

# Dynamics-Based Algorithm-Level Privacy Preservation for Push-Sum Average Consensus

Huqiang Cheng, Xiaofeng Liao, *Fellow, IEEE*, Huaqing Li, *Senior Member, IEEE*,  
and Qingguo Lü, *Member, IEEE*

## Abstract

Average consensus is essential for multi-agent systems to achieve specific functions and is widely used in network control, information fusion, etc. In conventional average consensus algorithms, all agents reach an agreement by individual calculations and sharing information with their respective neighbors. Nevertheless, the information interactions that occur in the communication network may make privacy information be revealed. In this paper, we develop a new privacy-preserving average consensus method for unbalanced digraphs. Specifically, we ensure privacy preservation by carefully embedding randomness in mixing weights to confuse communications and introducing an extra auxiliary parameter to mask the state-updated rule in initial several iterations. In parallel, we exploit the intrinsic robustness of consensus dynamics to guarantee that the average consensus is precisely achieved. Theoretical results demonstrate that the designed algorithms can converge linearly to the exact average consensus value and can guarantee privacy preservation of agents against both honest-but-curious and eavesdropping attacks. The designed algorithms are fundamentally different compared to differential privacy based algorithms that enable privacy preservation via sacrificing consensus performance. Finally, numerical experiments validate the correctness of the theoretical findings.

## Index Terms

Average consensus, privacy preservation, push-sum, unbalanced digraph.

## I. INTRODUCTION

As is known to all, multi-agent systems are growing rapidly in many fields such as smart grid, smart transportation, and blockchain, etc. An important feature of such systems is that the agents collaborate with each other to reach a consensus. To achieve this, the average consensus algorithm has emerged. Considering a network with  $N$  agents, the objective of such algorithms is to make the states of all agents converge asymptotically to the average of their initial values.

H. Cheng, X. Liao, and Qingguo Lü are with Key Laboratory of Dependable Services Computing in Cyber Physical Society-Ministry of Education, College of Computer Science, Chongqing University, Chongqing, China, 400044. E-mail: huqiangcheng@126.com; xfliao@cqu.edu.cn; qglv@cqu.edu.cn. (*Corresponding author: Xiaofeng Liao.*)

H. Li is with Chongqing Key Laboratory of Nonlinear Circuits and Intelligent Information Processing, College of Electronic and Information Engineering, Southwest University, Chongqing, China, 400715. E-mail: huaqingli@swu.edu.cn.

Averaging consensus is an essential ingredient in decentralized networks. Typical applications include network control [1], UAV formation [2], data fusion [3], etc. In order to make all agents' states reach the average of initial values, most of average consensus methods always demand that agents share their correct states with each other. This may result in privacy information being revealed, and it is highly inadvisable from the perspective of privacy protection. Indeed, privacy protection is critical in numerous distributed collaboration applications, such as smart grids, sensor networks, banking and medical systems. This is necessary to encourage participation in collaboration, as agents are often unwilling to sacrifice their privacy for favorable performance. A simple example is a group of individuals engaging in a discussion regarding a specific topic and reaching a common view while maintaining the confidentiality of each individual view [4]. A further common example is in power systems where several generators need to agree on costs as well as ensuring the confidentiality of their respective generation information [5]. As the frequency of privacy breaches continues to rise, it has become increasingly urgent to safeguard the privacy of every individual in distributed systems.

#### A. *Related Works*

Several algorithms have been available to tackle the growing privacy concerns in average consensus. One of the mostly widespread non-encryption privacy-preserving techniques is differential privacy [6], which essentially injects the uncorrelated noise to the transmitted state information. This technique has already been applied in some algorithms [7]–[11]. However, such algorithms cannot achieve exact average consensus owing to its inherent compromise between the privacy level and the consensus accuracy. This makes differential privacy algorithms unpalatable for sensor networks and cyber-physical systems with high requirements for consensus accuracy. To ensure computational accuracy, several improvement efforts were proposed in [12]–[14], focused on the strategic addition of correlated noise to the transmitted information, as opposed to the uncorrelated noise typically utilized in differential privacy. Another stand of interest is observability-based privacy-preserving methods [15]–[17], where the privacy is guaranteed by minimizing the observation information of a certain agent. However, both the correlated-noise based and the observability based approaches are vulnerable to external eavesdroppers who have the ability to wiretap all communication channels.

Note that the above mentioned algorithm is only valid for undirected and balanced networks. In real-world scenarios, communication among agents is usually directed and unbalanced. For example, broadcasting at different power levels, the communication activity corresponds to a directed and unbalanced graph. To preserve privacy of nodes interacting on an unbalanced graph, the authors in [18]–[21] proposed a series of encryption-based algorithms by utilizing the homomorphic encryption techniques. However, this type of method requires substantial computational and communication overhead, which is unfriendly to resource-limited systems. Recently, state-decomposition based methods [22], [23] have been favored by researchers. The idea of such algorithms is to divide the states of agents into two sub-states with one containing insignificant information for communication with other agents and the other containing sensitive information only for internal information exchange. Another extension of privacy-preserving consensus is dynamics-based methods [24]–[27], which is also the focus of this work. An important benefit of such algorithms is that no trade-off exists between privacy and consensus performances, and

they are easy to implement in conjunction with techniques like homomorphic encryption, differential privacy, etc. In contrast to state-decomposition based methods, dynamics-based methods have a simpler structure and seem easier to much understand and implement. Note that some of the above privacy-preserving techniques have also been recently applied in distributed optimization literature [28]–[33].

### B. Main Contributions

In this paper, our work contributes to enrich the dynamic-based privacy-preserving methods over unbalanced directed networks. Specifically, the contributions contain the points listed next.

- i) Based on the conventional push-sum algorithm, we design a novel push-sum algorithm enabling privacy preservation. Specifically, during the initial several iterations, we ensure privacy preservation by carefully embedding randomness in mixing weights to confuse communications and introducing an extra auxiliary parameter to mask the state-updated rule. As well, to ensure consensus accuracy, exploiting the intrinsic robustness of consensus dynamics to cope with uncertain changes in information exchanges, we carefully redesign the push-sum protocol so that the “total mass” of the system is invariant in the presence of embedded randomness.
- ii) We provide a formal and rigorous analysis of convergence rate. Specifically, our analysis consists two parts. One is to analyze the consensus performance of the initial several iterations with randomness embedded, and the other is to analyze that of remaining randomness-free dynamics, which has the same structure as the conventional push-sum method [34]–[36]. Our analysis exploits the properties of the mixing matrix product and norm relations to build consensus contractions of each dynamic. The result shows that the designed algorithm attains a linear convergence rate and explicitly captures the effect of mixing matrix and network connectivity structure on convergence rate.
- iii) Relaxing the privacy notion of considering only exact initial values in [14], [37]–[39], we present two new privacy notions for honest-but-curious attacks and eavesdropping attacks (see Definition 3), respectively, where the basic idea is that the attacker has an infinite number of uncertainties in the estimation of the initial value through the available information. The privacy notions are more generalized in the context that the attacker is not only unable to determine the exact initial value but also the valid range of the initial value.
- iv) Last but not least, this paper presents a version of the privacy-preserving algorithm in the vector-state case, which has rarely been discussed in existing works. We briefly discuss its convergence and privacy properties. Moreover, we conduct some numerical experiments to verify the convergence and privacy of the proposed algorithm in scalar and vector states, respectively.

*Notations:*  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbb{N}$  are the natural and real number sets, respectively.  $\mathbf{0}$ ,  $\mathbf{1}$ , and  $\mathbf{I}$  represent all-zero vector, all-one vector, and identity matrix, respectively, whose dimensions are clear from context.  $\mathbf{A} = [A_{ij}]_{N \times N}$  represents an  $N \times N$ -dimensional matrix whose  $ij$ -th element is  $A_{ij}$ .  $[\cdot]^\top$  denotes the transpose of  $[\cdot]$ . The symbol “\” stands for set subtraction. The symbol  $|\cdot|$  is applied to the set to represent the cardinality and to the scalar value to represent absolute value.  $\otimes$  denotes the Kronecker product. The  $\ell_2$ -norm (resp.  $\ell_1$ -norm) is signified by  $\|\cdot\|$  (resp.  $\|\cdot\|_1$ ).

## II. PRELIMINARIES

We recall several important properties and concepts associated with the graph theory, conventional push-sum protocol, and privacy preservation.

### A. Graph Theory

Consider a network consisting of  $N$  agents and it is modeled as a digraph  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ , where  $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \dots, N\}$  is the agent set, and  $\mathcal{E}$  is the edge set which comprises of pairs of agents and characterizes the interactions between agents, i.e., agent  $i$  affects the dynamics of agent  $j$  if a directed line from  $i$  to  $j$  exists, expressed as  $(j, i) \in \mathcal{E}$ . Moreover, let  $(i, i) \notin \mathcal{E}$  for any  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ , i.e., no self-loop exists in digraph. We let  $\mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}} = \{j | (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}\}$  and  $\mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}} = \{j | (j, i) \in \mathcal{E}\}$  be the in-neighbor and out-neighbor sets of agent  $i$ , respectively. Notice that the senses of  $j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}}$  and  $i \in \mathcal{N}_j^{\text{in}}$  are equivalent. For  $i, j \in \mathcal{V}$ , a trail from  $i$  to  $j$  is a chain of consecutively directed lines. The digraph  $\mathcal{G}$  is *strongly connected* if at least one trail lies between any pair of agents. The associated incidence matrix  $\mathbf{R} = [R_{ie}]_{N \times |\mathcal{E}|}$  for graph  $\mathcal{G}$  is given by

$$R_{ie} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if the starting point of the } e\text{-th edge } (i, j) \text{ is } j; \\ -1, & \text{if the starting point of the } e\text{-th edge } (i, j) \text{ is } i; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

One could readily check that the sum of each column of  $\mathbf{R}$  is zero, i.e.,  $\sum_{i=1}^N R_{il} = 0$ .

**Assumption 1.** *The directed network  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$  is strongly connected, and it holds  $|\mathcal{V}| = N > 2$ .*

**Definition 1.** *(Sum one condition:) For an arbitrary matrix  $\mathbf{A} = [A_{ij}]_{N \times N}$ , if  $\sum_{i=1}^N A_{ij} = 1$ , then  $A$  is column-stochastic. We refer to it as the sum one condition.*

### B. Conventional Push-Sum Method

Regarding the investigation of average consensus, the push-sum algorithm [34]–[36] is a well-established protocol, which is summarized in Algorithm 1. All agents simultaneously update two variable states:  $x_i(k)$  and  $y_i(k)$ , and the sensitive information of agent  $i$  is the initial value  $x_i(0)$ . Define  $\mathbf{x}(k) = [x_1(k), \dots, x_N(k)]^\top$ ,  $\mathbf{y}(k) = [y_1(k), \dots, y_N(k)]^\top$ , and  $\mathbf{C} = [C_{ij}]_{N \times N}$ . We can rewrite (1) and (2) in a compact form as follows:

$$\mathbf{x}(k+1) = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{x}(k), \quad (3)$$

$$\mathbf{y}(k+1) = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{y}(k), \quad (4)$$

initialized with  $\mathbf{x}(0) = [x_1^0, \dots, x_N^0]^\top$  and  $\mathbf{y}(0) = \mathbf{1}$ . For the setting of mixing weights  $\{C_{ij} | i, j \in \mathcal{V}\}$  in Algorithm 1, we can easily know that  $\mathbf{C}$  is column-stochastic.

---

**Algorithm 1** Push-Sum Algorithm
 

---

- 1: **Initial setting:** Set  $x_i(0) = z_i(0) = x_i^0$  and  $y_i(0) = 1$  for  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ . The mixing weight associated with any edge  $(j, i) \in \mathcal{E}$  is indicated as  $C_{ji}$ . Let  $C_{ji} \in (0, 1)$  if  $j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}} \cup \{i\}$  and  $C_{ji} = 0$  otherwise. Besides,  $\sum_{j=1}^N C_{ji} = 1$  for  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ .
  - 2: **for**  $k = 0, 1, \dots$  **do**
  - 3:   Agent  $i$  sends the computed  $C_{li}x_i(k)$  and  $C_{li}y_i(k)$  to  $l \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}}$ .
  - 4:   Agent  $i$  uses  $C_{ij}x_j(k)$  and  $C_{ij}y_j(k)$  received from  $j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}}$  to update  $x_i$  and  $y_i$  as follows:
 
$$x_i(k+1) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}} \cup \{i\}} C_{ij}x_j(k), \quad (1)$$

$$y_i(k+1) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}} \cup \{i\}} C_{ij}y_j(k), \quad (2)$$
  - 5:   Agent  $i$  computes  $z_i(k+1) = x_i(k+1)/y_i(k+1)$ .
  - 6:   Until a stopping criteria is satisfied, e.g., agent  $i$  stops if  $|z_i(k+1) - \bar{x}^0| < \epsilon$  for some predefined  $\epsilon > 0$ , where  $\bar{x}^0 \triangleq \sum_{j=1}^N x_j(0)/N$ .
  - 7: **end for**
- 

Under Assumption 1,  $\mathbf{C}^k$  converges to rank-1 matrix at an exponential rate [40], [41]. Let  $\mathbf{C}^\infty$  be the infinite power of matrix  $\mathbf{C}$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{C}^\infty = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{C}^k$ . Applying the Perron-Frobenius theorem [42] gives  $\mathbf{C}^\infty = \boldsymbol{\pi} \mathbf{1}^\top$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\pi} = [\pi_1, \dots, \pi_N]^\top$ . Using facts that  $\mathbf{x}(k) = \mathbf{C}^k \mathbf{x}(0)$  and  $\mathbf{y}(k) = \mathbf{C}^k \mathbf{y}(0)$ , we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} z_i(k) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{x_i(k)}{y_i(k)} = \frac{[\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{x}(0)]_i}{[\mathbf{C}^\infty \mathbf{y}(0)]_i} = \frac{\pi_i \sum_{j=1}^N x_j(0)}{\pi_i \sum_{j=1}^N y_j(0)} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N x_j(0)}{N}, \quad (5)$$

where  $[\cdot]_i$  means the  $i$ -th element of  $[\cdot]$ . So the ratio  $z_i(k)$  gradually reaches to  $\bar{x}^0$ . See [34]–[36] for more details.

### C. Privacy Concern

We first introduce two prevalent attack types, namely, honest-but-curious attacks and eavesdropping attacks, and then explain that Algorithm 1 fails to preserve privacy due to the explicit sharing of state variables.

**Definition 2.** *An honest-but-curious attack is an attack in which some agents, who follow the state-update protocols properly, try to infer the initial values of other agents by using the received information.*

**Definition 3.** *An eavesdropping attack is an attack in which an external eavesdropper is able to capture all sharing information by wiretapping communication channels so as to infer the private information about sending agents.*

In general, in terms of information leakage, an eavesdropping attack is more devastating than an honest-but-curious attack as it can capture all transmitted information, while the latter can only access the received information. Yet, the latter has the advantage that the initial values  $\{x_j^0\}$  of all honest-but-curious agents  $j$  are accessible, which are unavailable to the external eavesdroppers.

For the average consensus, the sensitive information to be protected is the initial value  $x_i(0)$ ,  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ . Recall that at the first iteration, agent  $i$  will send the computed values  $C_{ji}x_i(0)$  and  $C_{ji}y_i(0)$  to all of its out-neighbors  $j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}}$ . Then, the initial value  $x_i(0)$  is uniquely inferable by the honest-but-curious agent  $j$  using  $x_i(0) = \frac{C_{ij}x_i(0)}{C_{ij}y_i(0)}$  and  $y_i(0) = 1$ . Therefore, the honest-but-curious agents are always able to infer the sensitive information of its in-neighbors. Likewise, one can readily check that external eavesdroppers are also able to easily infer sensitive information about all agents. Therefore, the privacy concern is not addressed in the conventional push-sum method. In this work, we try to study the privacy concern and develop a privacy-preserving version of Algorithm 1 to achieve exact average consensus.

#### D. Performance Metric

Our task is to propose an average consensus algorithm that can achieve exact convergence while guaranteeing privacy security. According to the above discussion, we thus conclude that the following two requirements for privacy-preserving push-sum algorithms must be satisfied.

- i) Exact output: After the last iteration of the algorithm, each agent should converge to the average consensus point  $\bar{x}^0$ .
- ii) Privacy preservation: During the entire algorithm implementation, the private information, i.e., the initial value  $x_i^0$ , of each legitimate agent  $i$  should be preserved against both honest-but-curious and eavesdropping attacks.

In order to respond to the above two requirements, two metrics are required to quantify them.

**Output metric:** To measure the accuracy of the output, we adopt the consensus error  $\|\mathbf{z}(k) - \bar{x}^0 \mathbf{1}\|$ . The algorithm achieves exact consensus if  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathbf{z}(k) - \bar{x}^0 \mathbf{1}\| = 0$ . Furthermore, the algorithm is said to be *elegant* if  $\|\mathbf{z}(k) - \bar{x}^0 \mathbf{1}\| = \mathcal{O}(\rho^k)$ ,  $\rho \in (0, 1)$ .

**Privacy metric:** For the honest-but-curious attacks, we consider the presence of some honest-but-curious agents  $\mathcal{H}$ . The accessible information set of  $\mathcal{H}$  is represented as  $\mathcal{I}_h(k) = \{\mathcal{I}_j(k) | j \in \mathcal{H}\}$ , where  $\mathcal{I}_j(k)$  represents the information available to agent  $j \in \mathcal{H}$  at iteration  $k$ . Given a moment  $k' \in \mathbb{N}$ , the access information of agents  $\mathcal{H}$  in time period  $0 - k'$  is  $\mathcal{I}_h(0 : k') = \cup_{0 \leq k \leq k'} \mathcal{I}_h(k)$ . For any information sequence  $\mathcal{I}_h(0 : k')$ , define  $\mathcal{S}_0^i$  as the set of all possible initial values at the legitimate agent  $i$ , where all initial values leave the information accessed by agents  $\mathcal{H}$  unchanged. That is to say, there exist any two initial values  $x_i^0, \tilde{x}_i^0 \in \mathcal{S}_0^i$  with  $x_i^0 \neq \tilde{x}_i^0$  such that  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_h(0 : k') = \mathcal{I}_h(0 : k')$ . The diameter of  $\mathcal{S}_0^i$  is defined as

$$\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{S}_0^i) = \sup_{x_i(0), \tilde{x}_i(0) \in \mathcal{S}_0^i} |x_i(0) - \tilde{x}_i(0)|.$$

For the eavesdropping attacks, we consider the presence of an external eavesdropper whose available information is denoted as  $\mathcal{I}_e(k)$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\mathcal{I}_e(0 : k') = \cup_{0 \leq k \leq k'} \mathcal{I}_e(k)$ . Similar to the honest-but-curious attacks, we define  $\mathcal{S}_0$  as the set of all possible initial values for all agents, where all initial values leave the information accessed by an external eavesdropper unchanged. That is, there exist  $\mathbf{x}(0), \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(0) \in \mathcal{S}_0$  with  $\mathbf{x}(0) \neq \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(0)$  such that  $\mathcal{I}_e(k) = \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_e(k)$ . In addition, the diameter of  $\mathcal{S}_0$  is given as

$$\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{S}_0) = \sup_{\mathbf{x}(0), \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(0) \in \mathcal{S}_0} \|\mathbf{x}(0) - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(0)\|.$$

For the honest-but-curious and eavesdropping attacks, we use  $\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{S}_0^i)$  for all legitimate agents  $i \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{S}_0)$  for all agents to measure the individual privacy and algorithm-level confidentiality, respectively. For more details, see the definition below.

**Definition 4.** *The algorithm is said to be elegant in terms of privacy preservation, if  $\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{S}_0^i) = \infty$  or  $\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{S}_0) = \infty$  for any information sequence  $\mathcal{I}_h(0 : k')$  or  $\mathcal{I}_e(0 : k')$ ,  $k' \in \mathbb{N}$ , respectively.*

The privacy concept outlined in Definition 3 shares similarities with the uncertainty-based privacy concept presented in [43], which derives inspiration from the  $l$ -diversity principle [44]. Within the  $l$ -diversity framework, the variety of any private information is gauged by the number of disparate estimates produced for the information. The higher this diversity, the more ambiguous the associated private information becomes. In our setting, the privacy information is the initial value  $x_i^0$  (resp.  $\mathbf{x}(0)$ ), whose diversity is measured by the diameter  $\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{S}_0^i)$  (resp.  $\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{S}_0)$ ). Larger diameters imply greater uncertainty in the estimation of the initial values.

**Remark 1.** *Note that Definition 3 indicates that attackers cannot uniquely determine an exact value or even a valuable range of  $x_i^0$ , and hence is more stringent than the notion defined in [14], [37]–[39], which only considers the privacy information not to be exactly inferred.*

### III. PRIVACY-PRESERVING PUSH-SUM ALGORITHM

According to the above analysis, one can know that adopting the same weight  $C_{ij}$  for both  $C_{ij}x_i(0)$  and  $C_{ij}y_i(0)$  cause privacy (i.e., initial values) leakage. To solve the issue, a dynamics-based weight generation mechanism is developed in [24], whose details are outlined in Protocol 1.

---

#### Protocol 1 Weight generation mechanism

---

- 1: **Required parameters:** Parameters  $K \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\eta \in (0, 1)$  are known to each agent.
  - 2: Two sets of tailored mixing weights associated with any edge  $(j, i) \in \mathcal{E}$  are generated. Specifically, if  $k \leq K$ , two groups of mixing weights  $\{C_{ji}^1(k) \in \mathbb{R} \mid j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}} \cup \{i\}\}$  and  $\{C_{ji}^2(k) \in \mathbb{R} \mid j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}} \cup \{i\}\}$  associated with agent  $i$  are generated, which satisfy  $\sum_{j=1}^N C_{ji}^1(k) = 1$  and  $\sum_{j=1}^N C_{ji}^2(k) = 1$ ; otherwise, only one group of mixing weights  $\{C_{ji}^1(k) = C_{ji}^2(k) = C_{ji}(k) \in (\eta, 1) \mid j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}} \cup \{i\}\}$ , also subject to  $\sum_{j=1}^N C_{ji}(k) = 1$ , is generated. Note that  $\{C_{ji}^1(k)\}$  and  $\{C_{ji}^2(k)\}$  are mixed in  $x_i$  and  $y_i$ , respectively. Moreover, agent  $i$  always sets  $C_{ji}^1(k) = 0$  and  $C_{ji}^2(k) = 0$  for  $j \notin \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}} \cup \{i\}$ .
- 

The main idea of the dynamics-based protocol is to confuse the state variables of the agents by injecting randomness into the mixing matrix in the initial few iterations. Fig. 1 briefly depicts the basic process. Obviously, the dynamics-based protocol has two stages. The first stage is from iteration  $k = 0$  to  $k = K$ , which can be regarded as a re-initialization operation on the initial value. This stage is key to privacy protection. The second stage is from  $k = K + 1$  to  $k = \infty$ , which can be viewed as the normal executions of the conventional push-sum method. This stage is key to ensuring convergence.




Fig. 1: The idea of dynamics-based protocol.

The dynamics-based method has been proved to reach an exact consensus point, and the sensitive information of legitimate agents is not inferred by honest-but-curious agents in [24]. However, there are two significant challenges that have not been addressed: I) In the initial  $K$  iterations, although each weight is arbitrary, the sum one condition still imposes a constraint on the weight setting. II) The method cannot protect sensitive information from external eavesdropping attackers.

To solve the above issues, we carefully redesign the push-sum rule to address challenges I) and II). From Protocol 1, one knows that the dynamics-based method mainly operates on the first  $K$  iterations to preserve the privacy information. Specifically, the update rule of the  $x$ -variable is given as

$$x_i(k+1) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}} \cup \{i\}} C_{ij}^1(k) x_j(k), \quad k \leq K,$$

where  $C_{ij}^1(k)$  is generated from Protocol 1. Note that the sum one condition is used to ensure that the sum of all variables at each  $k \leq K$  is invariant, that is,

$$\sum_{i=1}^N x_i(k+1) = \sum_{i=1}^N x_i(k). \quad (6)$$

Thus, if we wish to circumvent the sum one constraint, the new update rule must make (6) hold. Specifically, we take advantage of the fact that the amount of messages sent and received is equal for the entire system (i.e., the total mass of the system is fixed) and modify the update of the  $x$ -variable as

$$x_i(k+1) = x_i(k) + \Xi_i(k) \quad (7)$$

with

$$\Xi_i(k) \triangleq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}}} C_{ij}^1(k) x_j(k) - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}}} C_{ji}^1(k) x_i(k),$$

where  $C_{ij}^1(k)$  can take any value in  $\mathbb{R}$  (the sum one condition is not required). One verifies that  $\sum_{i=1}^N \Xi_i(k) = 0$ . Obviously, summing  $x_i(k+1)$  in (7) over  $i = 1, \dots, N$  yields (6). However, the update rule (7) is valid for



honest-but-curious attacks and really ineffective for eavesdropping attacks, see Corollary 2 below. Thus, we further introduce an auxiliary parameter  $\sigma(k) \in \mathbb{R}$  for  $k \leq K$ , which is public information known for all agents, but not to the external eavesdropper. Details of our method are summarized in Algorithm 2.

---

**Algorithm 2** Secure average consensus algorithm
 

---

- 1: **Initial setting:** Set  $x_i(0) = z_i(0) = x_i^0$  and  $y_i(0) = 1$  for  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ . Parameters  $K \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\sigma(k) \in \mathbb{R}$  for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $\eta \in (0, 1)$  are known to each agent.
- 2: **Weight generation:** Two sets of random mixing weights associated with any edge  $(j, i) \in \mathcal{E}$  are generated. For  $y_i(k)$  at any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , a group of mixing weights  $\{C_{ji}^2(k) \in (\eta, 1) | j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}} \cup \{i\}\}$  are generated, which satisfy  $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}} \cup \{i\}} C_{ji}^2(k) = 1$ . For  $x_i(k)$  at any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , if  $k \leq K$ , a group of mixing weights  $\{C_{ji}^1(k) \in \mathbb{R} | j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}} \cup \{i\}\}$  are generated; Otherwise, a group of mixing weights  $\{C_{ji}^1(k) = C_{ji}^2(k) \in (\eta, 1) | j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}} \cup \{i\}\}$  are generated. Moreover, agent  $i$  always sets  $C_{ji}^1(k) = 0$  and  $C_{ji}^2(k) = 0$  for  $j \notin \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}} \cup \{i\}$ .
- 3: **for**  $k = 0, 1, \dots$  **do**
- 4: Agent  $i$  sends the computed  $C_{li}^1(k)x_i(k)$  and  $C_{li}^2(k)y_i(k)$  to  $l \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}}$ .
- 5: Agent  $i$  uses  $C_{ij}^1(k)x_j(k)$  and  $C_{ij}^2(k)y_j(k)$  received from  $j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}}$  to update  $x_i$  and  $y_i$  as follows:

$$x_i(k+1) = \begin{cases} x_i(k) + \sigma(k)\Xi_i(k), & \text{if } k \leq K; \\ \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}} \cup \{i\}} C_{ij}^1(k)x_j(k), & \text{if } k \geq K+1. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

$$y_i(k+1) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}} \cup \{i\}} C_{ij}^2(k)y_j(k), k \geq 0. \quad (9)$$

- 6: Agent  $i$  computes  $z_i(k+1) = x_i(k+1)/y_i(k+1)$ .
  - 7: Until a stopping criteria is satisfied, e.g., agent  $i$  stops if  $|z_i(k+1) - \bar{x}^0| < \epsilon$  for some predefined  $\epsilon > 0$ .
  - 8: **end for**
- 

**Remark 2.** Note that we mainly embed randomness for  $\mathbf{C}_1(k)$  in the first  $K$  iterations and do not consider  $\mathbf{C}_2(k)$ . Since embedding randomness for  $\mathbf{C}_1(k)$  alone can guarantee that  $\mathbf{C}_1(k) \neq \mathbf{C}_2(k)$  for  $k \leq K$ , and the auxiliary variable  $y$  does not contain privacy information, so there is no need to embed randomness for  $\mathbf{C}_2(k)$  either. Of course, if embedding randomness for  $\mathbf{C}_2(k)$  is necessary, the update of the  $y$ -variable in (9) is formulated as:

$$y_i(k+1) = y_i(k) + \sigma'(k) \left( \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}}} C_{ij}^2(k)y_j(k) - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}}} C_{ij}^2(k)y_j(k) \right),$$

where  $\sigma'(k)$  and  $C_{ij}^2(k)$  are generated in a similar way as  $\sigma(k)$  and  $C_{ij}^1(k)$  of Algorithm 2.

#### IV. CONVERGENCE ANALYSIS

Following Algorithm 2, it holds from the dynamics (8)-(9)

$$\mathbf{x}(k+1) = \mathbf{C}_1(k)\mathbf{x}(k), k \geq K, \quad (10)$$

$$\mathbf{y}(k+1) = \mathbf{C}_2(k)\mathbf{y}(k), k \geq 0, \quad (11)$$

where  $\mathbf{C}_1(k) = [C_{ij}^1(k)]_{N \times N}$  and  $\mathbf{C}_2(k) = [C_{ij}^2(k)]_{N \times N}$ . It is known from the setting of Algorithm 2 that: i)  $\mathbf{C}_1(k)$  and  $\mathbf{C}_2(k)$  are time-varying and column-stochastic; and ii)  $\mathbf{C}_1(k) = \mathbf{C}_2(k)$  for  $k \geq K$ .

Define  $\Phi_1(k : s) = \mathbf{C}_1(k) \cdots \mathbf{C}_1(s)$  and  $\Phi_2(k : s) = \mathbf{C}_2(k) \cdots \mathbf{C}_2(s)$  for  $k \geq s \geq 0$ . Particularly,  $\Phi_1(k : k) = \mathbf{C}_1(k)$  and  $\Phi_2(k : k) = \mathbf{C}_2(k)$ . Recursively computing (10) and (11), we can obtain

$$\mathbf{x}(k+1) = \Phi_1(k : K+1)\mathbf{x}(K+1), k \geq K+1, \quad (12)$$

$$\mathbf{y}(k+1) = \Phi_2(k : 0)\mathbf{y}(0), k \geq 0, \quad (13)$$

where it holds  $\Phi_1(k : K+1) = \Phi_2(k : K+1)$  for  $k \geq K+1$ . Then, it follows that

$$\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{x}(k+1) = \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{x}(K+1), k \geq K+1, \quad (14)$$

$$\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{y}(k+1) = \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{y}(0) = N, k \geq 0, \quad (15)$$

where we use the column stochasticities of  $\Phi_1(k : K+1)$  and  $\Phi_2(k : 0)$ . For the first  $K$  dynamics of  $x_i$  in (8), we have from  $\sum_{i=1}^N \Xi_i(k) = 0$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{x}(k+1) &= \sum_{i=1}^N x_i(k+1) = \sum_{i=1}^N (x_i(k) + \sigma(k)\Xi_i(k)) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N x_i(k) = \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{x}(k) = \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{x}(0), \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

which matches the relation (6). Combining (14) and (16) gives

$$\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{x}(k+1) = \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{x}(0), k \geq 0. \quad (17)$$

Note that the dynamics of Algorithm 2 for iterations  $k \geq K$  are analogous to the conventional push-sum method. Considering (17) in depth, it can be seen that the injected randomness of the first  $K$  dynamics has no impact on the consensus performance. Next we show that Algorithm 2 can guarantee linear convergence rate to  $\bar{x}^0$ . Let  $\mathbf{z}(k) = [z_1(k), \dots, z_N(k)]^\top$ .

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $\{(z_i(k))_{i=1}^N\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  be the sequence generated by Algorithm 2, and the network  $\mathcal{G}$  satisfies Assumption 1. Then, it holds, for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,*

$$\|\mathbf{z}(k) - \bar{x}^0 \mathbf{1}\| \leq c\rho^k,$$

where  $\rho = (1 - \eta^{N-1})^{\frac{1}{N-1}}$ , and  $c$  is a constant given as

$$c = \max \left\{ c_1, (c_2 + c_3)\|\mathbf{x}(0)\|_1, (c_2\rho^{-1} + c_3)\|\mathbf{x}(1)\|_1, \dots, (c_2\rho^{-K-1} + c_3)\|\mathbf{x}(K+1)\|_1 \right\},$$

where  $c_1 = 2\sqrt{N}c_0\|\mathbf{x}(K+1)\|_1\eta^{-N}\rho^{-K-2}$ ,  $c_2 = 2\sqrt{N}\eta^{-N} - (N-1)/\sqrt{N}$  and  $c_3 = N^{-1/2}\eta^{-N}c_0\rho^{-1}$ .

*Proof.* Proof details are outlined in Appendix A. □

**Remark 3.** *Theorem 1 indicates that Algorithm 1 can achieve an  $\mathcal{O}(\rho^k)$  convergence rate with  $\rho = (1 - \eta^{N-1})^{\frac{1}{N-1}}$ . Evidently, a smaller  $\rho$  yields a better convergence rate. A straightforward way to obtain a smaller  $\rho$  is to increase  $\eta$ . However, it is essential to be aware that  $\eta$  cannot be close to 1 arbitrarily due to the nonnegativity and column*

stochasticity of the mixing matrix for  $k \geq K + 1$ . To satisfy the weight generation mechanism in Algorithm 2, it holds  $0 \leq \eta \leq 1/(\max_i |\mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}}| + 1)$ .

## V. PRIVACY ANALYSIS

Now, we analyze that Algorithm 2 is resistant to both honest-but-curious and eavesdropping attacks.

### A. Performance Against Honest-but-curious Attacks

For the honest-but-curious attacks, we make the following standard assumption [22]–[27].

**Assumption 2.** Consider an  $N$ -agent distributed network, where some colluding honest-but-curious nodes exist. We assume that each node  $i$  has at least one legitimate neighbor, i.e.,  $\mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}} \cup \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}} \not\subseteq \mathcal{H}$ .

We show that under an honest-but-curious attack, Algorithm 2 enforces privacy protection.

**Theorem 2.** Consider an  $N$ -agent distributed network that satisfies Assumption 1. In the context of the existence of some colluding honest-but-curious agents, the initial value  $x_i^0$  of legitimate agent  $i$  can be safely protected if  $\mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}} \cup \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}} \not\subseteq \mathcal{H}$ .

*Proof.* Recalling the definition of privacy metric in Section II-D, it can be shown that the privacy of agent  $i$  can be safely protected insofar as  $\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{S}_0^i) = \infty$ . The available information to  $\mathcal{H}$  is  $\mathcal{I}_h = \{\mathcal{I}_j | j \in \mathcal{H}\}$ , where  $\mathcal{I}_j$  denotes the information available to each individual  $j \in \mathcal{H}$  given as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_j = & \{\mathcal{I}_j^{\text{state}}(k) \cup \mathcal{I}_j^{\text{send}}(k) \cup \mathcal{I}_j^{\text{receive}}(k) | k \geq 0\} \\ & \cup \{\sigma(k) | 0 \leq k \leq K\} \cup \{y_m(0) = 1 | m \in \mathcal{V}\} \\ & \cup \{C_{nj}^1(k), C_{nj}^2(k) | m \in \mathcal{V}, k \geq 0\} \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_j^{\text{state}}(k) &= \{x_j(k), y_j(k)\} \\ \mathcal{I}_j^{\text{send}}(k) &= \{C_{nj}^1(k)x_j(k), C_{nj}^2(k)y_j(k) | n \in \mathcal{N}_j^{\text{out}} \cup \{j\}\} \\ \mathcal{I}_j^{\text{receive}}(k) &= \{C_{jm}^1(k)x_m(k), C_{jm}^2(k)y_m(k) | m \in \mathcal{N}_j^{\text{in}}\}. \end{aligned}$$

To prove  $\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{S}_0^i) = \infty$ , it suffices to show that agents in  $\mathcal{H}$  fail to judge whether the initial value of agent  $i$  is  $x_i^0$  or  $\tilde{x}_i^0 = x_i^0 + \delta$  where  $\delta$  is an arbitrary value in  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $x_i^0, \tilde{x}_i^0 \in \mathcal{S}_0^i$ . Note that agents in  $\mathcal{H}$  are only able to infer  $x_i^0$  using  $\mathcal{I}_h$ . In other words, if the initial value  $\tilde{x}_i^0 = x_i^0 + \delta$  makes the information  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_h$  accessed by agents of  $\mathcal{H}$  unchanged, i.e.,  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_h = \mathcal{I}_h$ , then  $\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{S}_0^i) = \infty$ . Hence, we only need to prove that there is  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_h = \mathcal{I}_h$  under two different initial values  $\tilde{x}_i^0$  and  $x_i^0$ .

Since  $\mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}} \cup \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}} \not\subseteq \mathcal{H}$ , there exists at least one agent  $l \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}} \cup \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}} \setminus \mathcal{H}$ . Thus, some settings on initial values of agent  $l$  and mixing weights associated with agent  $l$  satisfying the requirements in Algorithm 2 make it necessary that  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_h = \mathcal{I}_h$  for any  $\tilde{x}_i^0$ . More specifically, the initial settings are given as

$$\tilde{x}_i^0 = x_i^0 + \delta, \tilde{x}_l^0 = x_l^0 - \delta, \tilde{x}_m^0 = x_m^0, m \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{i, l\}, \quad (18)$$

where  $\delta$  is nonzero and does not equal either  $-x_i(0)$  or  $x_l(0)$ . Apparently, such an initial value setting has no impact on the sum of the original initial values. Then, we properly choose the mixing weights such that  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_h = \mathcal{I}_h$ . Here, ‘‘properly’’ means the choosing mixing weights should obey the weight generation mechanism in Algorithm 2. Our analysis will be continued in two cases,  $l \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}}$  and  $l \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}}$ , respectively.

**Case I:** We consider  $l \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}}$ . One can derive  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_h = \mathcal{I}_h$  if the weights are set as

$$\tilde{C}_{mn}^1(0) = C_{mn}^1(0), m \in \mathcal{V}, n \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{i, l\}, \quad (19a)$$

$$\tilde{C}_{mi}^1(0) = C_{mi}^1(0)x_i^0/\tilde{x}_i^0, m \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{i, l\}, \quad (19b)$$

$$\tilde{C}_{li}^1(0) = (\sigma(0)C_{li}^1(0)x_i^0 + \delta)/\sigma(0)\tilde{x}_i^0, \quad (19c)$$

$$\tilde{C}_{ml}^1(0) = C_{ml}^1(0)x_l^0/\tilde{x}_l^0, m \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{l\}, \quad (19d)$$

$$\tilde{C}_{ii}^1(0), \tilde{C}_{ll}^1(0) \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (19e)$$

$$\tilde{C}_{mn}^1(k) = C_{mn}^1(k), m, n \in \mathcal{V}, k \geq 1, \quad (19f)$$

$$\tilde{C}_{mn}^2(k) = C_{mn}^2(k), m, n \in \mathcal{V}, k \geq 0. \quad (19g)$$

**Case II:** We consider  $l \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}}$ . One can derive  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_h = \mathcal{I}_h$  if the weights are set as

$$\tilde{C}_{mn}^1(0) = C_{mn}^1(0), m \in \mathcal{V}, n \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{i, l\}, \quad (20a)$$

$$\tilde{C}_{mi}^1(0) = C_{mi}^1(0)x_i^0/\tilde{x}_i^0, m \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{i\}, \quad (20b)$$

$$\tilde{C}_{ml}^1(0) = C_{ml}^1(0)x_l^0/\tilde{x}_l^0, m \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \{i, l\}, \quad (20c)$$

$$\tilde{C}_{il}^1(0) = (\sigma(0)C_{il}^1(0)x_l^0 - \delta)/\sigma(0)\tilde{x}_l^0, \quad (20d)$$

$$\tilde{C}_{ii}^1(0), \tilde{C}_{ll}^1(0) \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (20e)$$

$$\tilde{C}_{mn}^1(k) = C_{mn}^1(k), m, n \in \mathcal{V}, k \geq 1, \quad (20f)$$

$$\tilde{C}_{mn}^2(k) = C_{mn}^2(k), m, n \in \mathcal{V}, k \geq 0. \quad (20g)$$

Combining Cases I and II, it can be derived that  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_h = \mathcal{I}_h$  under the initial value  $\tilde{x}_i^0 = x_i^0 + \delta \in \mathcal{S}_0^i$ . Then

$$\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{S}_0^i) \geq \sup_{\delta \in \mathbb{R}} |x_i^0 - \tilde{x}_i^0| = \sup_{\delta \in \mathbb{R}} |\delta| = \infty$$

Therefore, the initial value  $x_i^0$  of agent  $i$  is preserved against agents  $\mathcal{H}$  if agent  $i$  has at least one legitimate neighbor  $l \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \mathcal{H}$ .  $\square$

**Remark 4.** According to (19e) and (20e), one knows that the privacy of the proposed algorithm does not have any requirement for the weights  $\tilde{C}_{ii}^1(0)$  and  $\tilde{C}_{ll}^1(0)$ . The reason for this is that each node  $i$  in Algorithm 2 does not use such weights in the iterations  $k = 0, 1, \dots, K$ . One benefit of this operation is that it allows the mixing weights of the transmitted information to be used in the iterations  $k = 0, 1, \dots, K$  without satisfying the constraint that the columns sum to one.

Note that if  $\mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}} \cup \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}} \subset \mathcal{H}$  for  $i \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \mathcal{H}$ , the initial value  $x_i^0$  will be inferred by  $\mathcal{H}$ , see Corollary 1 below.

**Corollary 1.** *Under the settings of Theorem 2, the initial value  $x_i^0$  of agent  $i \notin \mathcal{H}$  would be revealed if  $\mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}} \cup \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}} \subset \mathcal{H}$  holds.*

*Proof.* Recalling and recursively computing the update of  $x$ -variable for  $k \leq K$  yields

$$x_i(K+1) - x_i(0) = \sum_{t=0}^K \sigma(t) \left( \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}}} C_{in}^1(t) x_n(t) - \sum_{m \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}}} C_{mi}^1(t) x_i(t) \right). \quad (21)$$

Then, using the column stochasticities of  $\mathbf{C}_1(k)$  for  $k \geq K+1$  and  $\mathbf{C}_2(k)$  for  $k \geq 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} x_i(k) &= C_{ii}^1(k) x_i(k) + \sum_{m \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}}} C_{mi}^1(k) x_i(k), \quad k \geq K, \\ y_i(k) &= C_{ii}^2(k) y_i(k) + \sum_{m \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}}} C_{mi}^2(k) y_i(k), \quad k \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above relations with (8) and (9), one arrives

$$x_i(k) - x_i(K+1) = \sum_{t=K+1}^{k-1} \left( \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}}} C_{in}^1(t) x_n(t) - \sum_{m \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}}} C_{mi}^1(t) x_i(t) \right), \quad (22)$$

$$y_i(k) - y_i(0) = \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \left( \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}}} C_{in}^2(t) y_n(t) - \sum_{m \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}}} C_{mi}^2(t) y_i(t) \right). \quad (23)$$

Further, combining the results in (21) and (22) gives

$$\begin{aligned} x_i(k) - x_i(0) &= \sum_{t=K+1}^{k-1} \left( \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}}} C_{in}^1(t) x_n(t) - \sum_{m \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}}} C_{mi}^1(t) x_i(t) \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{t=0}^K \sigma(t) \left( \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}}} C_{in}^1(t) x_n(t) - \sum_{m \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}}} C_{mi}^1(t) x_i(t) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Note that each agent  $j \in \mathcal{H}$  has access to  $\mathcal{I}_h$ . If  $\mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}} \cup \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}} \subset \mathcal{H}$  holds for legitimate agent  $i$ , all the information involved on the right sides of (23) and (24) is accessible to the honest-but-curious agents. Then, using  $y_i(0) = 1$  and (23), agent  $j$  can capture  $y_i(k)$  for all  $k$ . Further, as  $C_{ij}^1(k) = C_{ij}^2(k)$  for  $k \geq K+1$ ,  $x_i(k)$  can be inferred correctly by agent  $j$  using

$$x_i(k) = \frac{C_{ji}^1(k) x_i(k)}{C_{ji}^2(k) y_i(k)} y_i(k).$$

Making use of (24), the desired initial value  $x_i(0) = x_i^0$  is revealed.  $\square$

## B. Performance Against Eavesdropping Attacks

*For the eavesdropping attacks, we make the following assumption.*

**Assumption 3.** *Consider an  $N$ -agent distributed network with an external eavesdropper. We assume that the parameter  $\sigma(0)$  is not accessible to the eavesdropper.*

*We show that Algorithm 2 can enable privacy preservation against eavesdropping attacks.*

**Theorem 3.** Consider an  $N$ -agent distributed network that satisfies Assumption 1. In the context of the existence of an external eavesdropper who is capable of collecting all sharing information, the initial values  $\{x_i^0\}_{i \in \mathcal{V}}$  of all agents can be preserved.

*Proof.* Recalling the definition of privacy metric in Section II-D, it is shown that all agents' privacy can be safely protected insofar as  $\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{S}_0) = \infty$ . The available information to the external eavesdropper is given as

$$\mathcal{I}_e = \{C_{ij}^1(k)x_j(k), C_{ij}^2(k)y_j(k) | \forall i, j \in \mathcal{V}, i \neq j, k \geq 0\}.$$

The dynamic (8) can be reformulated as

$$\mathbf{x}(k+1) = \mathbf{x}(k) + \sigma(k)\mathbf{R}\Delta\mathbf{x}(k), k \leq K, \quad (25)$$

where  $\mathbf{R}$  denotes the incidence matrix associated network  $\mathcal{G}$ , and  $\Delta\mathbf{x}(k)$  is a stack vector whose  $i$ -th element is  $C_{mn}^1(k)x_n(k)$  with  $(m, n)$  being the  $i$ -th edge in  $\mathcal{E}$ . Note that the external eavesdropper is only able to infer all  $\{x_i(0)\}_{i \in \mathcal{V}}$  using  $\mathcal{I}_e$ . To prove  $\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{S}_0) = \infty$ , it is required to indicate that any initial value  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(0) \triangleq \mathbf{x}(0) + \Delta\sigma(0)\mathbf{R}\Delta\mathbf{x}(0) \in \mathcal{S}_0$  makes the information  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_e$  accessed by the external eavesdropper unchanged, i.e.,  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_e = \mathcal{I}_e$ , where  $\Delta\sigma(0)$  is any value in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Hence, we only need to prove that it holds  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_e = \mathcal{I}_e$  under two different initial states  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(0)$  and  $\mathbf{x}(0)$ . Specifically, one derives  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_e = \mathcal{I}_e$  if some settings are as follows:

$$\tilde{C}_{mn}^1(0) = C_{mn}^1(0)x_n^0/\tilde{x}_n^0, m, n \in \mathcal{V}, m \neq n, \quad (26a)$$

$$\tilde{C}_{nn}^1(0) \in \mathbb{R}, n \in \mathcal{V}, \quad (26b)$$

$$\tilde{\sigma}(0) = \sigma(0) + \Delta\sigma(0), \quad (26c)$$

$$\tilde{C}_{mn}^1(k) = C_{mn}^1(k), m, n \in \mathcal{V}, k \geq 1, \quad (26d)$$

$$\tilde{C}_{mn}^2(k) = C_{mn}^2(k), k \geq 0, \quad (26e)$$

$$\tilde{\sigma}(k) = \sigma(k), k \geq 1. \quad (26f)$$

Further, owing to the fact that the rank of  $\mathbf{R}$  is  $N - 1$  and the nullity of  $\mathbf{R}$  is  $|\mathcal{E}| - N - 1$ , one concludes that  $\Delta\mathbf{x}(0)$  is any vector in  $\mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{E}|}$ . In other words, the probability of  $\Delta\mathbf{x}(0)$  landing in the null space of  $\mathbf{R}$  is zero. Thus, for any  $n \in \mathcal{V}$ , it holds

$$[\mathbf{R}\Delta\mathbf{x}(0)]_n = \sum_{m \in \mathcal{N}_n^{\text{in}}} C_{nm}^1(0)x_m(0) - \sum_{m \in \mathcal{N}_n^{\text{out}}} C_{mn}^1(0)x_n(0) \neq 0.$$

Naturally,  $\tilde{x}_n(0) - x_n(0) = [\Delta\sigma(0)\mathbf{R}\Delta\mathbf{x}(0)]_n$  can be any value in  $\mathbf{R}$ . Therefore,

$$\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{S}_0) = \sup_{\mathbf{x}(0), \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(0) \in \mathcal{S}_0} \|\mathbf{x}(0) - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(0)\| = \sup_{\Delta\sigma(0) \in \mathbb{R}} \|\Delta\sigma(0)\mathbf{R}\Delta\mathbf{x}(0)\| = \infty.$$

That is to say, all initial values  $\{x_i(0)\}_{i \in \mathcal{V}}$  are preserved against the external eavesdropper.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.** Under the settings of Theorem 3, if the update rule (8) is substituted with (7), i.e.,  $\sigma(k) = 1$  for  $k \leq K$ , Algorithm 2 cannot preserve the privacy of each agent  $i$  against eavesdropping attacks.

*Proof.* Recursively computing the update of  $x$ -variable in (7) for  $k \leq K$  gives

$$x_i(K+1) - x_i(0) = \sum_{t=0}^K \left( \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}}} C_{in}^1(t) x_n(t) - \sum_{m \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}}} C_{mi}^1(t) x_i(t) \right). \quad (27)$$

Note that (22) and (23) still hold in this setting. Combining (27) with (22), we have

$$x_i(k) - x_i(0) = \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \left( \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}}} C_{in}^1(t) x_n(t) - \sum_{m \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}}} C_{mi}^1(t) x_i(t) \right). \quad (28)$$

Since the external eavesdropper can capture all transmitted information, all terms in the right sides of (23) and (28) can be accessed by the external eavesdropper. Then, using  $y_i(0) = 1$  and (23), agent  $j$  can capture  $y_i(k)$  for all  $k$ . Further, since  $C_{ij}^1(k) = C_{ij}^2(k)$  for  $k \geq K+1$ ,  $x_i(k)$  can be inferred correctly by agent  $j$  using

$$x_i(k) = \frac{C_{ji}^1(k) x_i(k)}{C_{ji}^2(k) y_i(k)} y_i(k).$$

Making use of (28), the desired initial value  $x_i(0) = x_i^0$  is inferred.  $\square$

**Remark 5.** According to the discussions above, it is evident that the first  $K$ -step perturbations are crucial for preserving privacy against honest-but-curious attacks, while the time-varying parameter  $\sigma(t)$  is pivotal in protecting privacy from eavesdropping attacks. Note that we only require that  $\sigma(0)$  is agnostic to the eavesdropper. Although this requirement is extremely stringent in practice, it still has some developmental significance. Specifically, due to the arbitrariness of  $\sigma(0)$ , we can mask only  $\sigma(0)$  by some privacy-preserving techniques such as encryption and obfuscation. Since these techniques act only on  $\sigma(0)$ , they do not impact the convergence of the algorithm.

**Remark 6.** Theorem 1 states that the randomness of embeddings in the first  $K$  iterations has no impact on the consensus performance. Besides, from the privacy analysis, we can see that only changing the mixing weights and auxiliary parameter at the iteration  $k = 0$  is enough to mask the initial values. That is, we can make the proposed algorithm protect the initial value  $x_i(0)$  by simply embedding randomness to  $\mathbf{C}_1(0)$  (i.e., setting  $K = 1$ ). Here, our consideration of  $K \geq 1$  is to preserve more intermediate states  $x_i(k)$ , but this also delays the consensus process, see Figs. 6 and 7. Therefore, if the intermediate states are not information of privacy concern, we directly set  $K = 1$  to obtain the best convergence performance.

## VI. DISCUSSION

The privacy policy in this work can also be applied to the case of vector states. Actually, privacy (i.e., the agent's initial vector state) is naturally protected provided that each element of the vector state is assigned an independent mixing weights. The details of the privacy policy for the vector states are summarized in Algorithm 3.

### A. Performance analysis

Apparently, there is no change in the update of  $y_i$ , so we mainly focus on the update of  $\mathbf{x}_i$ . Note that setting  $\mathbf{C}_{ij}^1(k) = \mathbf{0}$  and  $C_{ij}^2(k) = 0$  for  $j \notin \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}} \cup \{i\}$ , the update rule (29) is transformed into

$$\mathbf{x}_i(k+1) = \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{C}_{ij}^1(k) \mathbf{x}_j(k), k \geq K+1.$$

TABLE I: Parameter design

Parameter	Iteration $k \leq K$	Iteration $k \geq K + 1$
$\mathbf{\Lambda}(k)$	$\mathbf{\Lambda}(k) = \text{diag}\{\sigma_1(k), \dots, \sigma_d(k)\}$ , where each $\sigma_l(k)$ , $l = 1, \dots, d$ , is chosen from $\mathbb{R}$ independently	\
$C_{ij}^2(k)$	Each $C_{ij}^2(k)$ is chosen from $[\eta, 1]$ for $j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}} \cup \{i\}$ with satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^N C_{ij}^1(k) = 1$	
$\mathbf{C}_{ij}^1(k)$	$\mathbf{C}_{ij}^1(k) = \text{diag}\{C_{ij,1}^1(k), \dots, C_{ij,d}^1(k)\}$ , where each $C_{ij,l}^1(k)$ , $l = 1, \dots, d$ , is chosen from $\mathbb{R}$ for $i \in \mathcal{N}_j^{\text{out}} \cup \{j\}$ independently	$\mathbf{C}_{ij}^1(k) = C_{ij}^1(k)\mathbf{I}$ , where $C_{ij}^1(k) = C_{ij}^2(k)$

---

**Algorithm 3** Secure average consensus algorithm in the vector-state case

---

- 1: **Initial setting:** Set  $\mathbf{x}_i(0) = \mathbf{x}_i^0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $y_i(0) = 1$  for  $i \in \mathcal{V}$ . Parameters  $K \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\mathbf{\Lambda}(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $\eta \in (0, 1)$  are known to each agent.
- 2: **Weight generation:** See TABLE I.
- 3: **for**  $k = 0, 1, \dots$  **do**
- 4: Agent  $i$  sends the computed  $\mathbf{C}_{ii}^1(k)\mathbf{x}_i(k)$  and  $C_{ii}^2(k)y_i(k)$  to  $l \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}}$ .
- 5: Agent  $i$  uses  $\mathbf{C}_{ij}^1(k)\mathbf{x}_j(k)$  and  $C_{ij}^2(k)y_j(k)$  from  $j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}}$  to update  $\mathbf{x}_i$  and  $y_i$  as follows:

$$\mathbf{x}_i(k+1) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}_i(k) + \mathbf{\Lambda}(k)\mathbf{\Xi}_i(k), & \text{if } k \leq K; \\ \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}} \cup \{i\}} \mathbf{C}_{ij}^1(k)\mathbf{x}_j(k) & \text{if } k \geq K + 1. \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

$$y_i(k+1) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}} \cup \{i\}} C_{ij}^2(k)y_j(k), k \geq 0, \quad (30)$$

where  $\mathbf{\Xi}_i(k) \triangleq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}}} \mathbf{C}_{ij}^1(k)\mathbf{x}_j(k) - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}}} \mathbf{C}_{ji}^1(k)\mathbf{x}_i(k)$ .

- 6: Agent  $i$  computes  $\mathbf{z}_i(k+1) = \mathbf{x}_i(k+1)/y_i(k+1)$ .
- 7: Until a stopping criteria is satisfied, e.g., agent  $i$  stops if  $\|\mathbf{z}(k) - \mathbf{1} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{x}}^0\| < \epsilon$  for some predefined  $\epsilon > 0$ , where  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^0 = \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{x}_j(0)/N$ .

8: **end for**

---

Define  $\mathbf{x}(k) = [(\mathbf{x}_1(k))^\top, \dots, (\mathbf{x}_N(k))^\top]^\top$ ,  $\mathbf{y}(k) = [y_1(k), \dots, y_N(k)]^\top$ ,  $\mathbf{C}_2(k) = [C_{ij}^2]_{N \times N}$ . Let  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1(k)$  be a block matrix with the  $(ij)$ -th block entry being  $\mathbf{C}_{ij}^1(k)$ . Then, the dynamic above can be further reformulated as

$$\mathbf{x}(k+1) = \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1(k)\mathbf{x}(k), k \geq K + 1, \quad (31)$$

Note that  $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1(k) = \mathbf{C}_2(k) \otimes \mathbf{I}$  holds for  $k \geq K + 1$ . Define  $\tilde{\mathbf{\Phi}}_1(k : s) = \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1(k) \cdots \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1(s)$  for  $k \geq s \geq 0$ . Particularly,  $\tilde{\mathbf{\Phi}}_1(k : k) = \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_1(k)$ . Recursively computing (31), we obtain

$$\mathbf{x}(k+1) = \tilde{\mathbf{\Phi}}_1(k : K+1)\mathbf{x}(K+1), k \geq K + 1, \quad (32)$$

where  $\tilde{\mathbf{\Phi}}_1(k : K+1) = \mathbf{\Phi}_2(k : K+1) \otimes \mathbf{I}$  for  $k \geq K + 1$ . Then, it holds

$$(\mathbf{1}^\top \otimes \mathbf{I})\mathbf{x}(k+1) = (\mathbf{1}^\top \otimes \mathbf{I})\mathbf{x}(K+1), k \geq K + 1, \quad (33)$$



For  $k \leq K$ , using  $\sum_{i=1}^N \boldsymbol{\Xi}_i(k) = \mathbf{0}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{1}^\top \otimes \mathbf{I})\mathbf{x}(k+1) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{x}_i(k+1) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N (\mathbf{x}_i(k) + \boldsymbol{\Lambda}(k)\boldsymbol{\Xi}_i(k)) = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{x}_i(k) = (\mathbf{1}^\top \otimes \mathbf{I})\mathbf{x}(k), \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Combining (33) and (34) yields

$$(\mathbf{1}^\top \otimes \mathbf{I})\mathbf{x}(k+1) = (\mathbf{1}^\top \otimes \mathbf{I})\mathbf{x}(0)$$

From the analysis above, it is clear that Algorithm 3 retains the same properties in the vector state case as it does in the scalar state case. So, we have the following theorems.

**Theorem 4.** Let  $\{(\mathbf{z}_i(k))_{i=1}^N\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  be the sequence generated by Algorithm 3,  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}^0 = \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{x}_j^0/N$  be the average point, and the network  $\mathcal{G}$  satisfies Assumption 1. Then, it holds, for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\|\mathbf{z}(k) - \bar{x}^0 \mathbf{1}\| \leq c\rho^k$ , where  $c' = \sqrt{dc}$ .

*Proof.* The proof follows the similar path to Theorem 1, the difference lies only in the use of the Kronecker product and thus omitted.  $\square$

**Theorem 5.** Consider an  $N$ -agent distributed network that satisfies Assumption 1. Let  $\mathcal{H}$  denote the set of all honest-but-curious agents. The following statements hold:

- 1) Under the settings of Theorem 2, the initial value  $\mathbf{x}_i(0)$  of agent  $i \notin \mathcal{H}$  can be preserved against  $\mathcal{H}$  during the running of Algorithm 3 if  $\mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}} \cup \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{in}} \not\subseteq \mathcal{H}$  holds;
- 2) Under the settings of Theorem 3, the initial values  $\mathbf{x}_i(0)$  of all agents  $i \notin \mathcal{H}$  can be preserved against eavesdropping attacks during the running of Algorithm 3 if  $\sigma(0)$  is agnostic to external eavesdroppers.

*Proof.* According to the analysis of Algorithm 2, we can know that each scalar-state element in the vector state can be preserved against both honest-but-curious and eavesdropping attacks. Therefore, each vector state can also be preserved.  $\square$

## VII. EXPERIMENTS VALIDATION

We construct simulations to confirm the consensus and the privacy performances of our methods. Several unbalanced directed networks are built in Fig. 2.

### A. Consensus Performance

We pick the network  $\mathcal{G}_1$  and set  $\eta = 0.01$ . In Algorithm 2, at iteration  $k \leq K$ , as required in Algorithm 2, the mixing weights  $C_{ji}^1(k)$  for  $j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}} \cup \{i\}$  are selected from  $(-100, 100)$ .  $x_1^0, \dots, x_5^0$  take values of 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, respectively, and thus  $\bar{x}^0 = 20$ . The parameter  $\sigma(k)$  is generated from  $\mathcal{N}(0, 10)$  for all  $k \leq K$ . In Algorithm 3, at iteration  $k \leq K$ , the parameters  $\sigma_l(k)$  are generated from  $\mathcal{N}(0, 10)$  for  $l = 1, \dots, d$  with  $d = 3$ , and the mixing weights  $C_{ij,l}^1(k)$  are chosen from  $(-100, 100)$  for  $l = 1, \dots, d$  and  $j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{\text{out}} \cup \{i\}$ . Each component of the initial values  $\mathbf{x}_i^0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, 5$ , is generated from the Gaussian distributions with different mean values




Fig. 2: Several built networks. **Line 1:** A simple directed network  $\mathcal{G}_1$  with 5 agents and a large-scale directed network  $\mathcal{G}_2$  consisting of 1000 agents. **Line 2:** Four 10-agent directed networks with out-degree=2, 3, 4, 5. **Line 3:** Four 10-agent directed networks with in-degree=2, 3, 4, 5.

0, 20, 40. Fig. 3 plots the evolutionary trajectories of the state variables under  $K = 2$ , and shows the evolutions of  $e(k) = \|\mathbf{z}(k) - \bar{x}^0 \mathbf{1}\|$  over  $K = 1, 2, 3, 4$ . One observes that: i) Each estimate  $z_i(k)$  converges to the average value  $\bar{x}^0$ , and the consensus rate  $\mathcal{O}(\rho^k)$  is achieved; and ii) a larger  $K$  means a worse consensus accuracy.




Fig. 3: Consensus performance. (a)-(b) The trajectories of states  $\{z_i(k)\}$  and the evolutions of  $e(k)$  of Algorithm 2; (c)-(d) The trajectories of states  $\{z_i(k)\}$  and the evolutions of  $e(k)$  of Algorithm 3.

### B. Comparison with other works

We compare our algorithms with three data-obfuscation based methods, i.e., the differential privacy algorithm [9], the decaying noise algorithm [13], and the finite-noise-sequence algorithm [14]. Here, we set  $K = 2$ , and the adopted mixing matrix  $W$  is generated using the rules in [9]. Specifically, the element  $W_{ij}$  is set to  $1/(|\mathcal{N}_j^{out}| + 1)$  if  $i \in \mathcal{N}_j^{out} \cup \{j\}$ ; otherwise,  $W_{ij} = 0$ . Since the directed and unbalanced networks are more generalizable than the undirected and balanced ones adopted in [9], [13], [14], these algorithms cannot achieve average consensus, as reported in Fig 4.




Fig. 4: Performance of the other works. (a)-(c) The trajectories of all states  $\{x_i(k)\}$  in [9], [13], [14] in order.

### C. Effect of network degrees and Scalability

Since the proposed algorithms is over unbalanced directed networks, we use the networks in lines 2 and 3 of Fig. 2 to explore the effect of different network degrees on the consensus rate. Here,  $x_1^0, \dots, x_{10}^0$  are taken sequentially from the interval  $[10, 55]$  at intervals of 5. We set  $K = 1$  and  $\eta = 0.01$ . For the iterations  $k \leq K$ , the mixing weights  $C_{ji}^1(k)$  for  $j \in \mathcal{N}_i^{out} \cup \{i\}$  are selected from  $(-5, 5)$ , and the parameter  $\sigma(k)$  is generated from  $\mathcal{N}(0, 5)$ . Moreover, we employ the network  $\mathcal{G}_2$  to demonstrate the scalability of the proposed algorithms. Each initial value  $x_i^0$  or  $\mathbf{x}_i^0$  is generated from i.i.d  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ . The parameters  $\eta$  and  $K$  take values of 0.05 and 3, respectively. In addition, the vector dimension  $d = 10$ . The mixing weights and the parameter  $\sigma(k)$  or  $\Lambda(k)$  are generated in the same way as the fist experiment.

As shown in Fig. 5, it is stated that i) As the out-degree or in-degree increases, the proposed algorithm has a faster consensus rate. A possible reason for this is that the increase in out-degree or in-degree leads to more frequent communication between the nodes, and thus more information is available for state updates, which in turn leads to a faster rate of consensus; ii) the proposed algorithms still ensure that all agents linearly converge to the correct average value even if a large-scale network is used.

### D. Privacy Performance

Finally, we evaluate the privacy-preserving performances of Algorithms 2 and 3. Under the network  $\mathcal{G}_1$ , we consider the initial value of the legitimate agent 1 will suffer from the joint inference of honest-but-curious agents




Fig. 5: Performance of the proposed algorithm over different works. (a) The effect of out-degrees on consensus rate; (b) The effect of in-degrees on consensus rate; (c) The evolutions of  $e(k)$  over the large-scale network  $\mathcal{G}_2$ .

4, 5, and agent 2 is legitimate. In the scalar-state case (i.e., Algorithm 2), we set  $x_1^0 = 40$  and  $x_2^0, \dots, x_N^0$  are generated from the Gaussian distributions with 50 variance and zero mean, while the initial value  $\mathbf{x}_1^0 = [50, 50]$  and  $\mathbf{x}_2^0, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N^0$  are randomly generated from i.i.d.  $\mathcal{N}(0, 50)$  in the vector-state case (i.e., Algorithm 3). Moreover, we set  $k = 2$  and the maximal iteration  $M = 200$ .

To infer  $x_1^0$ , agents  $\mathcal{H} = \{4, 5\}$  construct some linear equations based on their available information  $\mathcal{I}_h = \{\mathcal{I}_4, \mathcal{I}_5\}$  outlined below:

$$x_1(k+1) - x_1(k) + \sigma(k)C_{21}^1(k)x_1(k) = \sigma(k)\Delta x(k), 0 \leq k \leq K, \quad (35a)$$

$$x_1(k+1) - x_1(k) + C_{21}^1(k)x_1(k) = \Delta x(k), K+1 \leq k \leq M, \quad (35b)$$

$$y_1(k+1) - y_1(k) + C_{21}^2(k)y_1(k) = \Delta y(k), 0 \leq k \leq M, \quad (35c)$$

where

$$\Delta x(k) = \sum_{m \in \{4,5\}} C_{1m}^1(k)x_m(k) - \sum_{n \in \{4,5\}} C_{n1}^1(k)x_1(k),$$

$$\Delta y(k) = \sum_{m \in \{4,5\}} C_{1m}^2(k)y_m(k) - \sum_{n \in \{4,5\}} C_{n1}^2(k)y_1(k).$$

Furthermore, agents  $\mathcal{H}$  can also construct, for  $k = K+1, K+2, \dots, M$ ,

$$x_1(k) - z_1(k)y_1(k) = 0, \quad (35d)$$

where  $z_1(k)$  can be derived from

$$z_1(k) = \frac{C_{41}^1(k)x_1(k)}{C_{41}^2(k)y_1(k)},$$

since  $C_{41}^1(k) = C_{41}^2(k)$  for  $k \geq K+1$ .

The number of linear equations is  $3M-K+2$  while that of unknown variables to  $\mathcal{H}$  is  $4M+5$ , including specifically  $x_1(0), \dots, x_1(M+1), C_{21}^1(0)x_1(0), \dots, C_{21}^1(M)x_1(M), y_1(1), \dots, y_1(M+1), C_{21}^2(0)y_1(0), \dots, C_{21}^2(M)y_1(M)$ . Consequently, there are infinitely many solutions due to the fact that the number of equations is less than that of unknown variables. The analysis of the vector-state case is similar to that of the scalar-state case, so it will not be

elaborated here. To uniquely determine  $x_1^0$ , we use the least-squares solution to infer  $x_1^0$ . In this experiment, agents in  $\mathcal{H}$  estimate  $x_1^0$  or  $\mathbf{x}_1^0$  for 1000 times. Figs. 6a-6b show the estimated results. One can observe that agents in  $\mathcal{H}$  fail to obtain a desired estimate of  $x_1^0$  or  $\mathbf{x}_1^0$ .

Next, we consider the case of eavesdropping attacks. The parameter settings follow the above experiment. Let us choose agent 1 to illustrate that the proposed algorithms are privacy-preserving against external eavesdropping attacks. To infer the value  $x_1^0$ , the external eavesdropper constructs some linear equations below based on its available information  $\mathcal{I}_e$ :

$$x_1(k+1) - x_1(k) = \sigma(k)\Delta\hat{x}(k), 0 \leq k \leq K+1, \quad (36a)$$

$$x_1(k+1) - x_1(k) = \Delta\hat{x}(k), K+1 \leq k \leq M, \quad (36b)$$

$$y_1(k+1) - y_1(k) = \Delta\hat{y}(k), 0 \leq k \leq M, \quad (36c)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\hat{x}(k) &= \sum_{m \in \{4,5\}} C_{1m}^1(k)x_m(k) - \sum_{n \in \{2,4,5\}} C_{n1}^1(k)x_1(k), \\ \Delta\hat{y}(k) &= \sum_{m \in \{4,5\}} C_{1m}^2(k)y_m(k) - \sum_{n \in \{2,4,5\}} C_{n1}^2(k)y_1(k). \end{aligned}$$

Further, the external eavesdropper can deduce from (36) that

$$x_1(K+1) - x_1(0) = \sum_{t=0}^K \sigma(t)\Delta\hat{x}(t), \quad (37a)$$

$$x_1(k+1) - x_1(K+1) = \sum_{t=K+1}^k \Delta\hat{x}(t), K+1 \leq k \leq M, \quad (37b)$$

$$y_1(k+1) - y_1(0) = \sum_{t=0}^k \Delta\hat{y}(t), 0 \leq k \leq M. \quad (37c)$$

Obviously, all terms in the right side of (37) can be accessed by the external eavesdropper. Consequently, using  $y_1(0) = 1$ , the eavesdropper can be aware of all  $y_1(k)$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Moreover, the external eavesdropper can capture  $C_{21}^1(k)x_1(k)$  and  $C_{21}^2(k)y_1(k)$  for  $k = K+1, \dots, M$ . Then,  $x_1(k)$  for  $k = K+1, \dots, M$  can be derived using

$$x_1(k) = \frac{C_{21}^1(k)x_1(k)}{C_{21}^2(k)y_1(k)}y_1(k).$$

This implies that all information in (36b) and (36c) is captured by the external eavesdropper, which is considerably different from the case of honest-but-curious attacks. So, only (36a) has some unknown variables  $\sigma(k)$ ,  $k = 0, \dots, K$  and  $x_1(0)$  for the external eavesdropper. The vector-state case leads to the same results as the scalar-state case by following the same analysis path, so it is not stated again. In this experiment, we still use the least-squares solution to estimate  $x_1^0$ . The external eavesdropper estimates  $x_1^0$  or  $\mathbf{x}_1^0$  for 1000 times. Figs. 6c-6d show the estimated results. One observes that the external eavesdropper cannot obtain an expected estimate of  $x_1^0$  or  $\mathbf{x}_1^0$ .

## VIII. CONCLUSION

We proposed a dynamics-based privacy-preserving push-sum algorithm over unbalanced digraphs. We theoretically analyzed its linear convergence rate and proved that they can guarantee the privacy of agents against both




Fig. 6: Privacy Performance. (a) Estimation results of  $x_1^0$  by  $\mathcal{H}$ ; (b) Estimation results of  $\mathbf{x}_1^0$  by  $\mathcal{H}$ ; (c) Estimation results of  $x_1^0$  by the external eavesdropper; (d) Estimation results of  $\mathbf{x}_1^0$  by the external eavesdropper.

*honest-but-curious and eavesdropping attacks. Finally, numerical experiments further confirmed the soundness of our work. Future work will consider a method that can eliminate  $K$  and still protect privacy.*

## IX. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

*This work is supported in part by the National Key R&D Program of China under Grant 2018AAA0100101, in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 61932006, and in part by the Natural Science Foundation of Chongqing under Grant CSTB2022NSCQ-MSX1217.*

## REFERENCES

- [1] F. Acciani, P. Frasca, G. Heijenk, and A. A. Stoorvogel, "Achieving robust average consensus over lossy wireless networks", *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 127–137, 2019.
- [2] F. C. Souza, S. R. B. Dos Santos, A. M. de Oliveira, and S. N. Givigi, "Influence of network topology on UAVs formation control based on distributed consensus," in *IEEE International Systems Conference*, 2022, pp. 1–8.
- [3] B. Du, R. Mao, N. Kong, D. Sun, "Distributed data fusion for on-scene signal sensing with a multi-UAV system," in *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 1330–1341, 2020.
- [4] J. N. Tsitsiklis, "Problems in decentralized decision making and computation," *Ph.D. dissertation*, 1984.
- [5] Z. Zhang and M. Y. Chow, "Incremental cost consensus algorithm in a smart grid environment," in *IEEE Power and Energy Society General Meeting*, 2011, pp. 1–6.
- [6] C. Dwork, F. McSherry, K. Nissim, and A. Smith, "Calibrating noise to sensitivity in private data analysis," in *Proceedings of the 3rd Theory Cryptography Conference*, 2006, pp. 265–284.
- [7] Z. Huang, S. Mitra, and N. Vaidya, "Differentially private distributed optimization," in *International Conference on Distributed Computing and Networking*, 2015, pp. 1–10.
- [8] E. Nozari, P. Tallapragada, and J. Cortés, "Differentially private average consensus: Obstructions, trade-offs, and optimal algorithm design," *Automatica*, vol. 81, pp. 221–231, 2017.
- [9] Z. Huang, S. Mitra, and G. Dullerud, "Differentially private iterative synchronous consensus," in *Proceedings of the 2012 ACM Workshop on Privacy in the Electronic Society*, 2012, pp. 81–90.
- [10] L. Gao, S. Deng, W. Ren, and C. Hu, "Differentially private consensus with quantized communication," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 51, no. 8, pp. 4075–4088, Aug. 2021.
- [11] D. Ye, T. Zhu, W. Zhou, and S. Y. Philip, "Differentially private malicious agent avoidance in multiagent advising learning," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 50, no. 10, pp. 4214–4227, Oct. 2020.
- [12] M. Kefayati, M. S. Talebi, B. H. Khalaj, and H. R. Rabiee, "Secure consensus averaging in sensor networks using random offsets," in *IEEE International Conference on Telecommunications and Malaysia International Conference on Communications*, 2007, pp. 556–560.

- [13] Y. Mo and R. M. Murray, "Privacy preserving average consensus," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 62, no. 2, pp. 753–765, 2017.
- [14] N. E. Manitara and C. N. Hadjicostis, "Privacy-preserving asymptotic average consensus," in *European Control Conference (ECC)*, 2013, pp. 760–765.
- [15] S. Pequito, S. Kar, S. Sundaram, and A. P. Aguiar, "Design of communication networks for distributed computation with privacy guarantees," in *Proceedings of the 53rd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, 2014, pp. 1370–1376.
- [16] I. D. Ridgley, R. A. Freeman, and K. M. Lynch, "Simple, private, and accurate distributed averaging," in *Proceedings of IEEE 57th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing*, 2019, pp. 446–452.
- [17] A. Alaeddini, K. Morgansen, and M. Mesbahi, "Adaptive communication networks with privacy guarantees," in *Proceedings of American Control Conference*, 2017, pp. 4460–4465.
- [18] M. Kishida, "Encrypted average consensus with quantized control law," in *Proceedings of IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, 2018, pp. 5850–5856.
- [19] C. N. Hadjicostis and A. D. Domínguez-García, "Privacy-preserving distributed averaging via homomorphically encrypted ratio consensus," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 65, no. 9, pp. 3887–3894, Sep. 2020.
- [20] W. Fang, M. Zamani, and Z. Chen, "Secure and privacy preserving consensus for second-order systems based on paillier encryption," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 148, pp. 104869, 2021.
- [21] M. Ruan, H. Gao, and Y. Wang, "Secure and privacy-preserving consensus," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 64, no. 10, pp. 4035–4049, Oct. 2019.
- [22] Y. Wang, "Privacy-preserving average consensus via state decomposition," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 64, no. 11, pp. 4711–4716, 2019.
- [23] X. Chen, L. Huang, K. Ding, S. Dey, and L. Shi, "Privacy-preserving push-sum average consensus via state decomposition," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, doi:10.1109/TAC.2023.3256479, 2023.
- [24] H. Gao, C. Zhang, M. Ahmad, and Y. Q. Wang, "Privacy-preserving average consensus on directed graphs using push-sum," in *IEEE Conference on Communications and Network Security (CNS)*, 2018, pp. 1–9.
- [25] H. Gao, and Y. Wang, "Algorithm-level confidentiality for average consensus on time-varying directed graphs," *IEEE Transactions on Network Science and Engineering*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 918–931, 2022.
- [26] Y. Liu, H. Gao, J. Du, and Y. Zhi, "Dynamics based privacy preservation for average consensus on directed graphs," in *Proceedings of the 41st Chinese Control Conference*, 2022, pp. 4955–4961.
- [27] C. Fioravanti, V. Bonagura, G. Oliva, C. N. Hadjicostis, and S. Panzneri, "Exploiting the synchronization of nonlinear dynamics to secure distributed consensus," *IEEE Open J. Control Syst.*, vol. 2, pp. 249–262, 2023.
- [28] S. Gade and N. H. Vaidya, "Private optimization on networks," in *2018 Annual American Control Conference (ACC)*, pp. 1402–1409, 2018.
- [29] D. Han, K. Liu, H. Sandberg, S. Chai, and Y. Xia, "Privacy-preserving dual averaging with arbitrary initial conditions for distributed optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 67, no. 6, pp. 3172–3179, Jun. 2022.
- [30] H. Gao, Y. Wang, and A. Nedić, "Dynamics based privacy preservation in decentralized optimization," *Automatica*, vol. 151, pp. 110878, 2023.
- [31] H. Cheng, X. Liao, H. Li, and Y. Zhao, "Privacy-preserving push-pull method for decentralized optimization via state decomposition," *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2308.08164*, 2023.
- [32] Y. Lin, K. Liu, D. Han, and Y. Xia, "Statistical privacy-preserving online distributed nash equilibrium tracking in aggregative games," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 69, no. 1, pp. 323–330, Jan. 2024.
- [33] H. Cheng, X. Liao, and H. Li, "Distributed online private learning of convex nondecomposable objectives," *IEEE Transactions on Network Science and Engineering*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 1716–1728, Mar.- Apr. 2024.
- [34] D. Kempe, A. Dobra, and J. Gehrke, "Gossip-based computation of aggregate information," in *Proceedings of 44th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, 2003, pp. 482–491.
- [35] F. Bénézit, V. Blondel, P. Thiran, J. Tsitsiklis, and M. Vetterli, "Weighted gossip: Distributed averaging using non-doubly stochastic matrices," in *Proceedings of 2010 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, 2010, pp. 1753–1757.
- [36] C. N. Hadjicostis, A. D. Domínguez-García, and T. Charalambous, "Distributed averaging and balancing in network systems: With applications to coordination and control," *Foundations and Trends in Systems and Control*, vol. 5, no. 2–3, pp. 99–292, 2018.

- [37] K. Liu, H. Kargupta, and J. Ryan, "Random projection-based multiplicative data perturbation for privacy preserving distributed data mining," *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 92–106, 2005.
- [38] S. Han, W. K. Ng, L. Wan, and V. C. Lee, "Privacy-preserving gradient-descent methods," *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 22, no. 6, pp. 884–899, 2009.
- [39] N. Cao, C. Wang, M. Li, K. Ren, and W. Lou, "Privacy-preserving multi-keyword ranked search over encrypted cloud data," *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 222–233, 2013.
- [40] E. Seneta, "Non-negative matrices and markov chains," Springer, 1973.
- [41] J. A. Fill, "Eigenvalue bounds on convergence to stationarity for nonreversible markov chains with an application to the exclusion process," *The annals of applied probability*, 1991, pp. 62–87.
- [42] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, "Matrix Analysis," Cambridge university press Press, 2012.
- [43] Y. Lu and M. Zhu, "On privacy preserving data release of linear dynamic networks," *Automatica*, vol. 115, pp. 108839, 2020.
- [44] A. Machanavajjhala, D. Kifer, J. Gehrke, and M. Venkatasubramanian, "L-diversity: Privacy beyond k-anonymity," *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 3–es, 2007.
- [45] A. Nedić, A. Ozdaglar, and P. A. Parrilo, "Constrained consensus and optimization in multi-agent networks," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 55, no. 4, pp. 922–938, 2010.

## APPENDIX A

### PROOF OF THEOREM 1

*Proof.* We divide the convergence analysis into two cases.

**Case I:** We consider the case of  $k \geq K + 2$ . It holds  $\mathbf{C}_1(k) = \mathbf{C}_2(k)$ . Recalling (12) and (13), we have, for  $l \geq 1$ ,

$$\mathbf{x}(K + l + 1) = \Phi_1(K + l : K + 1)\mathbf{x}(K + 1), \quad (38)$$

$$\mathbf{y}(K + l + 1) = \Phi_2(K + l : K + 1)\mathbf{y}(K + 1). \quad (39)$$

Referring the Corollary 2 in [45], there exists a sequence of stochastic vectors  $\{\varphi(k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that, for any  $i, j \in \mathcal{V}$ ,

$$|[\Phi_1(k : K + 1)]_{ij} - \varphi_i(k)| \leq c_0 \rho^{k-K-1},$$

where  $c_0 = 2(1 + \rho^{-N+1})/(1 - \rho^{N-1})$  and  $\rho = (1 - \eta^{N-1})^{\frac{1}{N-1}}$ . Moreover,  $\varphi_i(k) \geq \eta^N/N$ . Thus, it follows that, for  $l \geq 1$ ,

$$|[\mathbf{M}(K + l : K + 1)]_{ij}| \leq c_0 \rho^{l-1}. \quad (40)$$

where  $\mathbf{M}(K + l : K + 1) \triangleq \Phi_1(K + l : K + 1) - \varphi(K + l)\mathbf{1}^\top$ . Since  $\mathbf{C}_1(k) = \mathbf{C}_2(k)$ , it holds that  $\Phi_1(K + l : K + 1) = \Phi_2(K + l : K + 1)$  for  $l \geq 1$ . So (38) and (39) can be evolved as

$$\mathbf{x}(K + l + 1) = \mathbf{M}(K + l : K + 1)\mathbf{x}(K + 1) + \varphi(K + l)\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{x}(K + 1), \quad (41)$$

$$\mathbf{y}(K + l + 1) = \mathbf{M}(K + l : K + 1)\mathbf{y}(K + 1) + N\varphi(K + l), \quad (42)$$

It follows from the Corollary 2(b) in [45] that  $y_i(k + 1) = [\mathbf{M}(k : 0)\mathbf{1}]_i + N\varphi_i(k) \geq \eta^N$  for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Using the relation (16), one arrives

$$\bar{x}^0 = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N x_j(0)}{N} = \frac{\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{x}(0)}{N} = \frac{\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{x}(K + 1)}{N}. \quad (43)$$



Combining (41) and (42) with (43) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{x_i(K+l+1)}{y_i(K+l+1)} - \bar{x}^0 \\
&= \frac{x_i(K+l+1)}{y_i(K+l+1)} - \frac{\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{x}(K+1)}{N} \\
&= \frac{[\mathbf{M}(K+l:K+1)\mathbf{x}(K+1)]_i + \varphi_i(k+l)\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{x}(K+1)}{y_i(K+l+1)} - \frac{Q(K;i)}{Ny_i(K+l+1)} \\
&= \frac{[\mathbf{M}(K+l:K+1)\mathbf{x}(K+1)]_i}{y_i(K+l+1)} - \frac{\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{x}(K+1)[\mathbf{M}(K+l:K+1)\mathbf{y}(K+1)]_i}{Ny_i(K+l+1)},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$Q(K;i) \triangleq \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{x}(K+1)[\mathbf{M}(K+l:K+1)\mathbf{y}(K+1)]_i + N\varphi_i(k+l)\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{x}(K+1).$$

Then, we can bound  $|z_i(K+l+1) - \bar{x}^0|$  as

$$\begin{aligned}
& |z_i(K+l+1) - \bar{x}^0| \\
&\leq \frac{|[\mathbf{M}(K+l:K+1)\mathbf{x}(K+1)]_i|}{y_i(K+l+1)} \\
&\quad + \frac{|\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{x}(K+1)[\mathbf{M}(K+l:K+1)\mathbf{y}(K+1)]_i|}{Ny_i(K+l+1)} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\eta^N} \left( \max_j |[\mathbf{M}(K+l:K+1)]_{ij}| \|\mathbf{x}(K+1)\|_1 + \frac{1}{N\eta^N} \times \right. \\
&\quad \left. |\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{x}(K+1)| \left( \max_j |[\mathbf{M}(K+l:K+1)]_{ij}| \right) \|\mathbf{y}(K+1)\|_1 \right) \\
&\leq \frac{2}{\eta^N} \left( \max_j |[\mathbf{M}(K+l:K+1)]_{ij}| \right) \|\mathbf{x}(K+1)\|_1,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality uses the relation  $y_i(K+l+1) \geq \eta^N$ , and the last inequality is based on  $\|\mathbf{y}(K+1)\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^N |y_i(K+1)| = \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{y}(K+1) = N$  and  $|\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{x}(K+1)| \leq \|\mathbf{x}(K+1)\|_1$ . Further taking into account (40), one derives that

$$|z_i(K+l+1) - \bar{x}^0| \leq 2\eta^{-N} c_0 \|\mathbf{x}(K+1)\|_1 \rho^{l-1}.$$

Thus, we arrive that

$$\|\mathbf{z}(K+l+1) - \bar{x}^0 \mathbf{1}\| \leq c_1 \rho^{K+l+1}, \quad (44)$$

where  $c_1 = 2\sqrt{N}c_0 \|\mathbf{x}(K+1)\|_1 \eta^{-N} \rho^{-K-2}$ . Consequently, for  $k \geq K+2$ , we have  $\|\mathbf{z}(k) - \bar{x}^0 \mathbf{1}\| \leq c_1 \rho^k$ .

**Case II:** We consider the case of  $k \geq K+1$ . Using  $y_i(k+1) = [\mathbf{M}(k:0)\mathbf{1}]_i + N\varphi_i(k) \leq \eta^N$ , one has

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{x_i(k)}{y_i(k)} - \bar{x}^k = \frac{x_i(k)}{y_i(k)} - \frac{\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{x}(k)}{N} \\
&= \frac{x_i(k)}{y_i(k)} - \frac{\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{x}(k)([\mathbf{M}(k-1:0)\mathbf{1}]_i + N\varphi_i(k-1))}{Ny_i(k)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we compute  $|z_i(k) - \bar{x}^k|$  as

$$\begin{aligned}
& |z_i(k) - \bar{x}^k| \\
& \leq \frac{|x_i(k)|}{y_i(k)} + \frac{|\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{x}(k) [\mathbf{M}(k-1:0)\mathbf{1}]_i|}{Ny_i(k)} + \frac{|\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{x}(k) \varphi_i(k-1)|}{y_i(k)} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{\eta^N} |x_i(k)| + \frac{1}{N\eta^N} |\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{x}(k)| \left( \max_j |[\mathbf{M}(k-1:0)]_{ij}| \right) \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{\eta^N} |\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{x}(k)| (\max_i \varphi_i(k-1)) \\
& \leq \frac{1}{\eta^N} \|\mathbf{x}(k)\|_1 + \frac{1}{N\eta^N} \|\mathbf{x}(k)\|_1 c_0 \rho^{k-1} + \left( \frac{1}{\eta^N} - \frac{(N-1)}{N} \right) \|\mathbf{x}(k)\|_1,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality uses the relation  $\varphi_i(k-1) \geq \frac{\eta^N}{N}$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{V}$  and  $k \geq 1$ . Specifically, as  $\varphi(k)$  is a stochastic vector,  $\sum_{i=1}^N \varphi_i(k) = 1$  holds, which in turn gives  $\max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \varphi_i(k-1) \leq 1 - (N-1)\eta^N/N$ . Thus, it yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\mathbf{z}(k) - \bar{x}^k \mathbf{1}\| \\
& \leq \sqrt{N} \eta^{-N} \|\mathbf{x}(k)\|_1 + N^{-1/2} \eta^{-N} \|\mathbf{x}(k)\|_1 c_0 \rho^{k-1} + \sqrt{N} \eta^{-N} \|\mathbf{x}(k)\|_1 \\
& \leq c_2 \|\mathbf{x}(k)\|_1 + c_3 \|\mathbf{x}(k)\|_1 \rho^k,
\end{aligned}$$

where  $c_2 = 2\sqrt{N}\eta^{-N} - (N-1)/\sqrt{N}$  and  $c_3 = N^{-1/2}\eta^{-N}c_0\rho^{-1}$ .

Combining Cases I and II and defining

$$c \triangleq \max \left\{ c_1, (c_2 + c_3) \|\mathbf{x}(0)\|_1, (c_2 \rho^{-1} + c_3) \|\mathbf{x}(1)\|_1, \dots, (c_2 \rho^{-K-1} + c_3) \|\mathbf{x}(K+1)\|_1 \right\}, \quad (45)$$

one derives, for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$\|\mathbf{z}(k) - \bar{x}^k \mathbf{1}\| \leq c \rho^k,$$

which is the desired result.  $\square$