

Resilient Distributed Optimization for Multi-Agent Cyberphysical Systems

Michal Yemini, Angelia Nedić, Andrea J. Goldsmith, Stephanie Gil

arXiv:2212.02459v2 [cs.RO] 6 Jun 2024

Abstract—This work focuses on the problem of distributed optimization in multi-agent cyberphysical systems, where a legitimate agents' iterates are influenced both by the values it receives from potentially malicious neighboring agents, and by its own self-serving target function. We develop a new algorithmic and analytical framework to achieve resilience for the class of problems where stochastic values of trust between agents exist and can be exploited. In this case we show that convergence to the true global optimal point can be recovered, both in mean and almost surely, even in the presence of malicious agents. Furthermore, we provide expected convergence rate guarantees in the form of upper bounds on the expected squared distance to the optimal value. Finally, numerical results are presented that validate our analytical convergence guarantees even when the malicious agents compose the majority of agents in the network and where existing methods fail to converge to the optimal nominal points.

Index Terms—Distributed optimization, resilience, malicious agents, Byzantine agents, stochastic trust values, cyberphysical systems.

I. INTRODUCTION

Distributed optimization is at the core of various multi-agent tasks including distributed control and estimation, multi-robot tasks such as mapping, and many learning tasks such as Federated Learning [2]–[4]. Owing to a long history and much attention in the research community, the theory for distributed optimization has matured, leading to several important results that provide rigorous performance guarantees in the form of convergence and convergence rate for different function types, underlying graph topologies, and noise [5]–[9]. However, in the presence of malicious activity, many of these known results are no longer applicable, requiring a new theoretical characterization of performance for the adversarial case.

M. Yemini is with the Faculty of Engineering, Bar-Ilan University, Israel (michal.yemini@biu.ac.il). A. Nedić is with the School of Electrical, Computer and Energy Engineering, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ 85281 USA (Angelia.Nedich@asu.edu). A. J. Goldsmith is with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544 USA (goldsmith@princeton.edu). S. Gil is with the Computer Science Department, School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02139 USA (sgil@seas.harvard.edu).

This work was partially supported by NSF awards #CNS-2147631, #CNS-2147641 and #CNS-2147694 and ONR YIP award #N00014-21-1-2714. M. Yemini and A. J. Goldsmith were partially supported by AFOSR award #002484665.

This paper was presented in part at the IEEE Conf. Decis. Control, [1].

The growing prevalence of multi-agent cyberphysical systems, and their reliance on distributed optimization methods for correct functioning in the real world, underscores the criticality of understanding the vulnerabilities of these systems. In particular, malicious agents can greatly interfere with the result of a distributed optimization scheme, driving the convergence to a non-optimal solution or preventing convergence altogether. They can accomplish this by either not sharing key information or by manipulating key information such as the shared gradients, which are critical for the correct functioning of the distributed optimization scheme [10]–[12]. Note that while well-established stochastic optimization methods characterize the effect of noise in distributed multi-agent systems [13], [14], malicious agents have the ability to inject intentionally biased or manipulated information which can lead to a greater potential damage for these systems. As a result, recent works have increasingly turned their attention to the investigation of robust and resilient versions of distributed optimization methods in the face of malicious intent and/or severe (potentially biased) noise [10]–[12], [15], [16]. These approaches can be coarsely divided into two categories: those that use the transmitted data between nodes to infer the presence of anomalies (for example see [11], [17]), and those that exploit additional side information from the network or the physicality of the underlying cyberphysical system to provide additional channels of resilience [18]–[20].

We are interested in investigating the class of problems where the physicality of the system plays an important role in achieving new possibilities of resilience for these systems. Indeed, the physicality of cyberphysical systems has been shown to provide many new channels of verification and establishing *inter-agent trust* through watermarking [21], wireless signal characteristics [20], [22], side information [23], and camera or lidar data cross-validation [24]. By exploiting these physical-based measurements, agents can extract additional information about the trustworthiness of their neighbors.

We capitalize on this observation, which motivates us to focus on a class of problems where the existence of additional information in the system can be exploited to arrive at much stronger performance results in the adversarial case – what we refer to as *resilience*. We abstract this information as a value α_{ij} that indicates the likelihood with which an agent i can trust data received from another agent j . We show that under mild assumptions, when this information is available, several powerful results for distributed optimization can be recovered such as: 1) *convergence to the true optimal point* in the case

of minimizing the sum of strongly convex functions, and 2) **characterization of convergence rate** that depends on the network topology, the amount of trust observations acquired, and the number of legitimate and malicious agents in the system.

A. Related work

In the absence of malicious agents, the legitimate agents can construct iterates converging to an optimal point $x_{\mathcal{L}}^*$ by using either their gradients, or sub-gradients when their objective functions are not differentiable. Each agent i updates its data value by considering the data values of its neighbors, and its self-serving gradient direction of its objective function f_i or the directions obtained from its neighbors. Convergence to an optimal point $x_{\mathcal{L}}^*$ can be achieved for constrained multi-agent problems in [5], [7], [14], [25]–[30] and with limited gradient information [31], [32]. Additionally, a zero-order method has been proposed in [33]. Some works, such as [5], assume that the weight matrices, which dictate how agents incorporate the data they receive from their neighbors, are doubly-stochastic. However, works such as [28] overcome this assumption by performing additional weighted averaging steps. Finally, it has been established that the convergence rate of distributed gradient algorithms with diminishing step size is at best $O(\frac{1}{T})$ where T is the algorithm running time, see for example [30].

To harm the system, a malicious agent can send falsified data to their legitimate neighbors. If the legitimate agents are unaware that this data comes from malicious neighbors, then the malicious agents will succeed in controlling the system [10], [11], [34]–[39]. To combat the harmful effect of an attack, the approach taken in [34]–[36] requires the pre-existence of a set of trusted agents such that all other agents (legitimate or malicious) are connected to at least one trusted agent. Nonetheless, this approach is unrealistic when communication is sporadic such as in robotic and ad-hoc networks. The approaches in [10], [11], [37]–[40] rely on the agent data values to detect and discard malicious inputs and either assume that all the legitimate agents have at least one common local minimizer [39], have an upper bound on the number of tolerable malicious agents (with a star network having the largest number - a half of the number of agents in the network) [37]. When the number of malicious agents exceeds the tolerable number, the attack succeeds and malicious agents evade detection. In contrast with the existing works, our proposed method provides a significantly stronger resilience to malicious activity by exploiting the physical aspect of the problem, i.e., the wireless medium. Thus, each legitimate agent can learn trustworthy neighbors while optimizing the system objective. Our prior work [41] studies the implications of the agents’ learning ability, with regards to the trustworthiness of their neighbors, on distributed *consensus* systems. This work considers the more general case of distributed *optimization* systems where the agent’s goal is to minimize the sum of their local objective function under limited information exchange.

Finally, this work also relates to stochastic optimization, see for example [42]–[49]. However, unlike the typical assumption that the stochastic gradients are unbiased and statistically independent of the weights, in this work the stochastic gradients are biased, where the bias occurs due to the adversarial

inputs of the malicious agents. Furthermore, learning the trustworthiness of neighboring agents and adjusting agents’ weight accordingly leads to a correlation between the agents’ values and the weights that are assigned to them. To this end, our analysis could not rely on previous results when analyzing the rate of convergence of the agents’ dynamic.

B. Paper contribution

This work extends our earlier paper [1], which formalized the problem of resilient distributed optimization with trust observations and presented an upper bound on the convergence rate in the mean squared sense. This work excluded the proofs for these theoretical results due to space limitations. The key contributions of this work beyond those of [1] are as follows: 1) We present the analysis of all the proofs that were omitted from [1]. 2) We provide additional insights and discussions for the theoretical results that are included in [1]. Specifically, this work includes extensive discussions regarding the assumptions that are used in this paper regarding the statistics of the trust observations and their relaxations. 3) We extend the convergence in the second moment that follows from [1] and establish the almost sure convergence to the true optimal point. Additionally, we derive convergence in the r th mean for any $r > 0$, both as a result of the almost sure convergence and by definition. These convergence results lead to an additional method to derive upper bounds on the convergence rate of the second moment which we present in this work. 4) We present additional numerical simulations that significantly extend the one-dimensional consensus with constraint setup to higher dimensional constraint optimization setups. Furthermore, we present in the supplementary material a comparison between the numerical simulations and the upper bounds we establish in this work.

C. Paper organization

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: Section II presents the system model and problem formulation. Section III proposes our algorithm for resilient distributed optimization. Section IV presents our learning mechanism for detecting malicious agents and provides upper bounds on the probability of misclassifying malicious and legitimate agents. Sections V and VI, respectively, present asymptotic and finite time regime convergence results. Finally, Section VII presents numerical results that validate our analytical results, and Section VIII concludes the paper.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

We consider a multi-agent system of n agents communicating over a network, which is represented by an undirected graph, $\mathbb{G} = (\mathbb{V}, \mathbb{E})$. The node set $\mathbb{V} = \{1, \dots, n\}$ represents the agents and the edge set $\mathbb{E} \subset \mathbb{V} \times \mathbb{V}$ represents the set of communication links, with $\{i, j\} \in \mathbb{E}$ indicating that agents i and j are connected. We denote by \mathcal{N}_i the set of neighbors of agent i , that is $\mathcal{N}_i \triangleq \{j : \{i, j\} \in \mathbb{E}\}$.

We study the case where an unknown subset of the agents is malicious and the trustworthy agents are learning which

neighbors they can trust. Thus, $\mathbb{V} = \mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{M}$ where \mathcal{L} is the nonempty and finite set of legitimate agents that execute computational tasks and share their data truthfully, while \mathcal{M} denotes a finite set of agents that are not truthful. *The sets \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{M} are just modeling artifacts, and none of the legitimate agents knows if it has malicious neighbors, or not, at any time.* Throughout the paper, we will use the subscripts \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{M} to denote the various quantities related to legitimate and malicious agents, respectively.

We are interested in a general distributed optimization problem, where the legitimate agents aim at optimizing a common objective whereas the malicious agents try to impair the legitimate agents by malicious injections of harmful data. The aim of the legitimate agents is to minimize distributively the sum of their objective functions over a constraint set $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, i.e.,

$$x_{\mathcal{L}}^* = \underset{x \in \mathcal{X}}{\operatorname{argmin}} f_{\mathcal{L}}(x), \text{ with } f_{\mathcal{L}}(x) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} f_i(x), \quad (1)$$

with a unique minimizer. By choosing a local update rule and exchanging some information with their neighbors, the legitimate agents want to determine the optimal solution $x_{\mathcal{L}}^*$ in (1). In contrast, the malicious agents aim to either lead the legitimate agents to a common non-optimal value $x \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $f_{\mathcal{L}}(x) > f_{\mathcal{L}}(x^*)$, or prevent the convergence of an optimization method employed by the legitimate agents.

Notation: We let x^T denote the transpose of x , where $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We denote by $\|x\| \triangleq \sqrt{x^T x}$ the ℓ_2 vector norm. We let $\Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(x)$ be the projection of x onto the set \mathcal{X} , i.e.,

$$\Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(x) = \underset{y \in \mathcal{X}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|y - x\|.$$

We use $\mathbb{1}_{\{A\}}$ to denote the indicator function of the event A , which is equal to one if the event A is true and zero otherwise. Finally, we denote by $\mathbf{E}[\cdot]$ the expectation operator, and by $\mathbf{E}[\cdot|A]$ the conditional expectation, where we arbitrarily define $\mathbf{E}[\cdot|A] = 0$ whenever the probability of the conditioned event A is 0.

A. Trust values

We employ a probabilistic framework of trustworthiness where we assume the availability of stochastic *observations of trust* between communicating agents. This information is abstracted in the form of a random variable α_{ij} defined below.

Definition II.1 (α_{ij}). For every $i \in \mathcal{L}$ and $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$, the random variable $\alpha_{ij} \in [0, 1]$ represents the probability that agent j is a trustworthy neighbor of agent i . We assume the availability of such observations $\alpha_{ij}(t)$ at every instant of time $t \geq 0$ throughout the paper.

This model of inter-agent trust observations has been used in prior works [22], [41]. In general, the trust observations can be extracted from the physicality of the systems in various ways as elaborated in the recent survey [50]. For example, the pioneering works [51], [52] extract trust observation based on the characteristics of the received wireless signals that are used to transfer information between agents. The trust values then capture the likelihood of discrepancies between the agent's reported location and its true location that is manifested in the signal characteristics, such as power and direction of arrival.

The focus of the current work is not on the derivation of the values α_{ij} themselves, but rather on the derivation of a theoretical framework for achieving resilient distributed optimization using this model. Indeed, we show that much stronger results of convergence are achievable by properly exploiting this information in the network. We refer to [22] for an example of such a value α_{ij} . Intuitively, a random realization $\alpha_{ij}(t)$ of $\alpha_{ij} \in [0, 1]$ contains useful trust information regarding the legitimacy of a transmission. Here the interval $[0, 1]$ denotes the level of trust, where 0 is the lowest value of trustworthiness and 1 indicates the highest level of trustworthiness. Thus, a value of $\alpha_{ij}(t) > 0.5$ indicates a legitimate transmission, and $\alpha_{ij}(t) < 0.5$ indicates a malicious transmission in a stochastic sense (misclassifications are possible). Note that $\alpha_{ij}(t) = 0.5$ means that the observation is completely ambiguous and contains no useful trust information for the transmission at time t . We note that the results presented in this paper are not limited to the choice of 0.5 as the threshold for this ambiguity, and can be generalized to any chosen threshold provided that Assumption 1 holds for that threshold.

We use the following assumptions regarding the underlying distribution trust observations throughout the paper:

Assumption 1. (i) [First moment homogeneity of trust variables] *There are scalars $E_{\mathcal{L}} > 0$ and $E_{\mathcal{M}} < 0$ such that*

$$E_{\mathcal{L}} \triangleq \mathbf{E}[\alpha_{ij}(t)] - 0.5, \quad \text{for all } i \in \mathcal{L}, j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{L},$$

$$E_{\mathcal{M}} \triangleq \mathbf{E}[\alpha_{ij}(t)] - 0.5, \quad \text{for all } i \in \mathcal{L}, j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{M}.$$

(ii) [Independence of trust observations] *The observations $\alpha_{ij}(t)$ are statistically independent for all t with $i \in \mathcal{L}, j \in \mathcal{N}_i$.*

We note that these assumptions are similar to the probabilistic trust framework employed in [22], [41].

Discussion: For the sake of simplicity of presentation, we assume that the expectation terms $E_{\mathcal{L}}$ and $E_{\mathcal{M}}$ are homogeneous (see Assumption 1(i)). We note that the closed-form analytical results derived in this work can be readily extended to the case where $E_{\mathcal{L}} \triangleq \min_{i \in \mathcal{L}, j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{L}} \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \{\mathbf{E}[\alpha_{ij}(t)] - 0.5\}$ and $E_{\mathcal{M}} \triangleq \min_{i \in \mathcal{L}, j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{M}} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \{\mathbf{E}[\alpha_{ij}(t)] - 0.5\}$ are such that $E_{\mathcal{L}} > 0$ and $E_{\mathcal{M}} < 0$. Additionally, our analysis can be readily adapted to incorporate heterogeneity across clients and replace the uniform $E_{\mathcal{L}}$ and $E_{\mathcal{M}}$ terms with per link terms, i.e., $E_{ij} = \mathbf{E}[\alpha_{ij}(t)] - 0.5$. Additionally, while in this work we derive a first-moment analysis by utilizing Hoeffding's inequality, one can derive an analogous second-moment analysis by utilizing Bernstein's inequality. Finally, we include in Section IV a discussion regarding the relaxation of Assumption 1(ii) to include random processes with memory such as Markov chains and martingales.

B. The update rule of agents

We propose distributed methods with significantly stronger resilience compared to [11]. This is enabled by each legitimate agent learning which neighbors it can trust while optimizing a system objective.

a) *The update rule of legitimate agents:* Each legitimate agent i updates $x_i(t)$ by considering the values $x_j(t)$ of its neighbors and *the gradient of its own objective function f_i*

similarly to the iterates described in [5]¹. This method takes the following form for every legitimate agent $i \in \mathcal{L}$,

$$\begin{aligned} c_i(t) &= w_{ii}(t)x_i(t) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} w_{ij}(t)x_j(t), \\ y_i(t) &= c_i(t) - \gamma(t)\nabla f_i(c_i(t)), \\ x_i(t+1) &= \Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(y_i(t)), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $\gamma(t) \geq 0$ is a stepsize that is common to all agents $i \in \mathcal{L}$ at each time t , and \mathcal{N}_i is the set of neighbors of agent i in the communication graph. The set \mathcal{N}_i is composed of both legitimate and malicious neighbors of agent $i \in \mathcal{L}$, while the weights $w_{ij}(t)$, $j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cup \{i\}$, are nonnegative and sum to 1. For each $i \in \mathcal{L}, j \in \mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{M}$, the choice of $w_{ij}(t)$ depends on the history of the random trust observations $(\alpha_{ij}(\tau))_{0 \leq \tau \leq t}$. As a result, the weights $w_{ij}(t)$ and the data points $x_i(t)$ are random, for every $i \in \mathcal{L}, j \in \mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{M}$ and time instant $t > 0$.

To increase the convergence rate, we allow $\gamma(t)$ and $w_{ij}(t)$ to depend on a parameter $T_0 \geq 0$ which dictates how many trust observations a legitimate agent collects before it decided to trust one of its neighbors. We specify $\gamma(t)$ and $w_{ij}(t), i \in \mathcal{L}, j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cup \{i\}$, precisely later on in Section III.

b) *The update rule for the malicious agents:* Malicious agents $i \in \mathcal{M}$ choose values in the set \mathcal{X} and they may or may not collaborate in choosing their values. We assume that their actions are not known, and thus we do not model them, but assume the worst-case scenario instead in our analysis. For simplicity of exposition, the dynamic (2) captures malicious inputs, where an adversarial agent $i \in \mathcal{M}$ sends all its legitimate neighbors identical copies of its chosen input $x_i(t)$ at time t . Let us denote by $x_{ij}(t)$ the input of a malicious agent i to a legitimate agent j at time t , then $x_{ij_1}(t) = x_{ij_2}(t)$ for every $j_1, j_2 \in \mathcal{L}$. Nonetheless, our analytical results also hold for byzantine inputs where an adversarial agent $i \in \mathcal{M}$ can send its legitimate neighbors different inputs at time t . In this case $x_{ij_1}(t)$ need not be equal to $x_{ij_2}(t)$ for every $j_1, j_2 \in \mathcal{L}$.

C. Assumptions on connectivity and objective functions

Assumption 2 (Sufficiently connected graph). *The subgraph $\mathbb{G}_{\mathcal{L}}$ induced by the legitimate agents is connected.*

Assumption 3. *We assume that $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is compact and convex and that there exists a known value $\eta > 0$ such that*

$$\|x\| \leq \eta, \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (3)$$

The η value in Assumption 3 is arbitrary, and its role is to bound the malicious agents' inputs away from infinity.

Assumption 4. *For all legitimate agents $i \in \mathcal{L}$, the function f_i is μ -strongly convex and has L -Lipschitz continuous gradients on \mathcal{X} , i.e., $\|\nabla f_i(x) - \nabla f_i(y)\| \leq L\|x - y\|$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$.*

Note that under Assumption 3 and the strong convexity of Assumption 4, the problem (1) has a unique solution $x_{\mathcal{L}}^* \in \mathcal{X}$.

Assumption 5. *Let the stepsize sequence $\{\gamma(t)\}$ be nonnegative, monotonically nonincreasing, and such that $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma(t) = \infty$ and $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^2(t) < \infty$.*

¹Note, however, that [5] does not include the projection on the set \mathcal{X} .

D. Research objectives

The objective of this work is to arrive at strong convergence results for the distributed optimization problem in (1) in the presence of malicious agents \mathcal{M} . We wish to achieve this by exploiting the availability of stochastic trust values $\alpha_{ij}(t)$ in the network. Specifically, we aim to achieve the following:

Objective 1: We wish to construct weight sequences $\{w_{ij}(t)\}$, $i \in \mathcal{L}, j \in \mathcal{N}_i$ in the method (2) to weight the influence of neighboring nodes in each legitimate agent's update. Specifically, we want to construct these sequences such that they converge over time to some *nominal weights* $\bar{w}_{ij}, i \in \mathcal{L}, j \in \mathcal{N}_i$, almost surely (a.s.), where $\bar{w}_{ij} = 0$ for all malicious neighbors $j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{M}$ of agent $i \in \mathcal{L}$.

Objective 2: Utilizing the proposed weights $\{w_{ij}(t)\}$, we aim to show that the iterates given by (2) converge (in some sense) to the true optimal point $x_{\mathcal{L}}^* \in \mathcal{X}$ under Assumptions 1-5.

Objective 3: We aim to establish an upper bound on the expected value of $\|x_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2$, for all $i \in \mathcal{L}$, as a function of the time t , for the iterates $x_i(t)$ produced by the method.

III. ALGORITHM

Next, we present an algorithm that incorporates the legitimate agents' learning of inter-agent trust values into the dynamic (2) through the choice of the time-dependent weights $w_{ij}(t)$. These weights depend on a parameter T_0 that captures the number of trust measurements a legitimate agent collects before deciding whether or not to trust one of its neighbors. We utilize the parameter T_0 to enable faster convergence rates of the algorithm, nonetheless T_0 is mostly used for analysis and it is not strictly necessary. In other words, as we show in Section V, *the algorithm converges to the optimal point $x_{\mathcal{L}}^*$ for any choice of nonnegative integer T_0 , including the special case where $T_0 = 0$* . In this case, legitimate agents have no prior trust observations to rely on when they first decide whether to trust their neighbors.

A. The weight matrix sequence

Consider the sum over a history of $\alpha_{ij}(t)$ values that we denote by $\beta_{ij}(t)$:

$$\beta_{ij}(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} (\alpha_{ij}(k) - 0.5) \quad \text{for } t \geq 1, i \in \mathcal{L}, j \in \mathcal{N}_i, \quad (4)$$

and define $\beta_{ij}(0) = 0$. We explore the probabilistic characteristics of $\beta_{ij}(t)$ in Section IV.

We define a time dependent *trusted neighborhood* for agent $i \in \mathcal{L}$ as:

$$\mathcal{N}_i(t) \triangleq \{j \in \mathcal{N}_i : \beta_{ij}(t) \geq 0\}. \quad (5)$$

This set is the subset of neighbors that legitimate agent i classifies as its legitimate neighbors at time t . For all $t \geq 0$, let

$$d_i(t) \triangleq |\mathcal{N}_i(t)| + 1 \geq 1 \quad \text{for all } i \in \mathcal{L}.$$

At each time t , every agent i sends the value $d_i(t)$ to its neighbors $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$ in addition to the value $x_i(t)$. Alternatively, we can assume that agent i sends $d_i(t)$ to its neighbors only when the value $d_i(t)$ changes.

Algorithm 1 The protocol of each agent $i \in \mathcal{L}$.

Inputs: $T, T_0, \mathcal{N}_i, x_i(0), \nabla f_i(\cdot), \gamma(\cdot)$.

Outputs: $x_i(T)$.

Set $\beta_{ij}(t) = 0$ for all $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$;

for $t = 0, \dots, T-1$ **do**

 Set $\mathcal{N}_i(t) = \{j \in \mathcal{N}_i : \beta_{ij}(t) \geq 0\}$;

 Set $d_i(t) = |\mathcal{N}_i(t)| + 1$;

 Send $x_i(t)$ and $d_i(t)$ to neighbors;

for $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$ **do**

 Receive $x_j(t)$ and $d_j(t)$;

 Extract $\alpha_{ij}(t)$;

 Set $\beta_{ij}(t+1) = \beta_{ij}(t) + (\alpha_{ij}(t) - 0.5)$;

 Set the weight $w_{ij}(t)$ based on the values of $T_0, \mathcal{N}_i(t), d_i(t)$, and $d_j(t)$ as follows:

$$w_{ij}(t) = \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{t \geq T_0\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(t)\}}}{2 \max\{d_i(t), d_j(t)\}};$$

end for

 Set $w_{ii}(t) = 1 - \sum_{m \in \mathcal{N}_i} w_{im}(t)$;

 Set $x_i(t+1)$ according to the dynamic (7);

end for

Legitimate agents are the most susceptible to making classification errors regarding the trustworthiness of their neighbors when they have a small sample size of trust value observations. Thus, we delay the updating of legitimate agents' values until time $T_0 \geq 0$. Up to time T_0 , the legitimate agents only collect observations of trust values.

We define the weight matrix $W(t)$ by choosing its entries $w_{ij}(t)$ as follows: for every $i \in \mathcal{L}, j \in \mathcal{N}_i$,

$$w_{ij}(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{\mathbb{1}_{\{t \geq T_0\}}}{2 \max\{d_i(t), d_j(t)\}} & \text{if } j \in \mathcal{N}_i(t), \\ 0 & \text{if } j \notin \mathcal{N}_i(t) \cup \{i\}, \\ 1 - \sum_{m \in \mathcal{N}_i} w_{im}(t) & \text{if } j = i. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Using the weights (6) and letting the stepsize $\gamma(k) = 0, \forall k < 0$, the dynamic in (2) is equivalent to the following dynamic where agents *only consider the data values received from their trusted neighbors at time t , i.e., $\mathcal{N}_i(t)$* , when computing their own value updates: for all $i \in \mathcal{L}$ and all $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} c_i(t) &= w_{ii}(t)x_i(t) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(t) \cap \mathcal{L}} w_{ij}(t)x_j(t) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(t) \cap \mathcal{M}} w_{ij}(t)x_j(t), \\ y_i(t) &= c_i(t) - \gamma(t - T_0) \nabla f_i(c_i(t)), \\ x_i(t+1) &= \Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(y_i(t)). \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

We note that though the choice of the parameter T_0 affects the weights $w_{ij}(t), i \in \mathcal{L}, j \in \mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{M}$ and the terms $c_i(t), y_i(t)$ and $x_i(t), i \in \mathcal{L}$, we omit this dependence from these notations for the sake of clarity of exposition.

Furthermore, the dependence of the weights $w_{ij}(t)$ on the trust observation history $\beta_{ij}(t)$ comes in through the choice of time-dependent and random trusted neighborhood $\mathcal{N}_i(t)$ (see (5)). Consequently, some entries of the matrix $W(t)$ are also random, as seen from (6). The gradients $\nabla f_i(c_i(t))$ are stochastic due to the randomness of $c_i(t)$, however, they are not unbiased as typically assumed in stochastic approximation methods, including [53]. Thus, we cannot readily rely on prior

analysis for stochastic approximation methods. However, as we show in our subsequent analysis, the variance of $\|\nabla f_i(c_i(t))\|$ decays sufficiently fast and allows convergence to the optimal point even in the presence of malicious agents.

IV. LEARNING THE SETS OF TRUSTED NEIGHBORS

This section establishes key characteristics of the stochastic observations $\alpha_{ij}(t)$ that result from the model described in Section II-A and that we will subsequently use in our analysis of the convergence of the iterates produced by Algo. 1.

Recall that we consider the sum $\beta_{ij}(t)$, defined in (4), over a history of $\alpha_{ij}(t)$ values. Intuitively, following the discussion on α_{ij} 's immediately after Definition II.1, the values $\beta_{ij}(t)$ will tend towards positive values for legitimate agent transmissions $i \in \mathcal{L}$ and $j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{L}$, and will tend towards negative values for malicious agent transmissions where $i \in \mathcal{L}$ and $j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{M}$. We restate an important result shown in [41] regarding the exponential decay rate of misclassifications given a sum over the history of stochastic observation values that we will use extensively in the forthcoming analysis.

Lemma 1 (Lemma 2 [41]). *Consider the random variables $\beta_{ij}(t)$ capturing the history of stochastic trust values as defined in (4) and let Assumption 1 hold. Then, for every $t \geq 0$ and every $i \in \mathcal{L}, j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{L}$,*

$$\Pr(\beta_{ij}(t) < 0) \leq \max\{\exp(-2tE_{\mathcal{L}}^2), \mathbb{1}_{\{E_{\mathcal{L}} < 0\}}\},$$

while for every $t \geq 0$ and every $i \in \mathcal{L}, j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{M}$,

$$\Pr(\beta_{ij}(t) \geq 0) \leq \max\{\exp(-2tE_{\mathcal{M}}^2), \mathbb{1}_{\{E_{\mathcal{M}} > 0\}}\}.$$

In other words, the probability of misclassifying malicious agents as legitimate, or vice versa, decays exponentially in the accrued number t of observations.

We can now conclude that there is a random but finite time T_f such that there exists a legitimate agent i which misclassifies the trustworthiness of at least one of its neighbors at time $T_f - 1$, and all the legitimate agents classify the trustworthiness of their neighbors correctly at each time $t \geq T_f$. We refer to the time T_f as the ‘‘correct classification time’’.

Denote by \mathcal{F}_k the filtration of the random trust observation sequences $\{\alpha_{ij}(0), \dots, \alpha_{ij}(k)\}_{i \in \mathcal{L}, j \in \mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{M}}, k \geq 0$. Interestingly, we observe that $\{T_f = k\}$ cannot be a stopping time² with respect to \mathcal{F}_k . This follows since $\{T_f = k\}$ depends on future trust observations, i.e. after time k , and thus $\{T_f = k\}$ is not measurable with respect to the σ -algebra \mathcal{F}_k . Consequently, at each time t we cannot conclude if the classification of even a single link, e.g., between i and j , is correct.

Corollary 1. *Under Assumption 1, there exists a random finite time $T_f \geq 0$, almost surely, such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{ij}(t) &\geq 0 \text{ for all } t \geq T_f \text{ and all } i \in \mathcal{L}, j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{L}, \\ \beta_{ij}(t) &< 0 \text{ for all } t \geq T_f \text{ and all } i \in \mathcal{L}, j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{M}, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

and there exists $i \in \mathcal{L}$ such that

$$\beta_{ij}(T_f - 1) < 0 \text{ for some } j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{L}, \text{ or,}$$

²For the definition of a stopping time see [54].

$$\beta_{ij}(T_f - 1) \geq 0 \text{ for some } j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{M}, \quad (9)$$

if $T_f \geq 1$.

Proof. The proof of this corollary relies on the Borel-Cantelli lemma and follows directly from [41, Proposition 1]. \square

Discussion: The proof of Corollary 1 relies on the part of the Borel-Cantelli lemma that does not require statistical independence. Thus, a similar conclusion holds for any sequence of probabilities $\{\Pr(\beta_{ij}(t) < 0)\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$, $i \in \mathcal{L}, j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{L}$ such that $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \Pr(\beta_{ij}(t) < 0) < \infty$. This, for example, holds for dependent trust observations such that $\{\beta_{ij}(t)\}_{t=0}^{\infty}$ is a submartingale under some additional assumptions. In this case, using the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality (see [55] for similar calculations for Markov chains) leads to the conclusion that Corollary 1 establishes. A similar discussion is true for classifying malicious neighbors with some adaptations.

For a legitimate agent $i \in \mathcal{L}$, let $|\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{L}|$ be the number of legitimate neighbors and $|\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{M}|$ be the number of malicious neighbors of agent i . We let $D_{\mathcal{L}}$ be the total number of legitimate neighbors and let $D_{\mathcal{M}}$ be the total number of malicious neighbors in the system, with respect to the legitimate agents. That is,

$$D_{\mathcal{L}} \triangleq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} |\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{L}| \quad \text{and} \quad D_{\mathcal{M}} \triangleq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} |\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{M}|.$$

Additionally, we define the following upper bound on the probability that at least one legitimate agent misclassifies one of its legitimate neighbors as malicious or one of its malicious neighbors as legitimate, when observing k trust values for each of its neighbors

$$p_c(k) \triangleq \mathbb{1}_{\{k \geq -1\}} \left[D_{\mathcal{L}} e^{-2 \max\{k, 0\} E_{\mathcal{L}}^2} + D_{\mathcal{M}} e^{-2 \max\{k, 0\} E_{\mathcal{M}}^2} \right].$$

Furthermore, we define the following upper bound on the probability that a legitimate agent misclassifies one of its legitimate or malicious neighbors, in one of the times after observing k trust values for each of its neighbors:

$$p_e(k) \triangleq D_{\mathcal{L}} \frac{\exp(-2kE_{\mathcal{L}}^2)}{1 - \exp(-2E_{\mathcal{L}}^2)} + D_{\mathcal{M}} \frac{\exp(-2kE_{\mathcal{M}}^2)}{1 - \exp(-2E_{\mathcal{M}}^2)}. \quad (10)$$

Using these quantities, we obtain some useful bounds on the probabilities of the events $(T_f = k)$ and $(T_f > k - 1)$ for any $k \geq 0$, as follows.

Lemma 2. For every $k \geq 0$

$$\Pr(T_f = k) \leq \min\{p_c(k - 1), 1\}, \text{ and}, \quad (11)$$

$$\Pr(T_f > k - 1) \leq \min\{p_e(k - 1), 1\}. \quad (12)$$

We present the proof of Lemma 2 in Appendix I. Note that (11) and (12) are well defined for $k < 0$, since $p_c(k) \geq 0$ and $p_e(k) > 1$ for all $k < 0$.

V. ASYMPTOTIC CONVERGENCE TO OPTIMAL POINT

This section analyzes the convergence characteristics of Algo. 1 by utilizing the almost surely finite correct classification time T_f and the upper bounds of Lemma 2. We show convergence to the nominal optimal point for legitimate

agents almost surely and in mean for any finite set of malicious agents and nonempty finite set of legitimate agents.

Assumptions 3 and 4 lead to the following conclusion.

Corollary 2. When \mathcal{X} is compact, Assumption 4 implies that there is a scalar G such that $\|\nabla f_i(x)\| \leq G$, $\forall x \in \mathcal{X}$, $i \in \mathcal{L}$.

The following lemma is a direct consequence of [25, Lemma 8]. Nonetheless, for completeness of presentation we provide the proof.

Lemma 3. Denote $\phi_i(t) \triangleq \Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(y_i(t)) - c_i(t)$. For every $i \in \mathcal{L}$, $T_0 \geq 0$, and $t \geq T_0$ we have that

$$\|\phi_i(t)\| \leq \gamma(t - T_0)G,$$

where $G > 0$ is from Corollary 2.

Proof. Since $x_i(t) \in \mathcal{X}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{M}$ and $t \geq 0$, and $[w_{ij}(t)]_{i \in \mathcal{L}, j \in \mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{M}}$ is a row stochastic matrix, by the convexity of the set \mathcal{X} , we have that $c_i(t) \in \mathcal{X}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{L}$ and $t \geq 0$. Now, by the standard non-expansiveness property of the projection operator it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi_i(t)\| &= \|\Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(y_i(t)) - \Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(c_i(t))\| \leq \|y_i(t) - c_i(t)\| \\ &= \|c_i(t) - \gamma(t - T_0) \nabla f_i(c_i(t)) - c_i(t)\| \\ &\leq \gamma(t - T_0) \|\nabla f_i(c_i(t))\| \leq \gamma(t - T_0)G. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Let us denote $d_{i,\mathcal{L}} \triangleq |\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{L}| + 1$. Next, we define the doubly stochastic matrix $\overline{W}_{\mathcal{L}} \in [0, 1]^{|\mathcal{L}| \times |\mathcal{L}|}$ with the entries $[\overline{W}_{\mathcal{L}}]_{i,j}$, for every $i, j \in \mathcal{L}$:

$$[\overline{W}_{\mathcal{L}}]_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2 \cdot \max\{d_{i,\mathcal{L}}, d_{j,\mathcal{L}}\}} & \text{if } j \in \mathcal{N}_i, \\ 0 & \text{if } j \notin \mathcal{N}_i \cup \{i\}, \\ 1 - \sum_{m \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{L}} \overline{w}_{im} & \text{if } j = i. \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

Note that $\overline{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$ is the *nominal* weight matrix, i.e., the value the weight matrix would take in the absence of malicious agents. Let $\sigma_2(A)$ be the second largest singular value of A , and denote $\rho_{\mathcal{L}} = \max_{k \geq 1} \sigma_2(\overline{W}_{\mathcal{L}}^k)$. Since $\mathbb{G}_{\mathcal{L}}$ is connected and $\overline{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$ is doubly stochastic, the value $\rho_{\mathcal{L}} < 1$ is equal to the second largest eigenvalue modulus of $\overline{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$. Additionally, our analysis holds for the lazy Metropolis weight as well for which by [56, Lemma 2.2], the value $\rho_{\mathcal{L}}$ can be upper bounded by $(1 - 1/(71|\mathcal{L}|^2))$, while [57] improves the constant $1/71$ to $1/8$.

Next, define for $t \geq 0$ the following deterministic dynamic that excludes malicious agents,

$$\begin{aligned} r_i(t) &= \overline{w}_{ii} z_i(t) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{L}} \overline{w}_{ij} z_j(t), \\ z_i(t+1) &= \Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(r_i(t) - \gamma(t) \nabla f_i(r_i(t))). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Denote for $T \geq 1$, the auxiliary error function which we utilize to characterize the convergence rate:

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{h}(T) &\triangleq \frac{G^2 T}{\mu} + \frac{2G^2 T}{\mu(1 - \rho_{\mathcal{L}})} + \frac{8(\mu + L)G^2}{\mu^2(1 - \rho_{\mathcal{L}})^2} \ln\left(\frac{T+2}{2}\right) + \frac{2\eta G}{1 - \rho_{\mathcal{L}}} \\ &+ \frac{2(\mu + L)(\mu\eta + 2G)^2}{\mu^2(1 - \rho_{\mathcal{L}})^2} + \frac{2G^2 + 4G\eta(\mu + L)}{\mu(1 - \rho_{\mathcal{L}})^3} + \frac{G^2(\mu + L)}{\mu^2(1 - \rho_{\mathcal{L}})^4}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

The function $\bar{h}(T)$ grows linearly in T . Additionally, it comprises two terms: 1) the first term which captures the contribution from the centralized gradient descent optimization (see [58]) at each time instant without malicious agents, and 2) the following terms that include $\rho_{\mathcal{L}}$ which capture the contribution from distributing the optimization over a decentralized network (without malicious agents) that is characterized by the second largest eigenvalue modulus of $\bar{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$.

Theorem 1. *If $\mathcal{L} = \mathbb{V}$ and Assumptions 2-5 hold, then the dynamic (14) converges to the optimal point for every initial point $z_i(0) \in \mathcal{X}$, $i \in \mathcal{L}$, that is,*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|z_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\| = 0, \forall i \in \mathcal{L}.$$

Moreover, if $\gamma(t) = \frac{2}{\mu(t+1)}$, then

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \|z_i(T) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2 \leq \min \left\{ 4\eta^2, \frac{4\bar{h}(T)}{\mu T(T+1)} \right\}, \quad (16)$$

for any initial points $z_i(0) \in \mathcal{X}$, $i \in \mathcal{L}$, and any $T \geq 1$.

The proof of this theorem is straightforward. Nonetheless, for the sake of the completeness of the presentation, we prove Theorem 1 in the supplementary material.

Discussion: It may be possible to generalize the explicit upper bound (16) which leads to a convergence rate of $O(1/T)$ to a set of choices for $\gamma(t)$ by extending [59, Lemma 6]. Additionally, the work [60, Corollary 14] and the recent work [61, Theorem 2.12] relax the individual strong convexity (see Assumption 4) and replace it with the strong convexity of the global objective function at the cost of increasing the convergence rate to $O(1/\sqrt{T})$. Finally, the recent work [61, Theorem 2.5] presents conditions to relax Assumption 3 (with convergence rate of $O(1/\sqrt{T})$), however, we note that we utilize Assumption 3 to limit the inputs of malicious agents.

A. Convergence to optimal point almost surely

Let us consider the data values $(x_i(t))_{i \in \mathcal{L}}$ of the dynamic (7), assuming that T_f is finite. Subsequently, for every $t \geq \max\{T_f, T_0\}$ all the legitimate agents participate in the dynamic (7) and all the malicious agents are excluded from it. Thus from time $\max\{T_f, T_0\}$ the dynamic (7) can be captured by a dynamic of the form (14), where t is replaced with $t - \max\{T_f, T_0\}$.

Theorem 2 (Convergence a.s. to the optimal point). *If Assumptions 1-5 hold, then the sequence $\{x_i(t)\}$ converges a.s. to $x_{\mathcal{L}}^*$ for every $i \in \mathcal{L}$ and $T_0 \geq 0$.*

Proof. By Corollary 1 there exists a finite time T_f such that every legitimate agent i classifies correctly all of its legitimate and malicious neighbors at all times $t \geq T_f$ a.s. Thus, the dynamic (7) including malicious agents is equivalent to the nominal dynamic (14) with the initial inputs $z_i(0) = x_i(\max\{T_f, T_0\})$ where $i \in \mathcal{L}$. By Theorem 1, the dynamic (14) converges to $x_{\mathcal{L}}^*$. Additionally, by Assumption 3, $x_{\mathcal{L}}(T_f)$ is finite for every finite T_f . Applying Corollary 1 with the a.s. finiteness of T_f concludes the proof. \square

B. Convergence to optimal point in mean

Next, we establish the convergence in mean of each sequence $x_i(t)$ to $x_{\mathcal{L}}^*$, where $i \in \mathcal{L}$.

Theorem 3 (Convergence in mean to the optimal point). *If Assumptions 1-5 hold, then for every $T_0 \geq 0$, the sequence $\{x_i(t)\}$ converges in the r -th mean to $x_{\mathcal{L}}^*$ for every $i \in \mathcal{L}$ and $r \geq 1$, i.e.,*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[\|x_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^r] = 0 \quad \text{for all } r \geq 1.$$

We present two types of proofs for this theorem, the first relies on the a.s. convergence of Theorem 2 and Assumption 3. For the sake of completeness of presentation, we additionally establish convergence in mean by definition in Appendix II.

Proof via Dominated Convergence Theorem. By Assumption 3 and the triangle inequality, we have $\|x - y\|^r \leq (2\eta)^r < \infty$ for every $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$. Recalling Theorem 2 we can apply the Dominated Convergence Theorem (see [54, Theorem 1.6.7]) to each sequence $\{\|x_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^r\}$, $i \in \mathcal{L}$, to conclude the result. \square

VI. FINITE TIME ANALYSIS: EXPECTED CONVERGENCE RATE

This section derives analytical guarantees for the finite time regime in the form of the expected convergence rate. We present two upper bounds on the convergence rate. The first upper bound, stated in Theorem 4, relies on Lemma 2 to provide probabilistic bounds on the correct classification time, and on the convergence rate of the nominal dynamic (14) which ignores the inputs of malicious agents. We tighten this bound in Theorem 5 by analyzing the dynamic (7) directly utilizing the bounds on the error probabilities presented in Lemma 1.

A. The Expected convergence rate via the correct classification time

Utilizing Theorem 1 and Lemma 2 we can upper bound the expected suboptimality gap by upper bounding the contributions to the suboptimality gap by the event $\{T_f \leq m\}$ and its complement. For each m this leads to an upper bound that coincides with (16) subject to a time shift with m and an additive error term of the probability that $\{T_f > m\}$. Since for every m either $\{T_f \leq m\}$ is correct or its complement, we can take the minimum over the derived upper bounds.

Theorem 4. *If Assumptions 1-5 hold, then for every $t \geq T_0$ we have that the average mean squared error is bounded by a decaying function such that:*

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{E}[\|x_i(t) - x^*\|^2] \leq \min_{m \in [T_0: t-1]} \left\{ \min \left\{ 4\eta^2, \frac{4\bar{h}(t-m)}{\mu(t-m)(t-m+1)} + 4\eta^2 p_e(m) \right\} \right\}. \quad (17)$$

Before proving this theorem we present the following corollary by choosing strategic values of m in the objective function of the RHS of (17).

Corollary 3. For every $t \geq \max\{T_0, 1\} + 1$ the mean squared error $\frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{E}[\|x_i(t) - x^*\|^2]$ is upper bounded by $U_1(t, T_0)$ and $U_2(t, T_0)$

$$U_1(t, T_0) \triangleq \min \left\{ 4\eta^2, \frac{4\bar{h}(t - T_0)}{\mu(t - T_0)(t - T_0 + 1)} + 4\eta^2 p_e(T_0) \right\}, \quad (18)$$

$$U_2(t, T_0) \triangleq \min \left\{ 4\eta^2, \frac{16\bar{h}\left(\frac{t - T_0}{2}\right)}{\mu(t - T_0)(t - T_0 + 2)} + 4\eta^2 p_e\left(\frac{t + T_0}{2} - 1\right) \right\}, \quad (19)$$

Further, for $m_3(t) \triangleq \lceil \frac{\ln(t(D_{\mathcal{L}} + D_{\mathcal{M}})) - \ln(1 - \exp(-2\min\{E_{\mathcal{L}}^2, E_{\mathcal{M}}^2\})}{2\min\{E_{\mathcal{L}}^2, E_{\mathcal{M}}^2\}} \rceil$ for every t such that $T_0 \leq m_3(t) \leq t - 1$, the average mean squared error $\frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{E}[\|x_i(t) - x^*\|^2]$ is upper bounded by

$$U_3(t, T_0) \triangleq \min \left\{ 4\eta^2, \frac{4\bar{h}(t - m_3(t))}{\mu(t - m_3(t))(t - m_3(t) + 1)} + \frac{4\eta^2}{t} \right\}. \quad (20)$$

Proof. Since $\frac{\bar{h}(t)}{t(t+1)}$ and $p_e(t)$ are monotonically decreasing for $t \geq 1$, choosing the values, $m = T_0$, $m = (t + T_0)/2$, and $m = m_3(t)$ in (17), establishes the proof of Corollary 3. \square

We note that since both $\frac{\bar{h}(t)}{t(t+1)}$ and $p_e(t)$ are monotonically decreasing with t for all $t \geq 1$, the functions $\frac{\bar{h}(t-m)}{(t-m)(t-m+1)}$ and $p_e(m)$ have opposite monotonicity with respect to m . The three chosen values reflect this observation. The first, i.e., $m = T_0$, is aimed to minimize the term $\frac{\bar{h}(t-m)}{(t-m)(t-m+1)}$ at the expense of $p_e(m)$ which for this choice of $m = T_0$ is a constant with respect to t . This choice of m is favorable when T_0 is close to t . The choice $m = m(t) = (t + T_0)/2$ is selected so that both the terms $\frac{\bar{h}(t-m)}{(t-m)(t-m+1)}$ and $p_e(t)$ decrease as a function of t , at a linear and an exponential rate, respectively. The last choice, i.e., $m = m_3(t)$, balances the convergence rate of the two additive terms that compose the objective function of (17) and thus is best to use for large values of t .

Now, we proceed to prove Theorem 4 utilizing the law of total expectation with respect to the event $\{T_f \leq m\}$. Additionally, we provide in Section II of the supplementary material an alternative proof for Theorem 4 that considers the individual events $T_f \triangleq \max\{k, T_0\}$.

Proof of Theorem 4. For every $t - 1 \geq T_0$ and $m \in [T_0 : t - 1]$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{E}[\|x_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2] \\ & \stackrel{(a)}{=} \Pr(T_f \leq m) \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{E}[\|x_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2 | T_f \leq m] \\ & \quad + \Pr(T_f > m) \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{E}[\|x_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2 | T_f > m] \\ & \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \max_{T_f \leq m} \left\{ \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{E}[\|z_i(t - T_f) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2 | T_f] \right\} + 4\eta^2 \Pr(T_f > m) \\ & \stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \min \left\{ 4\eta^2, \frac{4\bar{h}(t - m)}{\mu(t - m)(t - m + 1)} \right\} + 4\eta^2 p_e(m), \end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the law of total expectation, (b) follows from the definition of T_f and Assumption 3, and (c) follows from the fact that $\frac{\bar{h}(t)}{t(t+1)}$ is nonincreasing for $t \geq 1$ and Lemma 2. \square

B. Convergence results via trustworthiness misclassification error probabilities

This section aims to tighten the bound on the convergence rate presented in Theorem 4 and Corollary 3. To this end, we develop an alternative analytical approach that evaluates more carefully how our choice of weights $w_{ij}(t)$, stepsize $\gamma(t)$, and T_0 , together with the quality of trust values, captured by the constants $E_{\mathcal{L}}$ and $E_{\mathcal{M}}$, affects the dynamic (7).

Lemma 4. Denote $\bar{c}_i(t) \triangleq \bar{w}_{ii}x_i(t) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{L}} \bar{w}_{ij}x_j(t)$. Let $r > 0$, $i \in \mathcal{L}$, and $t \geq 0$. Then,

$$\mathbf{E} \left[\|c_i(t) - \bar{c}_i(t)\|^r \right] \leq (2\eta)^r p_c(t)$$

Proof. First, recall that by Assumption 3 and the stochasticity of the matrices $(w_{ij})_{i \in \mathcal{L}, j \in \mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{M}}$ and $\bar{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$ we have that $\|c_i(t)\| \leq \eta$ and $\|\bar{c}_i(t)\| \leq \eta$ for every $i \in \mathcal{L}$ and $t \geq 0$. Additionally, let $W_{\mathcal{L}}(t) \triangleq (w_{ij}(t))_{i, j \in \mathcal{L}}$, then by definition $c_i(t) = \bar{c}_i(t)$ for all $i \in \mathcal{L}$ whenever $W_{\mathcal{L}}(t) = \bar{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$. Consequently, by the law of total expectation:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{E} \left[\|c_i(t) - \bar{c}_i(t)\|^r \right] \\ & = \Pr(W_{\mathcal{L}}(t) = \bar{W}_{\mathcal{L}}) \mathbf{E} \left[\|c_i(t) - \bar{c}_i(t)\|^r | W_{\mathcal{L}}(t) = \bar{W}_{\mathcal{L}} \right] \\ & \quad + \Pr(W_{\mathcal{L}}(t) \neq \bar{W}_{\mathcal{L}}) \mathbf{E} \left[\|c_i(t) - \bar{c}_i(t)\|^r | W_{\mathcal{L}}(t) \neq \bar{W}_{\mathcal{L}} \right] \\ & \leq (2\eta)^r p_c(t). \end{aligned}$$

\square

Discussion: We used the term $p_c(k)$ in Lemma 4 to avoid introducing an additional notation. Nevertheless, we can tighten this lemma by observing that in the derivation, we should only consider the neighbors of the legitimate agent i . Thus, for the purpose of Lemma 4, the constant $D_{\mathcal{L}}$ and $D_{\mathcal{M}}$ in $p_c(k)$ can be replaced with the notations $d_{\mathcal{L}} \triangleq \max_{i \in \mathcal{L}} |\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{L}|$ and $d_{\mathcal{M}} \triangleq \max_{i \in \mathcal{L}} |\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{M}|$, respectively.

Next, we present an auxiliary proposition that we utilize in upper bounding the expected distance between an agent's value and the average agents' values at time t . Here we extend [62, Lemma 11] to the case of d -dimensional vectors with *random* perturbations. Note that a naive implementation of [62, Lemma 11] for each of the dimensions $1, \dots, d$ scales the resulting upper bound by \sqrt{d} . The upper bound we next derive eliminates this scaling.

Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times |\mathcal{L}|}$ and denote by $[A]_j$ the j th column of A . The Frobenius norm of the matrix A is defined as

$$\|A\|_F \triangleq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j \in \mathcal{L}} |a_{ij}|^2} = \sqrt{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{L}} \|[A]_j\|^2} = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^d \|[A^T]_i\|^2},$$

where A^T denotes the transpose matrix of the matrix A . Additionally, we denote by $\mathbf{1}$ the all-ones column vector with $|\mathcal{L}|$ entries.

Proposition 1. *Let $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a compact and convex set. Additionally, let $W(t) \triangleq (w_{ij}(t))_{i,j \in \mathcal{L}}$ be deterministic doubly stochastic matrices such that $\sigma_2(W(t)) \leq \rho$ for all $t \geq 0$. Furthermore, let $\Delta_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 1}$ be random vectors, and let $X(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times |\mathcal{L}|}$ be defined by the following dynamic*

$$X(t+1) = X(t)W^T(t) + \Delta(t), \quad (21)$$

where $\Delta(t) = (\Delta_1(t), \dots, \Delta_{|\mathcal{L}|}(t))$ for all $t \geq 0$. Assume that there exists a non-increasing sequence $\delta(t)$ such that

$$\mathbf{E}[\|\Delta_i(t)\|^2] \leq \delta^2(t), \forall i \in \mathcal{L},$$

and let $t/2 \triangleq \lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor$ and

$$\bar{X}(t) \triangleq \frac{X(t)\mathbf{1}}{|\mathcal{L}|}\mathbf{1}^T = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} [X(t)]_i \mathbf{1}^T.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{E}[\| [X(t)]_j - \bar{X}(t) \|]}{|\mathcal{L}|} &\leq 2\eta\rho^t + \frac{\delta(0)\rho^{t/2}}{1-\rho} + \frac{\delta(t/2)}{1-\rho}, \\ \frac{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{E}[\| [X(t)]_j - \bar{X}(t) \|^2]}{|\mathcal{L}|} &\leq \left[2\eta\rho^t + \frac{\delta(0)\rho^{t/2}}{1-\rho} + \frac{\delta(t/2)}{1-\rho} \right]^2. \end{aligned}$$

We present the proof for Proposition 1 in Appendix III. We apply this proposition in establishing the upper bounds in the forthcoming lemma. Toward providing the lemma, define

$$\bar{x}_{\mathcal{L}}(t) \triangleq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} x_i(t), \text{ and}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{\mathcal{M}}(t, T_0) &\triangleq 2\eta\rho_{\mathcal{L}}^{t-T_0} + \frac{(2\eta\sqrt{p_c(T_0)} + G\gamma(0))\rho_{\mathcal{L}}^{(t-T_0)/2}}{1-\rho_{\mathcal{L}}} \\ &\quad + \frac{2(\eta\sqrt{p_c((t+T_0)/2)} + G\gamma((t-T_0)/2))}{1-\rho_{\mathcal{L}}}. \quad (22) \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5. *For every $t \geq 0$*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{E}[\|x_i(t) - \bar{x}_{\mathcal{L}}(t)\|] &\leq \delta_{\mathcal{M}}(t, T_0), \text{ and} \\ \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{E}[\|x_i(t) - \bar{x}_{\mathcal{L}}(t)\|^2] &\leq \delta_{\mathcal{M}}^2(t, T_0). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Recall that $\phi_i(t) \triangleq \Pi_{\mathcal{X}}[y_i(t)] - c_i(t)$. The matrices $W_{\mathcal{L}}(t) \triangleq (w_{ij}(t))_{i,j \in \mathcal{L}}$ are random, vary with time, and can be sub-stochastic. Thus we cannot naively apply Proposition 1 for $\Delta_i(t) = \phi_i(t)$. Instead, we substitute

$$\Delta_i(t) = c_i(t) - \bar{c}_i(t) + \phi_i(t),$$

where $\bar{c}_i(t) \triangleq \bar{w}_{ii}x_i(t) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{L}} \bar{w}_{ij}x_j(t)$. It follows that

$$x_i(t+1) = \bar{w}_{ii}x_i(t) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{L}} \bar{w}_{ij}x_j(t) + \Delta_i(t).$$

By the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality for the ℓ_2 inner product, and by the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality for expectations

$$\mathbf{E}[\|\Delta_i(t)\|^2] = \mathbf{E}[\|c_i(t) - \bar{c}_i(t) + \phi(t)\|^2]$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \mathbf{E}[\|c_i(t) - \bar{c}_i(t)\|^2] + \mathbf{E}[\|\phi_i(t)\|^2] \\ &\quad + 2\sqrt{\mathbf{E}[\|c_i(t) - \bar{c}_i(t)\|^2]}\sqrt{\mathbf{E}[\|\phi_i(t)\|^2]}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4 and Assumption 3, we further have

$$\mathbf{E}[\|c_i(t) - \bar{c}_i(t)\|^2] \leq 4\eta^2 p_c(t).$$

Additionally, by Assumption 4 and the non-expansiveness property of the projection, since $c_i(t) \in \mathcal{X}$ for all i and all t , it follows that $\|\phi_i(t)\| \leq \|y_i(t) - c_i(t)\| \leq G\gamma(t - T_0)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[\|\Delta_i(t)\|^2] &= \mathbf{E}[\|c_i(t) - \bar{c}_i(t) + \phi_i(t)\|^2] \\ &\leq 4\eta^2 p_c(t) + G^2\gamma^2(t - T_0) + 4G\eta\sqrt{p_c(t)}\gamma(t - T_0) \\ &= \left(2\eta\sqrt{p_c(t)} + G\gamma(t - T_0) \right)^2. \quad (23) \end{aligned}$$

We conclude the proof by substituting $\delta(t) = \tilde{\delta}(t + T_0) = 2\eta\sqrt{p_c(t + T_0)} + G\gamma(t)$, $W(t) = \bar{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$, and $\rho = \rho_{\mathcal{L}}$ in Proposition 1 and using the transformation $t \rightarrow t - T_0$. \square

Now, we are ready to present our tightened convergence rate guarantees for Algo. 1.

Theorem 5. *If Assumptions 1-5 hold, then Algo. 1 converges to the optimal point $x_{\mathcal{L}}^*$ in the mean-squared sense for every collection $x_i(0) \in \mathcal{X}$, $i \in \mathcal{L}$, of initial points i.e.,*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[\|x_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2] = 0, \forall i \in \mathcal{L}. \quad (24)$$

Moreover, let $\gamma(t) = \frac{2}{\mu(t+2)}$. Then, for every $T_0 \geq 0$ and T_0 there exists a function $C_{\mathcal{M}}(T_0)$ that decreases exponentially with T_0 and is independent of T such that for any collection $x_i(0) \in \mathcal{X}$, $i \in \mathcal{L}$, and for all $T \geq T_0$,

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{E}[\|x_i(T) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2] \leq \min \left\{ 4\eta^2, \frac{4\bar{h}(T - T_0) + C_{\mathcal{M}}(T_0)}{\mu(T - T_0)(T - T_0 + 1)} \right\}, \quad (25)$$

where $\bar{h}(\cdot)$ is defined in (15).

For the sake of simplicity of exposition, we only characterize the function $C_{\mathcal{M}}(T_0)$ with respect to its exponential decrease in T_0 . Nonetheless, we define the function $C_{\mathcal{M}}(T_0)$ in (28) as part of the proof of Theorem 5. Intuitively, the $C_{\mathcal{M}}(T_0)$ term above represents the error term contributed by the presence of malicious agents in the distributed network, where the starting time T_0 is captured by the shift by T_0 with respect to (16). It can be seen that for a sufficiently large T the entire term on the right of the inequality (25) decays on the order of $O(\frac{1}{T})$. Finally, we can observe that Theorem 5 tightens the bound (17) that is derived in Theorem 4 for the regime $T \gg 1$. Consequently, it also tightens the bounds (18)-(20) that are presented in Corollary 3 in that regime.

Before proceeding to prove this theorem, we point out that unlike the analysis for stochastic gradient models such as [53], in our model $w_{ij}(t)$ and $x_j(t)$ are correlated. This follows by the statistical dependence of $w_{ij}(t)$ and $w_{ij}(t-1)$. Thus, we cannot use the standard analysis which requires that $\mathbf{E}[w_{ij}(t)x_j(t)] = \mathbf{E}[w_{ij}(t)]\mathbf{E}[x_j(t)]$. Finally, we observe that the nonnegativity of the variance of random variables (24) and the sandwich theorem imply that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[\|x_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2] =$

0, $\forall i \in \mathcal{L}$. This result also holds since convergence in expectation in the r th moment implies convergence in expectation in the s th moment whenever $0 < s < r$.

Proof. By the non-expansiveness property of the projection, for every $t \geq T_0$ and $i \in \mathcal{L}$,

$$\|x_i(t+1) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2 = \|\Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(y_i(t)) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2 \leq \|y_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2.$$

Denote

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{c}_i(t) &\triangleq \bar{w}_{ii}x_i(t) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{L}} \bar{w}_{ij}x_j(t), \text{ and} \\ \bar{g}_i(t) &\triangleq \bar{c}_i(t) - \gamma(t-T_0)\nabla f_i(\bar{c}_i(t)) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $y_i(t) = c_i(t) - \gamma(t-T_0)\nabla f_i(c_i(t))$, then by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for the inner product on ℓ_2 , the triangle inequality, and the linearity of the expectation

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{E}[\|x_i(t+1) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2] \\ &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{E} \left[\|\bar{c}_i(t) - \gamma(t-T_0)\nabla f_i(\bar{c}_i(t)) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^* \right. \\ &\quad \left. + c_i(t) - \bar{c}_i(t) + \gamma(t-T_0)[\nabla f_i(\bar{c}_i(t)) - \nabla f_i(c_i(t))] \|^2 \right] \\ &\leq \underbrace{\frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{E}[\|\bar{g}_i(t)\|^2]}_{\text{(I)}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{E}[\|c_i(t) - \bar{c}_i(t)\|^2]}_{\text{(II)}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\frac{\gamma^2(t-T_0)}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{E}[\|\nabla f_i(\bar{c}_i(t)) - \nabla f_i(c_i(t))\|^2]}_{\text{(III)}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\frac{2}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{E}[\|\bar{g}_i(t)\| \cdot \|c_i(t) - \bar{c}_i(t)\|]}_{\text{(IV)}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\frac{2\gamma(t-T_0)}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{E}[\|\bar{g}_i(t)\| \cdot \|\nabla f_i(\bar{c}_i(t)) - \nabla f_i(c_i(t))\|]}_{\text{(V)}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\frac{2\gamma(t-T_0)}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{E} \left[\|c_i(t) - \bar{c}_i(t)\| \right. \\ &\quad \left. \cdot \|\nabla f_i(\bar{c}_i(t)) - \nabla f_i(c_i(t))\| \right]}_{\text{(VI)}}. \end{aligned}$$

By (3), Lemma 4 we have that (II) $\leq 4\eta^2 p_c(t)$.

Since ∇f_i are L -Lipschitz continuous

$$\text{(III)} \leq L^2 \mathbf{E}[\|\bar{c}_i(t) - c_i(t)\|^2] \leq 4L^2 \eta^2 p_c(t).$$

Now, by Lemma 4, $\mathbf{E}[\|c_i(t) - \bar{c}_i(t)\|] \leq 2\eta p_c(t)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(IV)} &\leq (2\eta + \gamma(t-T_0)G) \mathbf{E}[\|\bar{c}_i(t) - c_i(t)\|] \\ &\leq 2\eta(2\eta + \gamma(t-T_0)G) p_c(t), \end{aligned}$$

and by the L -Lipschitz continuity of ∇f_i

$$\text{(V)} \leq 2L\eta(2\eta + \gamma(t-T_0)G) p_c(t),$$

$$\text{(VI)} \leq L \mathbf{E}[\|c_i(t) - \bar{c}_i(t)\|^2] \leq 4L\eta^2 p_c(t).$$

Define $h_{\mathcal{M}}(t, T_0)$ as

$$4\eta^2 p_c(t) \left[2(L+1) + \gamma^2(t-T_0)L^2 + \frac{\gamma(t-T_0)G(L+1)}{2\eta} \right],$$

and recall that $\bar{x}_{\mathcal{L}}(t) \triangleq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} x_i(t)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{E}[\|x_i(t+1) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2] \\ &\leq \text{(I)} + h_{\mathcal{M}}(t, T_0) \\ &\leq h_{\mathcal{M}}(t, T_0) + \frac{(1-\mu\gamma(t-T_0))}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{E}[\|x_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2] \\ &\quad + \gamma^2(t-T_0)G^2 + \frac{2\gamma(t-T_0)}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \left[G \mathbf{E}[\|x_i(t) - \bar{x}_{\mathcal{L}}(t)\|] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\mu+L}{2} \mathbf{E}[\|x_i(t) - \bar{x}_{\mathcal{L}}(t)\|^2] \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Assumption 4, the convexity of $\|\cdot\|^2$ and the double stochasticity of $\bar{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$.

Recall (22) and denote

$$\tilde{h}_{\mathcal{M}}(t, T_0) \triangleq \gamma(t-T_0)G^2 + 2G\delta_{\mathcal{M}}(t, T_0) + (\mu+L)\delta_{\mathcal{M}}^2(t, T_0).$$

Here, the term $\tilde{h}_{\mathcal{M}}(t, T_0)$ is affected by the distributed nature of our optimization process and the presence of malicious agents. We utilize Lemma 5 to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{E}[\|x_i(t+1) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2] \leq \gamma(t-T_0)\tilde{h}_{\mathcal{M}}(t, T_0) \\ &\quad + h_{\mathcal{M}}(t, T_0) + \frac{(1-\mu\gamma(t-T_0))}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{E}[\|x_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, since $|\mathcal{L}| < \infty$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[\|x_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2] = 0, \forall i \in \mathcal{L}, \quad (26)$$

whenever $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma(t) = \infty$ and $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^2(t) < \infty$.

To prove the second part of the theorem, we let $\gamma(t) = \frac{2}{\mu(t+2)}$ as proposed in [58]. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{E}[\|x_i(t+1) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2] \leq \frac{2\tilde{h}_{\mathcal{M}}(t, T_0)}{\mu(t-T_0+2)} \\ &\quad + h_{\mathcal{M}}(t, T_0) + \frac{t}{t-T_0+2} \cdot \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{E}[\|x_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2]. \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying both sides by $(t-T_0+1)(t-T_0+2)$ and summing over the set $t \in \{T_0, T_0+1, \dots, T-1\}$ yield the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{E}[\|x_i(T) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2] \leq \frac{2 \sum_{t=T_0}^{T-1} (t-T_0+1)\tilde{h}_{\mathcal{M}}(t, T_0)}{\mu(T-T_0)(T-T_0+1)} \\ &\quad + \frac{\sum_{t=T_0}^{T-1} (t-T_0+1)(t-T_0+2)h_{\mathcal{M}}(t, T_0)}{(T-T_0)(T-T_0+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the identity $\sqrt{a+b} \leq \sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b}$, we deduce that

$$\sqrt{p_c(t)} \leq \sqrt{D_{\mathcal{L}}} e^{-tE_{\mathcal{L}}} + \sqrt{D_{\mathcal{M}}} e^{-tE_{\mathcal{M}}}. \quad (27)$$

In addition, we utilize the identities for $|v| \in (0,1)$

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} tv^t = \frac{v}{(1-v)^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} t^2 v^t = \frac{2v}{(1-v)^3}.$$

Denote

$$\tilde{C}_1(T_0, E, D) \triangleq \frac{16\eta e^{-T_0 E^2} \sqrt{D}}{1-\rho_{\mathcal{L}}} \left[\frac{G}{(1-e^{-E^2})^2} + \frac{G + (\eta + \frac{4}{\mu})(\mu + L)}{(1-\rho_{\mathcal{L}})^2} + \frac{(\mu + L)(G + 2\mu\sqrt{D}e^{-T_0 E^2})}{\mu(1-\rho_{\mathcal{L}})^3} \right],$$

and $C_1(T_0) \triangleq \tilde{C}_1(T_0, E_{\mathcal{L}}, D_{\mathcal{L}}) + \tilde{C}_1(T_0, E_{\mathcal{M}}, D_{\mathcal{M}})$.

Further algebra yields that

$$\sum_{t=T_0}^{T-1} (t-T_0+1) \tilde{h}_{\mathcal{M}}(t, T_0) \leq 2\bar{h}(t-T_0) + C_1(T_0),$$

here, the added term $C_1(T_0)$ captures the influence of the malicious agents on the term (I). Additionally, denote

$$\tilde{C}_2(T_0, E, D) \triangleq \frac{4\eta(L+1)De^{-2T_0 E^2}}{(1-e^{-2E^2})} \cdot \left[\frac{4\eta e^{-2E^2}}{(1-e^{-2E^2})^2} + \frac{(6\eta + \frac{G}{\mu})e^{-2E^2}}{1-e^{-2E^2}} + 4\eta + \frac{4\eta L}{\mu^2} + \frac{G}{\mu} \right],$$

and $C_2(T_0) \triangleq \tilde{C}_2(T_0, E_{\mathcal{L}}, D_{\mathcal{L}}) + \tilde{C}_2(T_0, E_{\mathcal{M}}, D_{\mathcal{M}})$.

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{t=T_0}^{T-1} (t-T_0+1)(t-T_0+2)h_{\mathcal{M}}(t, T_0) \\ &= 8\eta^2(L+1) \sum_{t=0}^{T-T_0-1} (t+1)(t+2)p_c(t+T_0) \\ &+ 4\eta^2 L^2 \sum_{t=0}^{T-T_0-1} (t+1)(t+2)\gamma^2(t)p_c(t+T_0) \\ &+ 2\eta G(L+1) \sum_{t=0}^{T-T_0-1} (t+1)(t+2)\gamma(t)p_c(t+T_0) \leq C_2(T_0). \end{aligned}$$

We conclude the proof by letting

$$C_{\mathcal{M}}(T_0) = 2C_1(T_0) + \mu C_2(T_0). \quad (28)$$

□

Thus, we have shown that indeed we are able to recover convergence to the optimal value of the original distributed optimization problem given in (1), even in the presence of malicious agents. Further, we have established an upper bound on the expected value of $\|x_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2$, for all $i \in \mathcal{L}$, as a function of the time t as given by (25) in Theorem 5.

VII. NUMERICAL RESULTS

This section presents numerical results that validate the convergence results we derived for Algo. 1.




Fig. 1. Undirected graph G . Two agents are neighbors if they are connected by an edge. Legitimate and malicious agents are depicted by blue and red nodes, respectively. Since every malicious agent is connected to all legitimate agents, all malicious agents are captured by a single node for simplicity of presentation. Edges between legitimate agents are depicted by black solid lines. Edges between legitimate and malicious agents are depicted by red dashed lines.

We consider a distributed network with $|\mathcal{L}| = 15$ legitimate agents and $|\mathcal{M}| \in \{15, 30\}$ malicious agents. To maximize the malicious agents' impact, every malicious agent is connected to all the legitimate agents. The legitimate agent's connectivity is captured by Fig. 1.

The trust values are generated as follows. Let $\mathbf{E}[\alpha_{ij}(t)] = 0.55$ if $j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{L}$, and $\mathbf{E}[\alpha_{ij}(t)] = 0.45$ if $j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{M}$. The random variable $\alpha_{ij}(t)$ is uniformly distributed on the interval $[\mathbf{E}[\alpha_{ij}(t)] - \frac{\ell}{2}, \mathbf{E}[\alpha_{ij}(t)] + \frac{\ell}{2}]$, for every $i \in \mathcal{L}$ and $j \in \mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{M}$. We consider the values $\ell: 0.6, 0.8$, in both scenarios $|E_{\mathcal{L}}| = |E_{\mathcal{M}}| = 0.05$, however, the variance of the trust values when $\ell = 0.8$ are higher. We remark that the legitimate agents are ignorant regarding the values $\mathbf{E}[\alpha_{ij}]$ and ℓ . Due to the stochasticity of the trust values, we average the numerical results across 100 system realizations. Furthermore, we use the following stepsize $\gamma(t) = \frac{2}{t+2} \cdot \mathbb{1}_{\{t \geq 0\}}$.

Denote for every client i , $a_i \in \mathbb{R}^d, b_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Additionally, denote $\lambda \geq 0$, and define for every agent $i \in \mathcal{L}$ the following strongly convex loss with ℓ_2 regularizer:

$$f_i(x) = \frac{1}{2}(a_i^T x - b_i)^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2}\|x\|^2.$$

We constrain the legitimate agents' values to lie in the d -dimensional ball that is centered at the origin, i.e., $\mathcal{X} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x\| \leq \eta\}$, where $\eta = 30$. It follows that the global optimization problem the legitimate agents aim to solve distributively is

$$\min_{\|x\| \leq \eta} \left\{ \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \frac{1}{2}(a_i^T x - b_i)^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2}\|x\|^2 \right\}. \quad (29)$$

Furthermore, denote by $x_{\mathcal{L}}^{*UC}$ the optimal point of the unconstrained counterpart of (29), that is $x_{\mathcal{L}}^{*UC} = \left(\lambda I + \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} a_i a_i^T \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} a_i b_i \right)$. Then, the optimal point of (29) is

$$x_{\mathcal{L}}^* = \left((\nu + \lambda)I + \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} a_i a_i^T \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} a_i b_i \right),$$

where ν is a dual variable that is set to zero if $\|x_{\mathcal{L}}^{*UC}\| < \eta$. Otherwise, it is set such that $\|x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\| = \eta$.

In this setup for every $i \in \mathcal{L}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\nabla f_i(x) = a_i(a_i^T x - b_i) + \lambda x \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(x) = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\eta}{\|x\|} \right\} \cdot x.$$

To evaluate the performance of Algo. 1 we denote the average squared error at time t by $\bar{\epsilon}(t) \triangleq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \|x_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2$.

The W-MSR algorithm [11] for robust distributed optimization, which we use for comparison in the supplementary material for the one-dimensional case, is only valid for one-dimensional data values. Thus, as a benchmark we compare our results to the multi-dimensional extension of the W-MSR algorithm proposed in [63]. Following the notations in [11], we denote by F the maximal number of highest values and lowest values that each legitimate agent discards, overall a legitimate agent may ignore no more than $2F$ values for $d=1$. We note that in this case the number of tolerated malicious inputs for the W-MSR algorithm is reduced by a factor of d , i.e., the dimension of the data values. Additionally, we use the nominal case with no malicious agents (14) as another benchmark to evaluate the performance of Algo. 1.

In our numerical results, we use the following auxiliary vector $(\tilde{b}_i)_{i=1}^{15} = (115.7, 163.3, -81.7, 127.2, -63.7, 58.4, -3.1, 62.9, 54.5, 144.9, -121.1, 9.3, -2.6, -124.5, 131)$. Note that setting $d=1$, $a_i=1$, and $\lambda=0$ results in a one-dimensional constrained consensus problem. We consider this special case in Section III in the supplementary material.

Next, we examine a multi-dimensional setup where both the optimal solution and the updates are affected by the constraint set \mathcal{X} . We set $d=5$ and $\lambda=0.1$. Additionally, we set $b_i = \tilde{b}_i/2$ for all $i \in \mathcal{L}$, and

$$[(a_i)_{i=1}^{15}]^T = \begin{pmatrix} -0.87 & -1.05 & -2.81 & -0.4 & -1.76 \\ -0.88 & -0.34 & 0.34 & -2.46 & 0.44 \\ -0.25 & 0.47 & -0.09 & -0.99 & -2.33 \\ -0.27 & -0.61 & -2.5 & -0.79 & 0.46 \\ -0.23 & 1.83 & 0.89 & -0.83 & -0.67 \\ -1.6 & 0.27 & -0.81 & -2.77 & -0.21 \\ -1.42 & -1.11 & -1.63 & -0.66 & -1.54 \\ -1.19 & -0.3 & -1.97 & -1.42 & -1.21 \\ -1.43 & -1.64 & 0.17 & -2.11 & -2.11 \\ -0.73 & 0.46 & -0.42 & -1.75 & 0.22 \\ -0.97 & -0.12 & -2.35 & -2.51 & -1.63 \\ -1.18 & -1.42 & -0.13 & -1.66 & 0.36 \\ -0.63 & -2.19 & -1.15 & -1.65 & -2.02 \\ 0.59 & -2.08 & 0.26 & -0.74 & -2.66 \\ -3.05 & -0.7 & 0.2 & -1.94 & -1.4 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (30)$$

The optimal point of the nominal dynamic (14), when no malicious agents are present, rounded to the second digit after the decimal point is $x_{\mathcal{L}}^* \approx (-20.95, -6.15, -5.92, -3.54, 19.39)^T$. Additionally, the inputs of the malicious agents at all times are $-x_{\mathcal{L}}^*$ which is the farthest point from $x_{\mathcal{L}}^*$ in \mathcal{X} .

Figs. 2 and 3 capture the average value of the squared distance of each legitimate agent from the optimal point $x_{\mathcal{L}}^*$, i.e., the average value of $\bar{\epsilon}(t)$, for each time t . The plots presented in Figs. 2 and 3 for our higher dimensional setup are consistent with the one-dimensional setup which is captured in Figs. 1-4 in the supplementary material. We can see that Algo. 1 performs well and mitigates the harmful effect of malicious inputs even in higher dimensions. This is in contrast to the multi-dimensional W-MSR algorithm [63] which is more vulnerable to malicious attacks as the dimension of the data values, i.e., d , increases.

In particular, Algo. 1 provides resilience to malicious activity and can tolerate even $30 = 2|\mathcal{L}|$ malicious agents, as evident in Figs. 2 and 3. Furthermore, we can see from Figs. 2




Fig. 2. Average $\bar{\epsilon}(t)$ as a function of t for $|\mathcal{M}| = 15, \ell = 0.8$.




Fig. 3. Average $\bar{\epsilon}(t)$ as a function of t for $|\mathcal{M}| = 30, \ell = 0.6$.

and 3 that Algo. 1 is robust to undesirably small values of $|E_{\mathcal{L}}|$ and $|E_{\mathcal{M}}|$ where the trust observations are less informative. Figs. 2 and 3 demonstrate how our algorithm eventually recovers the global optimum as predicted by theory regardless of the value of the observation window T_0 . Thus, the value of T_0 mostly dictates the rate of recovery of the global optimum. Particularly, Figs. 2 and 3 show that the variance of the trust values has more impact on T_0 values that are smaller than 100. This occurs since the higher variance of the trust values increases the misclassification errors. Since the probability of these errors decreases with T_0 , they are less impactful when T_0 is 100 or higher. Finally, we refer the reader to Section III in the supplementary material for additional numerical results.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

This work studies the problem of resilient distributed optimization in the presence of malicious activity. We consider the case where additional information in the form of stochastic inter-agent trust values is available. Under this model, we propose a mechanism for exploiting these trust values where legitimate agents learn to distinguish between their legitimate and malicious neighbors. We incorporate this mechanism to arrive at resilient distributed optimization where strong performance guarantees can be recovered. Specifically, we prove that our algorithm converges to the optimal solution of the nominal distributed optimization system with no malicious

agents, both in expectation and almost surely. Additionally, we present two mechanisms to derive upper bounds on the expected distance of the agents' iterates from the optimal solution. The first is based on the correct classification of all malicious and legitimate agents. The second approach utilizes the dynamic of the attacked system to carefully tighten the upper bound on the expected convergence rate. Finally, we present numerical results that demonstrate the performance of our proposed distributed optimization framework.

The use of stochastic trust values allows us to recover convergence to the *global optimum* in distributed optimization problems even when more than half of the network is malicious. This represents a very challenging case where not many strong performance results are currently available, particularly in the case of distributed optimization problems. Thus the results of this paper strengthen our characterization of achievable performance and provide novel tools for resilient trust-centered optimization in multi-agent systems.

APPENDIX I

Proof of Lemma 2. Denote for every $k \geq 0$

$$\mathcal{E}(k) \triangleq \bigcup_{\substack{i \in \mathcal{L}, \\ j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{L}}} \{\beta_{ij}(k) < 0\} \bigcup_{\substack{i \in \mathcal{L}, \\ j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{M}}} \{\beta_{ij}(k) \geq 0\}.$$

By Lemma 1, for all $k \geq 1$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(T_f = k) &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \Pr\left(\mathcal{E}(k-1)\right) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \sum_{\substack{i \in \mathcal{L}, \\ j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{L}}} \Pr(\beta_{ij}(k-1) < 0) + \sum_{\substack{i \in \mathcal{L}, \\ j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{M}}} \Pr(\beta_{ij}(k-1) \geq 0) \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} |\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{L}| \exp(-2(k-1)E_{\mathcal{L}}^2) \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} |\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{M}| \exp(-2(k-1)E_{\mathcal{M}}^2), \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where (a) follows from the definition of T_f in Corollary 1 which implies that if $T_f = k$ there must be a misclassification error in the legitimacy of agents at time $k-1$, (b) follows from the union bound, and (c) follows from Lemma 1. Now, since by definition, $p_c(-1) \geq 1$ we can conclude (11).

From the definition of T_f in Corollary 1 $\Pr(T_f > k-1) = 1$ for $k=0$. Additionally, by the union bound, for all $k \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(T_f > k-1) &= \Pr\left(\bigcup_{t \geq k-1} \mathcal{E}(t)\right) \leq \sum_{t=k-1}^{\infty} \Pr(\mathcal{E}(t)) \\ &\leq \sum_{t=k-1}^{\infty} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} |\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{L}| \exp(-2tE_{\mathcal{L}}^2) \\ &\quad + \sum_{t=k-1}^{\infty} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} |\mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{M}| \exp(-2tE_{\mathcal{M}}^2) \\ &= D_{\mathcal{L}} \frac{\exp(-2(k-1)E_{\mathcal{L}}^2)}{1 - \exp(-2E_{\mathcal{L}}^2)} + D_{\mathcal{M}} \frac{\exp(-2(k-1)E_{\mathcal{M}}^2)}{1 - \exp(-2E_{\mathcal{M}}^2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Observe that $\Pr(T_f > k-1)$ vanishes as k tends to infinity. \square

APPENDIX II

Proof by Definition of Theorem 3. Let us assume that $t \geq 2T_0$. Denote $M_k \triangleq \max\{k, T_0\}$ and $t/2 \triangleq \lfloor \frac{t}{2} \rfloor$. Next, we utilize the law of total expectation as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[\|x_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^r] &= \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}[\|x_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^r | T_f]] \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \Pr(T_f = k) \mathbf{E}[\|x_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^r | T_f = k] \\ &\quad + \Pr(T_f > t-1) \mathbf{E}[\|x_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^r | T_f > t-1] \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \Pr(T_f = k) \mathbf{E}[\|x_{\mathcal{L}}(t, T_f = k) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^r | T_f = k] \\ &\quad + \Pr(T_f > t-1) \mathbf{E}[\|x_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^r | T_f > t-1] \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \Pr(T_f = k) \mathbf{E}[\|z_i(t - M_k) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^r | T_f = k] \\ &\quad + \Pr(T_f > t-1) (2\eta)^r. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we upper bound the term $\sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \Pr(T_f = k) \mathbf{E}[\|z_i(t - M_k) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^r | T_f = k]$ utilizing the upper bounds (11) and (16) which hold for every initial point $z_i(0) \in \mathcal{X}$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \Pr(T_f = k) \mathbf{E}[\|z_i(t - M_k) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^r | T_f = k] \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{t/2} \Pr(T_f = k) \left[\frac{4\bar{h}(t - M_k)|\mathcal{L}|}{\mu(t - M_k)(t - M_k + 1)} \right]^{\frac{r}{2}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=t/2+1}^{t-1} \Pr(T_f = k) \cdot \min \left\{ \left[\frac{4\bar{h}(t - M_k)|\mathcal{L}|}{\mu(t - M_k)(t - M_k + 1)} \right]^{\frac{r}{2}}, (2\eta)^r \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, since $t \geq 2T_0$ and $\frac{\bar{h}(t)}{t(t+1)}$ is a decreasing function we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k=0}^{t/2} \Pr(T_f = k) \left[\frac{4\bar{h}(t - M_k)|\mathcal{L}|}{\mu(t - M_k)(t - M_k + 1)} \right]^{\frac{r}{2}} \\ &\leq \left[\frac{4\bar{h}(t/2)|\mathcal{L}|}{\mu(t/2)(t/2 + 1)} \right]^{\frac{r}{2}} \sum_{k=1}^{t/2} \Pr(T_f = k) \leq \left[\frac{4\bar{h}(t/2)|\mathcal{L}|}{\mu(t/2)(t/2 + 1)} \right]^{\frac{r}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k=t/2+1}^{t-1} \Pr(T_f = k) \cdot \min \left\{ \left[\frac{4\bar{h}(t - M_k)|\mathcal{L}|}{\mu(t - M_k)(t - M_k + 1)} \right]^{\frac{r}{2}}, (2\eta)^r \right\} \\ &\leq (2\eta)^r \sum_{k=t/2+1}^{t-1} \Pr(T_f = k) \leq (2\eta)^r \Pr(T_f > t/2) \leq (2\eta)^r p_e(t/2). \end{aligned}$$

Additionally by (12), $\Pr(T_f > t-1) [2\eta]^r \leq [2\eta]^r p_e(t-1)$. Consequently, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}[\|x_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^r] = 0, \forall r \geq 1$. \square

APPENDIX III

Proof of Proposition 1. First, we utilize the identity

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{L}} \|[A]_j\|^2 = \|A\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2, \quad (33)$$

and the upper bound $\frac{1}{2}(\|[A]_i\|^2 + \|[A]_j\|^2) \geq \|[A]_i\| \cdot \|[A]_j\|$ to deduce that

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{L}} \|[A]_j\| \leq \sqrt{|\mathcal{L}|} \cdot \|A\|_{\mathbb{F}}. \quad (34)$$

Thus, in what follows, we focus our efforts on upper bounding the Frobenius norms $\|X(t) - \bar{X}(t)\|_{\mathbb{F}}$ and $\|X(t) - \bar{X}(t)\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2$.

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \Delta(t) - \frac{\Delta(t)\mathbf{1}}{|\mathcal{L}|} \mathbf{1}^T \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} &= \sqrt{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{L}} \left\| [\Delta(t)]_j - \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{L}} [\Delta(t)]_k \right\|^2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{L}} \|[\Delta(t)]_j\|^2} = \|\Delta(t)\|_{\mathbb{F}}. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Additionally,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \left(X(t) - \frac{X(t)\mathbf{1}}{|\mathcal{L}|} \mathbf{1}^T \right) W^T(t) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ &= \left\| W(t) \left(X(t) - \frac{X(t)\mathbf{1}}{|\mathcal{L}|} \mathbf{1}^T \right)^T \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^d \left\| W(t) \left([X^T(t)]_i - \mathbf{1} \frac{\mathbf{1}^T [X^T(t)]_i}{|\mathcal{L}|} \right) \right\|^2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^d \rho^2 \left\| \left([X^T(t)]_i - \mathbf{1} \frac{\mathbf{1}^T [X^T(t)]_i}{|\mathcal{L}|} \right) \right\|^2} \\ &= \rho \left\| X(t) - \frac{X(t)\mathbf{1}}{|\mathcal{L}|} \mathbf{1}^T \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|X(t+1) - \bar{X}(t+1)\|_{\mathbb{F}} &= \left\| X(t+1) - \frac{X(t+1)\mathbf{1}}{|\mathcal{L}|} \mathbf{1}^T \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ &= \left\| X(t)W^T(t) + \Delta(t) - \frac{[X(t) + \Delta(t)]\mathbf{1}}{|\mathcal{L}|} \mathbf{1}^T \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \left\| X(t)W^T(t) - \frac{X(t)\mathbf{1}}{|\mathcal{L}|} \mathbf{1}^T \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} + \left\| \Delta(t) - \frac{\Delta(t)\mathbf{1}}{|\mathcal{L}|} \mathbf{1}^T \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \left\| X(t)W^T(t) - \frac{X(t)\mathbf{1}}{|\mathcal{L}|} \mathbf{1}^T \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} + \|\Delta(t)\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} \left\| \left(X(t) - \frac{X(t)\mathbf{1}}{|\mathcal{L}|} \mathbf{1}^T \right) W^T(t) \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} + \|\Delta(t)\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{\leq} \rho \left\| X(t) - \frac{X(t)\mathbf{1}}{|\mathcal{L}|} \mathbf{1}^T \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} + \|\Delta(t)\|_{\mathbb{F}}, \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

where (a) follows from the triangle inequality, (b) follows from (35), (c) follows from the double stochasticity of $W(t)$, and (d) follows from (36).

Thus,

$$\|X(t) - \bar{X}(t)\|_{\mathbb{F}} \leq \rho^t \left\| X(0) - \frac{X(0)\mathbf{1}}{|\mathcal{L}|} \mathbf{1}^T \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} + \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \rho^{t-1-k} \|\Delta(k)\|_{\mathbb{F}}.$$

Now, since $\mathbf{E}[\|\Delta_i(t)\|^2] \leq \delta^2(t)$ for all $i \in \mathcal{L}$, and by the

non-negativity of the variance of $\|\Delta(k)\|_{\mathbb{F}}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[\|\Delta(k)\|_{\mathbb{F}}] &\leq \sqrt{\mathbf{E}[\|\Delta(k)\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2]} = \sqrt{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{E}[\|\Delta_j(k)\|^2]} \\ &\leq \sqrt{|\mathcal{L}| \delta^2(k)} = \sqrt{|\mathcal{L}|} \delta(k), \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

then $\mathbf{E}[\|\Delta_i(t)\|] \leq \delta(t)$ for all $i \in \mathcal{L}$.

It follows from (3)

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| X(0) - \frac{X(0)\mathbf{1}}{|\mathcal{L}|} \mathbf{1}^T \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} &= \sqrt{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{L}} \left\| \left[X(0) - \frac{X(0)\mathbf{1}}{|\mathcal{L}|} \mathbf{1}^T \right]_j \right\|^2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{L}} \left(\|[X(0)]_j\| + \left\| \left[\frac{X(0)\mathbf{1}}{|\mathcal{L}|} \mathbf{1}^T \right]_j \right\| \right)^2} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{L}} (2\eta)^2} = 2\eta \sqrt{|\mathcal{L}|}. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathbf{E}[\|X(t) - \bar{X}(t)\|_{\mathbb{F}}]}{|\mathcal{L}|} &\leq \frac{2\eta}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{L}|}} \rho^t + \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{L}|}} \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \rho^{t-1-k} \delta(k) \\ &\leq \frac{2\eta}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{L}|}} \rho^t + \frac{\delta(0)}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{L}|}} \cdot \frac{\rho^{t/2}}{1-\rho} + \frac{\delta(t/2)}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{L}|}(1-\rho)}. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \|X(t) - \bar{X}(t)\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 &\leq \rho^{2t} \left\| X(0) - \frac{X(0)\mathbf{1}}{|\mathcal{L}|} \mathbf{1}^T \right\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \\ &\quad + 2\rho^t \left\| X(0) - \frac{X(0)\mathbf{1}}{|\mathcal{L}|} \mathbf{1}^T \right\|_{\mathbb{F}} \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \rho^{t-1-k} \|\Delta(k)\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{k_1=0}^{t-1} \sum_{k_2=0}^{t-1} \rho^{t-1-k_1} \rho^{t-1-k_2} \|\Delta(k_1)\|_{\mathbb{F}} \cdot \|\Delta(k_2)\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ &\leq \rho^{2t} 4\eta^2 |\mathcal{L}| + 4\rho^t \eta \sqrt{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{k=1}^{t-1} \rho^{t-1-k} \|\Delta(k)\|_{\mathbb{F}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{k_1=0}^{t-1} \sum_{k_2=0}^{t-1} \rho^{t-1-k_1} \rho^{t-1-k_2} \|\Delta(k_1)\|_{\mathbb{F}} \cdot \|\Delta(k_2)\|_{\mathbb{F}}. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

By the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality for expectations

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[\|\Delta(k_1)\|_{\mathbb{F}} \cdot \|\Delta(k_2)\|_{\mathbb{F}}] &\leq \sqrt{\mathbf{E}[\|\Delta(k_1)\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2]} \sqrt{\mathbf{E}[\|\Delta(k_2)\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2]} \\ &\leq |\mathcal{L}| \delta(k_1) \delta(k_2). \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathbf{E}[\|X(t) - \bar{X}(t)\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2]}{|\mathcal{L}|} &\leq 4\eta^2 \rho^{2t} + 4\rho^t \eta \left[\frac{\delta(0)\rho^{t/2}}{1-\rho} + \frac{\delta(t/2)}{(1-\rho)} \right] + \left[\frac{\delta(0)\rho^{t/2}}{1-\rho} + \frac{\delta(t/2)}{(1-\rho)} \right]^2 \\ &= \left[2\eta \rho^t + \frac{\delta(0)\rho^{t/2}}{1-\rho} + \frac{\delta(t/2)}{(1-\rho)} \right]^2. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

We conclude the proof by utilizing (33), (34). \square

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Yemini, A. Nedić, S. Gil, and A. J. Goldsmith, “Resilience to malicious activity in distributed optimization for cyberphysical systems,” in *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2022.
- [2] T. Halsted, O. Shorinwa, J. Yu, and M. Schwager, “A survey of distributed optimization methods for multi-robot systems,” 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2103.12840.pdf>
- [3] M. Zhu and S. Martínez, *Distributed optimization-based control of multi-agent networks in complex environments*. Springer, 2015.
- [4] T. Li, A. K. Sahu, A. Talwalkar, and V. Smith, “Federated learning: Challenges, methods, and future directions,” *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 50–60, 2020.
- [5] A. Nedić and A. Ozdaglar, “Distributed subgradient methods for multi-agent optimization,” *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 48–61, 2009.
- [6] S. Boyd, N. Parikh, E. Chu, B. Peleato, and J. Eckstein, “Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers,” *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–122, 2011.
- [7] A. Nedić and A. Olshevsky, “Distributed optimization over time-varying directed graphs,” *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 60, no. 3, pp. 601–615, 2015.
- [8] G. Lan and Y. Zhou, “Asynchronous decentralized accelerated stochastic gradient descent,” *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Inf. Theory*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 802–811, 2021.
- [9] G. Lan, Y. Ouyang, and Y. Zhou, “Graph topology invariant gradient and sampling complexity for decentralized and stochastic optimization,” 2021, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2101.00143.pdf>.
- [10] N. Ravi, A. Scaglione, and A. Nedić, “A case of distributed optimization in adversarial environment,” in *IEEE Int. Conf. Acoust. Speech Signal Process. (ICASSP)*, 2019, pp. 5252–5256.
- [11] S. Sundaram and B. Ghahsifard, “Distributed optimization under adversarial nodes,” *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 1063–1076, 2019.
- [12] A.-Y. Lu and G.-H. Yang, “Distributed secure state estimation in the presence of malicious agents,” *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 66, no. 6, pp. 2875–2882, 2021.
- [13] J. Tsitsiklis, D. Bertsekas, and M. Athans, “Distributed asynchronous deterministic and stochastic gradient optimization algorithms,” *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 31, no. 9, pp. 803–812, 1986.
- [14] A. Nedić and A. Olshevsky, “Stochastic gradient-push for strongly convex functions on time-varying directed graphs,” *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 61, no. 12, pp. 3936–3947, 2016.
- [15] M. Zhu and S. Martínez, “On distributed constrained formation control in operator–vehicle adversarial networks,” *Automatica*, vol. 49, no. 12, pp. 3571–3582, 2013.
- [16] K. Saulnier, D. Saldana, A. Prorok, G. J. Pappas, and V. Kumar, “Resilient flocking for mobile robot teams,” *IEEE Robotics and Automation letters*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 1039–1046, 2017.
- [17] F. Pasqualetti, A. Bicchi, and F. Bullo, “Consensus computation in unreliable networks: A system theoretic approach,” *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 90–104, 2012.
- [18] A. A. Cárdenas, T. Roosta, G. Taban, and S. Sastry, *Cyber Security: Basic Defenses and Attack Trends*, 2008, pp. 73–101.
- [19] A. A. Cardenas, S. Amin, and S. Sastry, “Secure control: Towards survivable cyber-physical systems,” in *International Conference on Distributed Computing Systems Workshops*, 2008, pp. 495–500.
- [20] J. Xiong and K. Jamieson, “Securearray: Improving wifi security with fine-grained physical-layer information,” in *Annual International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking*, ser. MobiCom, 2013.
- [21] Y. Mo, S. Weerakkody, and B. Sinopoli, “Physical authentication of control systems: Designing watermarked control inputs to detect counterfeit sensor outputs,” *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 93–109, 2015.
- [22] S. Gil, S. Kumar, M. Mazumder, D. Katabi, and D. Rus, “Guaranteeing spoof-resilient multi-robot networks,” *Autonomous Robots*, vol. 41, pp. 1383–1400, 2017.
- [23] C. E. Shannon, “Channels with side information at the transmitter,” *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 289–293, 1958.
- [24] C. Pippin and H. Christensen, “Trust modeling in multi-robot patrolling,” in *IEEE Int. Conf. Robot. Autom. (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 59–66.
- [25] A. Nedić, A. Ozdaglar, and P. A. Parrilo, “Constrained consensus and optimization in multi-agent networks,” *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 55, no. 4, pp. 922–938, 2010.
- [26] S. S. Ram, A. Nedić, and V. V. Veeravalli, “Distributed stochastic subgradient projection algorithms for convex optimization,” *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, vol. 147, no. 3, pp. 516–545, 2010.
- [27] J. C. Duchi, A. Agarwal, and M. J. Wainwright, “Dual averaging for distributed optimization: Convergence analysis and network scaling,” *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 57, no. 3, pp. 592–606, 2012.
- [28] K. I. Tsianos, S. Lawlor, and M. G. Rabbat, “Push-sum distributed dual averaging for convex optimization,” in *IEEE Conf. Decision Control (CDC)*, 2012, pp. 5453–5458.
- [29] —, “Consensus-based distributed optimization: Practical issues and applications in large-scale machine learning,” in *Allert. Conf. Commun. Control Comput.*, 2012, pp. 1543–1550.
- [30] K. I. Tsianos and M. G. Rabbat, “Distributed strongly convex optimization,” in *Allert. Conf. Commun. Control Comput.*, 2012, pp. 593–600.
- [31] S. Magnússon, C. Enyioha, N. Li, C. Fischione, and V. Tarokh, “Convergence of limited communication gradient methods,” *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 63, no. 5, pp. 1356–1371, 2018.
- [32] R. Saha, S. Rini, M. Rao, and A. J. Goldsmith, “Decentralized optimization over noisy, rate-constrained networks: Achieving consensus by communicating differences,” *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 449–467, 2022.
- [33] Y. Tang, J. Zhang, and N. Li, “Distributed zero-order algorithms for nonconvex multiagent optimization,” *IEEE Trans. Control Netw. Syst.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 269–281, 2021.
- [34] W. Abbas, Y. Vorobeychik, and X. Koutsoukos, “Resilient consensus protocol in the presence of trusted nodes,” in *International Symposium on Resilient Control Systems (ISRCS)*, 2014, pp. 1–7.
- [35] J. S. Baras and X. Liu, “Trust is the cure to distributed consensus with adversaries,” in *2019 27th Mediterranean Conference on Control and Automation (MED)*, 2019, pp. 195–202.
- [36] C. Zhao, J. He, and Q.-G. Wang, “Resilient distributed optimization algorithm against adversarial attacks,” *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 65, no. 10, pp. 4308–4315, 2020.
- [37] B. Turan, C. A. Uribe, H.-T. Wai, and M. Alizadeh, “Resilient primal-dual optimization algorithms for distributed resource allocation,” *IEEE Trans. Control Netw. Syst.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 282–294, 2021.
- [38] W. Fu, Q. Ma, J. Qin, and Y. Kang, “Resilient consensus-based distributed optimization under deception attacks,” *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, vol. 31, no. 6, pp. 1803–1816, 2021.
- [39] S. Yu and S. Kar, “Secure distributed optimization under gradient attacks,” *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 71, pp. 1802–1816, 2023.
- [40] T. Ding, Q. Xu, S. Zhu, and X. Guan, “A convergence-preserving data integrity attack on distributed optimization using local information,” in *IEEE Conf. Decision Control (CDC)*, 2020, pp. 3598–3603.
- [41] M. Yemini, A. Nedić, A. J. Goldsmith, and S. Gil, “Characterizing trust and resilience in distributed consensus for cyberphysical systems,” *IEEE Trans. Robot.*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 71–91, 2022.
- [42] J. Duchi, E. Hazan, and Y. Singer, “Adaptive subgradient methods for online learning and stochastic optimization,” *Journal of machine learning research*, vol. 12, no. 7, 2011.
- [43] S. Ghadimi and G. Lan, “Optimal stochastic approximation algorithms for strongly convex stochastic composite optimization, i: a generic algorithmic framework,” *SIAM J. Optim.*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 1469–1492, 2012.
- [44] —, “Optimal stochastic approximation algorithms for strongly convex stochastic composite optimization, ii: shrinking procedures and optimal algorithms,” *SIAM J. Optim.*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 2061–2089, 2013.
- [45] R. Johnson and T. Zhang, “Accelerating stochastic gradient descent using predictive variance reduction,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, (Eds.) C. J. C. Burges, L. Bottou, Z. Ghahramani, and K. Q. Weinberger, 2013, pp. 315–323.
- [46] A. Jalilzadeh, A. Nedić, U. V. Shanbhag, and F. Yousefian, “A variable sample-size stochastic quasi-Newton method for smooth and nonsmooth stochastic convex optimization,” in *IEEE Conf. Decision Control (CDC)*, 2018, pp. 4097–4102.
- [47] C. Wilson, V. Veeravalli, and A. Nedić, “Adaptive sequential stochastic optimization,” *IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr.*, vol. 64, no. 2, pp. 496–509, 2019.
- [48] A. Nedić and S. Lee, “On stochastic subgradient mirror-descent algorithm with weighted averaging,” *SIAM J. Optim.*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 84–107, 2014.
- [49] S. Pu and A. Nedić, “Distributed stochastic gradient tracking methods,” *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 187, pp. 409–457, 2021.
- [50] S. Gil, M. Yemini, A. Chorti, A. Nedić, H. V. Poor, and A. J. Goldsmith, “How physicality enables trust: A new era of trust-centered cyberphysical systems,” in *arXiv:2311.07492*, 2023.

- [51] S. Gil, S. Kumar, M. Mazumder, D. Katabi, and D. Rus, "Adaptive communication in multi-robot systems using directionality of signal strength," *IJRR*, 2015.
- [52] S. Kumar, S. Gil, D. Katabi, and D. Rus, "Accurate indoor localization with zero start-up cost," in *Proceedings of the Annual International Conference on Mobile Computing and Networking*, 2014, pp. 483–494.
- [53] M. O. Sayin, N. D. Vanli, S. S. Kozat, and T. Başar, "Stochastic subgradient algorithms for strongly convex optimization over distributed networks," *IEEE Trans. Netw. Sci. Eng.*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 248–260, 2017.
- [54] R. Durrett, *Probability: theory and examples*, 5th ed. Belmont, CA: Duxbury Press, 2019.
- [55] M. Yemini, A. Leshem, and A. Somekh-Baruch, "The restless hidden markov bandit with linear rewards and side information," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 69, pp. 1108–1123, 2021.
- [56] A. Olshevsky, "Linear time average consensus and distributed optimization on fixed graphs," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 55, no. 6, pp. 3990–4014, 2017.
- [57] B. Charron-Bost, "Geometric bounds for convergence rates of averaging algorithms," *Information and Computation*, vol. 285, p. 104909, 2022.
- [58] S. Lacoste-Julien, M. Schmidt, and F. R. Bach, "A simpler approach to obtaining an $O(1/t)$ convergence rate for the projected stochastic subgradient method," 2012. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1212.2002.pdf>
- [59] Q. Li, C.-Y. Yau, and H.-T. Wai, "Multi-agent performative prediction with greedy deployment and consensus seeking agents," *Adv. Neural Inf. Process.*, vol. 35, pp. 38 449–38 460, 2022.
- [60] S. Liu, Z. Qiu, and L. Xie, "Convergence rate analysis of distributed optimization with projected subgradient algorithm," *Automatica*, vol. 83, pp. 162–169, 2017.
- [61] W. Choi and J. Kim, "On the convergence analysis of the decentralized projected gradient descent," in *arXiv:2303.08412*, 2023.
- [62] A. Nedić, A. Olshevsky, and M. G. Rabbat, "Network topology and communication - computation tradeoffs in decentralized optimization," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 106, no. 5, pp. 953–976, 2018.
- [63] K. Kuwaranacharoen, L. Xin, and S. Sundaram, "Byzantine-resilient distributed optimization of multi-dimensional functions," in *2020 American Control Conference (ACC)*, 2020, pp. 4399–4404.
- [64] H. J. LeBlanc, H. Zhang, X. Koutsoukos, and S. Sundaram, "Resilient asymptotic consensus in robust networks," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 766–781, 2013.

Supplementary Material: Resilient Distributed Optimization for Multi-Agent Cyberphysical Systems

Michal Yemini, Angelia Nedić, Andrea J. Goldsmith, Stephanie Gil

For the sake of completeness of presentation, this supplementary material includes complimentary proofs and discussions that the main manuscript could not elaborate on. Specifically, Section I presents the proof of Theorem 1 which analyzes the dynamic of the nominal case with no malicious agents. Section II presents an alternative proof by definition of Theorem 4. Finally, Section III includes additional numerical results and evaluations.

I. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Here, we aim to explore the dynamic (2) when $T_0 = 0$, $\mathcal{M} = \emptyset$ and the legitimate agents are aware that all the agents are legitimate. In this scenario the dynamic (2) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} r_i(t) &= \bar{w}_{ii}z_i(t) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{L}} \bar{w}_{ij}z_j(t) \\ y_i(t) &= r_i(t) - \gamma(t)\nabla f_i(r_i(t)), \\ \phi_i(t) &= \Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(y_i(t)) - r_i(t), \\ z_i(t+1) &= r_i(t) + \phi_i(t) = \Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(y_i(t)). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Denote $Z(t) \triangleq (z_1(t), \dots, z_{|\mathcal{L}|}(t))$ and $\Phi(t) \triangleq (\phi_1(t), \dots, \phi_{|\mathcal{L}|}(t))$, then

$$Z(t+1) = \bar{W}_{\mathcal{L}}Z(t) + \Phi(t),$$

where by Lemma 3, $\|\phi_i(t)\| \leq \gamma(t)G$. Thus we can utilize Proposition 1 to upper bound the distance of an agent value from that of the average. Denote

$$\bar{z}(t) \triangleq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} z_i(t),$$

and

$$g(t) \triangleq \min \left\{ 2\eta, \rho_{\mathcal{L}}^t 2\eta + \frac{\rho_{\mathcal{L}}^{t/2} G \gamma(0)}{1 - \rho_{\mathcal{L}}} + \frac{G \gamma(t/2)}{1 - \rho_{\mathcal{L}}} \right\}. \quad (2)$$

Observe that by the double stochasticity of $\bar{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$ we have that $\bar{z}(t) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} r_i(t)$.

Corollary (Supplementary) 1. For every $t \in |\mathcal{L}|$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \|z_i(t) - \bar{z}(t)\| &\leq g(t), \text{ and} \\ \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \|z_i(t) - \bar{z}(t)\|^2 &\leq g^2(t). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Proof. This is a direct result of (3) and of Proposition 1 (in the main manuscript), for deterministic $\Delta(t)$ where

$$[\Delta(t)]_i = \phi_i(t),$$

and

$$\delta(t) = \gamma(t)G.$$

□

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1. Under the dynamic (1), for every $i \in \mathcal{L}$ and $t \in |\mathcal{L}|$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \|z_i(t+1) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(y_i(t)) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \|\Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(y_i(t)) - \Pi_{\mathcal{X}}(x_{\mathcal{L}}^*)\|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \|y_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \|r_i(t) - \gamma(t)\nabla f_i(r_i(t)) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \|r_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2 + \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \gamma^2(t) \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \|\nabla f_i(r_i(t))\|^2 - \frac{2}{|\mathcal{L}|} \gamma(t) \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} [\nabla f_i(r_i(t))]^T (r_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*).
\end{aligned}$$

The convexity of $\|\cdot\|^2$ and the double stochasticity of $\overline{W}_{\mathcal{L}}$ yields that

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \|r_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \|z_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|,$$

and

$$\|\overline{z}(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2 = \left\| \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} r_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^* \right\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \|r_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2.$$

Additionally, we can conclude from Corollary 2 that

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \gamma^2(t) \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \|\nabla f_i(r_i(t))\|^2 \leq \gamma^2(t) G^2.$$

Thus, by the μ -strong convexity of f_i , $\forall i \in \mathcal{L}$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -2 \frac{\gamma(t)}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} [\nabla f_i(r_i(t))]^T (r_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*) \\
&= \frac{2\gamma(t)}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} [\nabla f_i(r_i(t))]^T (x_{\mathcal{L}}^* - r_i(t)) \\
&\leq \frac{2\gamma(t)}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \left[f_i(x_{\mathcal{L}}^*) - f_i(r_i(t)) - \frac{\mu}{2} \|r_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2 \right] \\
&\leq \frac{2\gamma(t)}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} [f_i(x_{\mathcal{L}}^*) - f_i(r_i(t))] - \frac{2\gamma(t)\mu}{2} \|\overline{z}(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2 \\
&= \frac{2\gamma(t)}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \left[f_i(x_{\mathcal{L}}^*) - f_i(\overline{z}(t)) - \frac{\mu}{2} \|z_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2 \right] + \frac{2\gamma(t)}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} [f_i(\overline{z}(t)) - f_i(r_i(t))] + \frac{\gamma(t)\mu}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \|z_i(t) - \overline{z}(t)\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we upper bound the terms in the last line by utilizing the L Lipschitz continuity of ∇f_i :

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{2\gamma(t)}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} [f_i(\overline{z}(t)) - f_i(r_i(t))] \\
&\leq \frac{2\gamma(t)}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \left[(\nabla f_i(r_i(t)))^T (\overline{z}(t) - r_i(t)) + \frac{L}{2} \|z_i(t) - \overline{z}(t)\|^2 \right] \\
&\leq \frac{2\gamma(t)}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \left[G \|r_i(t) - \overline{z}(t)\| + \frac{L}{2} \|z_i(t) - \overline{z}(t)\|^2 \right] \\
&\leq \frac{2\gamma(t)}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \left[G \|z_i(t) - \overline{z}(t)\| + \frac{L}{2} \|z_i(t) - \overline{z}(t)\|^2 \right].
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \|z_i(t+1) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \|z_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2 + \gamma^2(t)G^2 + \frac{2\gamma(t)}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \left[G\|z_i(t) - \bar{z}(t)\| + \frac{\mu+L}{2}\|z_i(t) - \bar{z}(t)\|^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Denote,

$$h(t) = G^2\gamma(t) + 2Gg(t) + (\mu+L)g^2(t).$$

We use Corollary (Supplementary) 1 to deduce that

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \|z_i(t+1) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2 \leq (1 - \mu\gamma(t)) \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \|z_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2 + \gamma(t)h(t). \quad (4)$$

Consequently,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|z_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\| = 0, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{L}, \quad (5)$$

whenever $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma(t) = \infty$ and $\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^2(t) < \infty$.

Motivated by [58] we let $\gamma(t) = \frac{2}{\mu(t+2)}$. It follows that

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \|z_i(t+1) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2 \leq \frac{t}{t+2} \cdot \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \|z_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2 + \frac{2h(t)}{\mu(t+2)}. \quad (6)$$

Multiplying both sides by $(t+1)(t+2)$ yields the following upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} & (t+1)(t+2) \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \|z_i(t+1) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2 \\ & \leq t(t+1) \cdot \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \|z_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2 + \frac{2(t+1)h(t)}{\mu}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Summing both sides over the set $t = 0, 1, \dots, T-1$ yields the upper bound:

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \|z_i(T) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2 \leq \frac{2 \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (t+1)h(t)}{\mu T(T+1)}. \quad (8)$$

To conclude the proof we upper bound the term $\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (t+1)h(t)$. To this end, we utilize the identity

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} (t+1)x^t = (1-x)^{-2},$$

for all $|x| \in (0, 1)$ as follows

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (t+1)h(t) = \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (t+1) (G^2\gamma(t) + 2Gg(t) + (\mu+L)g^2(t)). \quad (9)$$

Now,

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (t+1)G^2\gamma(t) = \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (t+1)G^2 \frac{2}{\mu(t+2)} \leq \frac{2G^2T}{\mu}. \quad (10)$$

Additionally,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (t+1)2Gg(t) \\
& \leq 2G \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (t+1) \left[\rho_{\mathcal{L}}^t 2\eta + \frac{\rho_{\mathcal{L}}^{t/2} G\gamma(0)}{1-\rho_{\mathcal{L}}} + \frac{G\gamma(t/2)}{1-\rho_{\mathcal{L}}} \right] \\
& \leq 4\eta G \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (t+1)\rho_{\mathcal{L}}^t + \frac{2G^2\gamma(0)}{1-\rho_{\mathcal{L}}} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (t+1)\rho_{\mathcal{L}}^{t/2} + \frac{4G^2T}{\mu(1-\rho_{\mathcal{L}})} \\
& \leq \frac{4\eta G}{1-\rho_{\mathcal{L}}} + \frac{4G^2\gamma(0)}{1-\rho_{\mathcal{L}}} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (t+1)\rho_{\mathcal{L}}^t + \frac{4G^2T}{\mu(1-\rho_{\mathcal{L}})} \\
& = \frac{4\eta G}{1-\rho_{\mathcal{L}}} + \frac{4G^2}{\mu(1-\rho_{\mathcal{L}})^3} + \frac{4G^2T}{\mu(1-\rho_{\mathcal{L}})}, \tag{11}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows since

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (t+1)\rho_{\mathcal{L}}^{t/2} \leq \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (2t+1)\rho_{\mathcal{L}}^t + \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (2t)\rho_{\mathcal{L}}^t \leq 2 \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (t+1)\rho_{\mathcal{L}}^t. \tag{12}$$

Finally, since $|\rho_{\mathcal{L}}| < 1$ then $(1-\rho_{\mathcal{L}}^x)^{-1} \leq (1-\rho_{\mathcal{L}})^{-1}$ for all $x \geq 1$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\mu+L) \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (t+1)g^2(t) \\
& \leq (\mu+L) \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (t+1) \left[\rho_{\mathcal{L}}^t 2\eta + \frac{\rho_{\mathcal{L}}^{t/2} G\gamma(0)}{1-\rho_{\mathcal{L}}} + \frac{G\gamma(t/2)}{1-\rho_{\mathcal{L}}} \right]^2 \\
& \leq \frac{4\eta^2(\mu+L)}{(1-\rho_{\mathcal{L}})^2} + \frac{2G^2(\mu+L)}{\mu^2(1-\rho_{\mathcal{L}})^4} + \frac{16(\mu+L)G^2 \ln\left(\frac{T+2}{2}\right)}{\mu^2(1-\rho_{\mathcal{L}})^2} + \frac{8G\eta(\mu+L)}{\mu(1-\rho_{\mathcal{L}})^3} + \frac{16G\eta(\mu+L)}{\mu(1-\rho_{\mathcal{L}})^2} + \frac{16G^2(\mu+L)}{\mu^2(1-\rho_{\mathcal{L}})^2} \\
& = \frac{4(\mu+L)(\mu\eta+2G)^2}{\mu^2(1-\rho_{\mathcal{L}})^2} + \frac{2G^2(\mu+L)}{\mu^2(1-\rho_{\mathcal{L}})^4} + \frac{8G\eta(\mu+L)}{\mu(1-\rho_{\mathcal{L}})^3} + \frac{16(\mu+L)G^2}{\mu^2(1-\rho_{\mathcal{L}})^2} \ln\left(\frac{T+2}{2}\right). \tag{13}
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, by utilizing the notation (15) we can conclude that

$$\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (t+1)h(t) \leq 2\bar{h}(T).$$

□

We note that it may be possible to extend the explicit upper bound presented in Theorem 1 to a general choices of γ_t by extending the recently proposed [59, Lemma 6]. This can lead to tighter upper bounds where an optimized stepsize can be chosen to reduce the current upper bound.

II. PROOF BY DEFINITION OF THEOREM 4

For the sake of completeness of discussion, we provide an alternative proof for Theorem 4, where we use the law of total expectation with respect to the events $\{T_f = k\}_{k=0}^{t-1}$ and $\{T_f > t-1\}$.

An Alternative Proof for Theorem 4. First, note that $\frac{\bar{h}(t)}{t(t+1)}$ is nonincreasing function of t for $t \geq 1$. Denote $M_k \triangleq \max\{k, T_0\}$.

For every $t - 1 \geq T_0$ and $m \in [T_0 : t - 1]$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{E} [\|x_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2] \\
& \stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \Pr(T_f = k) \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{E} [\|x_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2 | T_f = k] + \Pr(T_f > t-1) \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{E} [\|x_i(t) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2 | T_f > t-1] \\
& \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} \Pr(T_f = k) \mathbf{E} [\|z_i(t - M_k) - x_{\mathcal{L}}^*\|^2 | T_f = k] + 4\eta^2 \Pr(T_f > t-1) \\
& \stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \Pr(T_f = k) \min \left\{ 4\eta^2, \frac{4\bar{h}(t - M_k)}{\mu(t - M_k)(t - M_k + 1)} \right\} + 4\eta^2 \Pr(T_f > t-1) \\
& \leq \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \Pr(T_f = k) \min \left\{ 4\eta^2, \frac{4\bar{h}(t - M_k)}{\mu(t - M_k)(t - M_k + 1)} \right\} + 4\eta^2 \Pr(T_f > t-1) \\
& \leq \sum_{k=0}^m \Pr(T_f = k) \min \left\{ 4\eta^2, \frac{4\bar{h}(t - M_k)}{\mu(t - M_k)(t - M_k + 1)} \right\} \\
& + \sum_{k=m+1}^{t-1} \Pr(T_f = k) \min \left\{ 4\eta^2, \frac{4\bar{h}(t - M_k)}{\mu(t - M_k)(t - M_k + 1)} \right\} + 4\eta^2 \Pr(T_f > t-1) \\
& \leq \min \left\{ 4\eta^2, \frac{4\bar{h}(t - m)}{\mu(t - m)(t - m + 1)} \right\} \underbrace{\sum_{k=0}^m \Pr(T_f = k)}_{\leq 1} + 4\eta^2 \sum_{k=m+1}^{t-1} \Pr(T_f = k) + 4\eta^2 \Pr(T_f > t-1) \\
& \leq \min \left\{ 4\eta^2, \frac{4\bar{h}(t - m)}{\mu(t - m)(t - m + 1)} \right\} + 4\eta^2 \Pr(T_f > m) \\
& = \min \left\{ 4\eta^2, \frac{4\bar{h}(t - m)}{\mu(t - m)(t - m + 1)} \right\} + 4\eta^2 p_e(m),
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the law of total expectation, (b) follows from the definition of T_f and Assumption 3, (c) follows from Theorem 1, and the remaining steps follow since $\frac{\bar{h}(t)}{t(t+1)}$ is nonincreasing function of t for $t \geq 1$ and from Lemma 2. \square

III. ADDITIONAL NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section we present additional numerical results for the one-dimensional case. We first present numerical results of the mean squared error, and then include a numerical comparison of the upper bound for the average mean squared error and discuss their merits.

A. Consensus with Constraints

We examine the following consensus problem with constraints where $\mathcal{X} = [-50, 50]$, i.e., here $\eta = 50$. The legitimate agents aim to minimize the function

$$\min_{x \in [-50, 50]} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{L}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{L}} f_i(x),$$

where $f_i(x) = \frac{1}{2}(x - b_i)^2$ and $b_i = \tilde{b}_i$ for all $i \in \mathcal{L}$.

The optimal nominal value is $x_{\mathcal{L}}^* = x_{\mathcal{L}}^{\text{UC}} \approx 31.367$ for our choice of $(b_i)_{i=1}^{15}$, where we round the solution to the second digit after the decimal point. Consequently, the dynamic (7) can be written as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
c_i(t) &= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(t) \cup \{i\}} w_{ij}(t) x_j(t) \\
y_i(t) &= c_i(t) - \frac{\mathbf{1}_{\{t - T_0 \geq 0\}}}{t - T_0 + 2} \cdot (c_i(t) - b_i), \\
x_i(t+1) &= \mathbf{1}_{\{y_i(t) \in \mathcal{X}\}} y_i(t) + \text{sign}(y_i(t)) \eta \mathbf{1}_{\{y_i(t) \notin \mathcal{X}\}}
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

for the choice $\gamma(t) = \frac{2}{t+2}$. The initial values of the legitimate agents are chosen randomly and uniformly in the interval $[-\eta, \eta]$. Note that in this setup the optimal point lies in the constraint set \mathcal{X} . Nonetheless, the set \mathcal{X} affects the update rule (14) and limits the data values at all times to be in the set \mathcal{X} .




Fig. 1: Average $\bar{e}(t)$ as a function of t for $|\mathcal{M}| = 15$ and the noise in the stochastic trust value is chosen as $\ell = 0.8$.




Fig. 2: Average $\bar{e}(t)$ as a function of t for $|\mathcal{M}| = 30$, and the noise in the stochastic trust value is chosen as $\ell = 0.6$.

To maximize the harmful impact of malicious agents on our analytical results, we choose the malicious agents' values to be equal to -50 , i.e., $-\eta$, at all times. We choose this easy-to-spot malicious attack since it maximizes the deviation of the malicious inputs from the optimal nominal solution. Nonetheless, our algorithm can tolerate *arbitrary* malicious node inputs including the time-varying case or small deviation case that is usually much harder to detect.

As a benchmark, we compare the performance of our proposed Algo. 1 to that of [11] which adapts the W-MSR consensus algorithm [64] to the case of one-dimensional distributed optimization problems where $d = 1$.

1) *Trust Values with Uniform Distribution*: First, we consider the setup in the main paper where the trust observations are distributed as follows. Let $\mathbf{E}[\alpha_{ij}(t)] = 0.55$ if $j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{L}$, and $\mathbf{E}[\alpha_{ij}(t)] = 0.45$ if $j \in \mathcal{N}_i \cap \mathcal{M}$. The random variable $\alpha_{ij}(t)$ is uniformly distributed on the interval $[\mathbf{E}[\alpha_{ij}(t)] - \frac{\ell}{2}, \mathbf{E}[\alpha_{ij}(t)] + \frac{\ell}{2}]$, for every $i \in \mathcal{L}$ and $j \in \mathcal{N}_i$. We consider the values $\ell = 0.6$ and $\ell = 0.8$, in both scenarios $|E_{\mathcal{L}}| = |E_{\mathcal{M}}| = 0.05$.

Figs. 1 and 2 capture the average mean squared distance of the legitimate agents from the optimal point $x_{\mathcal{L}}^*$ for each time t . We can see that the W-MSR algorithm fails to converge to the optimal solution (i.e., nominal consensus point). This occurs due to the high number of malicious agents, which is higher in this case than the tolerance threshold¹ in [11]. Additionally, generally the W-MSR algorithm is not guaranteed to converge to the optimal value $x_{\mathcal{L}}^*$ but to a value in the convex hull of $\Pi_{[-\eta, \eta]}(b_i)$, $i \in \mathcal{L}$. In our case, this convex hull is exactly the interval $[-\eta, \eta]$, thus the W-MSR algorithm cannot guarantee the reduction of the distance to the optimal value with respect to the interval $[-\eta, \eta]$. In contrast, Algo. 1 provides resilience to malicious activity and can tolerate even $30 = 2|\mathcal{L}|$ malicious agents, as evident in Figs. 1 and 2. Furthermore, we can see from Figs. 1 and 2 that Algo. 1 is robust to small values of $|E_{\mathcal{L}}|$ and $|E_{\mathcal{M}}|$. Finally, Figs. 1 and 2 show the effect of the variance of the trust values on the incentive to increase T_0 . In Fig. 1, we can benefit from increasing T_0 up to 100. This occurs since the higher variance of the trust values increases the misclassification errors. Since the probability of these errors decreases with T_0 , they are less impactful when T_0 is 100 or higher. However, we can see that when we decrease in Fig. 2 the variance

¹We can upper bound the tolerance threshold for this setup by 2 following our argument in [41].




Fig. 3: Average $\bar{e}(t)$ of as a function of t for $|\mathcal{M}| = 15$ Bernoulli trust observations.




Fig. 4: Average $\bar{e}(t)$ as a function of t for $|\mathcal{M}| = 30$ for Bernoulli trust observations.

of the trust values by setting $\ell = 0.6$, it is not beneficial to increase T_0 beyond 25. Note that regardless of the value of the observation window T_0 , our algorithm eventually recovers the global optimum as predicted by theory. Thus, the value of T_0 mostly dictates *the rate* of recovery of the global optimum.


2) Trust Values with Bernoulli Distribution: We now consider trust value observations that are distributed according to Bernoulli random variables. That is, $\alpha_{ij}(t) \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p_{ij})$ where $p_{ij} = 0.6$ for $i, j \in \mathcal{L}$, i.e., both i and j are legitimate, and $p_{ij} = 0.4$ for $i \in \mathcal{L}$ and $j \in \mathcal{M}$. The importance and uniqueness of this choice of distribution stem from the fact that the Bernoulli distribution with parameter p has the highest variance, i.e., $p(1-p)$, among all the distributions defined over the sample space $[0, 1]$ with expectation p . Overall, this setup has larger variances than the one we examined in the previous subsection, even when taking into account the slightly improved values of $|E_{\mathcal{L}}| = |E_{\mathcal{M}}| = 0.1$ it leads to. Figs. 3 and 4 show that in this setup, increasing T_0 even beyond 100 can reduce the average mean squared error as opposed to Figs. 1 and 2 where increasing T_0 could lead to increased average mean squared error evaluations which are noticeable for smaller running time t .

B. Evaluating Analytical Bounds


Generally, upper bounds such as (16), (18)–(20), and (25) are utilized to understand the rate of convergence and are not necessarily tight in a finite time regime. In particular, their dependence on the worst-case scenario in using constants such as the maximal gradient and the second largest eigenvalue modulus of the weight matrix leads to somewhat loose bounds for short-time regimes, even in the nominal case where no malicious agents are present. In what follows we examine the relations between the upper bounds (16), (18)–(20), and (25). We will see that these bounds exhibit a more pessimistic view of the average mean squared error when compared with the numerical evaluation of Algorithm 1. Nonetheless, the intuitions they lead to are valuable in understanding and forecasting how different system components, such as the precision of the trust observation, the connectivity, etc., influence it. For our comparison, we chose the simple one-dimensional setup we presented in the previous subsection, where $|E_{\mathcal{L}}|$ and $|E_{\mathcal{M}}|$ are set to 0.1. Thus, $\mathbf{E}(\alpha_{ij}(t)) = 0.6$ for $i, j \in \mathcal{L}$, and $\mathbf{E}(\alpha_{ij}(t)) = 0.4$ for $i \in \mathcal{L}$ and $j \in \mathcal{M}$. For this setup, we have that $G = 193.3$, $\eta = 50$ and $\rho_{\mathcal{L}} \approx 0.9$, and $\mu = L = 1$. We note that since

$G^2 \approx 3.7 \times 10^4$ and $(1 - \rho)^4 \approx 10^{-4}$ the dominant constant in the nominal case is $\frac{G^2(\mu+L)}{L(1-\rho\mathcal{L})^4} \approx 7.4 \times 10^8$, and thus taking the other constant into account, we will need approximately 10^5 iterations until the effect of the constants, i.e., the terms that do not depend on the number of iterations T , ceases to dominate the upper bound (16).

a) $O(1/T)$ expected convergence rate: We first examine the convergence rate analysis and confirm its linearity. To this end, in Figs.5a and 6a we re-plot Figs. 3 and 4, respectively, in a logarithmic scale of both axes (and omit the W-MSR plot which is redundant for this comparison). We compare these numerical plots to the analytical bounds by plotting in Figs. 5b and 6b at each time the minimal upper bound among (18)–(20), and (25). As a baseline, we additionally plot in Figs.5b and 6b the analytical upper bound (16) for a system with no malicious agents. Figs. 5 and 6 validate both numerically and analytically the $O(1/T)$ expected convergence rate.




(a) Numerical: average $\bar{e}(t)$ as a function of t .




(b) The minimum analytical upper bound of (18)–(20), and (25).

Fig. 5: Convergence rate: a system with 15 malicious agents



(a) Numerical: average $\bar{e}(t)$ as a function of t .




(b) The minimum analytical upper bound of (18)–(20), and (25).

Fig. 6: Convergence rate: A system with 30 malicious agents


b) *Increased inter-connectivity of legitimate agents reduces the average mean square distance to the optimal point:* Lastly, we examine the effect of increasing the connectivity among the legitimate agents both numerically, and analytically (according to the upper bounds (18)–(20) and (25)). To this end, we consider the topology we have considered so far that is captured in Fig. 1 where $\rho_{\mathcal{L}} \approx 0.89$ where some legitimate agents are connected to others, and every legitimate agent is connected to all malicious agents. Additionally, we increase the connectivity among the legitimate agents and consider a fully connected connectivity graph where every legitimate agent is connected to all other agents (legitimate or malicious); in this scenario $\rho_{\mathcal{L}} = 0.5$.

Figs. 7 and 8 illustrate how increasing the connectivity between the legitimate agents reduces the mean squared error (in a logarithmic scale); for the sake of clarity of presentation, we present the results for $T_0 = 100$. Specifically, Figs. 7a and 8a

capture the influence of the increased connectivity of the legitimate agents on the mean squared error of Algo. 1 numerically for systems with 15 and 30 malicious agents, respectively. Similarly, Figs. 7b and 8b present the effect of increasing the connectivity of the legitimate agents on the minimum analytical upper bound of (18)–(20) and (25), for systems with 15 and 30 legitimate agents, respectively. We can observe from Figs. 7 and 8 that increasing the connectivity among the legitimate agents decreases the mean squared error in both the numerical evaluation and analytical bounds. Thus, the intuition that the analytical bounds provide also converts to the numerical evaluation of Algo. 1. We note, however, that the anticipated improvement in performance exhibited in Figs. 7b and 8b is more modest in reality, see Figs. 7a and 8a. We believe that this occurs due to the pessimism of many upper bounds in the literature including (18)–(20) and (25), where the connectivity is captured by multiplication of terms such $(1 - \rho_{\mathcal{L}})^k$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ that is not necessarily tight; additionally, this multiplication also amplifies other pessimistic terms in (18)–(20) and (25), such as $E_{\mathcal{L}}, E_{\mathcal{M}}$ and G .




(a) Numerical: average $\bar{e}(t)$ as a function of t .




(b) The minimum analytical upper bound of (18)–(20), and (25).

Fig. 7: A system with 15 malicious agents and $T_0 = 100$



(a) Numerical: average $\bar{e}(t)$ as a function of t .



(b) The minimum analytical upper bound of (18)–(20), and (25).

Fig. 8: A system with 30 malicious agents and $T_0 = 100$