

Opportunistic Wireless Control Over State-Dependent Fading Channels

Shuling Wang, Peizhe Li, Shanying Zhu and Cailian Chen

Abstract—The heterogeneous system consisting of the wireless control system (WCS) and mobile agent system (MAS) is ubiquitous in Industrial Internet of Things (IIoT) systems. Within this system, the positions of mobile agents may lead to shadow fading on the wireless channel that the WCS is controlled over and can significantly compromise the WCS's performance. This paper focuses on the controller design for the MAS to ensure the performance of WCS in the presence of WCS and MAS coupling. Firstly, the constrained finite field network (FFN) with profile-dependent switching topology is adopted to proceed the operational control for the MAS. By virtue of the algebraic state space representation (ASSR) method, an equivalent form is obtained for the WCS and MAS coupling. A necessary and sufficient condition in terms of constrained set stabilization is then established to ensure the Lyapunov-like performance with expected decay rate. Finally, a graphical method together with the breath-first searching is provided to design state feedback controllers for the MAS. With this method, it is easy to check the constrained set stabilization of MAS and to ensure the performance requirements of WCS in the presence of WCS and MAS coupling. The study of an illustrative example shows the effectiveness of the proposed method.

I. INTRODUCTION

Internet of Things (IoT) is an emerging domain in which all things are interconnected to realize dynamic information interaction [1]. Restricting the things in IoT to the industrial scenario, Industrial Internet of Things (IIoT) enables flexible, efficient and sustainable production in many fields including smart manufacturing through numerous plants that can be reconfigured based on process requirements [2], [3]. These plants consist of heterogeneous physical systems with sensing, computation, communication and actuation capabilities, which interact autonomously with each other by exchanging information over wireless networks [4].

In typical IIoT applications, e.g., smart manufacturing, heterogeneous physical systems which may have different objectives coordinate with each other to jointly perform overall task [2], [5]. The typical characteristic of the IIoT system lies

in that numerous wireless sensors are deployed to monitor and control industrial plants forming wireless control networks (WCSs). An integral aspect of IIoT in smart manufacturing are mobile agents, which coordinate with the WCS in various ways, and can flexibly execute diverse tasks contributing to the overall manufacturing process. Mobile agents system (MAS) can leverage the full potential of mobile agents to autonomously visually inspect and monitor plants, transport objects or personnel, and jointly carry complex and large components [6]–[8]. Such coordination of heterogeneous systems is necessary, e.g., manufacturing systems with heavy machines and cranes [9], assembly processes with autonomous assembly arms and forklifts [10] and sensor networks with mobile agents [11]. However, the joint coordination of MASs and WCSs brings heterogeneity to IIoT systems. Moreover, the positions of mobile agents may lead to shadow fading on the wireless channel that the WCS is controlled over and can significantly compromise the WCS's performance. The fading channel measurements acquired at a rolling mill at Sandvik in Sweden [9] show that mobile machinery and cranes in the ceiling leads to substantial variations in the measured channel gains. An industrial situation where different positions of mobile robots lead to different fading distributions is characterized in [11]. Therefore, it is necessary to explicitly examine the state-dependency of wireless channels due to such WCS and MAS coupling to ensure the performance of WCSs.

The channel gains used to characterize shadow fading are traditionally modeled as independent identical distributed random processes [12] or Markov chains [13], where the network state is assumed to be independent from physical states. Under this assumption, research on scheduling wireless network parameters has been conducted to satisfy given control performance requirements such as stability [14]–[17], controllability and observability [18] and minimizing linear quadratic objectives [19]. A survey on design and optimization for WCSs is presented in [20]. It is obvious that these methods on performance analysis of WCS fail in the scenario where the WCS and MAS coupling exists. Few works addressing the dependence of network state on physical states have been conducted. Reference [21] considers the power control in vehicular WCS, where the influence of vehicles's physical states on the network state has been established to ensure the performance of the WCS. In [10], the authors study a state-dependent channel model, based on which a novel co-design paradigm addressing the coupling between a WCS and a single mobile agent has been proposed to achieve safety and

This work was supported by National Key R&D Program of China under the grant 2018YFB1703201, the NSF of China under the grants 61922058, 62173225, and Chinese Ministry of Education Research Found on Intelligent Manufacturing under the grant MCM20180703.

The authors are with the Department of Automation, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai 200240, China; Key Laboratory of System Control and Information Processing, Ministry of Education of China, Shanghai 200240, China, and also Shanghai Engineering Research Center of Intelligent Control and Management, Shanghai 200240, China. E-mails: shuling-wang2021_sjtu@sjtu.edu.cn, lipiezhe2020@sjtu.edu.cn, shyzhu@sjtu.edu.cn, cailianchen@sjtu.edu.cn.

efficiency of overall IIoT system. A Markov decision process is adopted to characterize the dynamics of a mobile agent, which is, however, limited to the single agent case.

In this paper, we consider a heterogeneous IIoT system where a WCS and an MAS coordinate with each other to jointly perform overall task over state-dependent fading channels. We focus on the opportunistic wireless control to ensure the Lyapunov-like performance with expected decay rate of the WCS in the presence of WCS and MAS coupling. How to convert the performance requirements of the WCS to a specific control objective of MAS is the key to this problem.

The contributions of this paper are two-fold. Firstly, by discretizing the workshop of the MAS into finite two dimensional regions, the constrained finite field network (FFN) with profile-dependent switching topology is adopted to proceed the operational control for the MAS, which requires finite communication, memory and computation resources, and can achieve finite-time convergence. To the best of our knowledge, there are few results on the analysis and control of constrained FFNs with profile-dependent switching topology. Secondly, based on the algebraic state space representation (ASSR) method, the performance requirements of the WCS is converted into the constrained set stabilization of the FFN. A graphical method together with the breath-first searching is proposed for the controller design for the MAS to ensure the performance requirements of WCS in the presence of WCS and MAS coupling. Compared with the existing results on set stabilization of finite-value systems obtained via algebraic approaches [22]–[24], the results proposed in this paper is more computationally economical.

This paper is organized as follows. Section II characterizes the heterogeneous IIoT system and problem formulation. Lyapunov-like performance analysis of the WCS is presented in Section III. In Section IV, main results are demonstrated by an illustrative example, which is followed by the conclusion in Section V.

Notations: The cone of $m \times m$ real positive definite (semi-definite) matrices is denoted by S_{++}^m (S_+^m). Denote the s -th column and the s -th row of matrix F by $Col_s(F)$ and $Row_s(F)$, respectively. For $s \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, define $\mathcal{D}_s := \{0, 1, \dots, s-1\}$ and $\Delta_s := \{\delta_s^i : i = 1, \dots, s\}$, where $\delta_s^i := Col_i(I_s)$ and I_s is the s -dimensional identity matrix. $\mathcal{L}_{s \times t}$ consists of all $s \times t$ logical matrices in the form of $M = [\delta_s^{i_1} \ \delta_s^{i_2} \ \dots \ \delta_s^{i_t}]$, which is briefly expressed as $M = \delta_s[i_1 \ i_2 \ \dots \ i_t]$. Throughout this paper, semi-tensor product (\ltimes) is the basic matrix product [25] defined as $M \ltimes P := (M \otimes_{\frac{n}{l}} I_{\frac{p}{l}})(P \otimes I_{\frac{l}{p}})$, where $M \in \mathbb{R}_{m \times n}$, $P \in \mathbb{R}_{p \times q}$, l is the least common multiple of n and p , and \otimes is the Kronecker product. In most places of this paper, the symbol “ \ltimes ” is omitted. $W_{[s,t]}$ and $P_{r,s}$ represent the swap matrix and power-reducing matrix defined as $W_{[s,t]} := [I_t \otimes \delta_s^1 \ \dots \ I_t \otimes \delta_s^s]$ and $P_{r,s} := \text{diag}\{\delta_s^1, \dots, \delta_s^s\}$, respectively. For more properties on the swap matrix and power-reducing matrix, please refer to [25].

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

In this paper, we consider a heterogeneous IIoT system where a WCS and an MAS coordinate with each other to jointly perform overall task in a typical smart manufacturing scenario (Fig. 1). In the WCS, q independent plants are controlled over a shared wireless medium, where the measurements of plant i , $i \in \{1, \dots, q\}$ are wirelessly transmitted to the access point by sensor i to compute the control inputs. At the same time, several mobile agents perform manufacturing tasks in the nearby automation cell, i.e., the workshop, which is discretized into κ two dimensional regions, denoted by $0, 1, \dots, \kappa - 1$. $m + n$ mobile agents are classified into two groups as state agents $\{1, \dots, n\}$ and control agents $\{n + 1, \dots, n + m\}$, where state agents are responsible for completing tasks such as inspection, monitoring, sensing and transporting, while control agents are responsible for controlling the evolutionary behavior of the MAS. In this process, the positions of mobile agents may lead to shadow fading on the wireless channel that the WCS is controlled over, resulting in the coupling between the WCS and MAS.




Fig. 1: Framework of a heterogeneous IIoT system where a WCS and an MAS coordinate with each other to jointly perform overall task. ‘S’ and ‘A’ respectively represent sensing and actuation capabilities. The local channel state of each system i ($\gamma_i \in \mathcal{D}_s$) in WCS is dependent on the positions of state agents ($\beta_j \in \mathcal{D}_\kappa$ represents the position of state agent j , $j = 1, \dots, n$) and positions of control agents ($u_l \in \mathcal{D}_\kappa$ represents the position of control agent $n + l$, $l = 1, \dots, m$).

A. Description of the WCS

Denote the state of system i at time k by $x_i(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$, $i = 1, \dots, q$. Assume that the evolution of each system i depends on whether a transmission occurs at time k or not. Using $\lambda_i(k) \in \mathcal{D}_2$ to indicate the successful or fail

transmission of system i at time k , then the dynamics of the WCS is described as the following switched model:

$$x_i(k+1) = \begin{cases} A_{c,i}x_i(k) + \xi_i(k), & \lambda_i(k) = 1, \\ A_{o,i}x_i(k) + \xi_i(k), & \lambda_i(k) = 0, \end{cases} \quad i = 1, \dots, q. \quad (1)$$

In (1), the dynamics of each system i at a successful transmission and a fail transmission are characterized by matrices $A_{c,i}$ and $A_{o,i} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i \times n_i}$, respectively, where ‘c’ and ‘o’ respectively represent the closed-loop and open-loop. The additive terms $\xi_i(k)$ represent an independent identically distributed noise process with mean zero and covariance $\Xi_i \in S_+^{n_i}$. The above WCS description (1) can model a variety of control operations [14]. In this model, the closed-loop dynamics for all q systems are fixed, that is, adequate controllers have been pre-designed.

At every slot k each sensor i chooses whether transmitting over the shared channel or not adapting to its local channel state. Discretize the wireless channel state of the WCS into s values with each value representing a channel state interval, denoted by $0, 1, \dots, s-1$, and denote the local channel state of system i at slot k by $\gamma_i(k) \in \mathcal{D}_s$. Assume that the wireless communication policy is pre-designed, and suppose that it holds

$$\alpha_i(k) = h_i(\gamma_i(k)), \quad (2)$$

where $h_i : \mathcal{D}_s \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_2$, $\alpha_i(k) = 1$ (or 0) means that sensor i transmits (or does not transmit) over the shared channel at slot k .

At slot k , if sensor i chooses to transmit over the shared channel, assume that it selects a transmit power level $\mu_i(k) \in \{\mu_{i,1}, \dots, \mu_{i,p_i}\}$ according to the following rule:

$$\mathbb{P}\{\mu_i(k) = \mu_{i,a} | \alpha_i(k) = 1, \gamma_i(k) = b\} = \mu_{a,b}^i, \quad (3)$$

where $a \in \{1, \dots, p_i\}$, $b \in \mathcal{D}_s$, $\mu_{a,b}^i \in [0, 1]$ and \mathbb{P} is the probability.

The sensor’s transmission might fail due to packet decoding errors and packet collisions. We call a collision happens on system i , if some other sensor $j \neq i$ transmits in the same time slot. Use $\eta_i(k) \in \mathcal{D}_2$ to indicate the successful or fail packet decoding at the access point of system i at time k . Then, if sensor i transmits at slot k , and no other sensor transmits, then the relationship among the packet decoding success, local channel state and transmission power is

$$\mathbb{P}\{\eta_i(k) = 1 | \gamma_i(k) = a, \mu_i(k) = \mu_{i,b}\} = \eta_{a,b}^i, \quad (4)$$

where $a \in \mathcal{D}_s$ and $\eta_{a,b}^i \in [0, 1]$.

B. Description of the MAS

We adopt the FFN architecture [26] to model the operational control for MASs with limited communication, memory and computation capabilities. For the state agents, the state is updated as a weighted combination of its own value and those

of its in-neighbors including state agents and control agents. More specifically, it holds that

$$\beta_i(k+1) = \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^n a_{i,j}^{\sigma(k)} \right\}_{\times \kappa} \beta_j(k) + \left\{ \sum_{l=1}^m b_{i,l}^{\sigma(k)} \right\}_{\times \kappa} u_l(k), \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (5)$$

where κ is a prime number, $a_{i,j}^{\sigma(k)}, b_{i,l}^{\sigma(k)} \in \mathcal{D}_\kappa$, $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, $l = 1, \dots, m$, $\sigma : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, w\}$ is the profile-dependent switching signal, and operations “ $+_\kappa$ ” and “ \times_κ ” are modular addition and modular multiplication over \mathcal{D}_κ , respectively [27]. $\beta(k) := (\beta_1(k), \dots, \beta_n(k)) \in C_\beta \subseteq \mathcal{D}_\kappa^n$ and $u(k) := (u_1(k), \dots, u_m(k)) \in C_u(\beta(k)) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_\kappa^m$ represent the state profile and control profile, respectively, where C_β and $C_u(\beta)$, $\beta \in C_\beta$ respectively denote state constraints and control constraints.

Consider the state feedback controller of FFN (5) in the following form:

$$u(k) = \pi(\beta(k)), \quad (6)$$

where $\pi : \mathcal{D}_\kappa^n \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_\kappa^m$. Denote the profile of FFN (5) by $z(k) := (u(k), \beta(k)) \in \mathcal{D}_\kappa^{m+n}$. Given an initial state profile $\beta(0) = \beta_0 \in C_\beta$ and a state feedback law π , FFN (5) becomes a closed-loop system and one can obtain $z(k; \beta_0, \pi)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$. If for any initial state profile $\beta_0 \in C_\beta$, $z(k; \beta_0, \pi) \in \{(u, \beta) : \beta \in C_\beta, u \in C_u(\beta)\}$ holds for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we call π an admissible state feedback law. Denote the set of all admissible state feedback laws π by Π .

C. WCS and MAS Coupling

When the WCS and the MAS coordinate with each other to jointly perform overall task, the positions of mobile agents may lead to shadow fading on the wireless channel that the WCS is controlled over. We model such state-dependent fading channel as follows:

$$\mathbb{P}\{\gamma_i(k) = a | z(k) = z\} = \gamma_{a,z}^i, \quad (7)$$

where $z \in \mathcal{D}_\kappa^{n+m}$ and $\gamma_{a,z}^i \in [0, 1]$. According to (2)-(4), the positions of the mobile agents influence the probability of successful wireless transmission for the WCS. The WCS and MAS coupling can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\{\lambda_i(k) = 1 | z(k) = z\} \\ &= \mathbb{P}\{\alpha_i(k) = 1 | z(k) = z\} \mathbb{P}\{\eta_i(k) = 1 | z(k) = z\} \\ & \quad \times \prod_{j \neq i} (1 - \mathbb{P}\{\alpha_j(k) = 1 | z(k) = z\}) \\ &= \alpha_z^i \eta_z^i \prod_{j \neq i} (1 - \alpha_z^j) := \lambda_z^i, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $\alpha_z^i := \sum_{a=0}^{s-1} \gamma_{a,z}^i h_i(a)$, $\bar{\mu}_{b,z}^i := \sum_{c=0}^{s-1} \gamma_{c,z}^i \mu_{b,c}^i$ and $\eta_z^i := \sum_{(a,b) \in \mathcal{D}_s \times \{1, \dots, p_i\}} \gamma_{a,z}^i \bar{\mu}_{b,z}^i \eta_{a,b}^i$.

Eq. (8) presents a state-dependent channel model. The probability of a successful transmission for WCS (1) depends on

the profile of FFN (5). It is quite different from the traditional shadow fading model [12], [13] assuming the channel states independent from the physical states. Such coupling makes the traditional methods on performance analysis of WCS [14]–[19] fail in the scenario considered in this paper.

D. Problem Formulation

Our primary goal in this paper is to design admissible controllers for MAS (5) to satisfy certain level of closed-control performance of the WCS (1) with respect to (5) in the presence of coupling (8). To this end, we introduce the Lyapunov function $V_i(x_i) = x_i^\top Q_i x_i$, $Q_i \in S_{++}^{n_i}$ and consider the following Lyapunov-like performance requirements for WCS (1).

Definition 1: Given $Q = \{Q_1, \dots, Q_q\}$ and $\rho = \{\rho_1, \dots, \rho_q\}$ with $\rho_i \in (0, 1)$, $i = 1, \dots, q$, WCS (1) is said to be (Q, ρ) -asymptotically stable with respect to FFN (5), if there exist a state feedback law $\pi \in \Pi$ and a positive integer T such that the inequalities

$$\mathbb{E}[V_i(x_i(k+1)) | x_i(k), z(k; \beta_0, \pi)] \leq \rho_i V_i(x_i(k)) + Tr(Q_i \Xi_i), \forall x_i(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_i} \quad (9)$$

hold for any initial state profile $\beta_0 \in C_\beta$, any $i \in \{1, \dots, q\}$ and any $k \geq T$, where \mathbb{E} is the expectation. In (9), ρ_i represents desired decay rate and $Tr(Q_i \Xi_i)$ denotes the trace of matrix $Q_i \Xi_i$ representing a persistent noise perturbation.

III. MAIN RESULTS

In this section, based on ASSR approach and graph theory, we design state feedback controllers for the MAS to ensure the Lyapunov-like performance of WCS in the presence of WCS and MAS coupling.

A. ASSR Reformulation of the MAS

Due to the variables taking values from finite fields and the operations being modular addition and modular multiplication, it is difficult to apply classical nonlinear system theory to investigate FFNs. The ASSR approach is a powerful tool which builds a bridge between finite-value systems and classical control theory [25]. It has been applied to Boolean networks and logical control networks, finite games, finite automata and so on [28], [29]. In this part, by virtue of ASSR method, we convert FFN (5) into its equivalent algebraic form, which facilitates the sequential studies.

Represent $i - 1 \in \mathcal{D}_\kappa$ by a vector δ_κ^i , $i = 1, \dots, \kappa$. In addition, represent the switching signal $\sigma(k) = i$ by δ_w^i , $i = 1, \dots, w$. Then, $\beta_i(k), u_i(k) \in \mathcal{D}_\kappa$ and $\sigma(k) \in \{1, \dots, w\}$ have their corresponding vector forms (still using the same symbols) $\beta_i(k), u_i(k) \in \Delta_\kappa$ and $\sigma(k) \in \Delta_w$, respectively. Letting $\beta(k) = \times_{i=1}^n \beta_i(k)$, $u(k) = \times_{i=1}^m u_i(k)$ and $z(k) = u(k)\beta(k)$, we have $C_\beta \subseteq \Delta_N$, $C_u(\beta(k)) \subseteq \Delta_M$, where $N :=$

κ^n and $M := \kappa^m$. In addition, the state feedback law π has the form $\pi : \Delta_N \rightarrow \Delta_M$.

The following lemma presents the structural matrices for “ $+\kappa$ ” and “ \times_κ ” [29].

Lemma 1: Let $a, b \in \mathcal{D}_\kappa \sim \Delta_\kappa$.

- (i) $a +_\kappa b = F_{+\kappa} a \times_\kappa b$, where $F_{+\kappa} = \delta_\kappa[A_1 \ A_2 \ \dots \ A_\kappa]$, $A_1 = (1 \ \dots \ \kappa)$ and $A_j = (j \ \dots \ \kappa \ 1 \ \dots \ j - 1)$, $j = 2, \dots, \kappa$.
- (ii) $a \times_\kappa b = F_{\times_\kappa} a \times_\kappa b$, where $F_{\times_\kappa} = \delta_\kappa[B_1 \ B_2 \ \dots \ B_\kappa]$, $B_j = ((0 \times (j - 1)) \bmod(\kappa) + 1 \ (1 \times (j - 1)) \bmod(\kappa) + 1 \ \dots \ ((\kappa - 1) \times (j - 1)) \bmod(\kappa) + 1)$, $j = 1, \dots, \kappa$.

Define

$$A_{i,j} = [a_{i,j}^1 \ \dots \ a_{i,j}^w], \quad B_{i,l} = [b_{i,l}^1 \ \dots \ b_{i,l}^w], \quad (10)$$

$i, j = 1, \dots, n$, $l = 1, \dots, m$. Then, using the vector form of elements in \mathcal{D}_κ and $\{1, \dots, w\}$, for the dynamics of the i -th agent in FFN (5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i(k+1) &= \left\{ \kappa \sum_{j=1}^n a_{i,j}^{\sigma(k)} \times_\kappa \beta_j(k) + \kappa \sum_{l=1}^m b_{i,l}^{\sigma(k)} \times_\kappa u_l(k) \right\} \\ &= F_{+\kappa}^n \times_{j=1}^n (F_{\times_\kappa} A_{i,j} \sigma(k) \beta_j(k)) F_{+\kappa}^{m-1} \\ &\quad \times_{j=1}^m (F_{\times_\kappa} B_{i,j} \sigma(k) u_j(k)). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Skipping simple derivations, one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\times_{j=1}^n (F_{\times_\kappa} A_{i,j} \sigma(k) \beta_j(k)) \\ &= F_{\times_\kappa} A_{i,1} \times_{j=1}^{n-1} \left\{ [I_{w\kappa^j} \otimes (F_{\times_\kappa} A_{i,j+1})] W_{[w, w\kappa^j]} P_{r,w} \right\} \\ &\quad \times \sigma(k) \beta(k) \\ &:= F_{i,1} \sigma(k) \beta(k). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\times_{j=1}^m (F_{\times_\kappa} B_{i,j} \sigma(k) u_j(k)) \\ &= F_{\times_\kappa} B_{i,1} \times_{j=1}^{m-1} \left\{ [I_{w\kappa^j} \otimes (F_{\times_\kappa} B_{i,j+1})] W_{[w, w\kappa^j]} P_{r,w} \right\} \\ &\quad \times \sigma(k) u(k) \\ &:= F_{i,2} \sigma(k) u(k). \end{aligned}$$

Then, for (11), it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i(k+1) &= F_{+\kappa}^n F_{i,1} \sigma(k) \beta(k) F_{+\kappa}^{m-1} F_{i,2} \sigma(k) u(k) \\ &= F_{+\kappa}^n F_{i,1} [I_{wN} \otimes (F_{+\kappa}^{m-1} F_{i,2})] \sigma(k) \beta(k) \sigma(k) u(k) \\ &= F_{+\kappa}^n F_{i,1} [I_{MN} \otimes (F_{+\kappa}^{m-1} F_{i,2})] (I_w \otimes W_{[wM, N]}) \\ &\quad \times P_{r,w} \sigma(k) z(k) := F_{i,3} \sigma(k) z(k). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

In this paper, we consider the case where the switching signal $\sigma(k)$ is profile dependent, namely, $\sigma(k)$ is determined by the profile $z(k)$. Then, the switching signal has the following form:

$$\sigma(k) = \Theta z(k),$$

which together with (12) shows

$$\beta_i(k+1) = F_{i,3} \Theta P_{r, MN} z(k) := F_i z(k),$$

where $\Theta \in \mathcal{L}_{w \times MN}$ and $F_i \in \mathcal{L}_{\kappa \times MN}$. Multiplying the dynamics of n state agents in FFN (5), one can obtain the following equivalent algebraic form of FFN (5):

$$\beta(k) = Fz(k), \quad (13)$$

where $F \in \mathcal{L}_{N \times MN}$ satisfying $Col_l(F) = \times_{i=1}^n Col_l(F_i)$, $l = 1, \dots, MN$. Split matrix F into M equal blocks as

$$F = [Blk_1(F) \ Blk_2(F) \ \dots \ Blk_M(F)].$$

Then, $[Blk_l(F)]_{a,b} = 1$ means that under the control profile δ_M^l , state profile δ_N^b can reach state profile δ_N^a in one step.

Similarly, we can obtain the following equivalent algebraic form for state feedback controller (6):

$$u(k) = L\beta(k), \quad (14)$$

where $L \in \mathcal{L}_{M \times N}$ is the state feedback gain matrix.

In addition, using the vector form of $z(k)$, the WCS and MAS coupling (8) can be converted into an equivalent form

$$\mathbb{P}\{\lambda_i(k) = 1 | z(k)\} = \Lambda_i z(k), \quad (15)$$

where $\Lambda_i = [\lambda_{z_1}^i \ \lambda_{z_2}^i \ \dots \ \lambda_{z_{MN}}^i]$ with $\lambda_{z_j}^i$ given in (8), and z_j has vector form δ_{MN}^j , $j \in \{1, \dots, MN\}$.

B. Lyapunov-like Performance Analysis of the WCS

In this part, in order to facilitate the controller design for the MAS, we convert Lyapunov-like performance requirements (9) of WCS (1) to a specific control objective of FFN (13).

Consider Lyapunov-like performance requirements (9). Since $\mathbb{E}[\xi_i(k)] = \mathbf{0}$ and $\lambda_i(k)$ is independent of $x_i(k)$, it holds

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[V_i(x_i(k+1)) | x_i(k), z(k; \beta_0, \pi)] \\ &= \mathbb{P}\{\lambda_i(k) = 1 | z(k; \beta_0, \pi)\} x_i^\top(k) A_{c,i}^\top Q_i A_{c,i} x_i(k) \\ & \quad + \mathbb{P}\{\lambda_i(k) = 0 | z(k; \beta_0, \pi)\} x_i^\top(k) A_{o,i}^\top Q_i A_{o,i} x_i(k) \\ & \quad + T_r(Q_i \Xi_i). \end{aligned}$$

Then, condition (9) is equivalent to the condition that for all $x_i(k) \neq \mathbf{0}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\{\lambda_i(k) = 1 | z(k; \beta_0, \pi)\} \\ & \geq \frac{x_i^\top(k) (A_{o,i}^\top Q_i A_{o,i} - \rho_i Q_i) x_i(k)}{x_i^\top(k) (A_{o,i}^\top Q_i A_{o,i} - A_{c,i}^\top Q_i A_{c,i}) x_i(k)}, \end{aligned}$$

which is equivalent to

$$\mathbb{P}\{\lambda_i(k) = 1 | z(k; \beta_0, \pi)\} \geq s_i, \quad (16)$$

where

$$s_i = \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^n, y \neq 0} \frac{y^\top (A_{o,i}^\top Q_i A_{o,i} - \rho_i Q_i) y}{y^\top (A_{o,i}^\top Q_i A_{o,i} - A_{c,i}^\top Q_i A_{c,i}) y}. \quad (17)$$

It is noted that s_i represents the lower bound of the probability of successful transmission for system i that ensures the desired Lyapunov decay rate ρ_i under the WCS and MAS coupling.

Based on the above representation, we can then define $\Omega(s)$ consisting of all profiles of FFN (13) in C_z under the influence

of which the probability of successful transmission for each system i is no less than s_i , that is,

$$\Omega(s) := \cap_{i=1}^n \{\delta_{MN}^j : Col_j(\Lambda_i) \geq s_i\} \cap C_z, \quad (18)$$

where $s = [s_1 \ \dots \ s_q]$, $C_z := \{z = u\beta \in \Delta_{MN} : \beta \in C_\beta, u \in C_u(\beta)\}$ and Λ_i is defined in (15). It follows from (15) and (16) that $\Omega(s)$ consists of all profiles of FFN (13) ensuring the desired Lyapunov decay rates for all systems in WCS (1).

Definition 2: Given $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \Delta_{MN}$, FFN (13) is called constrained control-state \mathcal{M} -stabilizable, if there exist a state feedback law $\pi \in \Pi$ and a positive integer T such that $z(k; \beta_0, \pi) \in \mathcal{M}$ holds for any integer $k \geq T$ and any initial state profile $\beta_0 \in C_\beta$.

We have the following result on the (Q, ρ) -asymptotically stability of WCS (1).

Lemma 2: WCS (1) is (Q, ρ) -asymptotically stable with respect to FFN (13), if and only if FFN (13) is constrained control-state $\Omega(s)$ -stabilizable, where $\Omega(s)$ is defined in (18).

Proof: The result can be directly obtained from (15), (16) and the construction of $\Omega(s)$, so we omit the proof here. \square

Note that the constrained control-state stabilization imposes a coupled requirement of control profile and state profile on controller design. A natural idea is to adopt the constrained set stabilization, which requires the state profiles converging to a given set. It is more convenient for controller design than constrained control-state set stabilization. To this end, we introduce the definition of constrained control invariant set (CCIS).

For $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \Delta_{MN}$, define

$$\Phi(\mathcal{M}) := \{\beta \in C_\beta : \text{there exists } u \in C_u(\beta) \text{ such that } u\beta \in \mathcal{M}\}. \quad (19)$$

Correspondingly, for any $\beta \in \Phi(\mathcal{M})$, define

$$C_u^{\mathcal{M}}(\beta) = \{u \in C_u(\beta) : u\beta \in \mathcal{M}\}. \quad (20)$$

Definition 3: Given $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \Delta_{MN}$, a subset $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \Phi(\mathcal{M})$ is called a CCIS of FFN (13) with respect to \mathcal{M} , if for any $\beta_0 \in \mathcal{C}$, there exists a control sequence $u = \{u(k) \in C_u^{\mathcal{M}}(\beta(k)) : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that $\beta(k; \beta_0, u) \in \mathcal{C}$ holds for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Obviously, the union of any two CCISs of FFN (13) with respect to \mathcal{M} is another CCIS with respect to \mathcal{M} . The union of all CCISs with respect to \mathcal{M} is called its largest constrained control invariant set (LCCIS) with respect to \mathcal{M} , denoted by $I(\mathcal{M})$.

By virtue of LCCIS, the following result establishes the equivalence between constrained control-state set stabilization and constrained set stabilization.

Lemma 3: FFN (13) is constrained control-state \mathcal{M} -stabilizable, if and only if it is constrained $I(\mathcal{M})$ -stabilizable.

Proof: (Necessity) Since $I(\mathcal{M})$ is the LCCIS with respect to \mathcal{M} , for any $\beta_0 \in \Phi(\mathcal{M}) \setminus I(\mathcal{M})$ and any control sequence

$u = \{u(k) \in C_u^{\mathcal{M}}(\beta(k)) : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$, there exists an integer $k(\beta_0, u)$ such that

$$\beta(k(\beta_0, u); \beta_0, u) \notin \Phi(\mathcal{M}). \quad (21)$$

Next, we prove the conclusion by absurdity.

If FFN (13) is constrained control-state \mathcal{M} -stabilizable, then we can obtain a feasible state feedback law π and a positive integer T . Then, for any integer $k \geq T$ and any initial state profile $\beta_0 \in C_\beta$, it holds that

$$\beta(k; \beta_0, \pi) \in \Phi(\mathcal{M}), \quad \pi(\beta(k; \beta_0, \pi)) \in C_u^{\mathcal{M}}(\beta(k; \beta_0, \pi)). \quad (22)$$

If there exist an integer $k_0 \geq T$ and a state profile $\beta_0 \in C_\beta$ satisfying $\beta(k_0; \beta_0, \pi) \notin I(\mathcal{M})$, then according to (21), setting $u = \{\pi(\beta(k_0 + k; \beta_0, \pi)) : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$, it holds that

$$\beta(k_0 + k(\beta(k_0; \beta_0, \pi), u); \beta_0, \pi) \notin \Phi(\mathcal{M}),$$

which contradicts to (22). Thus, for any integer $k_0 \geq T$ and any initial state profile $\beta_0 \in C_\beta$, it holds that $\beta(k; \beta_0, \pi) \in I(\mathcal{M})$, which together with $\pi \in \Pi$ shows that FFN (13) is constrained $I(\mathcal{M})$ -stabilizable.

(Sufficiency) If FFN (13) is constrained $I(\mathcal{M})$ -stabilizable, then there exist a state feedback law $\pi \in \Pi$ and a positive integer T such that $\beta(k; \beta_0, \pi) \in I(\mathcal{M})$ holds for any integer $k \geq T$ and any initial state profile $\beta_0 \in C_\beta$. Defining

$$\bar{\pi}(\beta) := \begin{cases} u \in C_u^{\mathcal{M}}(\beta), & \beta \in I(\mathcal{M}); \\ \pi(\beta), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

it is obvious that $\bar{\pi} \in \Pi$. In addition, it is easy to obtain from (20) that $z(k; \beta_0, \bar{\pi}) \in \mathcal{M}$ holds for any integer $k \geq T$ and any initial state profile $\beta_0 \in C_\beta$. Thus, FFN (13) is constrained control-state \mathcal{M} -stabilizable. \square

Based on Lemmas 2 and 3, the following result deduces the (Q, ρ) -asymptotically stability of WCS (1) to the constrained set stabilization of FFN (13).

Theorem 1: WCS (1) is (Q, ρ) -asymptotically stable with respect to FFN (13) if and only if FFN (13) is constrained $I(\Omega(s))$ -stabilizable, where $\Omega(s)$ is defined in (18).

Proof: The result can be directly obtained from Lemmas 2 and 3, so we omit the proof here. \square

C. A Graphical Method for Feasible Controller Design

In this part, we present a graph-based criterion on (Q, ρ) -asymptotically stability of WCS (1), which is much easier to verify. To this end, we introduce the constrained state transition graph (STG) $G[C_\beta^0, C_u^0] = (V(G[C_\beta^0, C_u^0]), E(G[C_\beta^0, C_u^0]))$ with respect to state constraints C_β^0 and control constraints $C_u^0(\beta)$, $\beta \in C_\beta^0$.

Represent each state profile $\delta_N^a \in C_\beta^0$ by a vertex v_a and collect all vertices to form the vertex set $V(G[C_\beta^0, C_u^0])$. In addition, represent each constrained one-step state profile transition from $\delta_N^a \in C_\beta^0$ to $\delta_N^b \in C_\beta^0$ by a directed edge,

denoted by (v_a, v_b) , and collect all directed edges to form a edge set $E(G[C_\beta^0, C_u^0])$, then

$$E(G[C_\beta^0, C_u^0]) = \{(v_a, v_b) \in C_\beta^0 \times C_\beta^0 : \delta_N^b \in \mathcal{R}_1(\delta_N^a; C_u^0)\},$$

where $\mathcal{R}_1(\delta_N^a; C_u^0)$ denotes the one-step reachable set of state profile δ_N^a with respect to control constraint $C_u^0(\delta_N^a)$. Then, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_1(\delta_N^a; C_u^0) &:= \{Fu\delta_N^a : u \in C_u^0(\delta_N^a)\} \\ &= \{Col_a(Blk_l(F)) : \delta_M^l \in C_u^0(\delta_N^a)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 1 establishes the equivalence between the (Q, ρ) -asymptotically stability of WCS (1) and the constrained set stabilization of FFN (13). In this part, we extend the approach in [30] to the constrained set stabilization of FFNs, and the extensions are mainly two-fold. On one hand, the state constraint and state-dependent control constraint is considered in this paper. On the other hand, the constrained set stabilization considered in this paper is originated from the constrained control-state set stabilization, which leads to the set $I(\Omega(s))$ being an LCCIS, while the key to the set stabilization considered in [30] is the LCIS contained in a given set. By Definition 3, one can see that the LCCIS $I(\Omega(s))$ is essentially an LCIS contained in $\Phi(\Omega(s))$ with control constraints $C_u^{\Omega(s)}(\beta)$, $\beta \in \Phi(\Omega(s))$. Thus, by virtue of Algorithm 2 in [30] with replacing $G[\mathcal{M}]$ by $G[\Phi(\Omega(s)), C_u^{\Omega(s)}]$, one can obtain $I(\Omega(s))$.

Assume that $I(\Omega(s)) \neq \emptyset$. We construct a STG G_c to check the constrained $I(\Omega(s))$ -stabilization by contracting $I(\Omega(s))$ to a single vertex v_0 and reversing all edges in $G[(C_\beta \setminus I(\Omega(s))) \cup \{v_0\}, C_u]$. More specifically, the STG G_c is defined as

$$V(G_c) = (C_\beta \setminus I(\Omega(s))) \cup \{v_0\} \quad (24)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} E(G_c) &:= E^\top(G) \cup \{(v_0, v_a) : \text{there exists } \delta_N^b \in I(\Omega(s)) \\ &\text{such that } \delta_N^b \in \mathcal{R}_1(\delta_N^a; C_u), v_a \in V(G)\}, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where v_0 is a new node representing $I(\Omega(s))$, $E^\top(G) := \{(v_b, v_a) : (v_a, v_b) \in E(G)\}$ and $G := G[C_\beta \setminus I(\Omega(s)), C_u]$. Then, we can adopt the breath-first search algorithm [31] to check the constrained $I(\Omega(s))$ -stabilization of FFN (13).

We have the following criterion on (Q, ρ) -asymptotically stability of WCS (1).

Theorem 2: WCS (1) is (Q, ρ) -asymptotically stable with respect to FFN (13), if and only if $V(T_{v_0}) = V(G_c)$, where G_c is defined by (24) and (25), and T_{v_0} is the breadth-first spanning tree of G_c rooted at v_0 . Moreover, feasible state feedback laws π^* with state feedback gain matrices $L^* = [l_1^* \ l_2^* \ \cdots \ l_N^*]$ can be constructed as follows:

$$l_a^* \in \begin{cases} U_a, & \delta_N^a \in I(\Omega(s)); \\ \bar{U}_a, & \delta_N^a \in C_\beta \setminus I(\Omega(s)); \\ \Delta_M, & \delta_N^a \in \Delta_N \setminus C_\beta, \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} U_a &= \{\delta_M^l \in C_u^{\Omega(s)}(\delta_N^a) : \sum_{\delta_N^b \in I(\Omega(s))} \text{Row}_b(\text{Col}_a(\text{Blk}_l(F))) \\ &= 1\}, \\ \bar{U}_a &= \{\delta_M^l \in C_u(\delta_N^a) : \text{Col}_a(\text{Blk}_l(F)) = p[\iota(v_0, v_a) - 1], \\ &p \in P(v_0, v_a)\}, \end{aligned}$$

P_{v_0, v_a} denotes the set of all paths from v_0 to v_a with the number of vertices in each path $p \in P_{v_0, v_a}$ being $\iota(v_0, v_a)$, and $p[j]$ denotes the j -th element of path p .

Proof: Since $I(\Omega(s))$ is a CCIS, FFN (13) is constrained $I(\Omega(s))$ -stabilizable if and only if there exists a state feedback law $\pi \in \Pi$ under which all state profiles in $C_\beta \setminus I(\Omega(s))$ can be driven to $I(\Omega(s))$, which is equivalent to $V(T_{v_0}) = V(G_c)$ according to the construction of STG G_c . Then, by Theorem 1, the criterion is proved.

On one hand, by the construction of \bar{U}_a , under the control of state feedback laws π^* , the state profile of FFN (13) from any initial state profile $\beta_0 \in C_\beta \setminus I(\Omega(s))$ can be driven to $I(\Omega(s))$ along with a corresponding path in $T_{v_0}^\top$, where $T_{v_0}^\top$ represents a graph obtained by reversing the directions of all edges in T_{v_0} . On the other hand, for any $\delta_N^a \in I(\Omega(s))$ and any $u \in U_a$, it holds that $\beta(1; \delta_N^a, u) \in I(\Omega(s))$. Thus, by Theorem 1, under the control of π^* , WCS (1) is (Q, ρ) -asymptotically stable with respect to FFN (13). \square

IV. ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE

Consider a heterogeneous IIoT system consisting of two autonomous assembly arms and an automated guided vehicles system (AGVS) of three AGVs. When the raw materials of the production line are about to run out, the AGVS enter the workshop of autonomous assembly arms. Then, two autonomous assembly arms load raw materials into the AGVs by exchanging information between AGVs and remote controllers via wireless networks. Finally, the AGVS transport raw materials to the corresponding production line.

In the AGVS, assume that only two state agents are responsible for transporting raw materials, and the control agent does not have the transport ability. Discretize the workshop of AGVS into three two dimensional regions. Assume that the AGVS has three modes as

$$\begin{aligned} A_{11} &= [1 \ 0 \ 0], \quad A_{12} = [1 \ 0 \ 0], \quad A_{21} = [1 \ 0 \ 0], \\ A_{22} &= [1 \ 0 \ 0]; \quad B_{11} = [1 \ 0 \ 0], \quad B_{21} = [1 \ 0 \ 0], \end{aligned}$$

where $A_{i,j}$ and $B_{i,l}$ are defined in (10). Then, the AGVS is modeled as the following FFN with profile-dependent switching topology:

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i(k+1) &= a_{i,1}^{\sigma(k)} \times_3 \beta_1(k) +_3 a_{i,2}^{\sigma(k)} \times_3 \beta_2(k) \\ &+_3 b_{i,1}^{\sigma(k)} \times_3 u_1(k), \quad i = 1, 2, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where $u_1(k), \beta_i(k) \in \mathcal{D}_3$, $i = 1, 2$.

Assume that the two autonomous assembly arms are located in region 0 and region 2, respectively. The dynamics of the WCS of the two autonomous assembly arms is in the form of (1) with states $x_1(k) \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x_2(k) = [x_{21}(k) \ x_{22}(k)]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^2$ denoting the differences between current and desired states, where $A_{c,1} = 0.4$, $A_{o,1} = 1.1$ and

$$A_{c,2} = \begin{bmatrix} -0.4 & -0.1 \\ 0.1 & 0.6 \end{bmatrix}, \quad A_{o,2} = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -0.4 \\ -0.5 & 0.3 \end{bmatrix}.$$

They are perturbed by zero-mean unite-variance Gaussian noises. Let $\rho_1 = 0.75$, $\rho_2 = 0.95$, $Q_1 = 1$ and suppose that Q_2 solves $A_{c,2}^\top Q_2 A_{c,2} = 0.7Q_2 + I$. Then, by (17), we can obtain $s_1 = 0.44$ and $s_2 = 0.42$. The algebraic equivalent form of




Fig. 2: The evolution of the state profiles for AGVS.

profile-dependent switching signal is $\sigma(k) = \Sigma z(k)$, where $\Sigma = \delta_3[1 \ 1 \ 3 \ 1 \ 1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 2 \ 3 \ 1 \ 1 \ 2 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 2 \ 1 \ 1 \ 3 \ 2 \ 3 \ 2 \ 1 \ 1 \ 3 \ 1 \ 1]$. Then, we can obtain the following equivalent algebraic form of FFN (27):

$$\beta(k+1) = Fz(k), \quad (28)$$

where $F = \delta_9[1 \ 7 \ 3 \ 5 \ 2 \ 8 \ 2 \ 6 \ 1 \ 3 \ 9 \ 8 \ 4 \ 1 \ 7 \ 1 \ 5 \ 2 \ 6 \ 6 \ 5 \ 1 \ 3 \ 9 \ 4 \ 4 \ 1]$. Let $C_\beta = \Delta_9$ and

$$C_u(\beta) = \begin{cases} \{\delta_3^1, \delta_3^2\}, & \beta \in \{\delta_9^i : i = 1, \dots, 4\} \\ \{\delta_3^2, \delta_3^3\}, & \beta \in \{\delta_9^i : i = 5, \dots, 9\}. \end{cases}$$

Then, $C_z = \{1, \dots, 4, 10, \dots, 18, 23, \dots, 27\}$. According to (28), we can obtain the evolution of the state profiles for AGVS (Fig. 2).

The WCS and AGVS coupling has equivalent form

$$\mathbb{P}\{\lambda_i(k) = 1|z(k)\} = \Lambda_i z(k)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_1 &= [0.53 \ 0.21 \ 0.53 \ 0.49 \ 0.21 \ 0.53 \ 0.16 \ 0.00 \ 0.20 \\ &0.49 \ 0.53 \ 0.21 \ 0.00 \ 0.21 \ 0.53 \ 0.00 \ 0.21 \ 0.53 \\ &0.00 \ 0.64 \ 0.64 \ 0.00 \ 0.21 \ 0.00 \ 0.00 \ 0.21 \ 0.53], \\ \Lambda_2 &= [0.67 \ 0.21 \ 0.67 \ 0.00 \ 0.00 \ 0.53 \ 0.00 \ 0.21 \ 0.53 \\ &0.32 \ 0.67 \ 0.53 \ 0.16 \ 0.00 \ 0.32 \ 0.00 \ 0.32 \ 0.00 \\ &0.00 \ 0.53 \ 0.16 \ 0.00 \ 0.67 \ 0.53 \ 0.00 \ 0.16 \ 0.00]. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by (18), we have $\Omega(s) = \{\delta_{27}^1, \delta_{27}^3, \delta_{27}^{11}\}$ and $I(\Omega(s)) = \{\delta_9^1, \delta_9^3\}$. Since the two autonomous assembly arms are located in region δ_3^1 and region δ_3^3 , respectively, FFN (27)

accomplishes the transport task while WCS being (Q, ρ) -asymptotically stable with respect to FFN (27), if and only if FFN (27) is constrained $\bar{I}(\Omega(s))$ -stabilizable, where $\bar{I}(\Omega(s)) := \{\delta_3^3\}$.




Fig. 3: Breadth-first spanning tree T_{v_0} along with (Q, ρ) -state feedback laws.

By constructing the STG G_c defined by (24) and (25), we can draw the conclusion that FFN (27) is constrained $\bar{I}(\Omega(s))$ -stabilizable. In addition, according to Theorem 2, state feedback gain matrices for feasible state feedback laws of AGVS can be designed as

$$L^* = \delta_3 [2 \ i \ 1 \ 1 \ 3 \ j \ 2 \ 2 \ 3], \quad i = 1, 2, \quad j = 2, 3. \quad (29)$$

The breadth-first spanning tree T_{v_0} along with (Q, ρ) -state feedback laws is shown in Fig. 3. By recovering the logical forms from algebraic forms (29), we finally obtain the following four state feedback laws for AGVS:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_1^*((0, 1)) &= \pi_2^*((0, 1)) = 0, \pi_3^*((0, 1)) = \pi_4^*((0, 1)) = 1, \\ \pi_1^*((1, 2)) &= \pi_3^*((1, 2)) = 1, \pi_2^*((1, 2)) = \pi_4^*((1, 2)) = 2, \\ \pi_i^*(\beta) &= \begin{cases} 0, & \beta \in \{(0, 2), (1, 0)\}, \\ 1, & \beta \in \{(0, 0), (2, 0), (2, 1)\}, \\ 2, & \beta \in \{(1, 1), (2, 2)\}. \end{cases} \quad i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}. \end{aligned}$$

By resorting to the Monte Carlo method and averaging over 100 simulation results, we plot in Fig. 4 the evolution of the states for the WCS with two state agents of the AGVS all starting from position 2 under the obtained feasible state feedback law π_1^* and a random state feedback law π with $\pi(0, 1) = \pi(0, 2) = \pi(1, 0) = 0$, $\pi(0, 0) = \pi(1, 1) = \pi(1, 2) = \pi(2, 1) = \pi(2, 2) = 1$, $\pi(2, 0) = 2$. Simulation results show that state feedback laws π_1^* and π all ensure the Lyapunov-like performance of the WCS and the transient period T under π_1^* is shorter than that under π , and that is because under π_1^* , each state profile of the AGVS enters $\bar{I}(\Omega(s))$ along with a corresponding path in $T_{v_0}^\top$.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we have focused on the controller design for the MAS to ensure the performance of WCS in the presence of WCS and MAS coupling. We have adopted the FFN with profile-dependent switching topology to proceed the




Fig. 4: The evolution of the empirical averages of the states for the WCS under state feedback law π_1^* and π , respectively.

operational control for the MAS. Using the ASSR approach, we have obtained an equivalent form for the WCS and MAS coupling. Then, we have proposed a criterion in terms of constrained set stabilization to guarantee the Lyapunov-like performance with expected decay rate. In addition, based on graph theory and the breath-first searching, we have designed state feedback controllers for the MAS to ensure the performance requirements of WCS in the presence of WCS and MAS coupling. Future works will devote to converting the set stabilization of large-scale MASs into the set stabilization of subsystems via aggregation method.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Al-Fuqaha, M. Guizani, M. Mohammadi, M. Aledhari, and M. Ayyash, Internet of Things: A survey on enabling technologies, protocols, and applications, *IEEE Commun. Surveys Tuts.*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 2347-2376, 4th Quart. 2015.
- [2] D. Baumann, F. Mager, U. Wetzker, L. Thiele, M. Zimmerling, S. Trimpe, Wireless control for smart manufacturing: Recent approaches and open challenges, *Proc. IEEE*, Vol. 109, no. 4, pp. 441-467, Apr. 2021.
- [3] Z. M. Fadlullah, M. M. Fouda, N. Kato, A. Takeuchi, N. Iwasaki, and Y. Nozaki, Toward intelligent machine-to-machine communications in smart grid, *IEEE Commun. Mag.*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 60-65, Apr. 2011.
- [4] S. Vitturi, C. Zunino, and T. Sauter, Industrial communication systems and their future challenges: Next-generation Ethernet, IIoT, and 5G, *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 107, no. 6, pp. 944-961, Jun. 2019.
- [5] A. Ahlen, J. Akerberg, M. Eriksson, A. J. Isaksson, T. Iwaki, K. H. Johansson, S. Knorn, T. Lindh, and H. Sandberg, Toward wireless control in industrial process automation: A case study at a paper mill, *IEEE Control Syst. Mag.*, vol. 39, no. 5, pp. 36-57, Oct. 2019.
- [6] W. He, W. Xu, X. Ge, Q. Han, W. Du, and F. Qian, Secure Control of multiagent systems against malicious attacks: A brief survey, *IEEE Trans. Industr. Inform.*, vol. 18, no. 6, pp. 3595-3608, Jun. 2022.
- [7] T. Pulikottil, L. Estrada-Jimenez, H. Rehman, J. Barata, S. Nikghadam-Hojjati, and L. Zarzycki, Multi-agent based manufacturing: current trends and challenges, in *Proc. 26th IEEE Int. Conf. on Emerging Technologies and Factory Automation*, Sept. 2021.
- [8] W. Liang, M. Zheng, J. Zhang, H. Shi, H. Yu, Y. Yang, S. Liu, W. Yang, and X. Zhao, WIA-FA and its applications to digital factory: A wireless network solution for factory automation, *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 107, no. 6, pp. 1053-1073, Jun. 2019.
- [9] P. Agrawal, A. Ahlén, T. Olofsson, and M. Gidlund, Long term channel characterization for energy efficient transmission in industrial environments, *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 62, no. 8, pp. 3004-3014, Aug. 2014.

- [10] B. Hu, Y. Wang, P. V. Orlik, T. Koike-Akino, and J. Guo, Co-design of safe and efficient networked control systems in factory automation with state-dependent wireless fading channels, *Automatica*, vol. 105, pp. 334-346, Apr. 2019.
- [11] D. E. Quevedo, A. Ahlen, and K. H. Johansson, State estimation over sensor networks with correlated wireless fading channels, *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 581-593, Mar. 2013.
- [12] K. Gatsis, A. Ribeiro, and G. J. Pappas, Optimal power management in wireless control systems, *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 59, no. 6, pp. 1495-1510, Jun. 2014.
- [13] Q. Zhang and S. Kassam, Finite-state Markov model for Rayleigh fading channels, *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 47, no. 11, pp. 1688-1692, Nov. 1999.
- [14] K. Gatsis, M. Pajic, A. Ribeiro, and G. Pappas, Opportunistic control over shared wireless channels, *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 60, no. 12, pp. 3140-3155, Dec. 2015.
- [15] K. Gatsis, A. Ribeiro, and G. Pappas, Random access design for wireless control systems, *Automatica*, vol. 91, pp. 1-9, Feb. 2018.
- [16] D. Hristu-Varsakelis, Feedback control systems as users of a shared network: Communication sequences that guarantee stability, in *Proc. 40th IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control*, pp. 3631-3636, Dec. 2001.
- [17] A. Molin and S. Hirche, Price-based adaptive scheduling in multi-loop control systems with resource constraints, *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 59, no. 12, pp. 3282-3295, Dec. 2014.
- [18] L. Zhang and D. Hristu-Varsakelis, Communication and control co-design for networked control systems, *Automatica*, vol. 42, no. 6, pp. 953-958, Jun. 2006.
- [19] J. Le Ny, E. Feron, and G. J. Pappas, Resource constrained LQR control under fast sampling, in *Proc. 14th Int. Conf. Hybrid Syst.: Comput. Control*, pp. 271-280, Apr. 2011.
- [20] P. Park, S. C. Ergen, C. Fischione, C. Lu, and K. H. Johansson, Wireless network design for control systems: A survey, *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tutor.*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 978-1013, Second Quart. 2018.
- [21] B. Hu, Event-based adaptive power control in vehicular networked systems with state-dependent bursty fading channels, *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems II: Express Briefs*, Vol. 67, no. 3, pp. 506-510, Mar. 2020.
- [22] Y. Guo, P. Wang, W. Gui, and C. Yang, Set stability and set stabilization of Boolean control networks based on invariant subsets, *Automatica*, vol. 61, pp. 106-112, Nov. 2015.
- [23] F. Li, H. Li, L. Xie, and Q. Zhou, On stabilization and set stabilization of multivalued logical systems, *Automatica*, vol. 80, pp. 41-47, Jun. 2017.
- [24] Q. Zhang, J. Feng, Y. Zhao, and J. Zhao, Stabilization and set stabilization of switched Boolean control networks via flipping mechanism, *Nonlinear Anal-Hybri.*, vol. 41, pp. 101055, May 2021.
- [25] D. Cheng and H. Qi, *Analysis and Control of Boolean Networks: A Semi-tensor Product Approach*. London, U.K.: Springer-Verlag, 2011.
- [26] F. Pasqualetti, D. Borra, and F. Bullo, Consensus networks over finite fields, *Automatica*, vol. 50, pp. 349-358, Feb. 2014.
- [27] R. Lidl and H. Niederreiter, *Finite Fields*. New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- [28] H. Li, G. Zhao, P. Guo, and Z. Liu, *Analysis and Control of Finite-Value Systems*. Boca Raton, FL, USA: CRC Press, 2018.
- [29] Y. Li, H. Li, X. Ding, and G. Zhao, Leader-follower consensus of multiagent systems with time delays over finite fields, *IEEE Trans. Cybern.*, vol. 49, no. 8, pp. 3203-3208, Aug. 2019.
- [30] S. Gao, C. Xiang, and T. Lee, Set invariance and optimal set stabilization of Boolean control networks: A graphical approach, *IEEE Trans. Control. Netw. Syst.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 400-412, Mar. 2021.
- [31] T. H. Cormen, C. E. Leiserson, R. L. Rivest, and C. Stein, *Introduction to Algorithms*, 3rd ed. Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press, 2009.