigma I_{Nn_y}, I_{Nn_y}), \right) \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where $n_f = n_y + n_w$. Using a Schur complement results in

$$\begin{bmatrix} \bar{R}_1 & \bar{H}^\top(\theta_k) \bar{R}_2^\top \\ \bar{R}_2 \bar{H}(\theta_k) & \bar{R}_2 \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \quad (30)$$

which is a non-linear matrix inequality. This inequality is linearized via multiplying it from the right by $\text{diag}(\bar{D}(\theta_k), \bar{R}_2^{-1})$, where

$$\bar{D}(\theta_k) = \text{diag}(\bar{G}(\theta_k), I_{Nn_y + Nn_w})$$

and

$$\bar{G}(\theta_k) = \text{diag} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \check{G}_x(\theta_k) & \check{G}_{x\zeta}(\theta_k) \\ \check{G}_{\zeta x}(\theta_k) & \check{G}_\zeta(\theta_k) \end{bmatrix}, \check{G}_2(\theta_k) \right)$$

and from the left by its transpose, using the inequality $\bar{S} \leq \bar{G}(\theta_k) + \bar{G}(\theta_k)^\top - \bar{S}$, where $\bar{S} = \bar{P}^{-1}$, to get the more conservative but linear matrix inequality

$$\begin{bmatrix} \bar{M}_{11}(\theta_k) & \bar{M}_{21}^\top(\theta_k) \\ \bar{M}_{21}(\theta_k) & \bar{M}_{22} \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \quad (31)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{M}_{11}(\theta_k) &= \text{diag}(\bar{G}(\theta_k) + \bar{G}(\theta_k)^\top - \bar{S}, I_{Nn_y}, t I_{Nn_f}), \\ \bar{M}_{21}(\theta_k) &= \begin{bmatrix} \bar{A}_{OL} \bar{G} + \bar{B}_F \bar{K} & \bar{B}_e & \bar{B}_f \\ \bar{C}_{\hat{\eta}} \bar{G} & \bar{D}_{\hat{\eta}e} & \bar{D}_{\hat{\eta}f} \\ \bar{C}_z \bar{G} & \bar{D}_{ze} & \bar{D}_{zf} \end{bmatrix} (\theta_k), \\ \bar{M}_{22} &= \text{diag}(\bar{S}, \sigma_x I_{Nn_y}, I_{Nn_y}), \\ \bar{K}(\theta_k) &= [\check{K}_x(\theta_k) \check{K}_{x\zeta}(\theta_k) 0_{Nn_u \times Nn_y}], t = \gamma^2, \sigma_x = \sigma^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Under the assumption of homogeneous scheduling (Assumption 1), the matrix inequality can be diagonalized, since

$$\theta_k = \mathbf{1}_N \otimes \theta_k^1$$

implies applications of the Kronecker product, e.g.

$$\check{A}(\theta_k) = I_N \otimes A(\theta_k^1),$$

and the transformation

$$Z_{(n_x)}^\top \mathcal{L}_{(n_x)} Z_{(n_x)} = \text{diag}(0, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_N) \otimes I_{n_x}$$

has no effect on e.g. $\check{A}(\theta_k)$ for orthonormal transformation matrices Z , i.e. $Z_{(n_x)}^\top \check{A}(\theta_k) Z_{(n_x)} = \check{A}(\theta_k)$, due to properties of the Kronecker product. Thus, the transformation matrix

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{T} &= \text{diag}(Z_{(n_x)}, Z_{(n_y)}, Z_{(n_y)}, Z_{(n_y)}, Z_{(n_y)}, Z_{(n_w)}, \\ & \quad Z_{(n_x)}, Z_{(n_y)}, Z_{(n_y)}, Z_{(n_y)}, Z_{(n_y)}) \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

brings (31) into diagonal form, where entries are dependent on λ_i and ordered from $i = 1$ to $i = N$, displayed for the vertex model matrices by (19). The inequality (19) needs to be feasible for $l = 1, \dots, s$ for λ_2 and λ_N , since $\theta_k^i \in \Theta$ and the matrices are affine in λ_i and λ_1 corresponds to the agreement space.